

Amendment C208 - Lancefield Road PSP 75

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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
1	Andrew Bowyer (Sunbury Resident)					
LR1	AB1	Queries why the train station is on the northern boundary. Suggests that Raes Road seems like a more logical location due to greater walking catchment, closer to the planned road across creek, still close to planned schools, and generally flat terrain.	There are a number of additional considerations that informed the location of the train station, including planning undertaken by PTV (operational considerations such as line speed/distance from curves etc.), relative centrality to the broader catchment (including capacity to serve development within the future Sunbury North PSP, to the north of the Lancefield Road precinct, and relationship to planned grade separated road crossings of the rail line. We'll need to consider all of these factors in addition to those you've pointed out when we adopt our ultimate position on the preferred train station location.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR1b	AB(b)1	Cars from the new area will high speed short-cut through Rolling Meadows as a short-cut to Sunbury (it is shorter than Lancefield Road).	There may be some drivers who will utilise this route, however it is more likely that drivers will exit directly onto Lancefield Road. The road network to access the town centre via Rolling Meadows is less direct than utilising Lancefield Road for these residents. In the longer term, the northern link to the town centre may result in existing Rolling Meadows residents utilising this approach into the town centre. The link will provide for the residents of Rolling Meadows to directly access the local convenience centre within the Balbethan Drive area.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR1b	AB(b)2	2) The Skyline and Curtis Ave (in particular) and other roads on the North side of Rolling meadows are not designed to take volumes of through traffic (e.g. shoulders must be used when vehicles pass).	It is not anticipated that the plan will significantly increase the volume of traffic on these roads as drivers tend to drive to local conditions through residential areas. The existing street conditions will act as a deterrent to this type of movement, and this can be supported by localised design treatments.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR1b	AB(b)3	There are many walkers in the area - and no footpaths apart from the Skyline and Rolling Meadow Dve. Has correspondence from Council stating that the design of the estate means footpaths cannot be created.	The PSP is not able to address the local conditions of existing residential areas within the Sunbury township.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR1b	AB(b)4	Notes that R61 was not in place when the Rolling Meadow estate was created.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR1b	AB(b)5	Proposes moving the train station approximately 500m south where the track straightens. This would: a) remove the 'wasted catchment' of the BCS area in the north. B) Improve access for Non Government School c) Leave access to the Government School unchanged d) Have minimal impact on the town centre e) Better service the working commuter (the majority) f) May reduce excavation for grade separated crossing.	The station location has been planned to be in a location central to the broader catchment, which includes the approximately 4,500 future households planned north of the Lancefield Road precinct in Sunbury North. In addition, the station has been co-located with a planned grade separated road crossing of the rail line, to provide appropriate station access. The existing level cross at Raes Road cannot be upgraded as an at grade crossing, and connectivity to the Jacksons Creek road crossing at this location would be problematic.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR1b	AB(b)6	Submits that the potential heritage site which would be affected by a move of the train station appears to be 'unremarkable' farm sheds.	The post-contact heritage report for the precinct identifies the site in question as having archaeological potential on the basis of evidence for previous structures to have existed there, and an assumption that the site has not been subject to the kind of significant ground disturbance that would have destroyed any sub-surface deposits. This needs to be further investigated prior to development of the land.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR1c	AB(c)1	The roundabout at the corner of Francis Boulevard and Sunbury Road is already unable to cope with Peak AM traffic toward Sunbury. There can be no further road connections north of Rolling Meadows while this intersection remains in the current low capacity configuration.	The Urban Growth Zone Schedule exhibited alongside the PSP requires that an application for subdivision is accompanied by a Precinct Infrastructure Plan which must address "the provision, staging and timing of road works internal and external to the land consistent with any relevant traffic report or assessment". It is considered that the individual local traffic impacts associated with particular subdivision applications are most appropriately considered at the subdivision stage, in response to this requirement.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
2	Christopher O'Neill (Sunbury Resident)					
LR2	CO1	Object based on no improvements to current road infrastructure to support growth, including: a) Calder Freeway b) Bulla Bypass c) Widening of Vineyard Road to support additional traffic d) Widening of Reservoir Road to support additional traffic e) No removal of level crossing in CBD area.	A range of key transport infrastructure priorities have been identified to ease existing pressure on the Sunbury CBD. These include two additional road crossings of the Jacksons Creek, as well as three additional grade separated rail crossings, In particular, the southern Jacksons Creek Crossing has been identified as a key priority for early delivery. 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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR2	CO2	No improvements to current health infrastructure including emergency room 24 hour service.	The PSP has nominated a site adjacent to the Yellow Gum Local Town Centre for a potential future hospital or TAFE use, however planning legislation does not allow charges for larger services such as hospitals and emergency services to be charged through the planning scheme.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR2	CO3	Concerned about car parking capacity in the Sunbury CBD.	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
LR2	CO4	<p>Concerned that no timing for building or funding set aside for schools and the PSP is merely 'meeting planning guidelines, to be changed at a later date'.</p> <p>Notes that the document suggests that land set aside for schools may be used for other purposes, indicating that the schools are likely to never be built.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>R39 of the PSP does identify that where the responsible authority is satisfied that land shown as a school site is unlikely to be used as a school at ultimate development of the PSP that the site may be used for an alternative purpose. In order for the responsible authority to be satisfied of this, they would require the agreement of the Department of Education. It is unlikely that any of these sites will be deemed to be not required for a school, however given the long-term nature of the document, this requirement allows for flexibility in responding to any unanticipated changes to either education delivery (i.e. larger schools) or major land use changes (i.e. a lower density of residential development, or major land use changes following a 5-yearly PSP review).</p>	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR2	CO5	Objects to the planned growth. Believes infrastructure delivery will lag based on other growth area scenarios.	Sunbury has been earmarked for growth in a number of different plans since the 1960s. The PSPs respond to a number of more high level plans including the Sunbury Hume Integrated Growth Area Plan and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan. The two PSPs which are currently being exhibited for Sunbury are accompanied by the Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy, which provides a level of detail in relation to the staging of infrastructure that is not usually provided with PSPs. This is in large part to ensure that critical infrastructure responds to development in a timely manner. In addition, an Infrastructure Charges Plan will be applied to these two growth area precincts. The payment of charges associated with this is tied to development, guaranteeing income for infrastructure is tied to development	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR2	CO6	Submits that the plan overall only takes the developers into account, and has not taken any respect for the residents of Sunbury, the impacts on them, or the needs of current residents.	<p>The plan responds to, and is intended to enhance, the existing township of Sunbury. The ultimate delivery of the precincts will result in many improvements to the local transport and activity centre networks, and will provide many benefits to existing residents including access to new recreation facilities, an extensive path network, access to two new train stations, and more local jobs. The precincts will provide for substantial new infrastructure to support the growth, and the VPA has consistently considered the existing township and residents during the creation of the plans.</p> <p>The plans demonstrate a high degree of consistency with the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan and the Sunbury Hume Integrated Growth Area Plan, both of which were prepared with high levels of community engagement.</p> <p>The VPA does not agree that the plan only takes developers into account.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
3	Michael Mazur					
LR3	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
4	Simon Hibbert (Rolling Meadows Resident)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR4	SH1	Concerned that the Bulla Rd bypass is not budgeted for or in planning, considers the approach to 'build the new area and the Government will be forced to do the Bypass' is inadequate.	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
LR4	SH2	Concerned the expected 22,000 homes in the area will place much stress and congestion on Lancefield Road.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR4	SH3	The submitter lives on Rolling Meadows Drive and did not see any mention of the provisions for traffic flow and management in these existing areas. Concerned about amenity impacts if the road becomes a major thoroughfare for the new area.	There may be some drivers who will utilise this route, however it is more likely that drivers will exit directly onto Lancefield Road. The road network to access the town centre via Rolling Meadows is less direct than utilising Lancefield Road for these residents. In the longer term, the northern link to the town centre may result in existing Rolling Meadows residents utilising this approach into the town centre. The link will provide for the residents of Rolling Meadows to directly access the local convenience centre within the Balbethan Drive area. It is not anticipated that the plan will significantly increase the volume of traffic on these roads as drivers tend to drive to local conditions through residential areas. The existing street conditions will act as a deterrent to this type of movement, and this can be supported by localised design treatments.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR4	SH4	In general, understands and supports the growth of the area, but consideration must be given to the rural and quiet aspect of the areas being flagged for development.	Noted. The VPA has sought to complement the existing adjacent communities and minimise impacts insofar as practical. This area has been earmarked for growth by successive governments, with bipartisan support. The PSPs demonstrate a high degree of consistency with both the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan and the Sunbury Hume Integrated Growth Plan, both of which were prepared with extensive engagement with the existing community. The PSPs seek outcomes which respect the natural landscape features, particularly the creek corridors, escarpments and hilltops, and seek to maintain view lines to rural aspects to maintain visual links with the existing natural environment.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
5	John Tartaglia (Sunbury Resident)					
LR5	JT1	Concerned about the increase in traffic flow in Racecourse Road as a result of the extra 407 residential lots in P18854. There is no planned infrastructural upgrades to Racecourse Road and Elizabeth Drive or their intersections with Riddell Road. Existing traffic flows out of both Racecourse Road and Elizabeth Drive into Riddell Road is already congested during peak hours.	<p>The subdivision application for P18854 includes traffic modelling undertaken by Cardno, which indicates that the development is anticipated to generate in the order of 3,541 daily vehicle movements and 407 peak hour vehicle movements and is expected to be comfortably accommodated by the proposed internal road network and the surrounding road network.</p> <p>This is consistent with the findings of the Victorian Planning Authority's traffic modelling (prepared by GTA Consultants), and as such, the Victorian Planning Authority is satisfied that the road network in this area will be able to accommodate the development envisaged in both the broader Precinct and the Sherwood Heights Development.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR5	JT2	<p>Concerned about the accuracy of the traffic modelling in relation to Racecourse Road.</p> <p>The argument that additional traffic can also route via the Elizabeth Drive extension is a poor one because:</p> <p>a) Elizabeth Drive also suffers from heavy traffic during peak hours; and</p> <p>b) The new Sunbury Fields Estate is going to also add about 350 residential lots that also have to use both Elizabeth Drive and Racecourse Road.</p> <p>There has been no instrumental upgrades to Racecourse Road and Elizabeth Drive, or their intersections with Riddell Road, to compensate for the additional traffic that is very soon to be generated by the Sunbury Fields Estate.</p>	See response to JT1	No	No action	Unresolved
LR5	JT3	When the proposed north-east road and bridge from P18854 is completed there will be more traffic from the Lancefield Road subdivisions that find a route into central Sunbury via Racecourse Road more appealing than south via Lancefield Road.	See response to JT1	No	No action	Unresolved
LR5	JT4	Concerned that there are already serious problems with available parking spaces in the main shopping area in Sunbury, and asks whether the PSPs are providing financial assistance to the Hume Council to increase parking spaces in the main shopping centres in Sunbury.	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
6	John McKerrow (Sunbury Resident)					
LR6	JM1	Concerned about Balbethan Drive no longer being able to provide access from Sunbury to the rapidly growing Lancefield Road precinct and possibly a link to Craigieburn.	<p>The PSP does provide for access from the Lancefield Road precinct to Sunbury via Balbethan Drive and the proposed northern crossing of the Jacksons Creek.</p> <p>In relation to the possible link to Craigieburn, the GTA transport modelling shows not required, however there would possibly an opportunity to deliver in the ultimate stages (GCP).</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR6	JM2	Notes Plan 10 which can be inaugurated with Balbethan Drive in the future.	The infrastructure projects identified on Plan 10 (including the Jacksons Creek Crossing) will be delivered through the life of the PSP, parallel with development. Whilst the alignment shown is different to the previously applied Public Acquisition Overlay, the proposed road will deliver the same outcome in terms of linkages back to the township of Sunbury.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR6	JM3	Draws to the VPA's attention the possible sale of land, fronting Racecourse Road by Salesian College as Expressions of Interest have been advertised by the College. The College land provides Hume's PAO2 link from Racecourse Road to Lancefield Road via Balbethan Drive.	The VPA is aware of the sale of the Salesian land. The PAO2 is proposed to be removed through Planning Scheme Amendment C208 as the PSP will provide for the delivery of this road, albeit in a slightly different alignment to the existing PAO. During the preparation of the PSPs, the VPA commissioned GTA to undertake an assessment of the different crossing opportunities of the Jacksons Creek, and they assessed a number of alignments against performance criteria. The alignment shown in the PSP is the preferred alignment based on this assessment, although a portion of the alignment is still under review, as identified on Plan 10 and the Future Urban Structure. This will be resolved through the exhibition process.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR6	JM4	Hume allowed the sale of Balbethan Drive some years ago due to its lack of knowledge of Sunbury's future needs. The VPA is urged to investigate the current situation and ensure the creation of this vital second crossing of Jacksons Creek. The existing crossing in the township will be insufficient for future needs.	The PSP has noted and responded to the future transport needs of Sunbury through the inclusion of a second crossing of Jacksons Creek.	No	No action	Resolved
LR6	JM5	Inspection shows there is sufficient land available for acquisition north of the existing 12m wide walkway to ensure a properly designed connection can be achieved.	The PSP seeks to deliver a crossing on an alternative alignment.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
7	Heritage Victoria					
LR7	HV1	Plan 2 Precinct features is not entirely consistent with the mapping of the heritage sites and possible heritage sites in the Heritage Overlays.	These will be comprehensively reviewed to ensure that they are accurate.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR7	HV2	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 C208 occurs but if this is not possible, then soon after.	Hume City Council have currently commissioned a study to investigate the location and extent of existing heritage overlays. It is anticipated that this work will be completed in time to inform the final version of the PSP. 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	No action	Resolved
LR7	HV3	Please note two of the heritage sites are on the Victorian Heritage Register and are subject to the provisions of the Heritage Act (HO45/HO275 Rupertswood, 3-5 Macedon St; and HO61 Rail Bridge over Jacksons Creek 350m north of Rupertswood).	Noted. The VPA consider that these sites are appropriately protected through the existing provisions in the PSP and the Heritage Overlay.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR7	HV4	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	No action	Resolved
LR7	HV5	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	No action	Resolved
8	Tuula Davis (Sunbury Resident)					
LR8	TD1	Object to residential zoning to existing farm and hobby farm land due to congestion and land stress to existing road. Also very slow travel time from Sunbury to Bulla due to the road being single lane.	<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
LR8	TD2	There have been no environmental checks in regards to native animals or vineyards.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Corridors (Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning) 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
9	David Kemp (Sunbury Resident)					
LR9	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR9	DK2	The proposal has an unacceptable impact on a vital transport corridor of regional Victoria, i.e. Lancefield Road and Sunbury Road.	Public transport will continue to be a mode of transportation that individuals in regional Victoria will choose to use in order to access metropolitan Melbourne (and vice versa) as the north east of Victoria is already served by rail and shuttle. Both Sunbury Road and Lancefield Road are designated to become 6 lane divided arterial roads. 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 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.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR9	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	No action	Unresolved
LR9	DK7	Unchecked urban sprawl places an automatic requirement for all residents to own and operated 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	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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	No action	Unresolved
LR9	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
LR9	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.	The ICP is projected to cover the majority of cost associated with new local infrastructure required to support new communities.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR9	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
10	Darren Bartley					
LR10	DB1	Objects to the future development of Cannon Gully due to its historic significance.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR10	DB2	Opposes the amount of infrastructure, notes that at peak times traffic congestion is 'bumper to bumper' in and around the shops.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR10	DB3	Does not think that two extra train stop will suffice as more trains would be needed to ferry extra people to and from.	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
LR10	DB4	Notes that the roads are limited in all directions, including the single bridge in Bulla. Concerned for emergency situations should an evacuation of the township be required.	<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
11	Billy Mifsud (Sunbury Resident)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR11	BM1	Objects to the permit application P18854, which the submitter considers will see Cannon Gully carved up into approximately 400 lots, with a proposed connecting road and bridge to pass right through conservation land.	<p>The VPA has revised the development area on the Racecourse Road site (west of Jacksons Creek) to provide for greater setbacks to the creek corridor and Emu Bottom wetlands. The VPA has also developed new controls for this area which will provide additional guidance for development in this area to ensure positive design outcomes.</p> <p>The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay.</p>	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR11	BM2	There is considerable Aboriginal significance documented, with the Sunbury Rings being only 8 of which exist in Victoria (with 3 in Sunbury).	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, which will ensure that any known or discovered sites are appropriately respected.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR11	BM3	The valley is one of the very few remaining natural habitats in Victoria for the platypus and swift parrot which are present in the immediate area of the proposed development along Jacksons Creek. Considers that the platypus would be adversely affected by street and house lighting.	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
LR11	BM4	Many kangaroos use the proposed subdivision site as a corridor (grazing there almost daily), not to mention the rare native vegetation.	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
12	(Susan) Christine Davies and Brian Woodford (Sunbury Residents)					
LR12	CDBW1	When the submitter purchased their property, the area was surrounded by the Green zone that was to protect it from future development. Concerned that the plans allow for high density housing in an area of great historical and environmental significance.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR12	CDBW2	The Indigenous ring located into the area must be respected and protected as sacred land that belongs to the First People of the area. The ring is extremely rare being one of only eight in Victoria.	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, which will ensure that any known or discovered sites are appropriately respected	No	No action	Unresolved
LR12	CDBW3	The land and creek are home to rare and endangered flora and fauna (including platypus and wedge tailed eagles) that will be impacted by habitat destruction.	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 platypus habitat, within the two precincts, from urban development.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR12	CDBW4	The land is extremely historical in other ways and is intimately entwined with the history of Sunbury and its founding fathers including George Evans and Big Red Clarke. This land has too much history to wipe out indiscriminately.	Refer to response CDBW1 above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR12	CDBW5	Development on these ridge lines has the potential to devalue property prices due to impact on views. It also contravenes Council's own requirement that houses cannot be built on hills in order to protect sky views.	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
13	Melton City Council					
LR13	MCC1	Have reviewed the PSPS and have no comments to make.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
14	Sunbury Residents Association					
LR14	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	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR14	SRA2	States that this is a 'place-holding' submission with a more detailed submission to follow.	N/A	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR14B	SRA3	Submit that the Racecourse Road rezoning is inappropriate, and the RCZ zoning should be retained on this land for environmental and historical reasons.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
15	Scott Spargo (Sunbury Resident)					
LR15	SS1	Supports the two PSPs.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR15	SS2	Congratulates the VPA for their commitment to preparing a (well overdue) 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
LR15	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
LR15	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. This is based on daily observation and use of Sunbury's road network.	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
16	Colin McKinnon (Adjacent Landowner)					
LR16	CM1	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
LR16	CM2	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
LR16	CM3	With so many new houses and no parking for rail and services 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
LR16	CM4	Hume Council has been given millions of dollars for the third rail crossing but has sat on its hands and cannot be relied upon.	Infrastructure in the precinct will primarily by funded through an Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP). ICPs are a transparent mechanism for funding new infrastructure. 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.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR16	CM5	Racecourse Road will be blocked at the High School unless an underpass is built in Riddell Road.	The subdivision application for P18854 includes traffic modelling undertaken by Cardno, which indicates that the development is anticipated to generate in the order of 3,541 daily vehicle movements and 407 peak hour vehicle movements and is expected to be comfortably accommodated by the proposed internal road network and the surrounding road network. This is consistent with the findings of the Victorian Planning	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR16	CM6	Stage 7 plus (assume reference is to P18854 application) is to be built on a Flood area.	The site is located within Melbourne Water's Devon Park Development Services Scheme (DSS). The Devon Park DSS provides a masterplan for future drainage and stormwater treatment of the catchment. The exhibited 96A subdivision layout does not meet the intent or conceptual layout of the Devon Park DSS. This has been communicated to the applicant in writing on 10th February, 2017. The VPA has requested that the applicant provide revised plans which address this issue.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
17	Sunbury Resident - Details Redacted.					
LR17	EB1	Background Report - Page 4 - Bullet Point 5 - Environment and Water must be particularly protected.	The PSP's include numerous Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines which will ensure the protection of the environment and water.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB2	Background Report - Section 2.3 - States that Sunbury HIGAP had extensive community input, however the submitter does not believe this to be the case after speaking with the local heritage group, both sides of major political parties, residents and other interested parties.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB3	Background Report - Section 3 - Queries how the views on Redstone Hill to Jacksons Creek be protected, and whether these will be documented and photographed for future evidence if not abided to.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB4	Background Report - 3.1.2 - Queries how will the visual scarring from earthworks be reduced.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
	EB5	Background Report - 3.1.2 - Queries how waterways will be protected from run off.	The Development Services Scheme (DSS) provides a masterplan for the future drainage of the catchment(s). The DSS was informed by a number of waterway geomorphic, hydrological and hydraulic 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.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB6	Background Report - 3.1.3 - Queries how many residential concept plans have been developed to protect and retain the qualities of this environment.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
	EB7	Background Report - 3.1.3 - The topography, geology and waterways that the VPA quote as being able to support development of a plateau by the creek would be environmental vandalism for the creatures reliant on fresh water and natural habitat.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR17	EB8	Background Report - 3.1.3 - Submitters research has found that the hills around the satellite town of Sunbury in the 60s were to be protected, however this has not occurred. Notes the presence of native fauna found in the VPA studies.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB9	Background Report - 3.1.4 - Queries how the proposed bridges will be put into place without destruction of aboriginal relics and waterways. Notes that there are plans for ongoing consultation with the Wurundjeri which the submitter would like to be advised of.	A detailed Cultural Heritage Management Plan will be prepared following the detailed design of the bridge.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB10	Queries who will make sure that the culturally sensitive land and gullies are protected from the proposed development and then from vandalism once this special place is opened up for housing.	The conservation areas and Waterways within the PSP will be vested in a public land manager. The land will be managed by a number of agencies including Melbourne Water, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (Parks Victoria) and Hume City Council.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB12	The Cannon Gully Sunbury Volunteer Military Exercise Site (VHI H7822-2291) should never be impacted on and must remain as open space, protected from any form of further man made vandalism. Does not believe that there would be any sensitive design that could protect this listed place of significance.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay to Canon Gully.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB13	Background Report - 3.1.7 - The report states that 170, 280 and 295 Lancefield Road have potential contamination risk and 670 and 675 Sunbury Road have high contamination risks. These areas with ground pollution should be left undisturbed. Queries where this contaminated material would be rehoused to.	It is not unusual for former agricultural areas to be impacted by land contamination and the controls included within the Urban Growth Zone schedule will ensure that the land is remediated safely. It is not considered necessary to leave the land undisturbed, as long as the requirements of the zone are complied with.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB14	Background Report - 3.1.8 - The Goonawarra Estate contains damage and destruction, including few mature trees, rubbish on road reserves, untidy properties, graffiti and vandalism. Queries whether these new proposed estates would be any different.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB15	Background Report - 3.1.8 - The small pockets of open space do not allow for human passive activities, and there is only one football oval denuded of trees, no pools or other activity centres. Notes that it is mentioned that these would be allocated in the new proposed plans, but with thousands coming into the area, most would not be catered for.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB16	Background Report - 3.1.8 - The recycled water plant, quarry and land fill are not unavailable to the general public with access to the waterways would continue to be another pollutant to the waterways and valleys and the VPA will continue the use of both these sites with the intention of Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan, with more housing and high level industrial business.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR17	EB17	The town centre proposals are unsuitable for people who don't have a vehicle. With the movement of doctors and specialists from Sunbury to service the new areas, unless you have a vehicle is not within the means of the elderly or disabled.	The town centres concept plans have been designed with accessibility in front of mind, and will be accessible by bus, and in the case of the Yellow Gum and Harpers Creek Local Town Centre, by train. Further accessibility requirements will be considered by the Council when considering a planning permit application for the town centres.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB18	The planned centres would impact on the struggling community with roads already packed to capacity, employment would be minimal after the main development takes place, and further ugly industrial buildings will be left empty and used for inappropriate storage and use.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB19	The VPA has included schools, but excluded facilities for the elderly.	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB20	The plans should accommodate land for a cemetery.	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB21	Refutes that the unique semi rural and natural setting of the town will be preserved. The Redstone Hill Town Centre (Sunbury South) will only add to the need for more car parking facilities, which will result in the removal of natural habitat and open space. The Yellow Gum and Harpers Creek Town Centres will have detrimental effects on the flora and fauna that reside in these protected areas.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB22	There is no mention of police stations to keep law in order.	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	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB23	Requests that fast food chains not be part of the proposals as they breed trouble, pollution and vandalism.	The VPA does not consider it appropriate to 'lock out' a land use of this nature from the Precinct. Fast Food chains are a part of many town centres and service stations, and may be appropriate in certain locations within the precincts.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB24	Background Report - Section 4.2 - Queries the use of '.8 of a person' in relation to people per dwelling and 1.6 centres per 10,000 children.	Point of clarification only. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB25	Notes the lack of civic centres, regional parks, TAFEs or University, no law courts and only mention of one additional ambulance station. Requires more early learning child care and local day hospitals.	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. The Jacksons Creek Corridor is proposed to be a Regional Park, and the parks at the north of the Lancefield Road Precinct, as well as the Redstone Hill hilltop park will serve regional functions. Land has been set aside for a hospital / TAFE within the Lancefield Road PSP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB26	Background Report - Section 4.3 - Sports reserves and small linear parks would not be sufficient for the amount of people coming to live in this new proposed development. There is a major need for a large natural regional park protecting the existing vegetation and historic areas.	The preservation and enhancement of the Jacksons and Emu creek corridors is expected to fulfil this regional function.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR17	EB27	States that sewerage infrastructure and bushfire management are not addressed.	<p>Sewerage infrastructure has been considered in the preparation of the PSPs, with consultation with Western Water occurring throughout the development of the plans.</p> <p>The Victorian Planning Authority has engaged with the CFA and other emergency services in the preparation of the Precinct Structure Plans, and has also recently had an additional bushfire study undertaken to inform the plans. It is anticipated that the increased connectivity created through additional grade-separated railway crossings and creek crossings will assist with movement flows and emergency service access.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB28	States that the Friends' of the Maribyrnong Valley have not been advised of the development, and will be unable to meet the closing date for submissions.	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
LR17	EB29	Does not agree that the new proposed neighbourhood will be sensitively managed with the striking twin creek corridors and associated valleys as access will be allowed to the once protected creeks and waterways.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB30	The man made street lighting will destroy the way of life of the platypus.	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 platypus habitat, within the two precincts, from urban development.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB31	There will be recreational trails for off road unregistered motorbikes which will cause destruction.	This is not a matter that can be addressed through the amendment.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB32	Submits that kangaroos will be pushed further into built up areas and killed on roads.	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR17	EB33	Queries where the fresh drinking water for the new residents coming from.	The VPA has consulted with all relevant servicing authorities, and is satisfied that the precincts will be appropriately serviced.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR17	EB34	The new residents will complain about being under the flight path and circuits.	<p>Plan 5 of the PSP is being amended to show the Melbourne Airport Night Contour affected area.</p> <p>A Permit Condition will be added into the Urban Growth Zone schedule which will state:</p> <p>"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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An acknowledgement that the land is in an area affected by aircraft noise, including aircraft noise at night." 	No	No action	Unresolved
18	David White (Sunbury resident)					
LR18	DW1	The area currently included on the Heritage Overlay HO366 should be retained as open space in order to protect the distinctive landscape features which contributed to its use. As a result, this area would be bypassed by the construction of a crossing in the area shown. In the event that the route deviates to impact upon the HO area, the further works (i.e. more detailed survey of the construction footprint in advance of any construction work, and identification of any necessary mitigation measures) should be expanded in recognition of the place's local significance in discussion with the HCC and HV.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay to Canon Gully.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR18	DW2	The proposal appears to ignore the history of the area that is identified in relevant HCC, HV and VPA documents, and allowing the developer to place houses on the original battle site and a bridge across the valley destroying the zigzag track in the process.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay to Canon Gully.	No	No action	Unresolved
19	Neil and Robyn Isles (adjacent landowners)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR19	NRI1	There will be a significant loss of cultural landscape of significant community and wider value as well as significant loss of amenity to the area will occur as a result of the planned development of the area currently zoned RCZ1 bounded by Racecourse Road and Jacksons Creek. Only a relatively narrow corridor defined by Jacksons Creek and the most of the land subject to inundation will remain.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR19	NRI2	Requests that the VPA do not proceed with the rezoning of this area and subsequent development maintaining the current RCZ1 and ESO10. Instead preserve the amenity and cultural landscape as suggested in the Post Contact Heritage assessment.	Please refer to NRI1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR19	NRI3	Requests a significant reduction in the area subject to rezoning and reduce the extent of development to protect amenity of the area and the cultural landscape (suggestion provided in Figure 7 within submission).	Please refer to NRI1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR19	NRI4	Request providing wider buffer zones along the Racecourse Road alignment - using landscaping and possibly earth mounds - to retain some of the amenity of residents immediately north of 275 Racecourse Rd (3 Emu Road) through to the northern limit of the development.	Please refer to NRI1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR19	NRI5	Submits that significant threat to biodiversity in the area in question will occur as a result of the significant reduction in RCZ1 and the ESO10 and subsequent development and construction of Jacksons Creek road crossing. Stated "refinements" to BCS areas 20 and 21 will likewise threaten biodiversity. No ecological study of the impact of development of this area has been completed apart from the studies associate with road development.	The RCZ1 and ESO10 were applied broadly as part of Amendment VC68, with the intention that these areas would be refined at the precinct structure planning stage. The adjustments to the BCS areas have to meet DELWP's stringent criteria, and are supported by an analysis of flora. 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, within the two precincts, from urban development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR19	NRI6	Request (in order of preference): 1. Prior to any amendments to the Hume Planning Scheme, require completion of an ecological assessment of the impact of the developments within the PSP. 2. In addition to recommendation 1.1, restore the area as appropriate to expand habitat and increase biodiversity. 3. Significantly reduce the area subject to rezoning and reduce the extent of development to protect biodiversity and provide a real, undeveloped significant buffer zone abutting the conservation zones. (refer Figure 7 of submission for suggested change to development scope).	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. The VPA has proposed to reduce the footprint of the Racecourse Road area. Please refer to the Part A report for further details.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR19	NRI7	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.	Melbourne Water is the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority. The Development Services Schemes (DSS) provide a masterplan for management of stormwater within the catchment. Under the DSS, stormwater must be treated to 'Best Practice' (R75 pg. 43) and alternative water will be further explored through the regional harvesting scheme (R77). The full list of Integrated Water Management Requirements and Guidelines can be found in Section 3.5, commencing pg. 43. Melbourne Water would welcome the opportunity to discuss concerns with the submitter.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR19	NRI8	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.	A Development Services Scheme is a masterplan for future management of stormwater within the catchment. The DSS has been informed by background reports on geomorphology, hydrology and hydraulics from reputable, qualified, independent third parties such as Alluvium and Engeny. Landowners within the catchment area have been/ will be consulted through the DSS process.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR19	NRI9	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
LR19	NRI10	Submits that the proposed "Northern Link" that forms part of the Orbital Route around Sunbury appears to offer marginal traffic benefits and the greater cost to the cultural landscape, biodiversity and the community that has not been fully assessed in the information provided. Further, the funding of this road appears to be dependent on the development of the land east of Racecourse Road and between Jacksons Creek which is of significant concern.	<p>Please refer to Part A report for strategic need for the Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge.</p> <p>The design of the Northern Crossing of Jacksons Creek will need to respond to many environmental and landscape constraints. The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning and Melbourne Water have provided in-principle support for a creek-crossing generally in accordance with the alignment shown in the PSP, however the detailed design of the bridge will need to mitigate potential impacts on the environment and waterways, including the potential impact on fauna.</p> <p>The construction of this bridge will be funded through the Infrastructure Contributions Plan, and is not reliant on the development of the Racecourse Road site.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
LR19	NRI11	Requests that, as suggested in the Creek Crossing Options Report, complete a robust, transparent cost-benefit analysis of the northern (and possible southern) creek crossing cognisant of a wide range of inputs prior to any planning amendments and subsequent development.	Please refer to Part A report for strategic need for the Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR19	NRI12	Submits that the main road transport issue - getting out of Sunbury and heading to Melbourne - is not well addressed in the PSP.	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	No action	Unresolved
LR19	NRI13	Requests that the staging of development and implementation of the PSP should be more closely linked to the delivery of road infrastructure. That is development should be restricted to coincide with infrastructure delivery to minimise road "gridlock".	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
LR19	NRI14	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 an aspiration to deliver one new job per household within greater 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
LR19	NRI15	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
20	Doug Manning					
LR20	DM1	Car parking needs to be increased at Sunbury Station. This could be achieved by creating multi-level parking at the Sunbury Square with a link walkway to the station facilities, and this could also enable better traffic flow in the square by separating foot traffic from the Sunbury Square entry. Car parking in the Sunbury town centre and at key tourist spots should also be improved. As a minimum, any decision to change the planning overlay of the greater Sunbury area needs to be directly linked and dependent on a large scale parking expansion in the existing Sunbury town centre.	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR20	DM3	The amendment should further protect all significant sites, flora and fauna that currently exist within the areas targeted for rezoning. Heritage needs to be protected from development at all costs.	The Precincts themselves are not considered 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. Infrastructure items have been sited to avoid impacting on areas of heritage significance..	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR20	DM4	Does not consider the GTA report to be sufficient to base decisions for rezoning and expanding Sunbury to such an extreme level, as it was based on 2011 data with some tube counts performed in 2015 that were not accurate due to vandalism. Also the surveys were performed when a large percentage of people were still on holidays.	Sunbury has been earmarked for growth in a number of different plans since the 1960s. The PSPs respond to a number of more high level plans including the Sunbury Hume Integrated Growth Area Plan and the Sunbury / Diggers Rest Growth Corridor Plan. GTA provided specialist advice around the basis to appropriately calibrate their traffic model	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR20	DM5	As a minimum, any decision to change the planning overlay of the greater Sunbury area needs be directly linked and dependent on a large scale road projects that need to start before the overlay changes are approved. The VPA need to make VicRoads and the state Government accountable to improve the daily commuter journey before any rezoning is approved.	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	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR20	DM6	Submits that the town centre and primary shopping centre do not have any capacity to cater for increased capacity.	As per response to DM1 above.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR20	DM7	The intersection at Gap Road and Horne Street often has queues approaching 80m long. Adding more general traffic from any subdivision will only increase queues and delays.	As per response to DM1 above.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR20	DM8	The VPA needs to make PTV and the state Government accountable to bring forward new station construction, level crossing removal and a third crossing before any rezoning is approved.	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
LR20	DM9	Emu Bottom residents will only have a single path in and out of the area which is dangerous during bushfires. Submits that a better proposal would be to extend Racecourse Road through to Settlement Road.	The Victorian Planning Authority has engaged with the CFA and other emergency services in the preparation of the Precinct Structure Plans, and has also recently had an additional bushfire study undertaken to inform the plans. It is anticipated that the increased connectivity created through additional grade-separated railway crossings and creek crossings will assist with movement flows and emergency service access.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
21	Stephen Bock (Sunbury Resident)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR21	SB1	Submits that the existing water infrastructure is fragile and inadequate and requires urgent upgrades to meet the demands of the current population, and there is also a risk on extreme danger days of a system reliant on electricity and pumps. Concerned about the cost of an increase in capacity to the water supply. Also concerned about the reliability of Rosslyn as a water source with the increased population.	Western Water has had ongoing involvement throughout the preparation of the PSP and are comfortable that this area can be serviced. Western Water and Melbourne Water are looking at a range of integrated water management strategies for the area.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB2	Suggests that Melbourne should concentrate growth in the south-east as this is where the main source of power and water is, in the Latrobe Valley.	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 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	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB3	The roads in and around Sunbury are not coping with the current population. Bulla bypass is required now to deal with the volume and type of traffic it carries.	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	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB4	A second crossing of the railway line in Sunbury is overdue. The people and businesses in the south east of Sunbury are put at risk if the traffic on Gap Rod is blocked at the crossing and emergency services can't get through.	Noted. The PSPs make provision for additional crossings of the railway lines which will assist in easing this congestion and risk.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB5	Notes that coinciding with the announcement of these PSPs, there were further infrastructure promises which do not have funding approval.	Infrastructure in the precinct will primarily be funded through an Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP). ICPs are a transparent mechanism for funding new infrastructure. 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.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR21	SB6	Sunbury needs a 24hr hospital to service the current population.	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
LR21	SB7	Notes the cultural significance of the region, including the five earth rings. States that we cannot continue to develop Sunbury without losing culturally significant areas like this forever. This is not just a loss for the community of Sunbury but the whole of society and future generations.	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
LR21	SB8	Notes that the area contains important Grasslands of the volcanic plains, which is Critically Endangered under the Federal EPBC Act, and is listed under the State Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act 1988. It is home to 68 threatened animal species and 26 threatened plant species.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will also 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.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB9	Increased and poor urban drainage will cause stresses on animals such as platypus as no matter how good the drainage system is, it will not replicate current state for subterranean water table height and flow.	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 platypus habitat, within the two precincts, from urban development.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB10	These areas are not just important to protect the flora and fauna in these proposed sites, but also as wildlife corridors. Species will die out if they're simply isolated to small pockets or islands with little or no inter-connectivity.	Refer to response SB8 above.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR21	SB11	Need to retain the rural feel and aspects of Sunbury and nurture the growing sense of community, plus promote the health benefits of these open spaces for reduced stress.	The two PSPs are collectively providing for the protection of over 1300ha of land for open space, waterways and conservation areas.	No	No action	Unresolved
22	Michael Carter (adjacent landowner)					
LR22	MC1	Increased housing development will put a strain on the road and volumes of traffic along Lancefield Road.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC2	The expansion of Balbethan Drive and over the train line will increase traffic volumes and create bottle necks - including increased fire and emergency services access threat.	The Victorian Planning Authority has engaged with the CFA and other emergency services in the preparation of the Precinct Structure Plans, and has also recently had an additional bushfire study undertaken to inform the plans. It is anticipated that the increased connectivity created through additional grade-separated railway crossings and creek crossings will assist with movement flows and emergency service access.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC3	Proposed allowance of subdivision of existing properties on Balbethan Drive / Stockwell Drive (Balbethan Residential Concept Figure 1) will have a negative impact on existing housing in Rolling Meadows (Highgrove Drive) where properties of an acre or more were developed believing the existing long term larger scale properties of the Balbethan precinct added to the rural feel of the area. Impact on housing prices for larger land owners (1 acre plus) from Rolling Meadows and Balbethan precinct due to more traffic volume above the existing Rolling Meadows estate.	The land within the Balbethan Drive area has been included within the Urban Growth Zone for some time, and the VPA consider that it is appropriate for the PSPs to facilitate additional urban growth within this area. The concept plan for Balbethan Drive within the PSP will be updated to provide additional guidance around the need for larger lots in the area immediately abutting the Rolling Meadows area.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR22	MC4	Opposition to the local convenience centre at the corner of Balbethan drive increasing traffic volumes, noise and impacting on rural value of properties. Strong opposition to a direct petrol station on that immediate corner.	The local convenience centre at Balbethan Drive is to cater local convenience retail, health, community and other services. Whilst there will be some increase in local traffic, this is only expected to be of a local scale, with minimal impact on surrounding residential streets.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC5	Suggests supporting existing utilised primary school at Clarkefield rather than create several new ones.	The provision of new primary schools within the Precincts has been prepared with input from the Department of Education and Training who have identified that there will be a need for new primary schools within the precincts themselves. The proposed new population growth will not be able to be supported by the existing schools.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC7	Opposition to subdivision allowance contrary to covenants for land purchased in Rolling Meadows where no subdivision allowed and purchases made under existing conditions.	This covenant only applies to two properties within the Balbethan Drive area, and the land has subsequently be zoned to Urban Growth Zone. The VPA is of the view that to leave these covenants in place would lead to undesirable urban outcomes in the future landscape, and would also lead to unnecessarily onerous provisions on the existing landowners, who are paying higher rates and will be subject to GAIC and ICP payments for their land.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC8	Concerned about impact on public transport for commuters with limited bus services past Rolling Meadows, impact on vline with increased passenger flow from the growth pushed into Sunbury or up to Clarkefield (under strain from Romsey / Lancefield growth). The proposed Sunbury North station should be built for infrastructure before the housing growth to cater to the growth in stages.	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	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC9	Concerned about impact on traffic flow from increased volumes on Lancefield Road causing: 1) Increased traffic noise to residents of Rolling Meadows that back onto Lancefield Road. How are you planning to mitigate this? 2) Deterioration of existing roads 3) Increased difficulty accessing Lancefield Road from Rolling Meadows Drive and The Old Stock Run 4) Emu Creek town centre to have impact that the infrastructure cannot cope with. 5) Consideration of 80km/hr zones along Lancefield Road between Rolling Meadows Drive to Raes Road. 6) Often maintenance issues are deferred as a VicRoads issue but they "maintain" once to twice a year in terms of grass cutting and less on maintenance.	There may be some drivers who will utilise this route, however it is more likely that drivers will exit directly onto Lancefield Road. The road network to access the town centre via Rolling Meadows is less direct than utilising Lancefield Road for these residents. In the longer term, the northern link to the town centre may result in existing Rolling Meadows residents utilising this approach into the town centre. The link will provide for the residents of Rolling Meadows to directly access the local convenience centre within the Balbethan Drive area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR22	MC10	More consultation is needed with existing land owners along Lancefield Road, within Rolling Meadows and Balbethan Drive, Stockwell Drive, Raes Road.	The VPA has had ongoing engagement with the residents of Balbethan Drive. In relation to consultation with residents within Rolling Meadows, those that were expected to be impacted by the proposal were directly invited to an information evening in December 2016. The public 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. The VPA consider that the residents have had sufficient opportunity to engage in the process, and to contact the VPA directly if they have specific concerns which they wish to discuss.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC11	Requires better planning on infrastructure, with a timetable on infrastructure to support growth and be built out first.	The Precinct Infrastructure Plan (at Table 10 of the PSP) clearly sets out responsibilities for the delivery of infrastructure, and also nominates those projects to be funded by the ICP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR22	MC12	There must be accountability of land developers and housing estates to build and finish infrastructure.	The Infrastructure Contributions Plan will provide accountability for the delivery of infrastructure.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
23	Joe Rogowski (Sunbury Resident)					
LR23	JR1	Strongly object to the development of houses at this location (Racecourse Road).	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR23	JR2	Has concerns about the density and number of houses. These need to be dramatically reduced and contained within restricted boundaries, as per National Trust recommendations to save and protect the valley's landscape and history. The block sizes also need to be adjusted to allow for a gradual transition to the existing 1-hectare neighbouring properties.	Please refer to JR1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR23	JR3	This plan would damage the beautiful valleys and fauna which have so much historical significance, and as out laid by the National Trust of Australia report and Hume City Council Heritage Report (both attached to submission).	Please refer to JR1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR23	JR4	The negative impact this development is going to have on the area's beauty and history is also a concern.	Please refer to JR1 response above.	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR23	JR5	Concerned also about the increased volume of traffic that the proposed layout and number of houses will bring to the area, particularly Racecourse Road.	<p>The subdivision application for P18854 includes traffic modelling undertaken by Cardno, which indicates that the development is anticipated to generate in the order of 3,541 daily vehicle movements and 407 peak hour vehicle movements and is expected to be comfortably accommodated by the proposed internal road network and the surrounding road network.</p> <p>This is consistent with the findings of the Victorian Planning Authority's traffic modelling (prepared by GTA Consultants), and as such, the Victorian Planning Authority is satisfied that the road network in this area will be able to accommodate the development envisaged in both the broader Precinct and the Sherwood Heights Development.</p>	No	No action	Unresolved
24	Tony and Sue Quick					
LR24	TSQ1	Submit that the process for consideration of Application P18854 has been severely compromised, as a developer has an option on the land and undertaken significant planning and preparatory work on the area, at their own risk, so they can proceed with haste once approval is granted. This should not have any impact on the consideration of the merit of the proposal by the relevant authorities.	The assessment of the 96A application will be on a merits basis, and will not be influenced by the timing with the PSPs.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR24	TSQ2	Concerned that a disregard for process has applied to the detailed planning activities where it would appear that heritage overlays have been modified to accommodate the proposed development.	This is not the case. The only heritage overlay proposed for removal is within the Sunbury South precinct, and 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
LR24	TSQ3	The National Trust report identifies that "Several elements within the landscape are already included on the Victorian Heritage Register. What has not been acknowledged is the importance of the landscape as a whole and the relation that all of these elements have to Jacksons Creek and the geography of the valley." This relationship was protected under the current Rural Conservation Zone arrangements. The proposed rezoning, including both the P18854 permit application and the extension to Elizabeth drive destroys the impact of the landscape as a whole, even if it leaves the specific sites of the rings intact.	Objection noted. The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR24	TSQ4	Another visible example that the process was compromised is the advertising placed by Villawood on the site declaring that their development is "coming soon". Nowhere, is there any indication that this is subject to any planning approval. A consequence of this advertising is that many residents have formed the view that the planning changes have been made and any comment or objection would be a waste of time.	Noted. No change to the amendment requested. The VPA has not been involved in any advertising on site by Developers, and clearly included reference to the planning permit applications as forming part of the exhibited material as per the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.	No	No action	Unresolved
25	John Lego (Adjacent landowner)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR25	JL1	Object to the Subdivision Plan P18854 as it will greatly reduce the amenity of the residents of The Skyline and the hundreds of regular users of the adjacent walking path. What is now a rural view will become a sea of rooftops (picture provided).	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR25	JL2	In common with other proposed residential developments, unacceptable additional pressure would be placed on parking within the Sunbury shopping precinct as well as further increased traffic congestion during busy times.	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
26	E & M Gauntlett (Adjacent landowner)					
LR26	EMG1	No buildings should be erected to the west of the Melbourne-Bendigo railway line, and any further development behind the railway line (along The Skyline) should be set well back and limited in height so as not to be visible from the valley below. Preservation of the natural aspect of the top of the escarpment is crucial to the aesthetic integrity of the landscape and to the appreciation of the historical significance attested by the Hume Council Heritage Study of 1998 and the National Trust Classification Report of June 2015. Having school buildings or other structures poking up over the ridge will both drastically compromise the landscape and vitiate the historic character of this site of heritage importance.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR26	EMG2	The proposed extension of Elizabeth Drive is ill-conceived and would disfigure the landscape. Requires demonstration of the need for it and a cost-benefit analysis. All of the GTA options are problematic. It should be the subject of a further full round of community consultations when the VPA is able to describe and justify its alignment precisely.	Please refer to Part A report for strategic need for the Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge. Please note that the PSP includes a requirement (R64) that 'The Jacksons Creek road crossing must respond sensitively to landform, amenity and cultural and heritage values.' It is therefore a requirement that the impact on the landscape is an important consideration in the bridge design.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR26	EMG3	Efforts to boost the population of Sunbury even to 50,000 should be put on hold pending the completion — not just the planning and design — of the Bulla Bypass and substantial improvements to rail services.	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	No action	Unresolved
LR26	EMG4	The VPA should stipulate and then ensure that contracts with the developers involved in this project must guarantee proper provision for community safety throughout construction periods, particularly where traffic restrictions might be imposed on main roads during the bushfire season.	This matter will be dealt with by Council / VPA through the inclusion of a condition on subdivision permits which requires a Construction Management Plan to be prepared to address such issues. It is not a structural matter that can be addressed through the PSP itself.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
27	Anthony Menhennitt (Sunbury resident)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR27	AM1	All eucalypt trees and stumps on the designated area of the Lancefield Road Precinct, both dead and alive, should be preserved as this area was a highly significant area for the indigenous natives, so need to be investigated as well.	The growth areas of Melbourne, including the Lancefield Road PSP area, is subject to the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Corridors (BCS). The BCS improves biodiversity outcomes for matters of environmental significance through complete protection and enhancement of significant areas, which are enabled through the offsets paid for the removal of vegetation outside of these areas. The BCS provides a net environmental benefit.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR27	AM2	All non-native plants within this area should be preserved as well, as it is part of the history of the area from the 1830's to present. The submitter understands that these items relating to relevant legislation, but suggests that the VPA should do it properly and demonstrate how it should be done.	As described in response to AM1 above, the BCS provides for environmental outcomes in the growth corridors. It would be unreasonable for the VPA to apply yet another layer of regulation to developers within the precinct without considerable reason.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR27	AM3	Submits that the entire area is historically significant to Sunbury and also extremely important to our State. This history should be assessed prior to any developments. Other areas that the Victorian Planning Authority have assessed as being of historical value do pale into insignificance compared with this Lancefield Road Precinct.	The Precincts themselves are not historical sites, however they do contain several heritage listed sites. The PSPs require a Heritage Assessment 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
LR27	AM4	Recommends that all flood prone land beside Jacksons Creek be set aside as public open space for the people of Victoria.	Melbourne Water recognises the importance of the Jacksons Creek Valley. Melbourne Water has made an assessment of waterway corridor widths based on the 'Waterway Corridors - Greenfield Development Guidelines' the 'Healthy Waterways Strategy' and other reference documents (including Development Services Schemes). A waterway corridor map has been provided to the Victorian Planning Authority based on a careful assessment of the guidelines and reference documents.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR27	AM5	That the entire area of the Lancefield Road Precinct be assessed for signs of native habitation and usage.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will also 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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR27	AM6	That the Zig Zag Track and Cannon Gully be protected in its entirety and preserved as an important Military site. That all historical and natural sites within the Lancefield Precinct have interpretive signage erected.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay to Canon Gully. The PSP is a high level strategic planning document, and it is not appropriate for it to prescribe details such as interpretive signage.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR27	AM7	That Elizabeth Drive be built as a raised roadway across the Jacksons Creek Valley for safety reasons and to minimise the disturbance to the archaeological value of the valley.	The current alignment reflects a raised roadway for these reasons and for the protection of cultural heritage.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR27	AM8	That all revegetation be genetically relevant to this region.	These areas will be managed by public authorities (i.e. Parks Victoria, Department of Environment, Melbourne Water) who will give due consideration to all environmental matters.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
28	Oliver Hume Property Funds (Landowner within the municipality)					
LR28	OHP1	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. 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
29	Sunbury Business Association					
LR29	SBA1	Existing infrastructure: a. Cannot meet current population needs and demands. b. Cannot meet additional loads from regional shoppers already wanting to use Sunbury as a regional shopping and transport hub. 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.	The PSPs provide for a significant number of infrastructure projects, and includes a new major town centre and three new local town centres to service the needs of the new residents. 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
LR29	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR29	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
LR29	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
LR29	SBA6	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
30	Peter and Sandra Gill (Landowner)					
LR30	PSG1	Support the Amendment, the adoption of the FUS and Balbethan Residential Concept Plan to guide the future development. Encourage the development to proceed as soon as possible.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR30	PSG3	Will be represented by QOD at the Panel hearing.	Noted	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
31	Sean and Bianca Kerr (Sunbury resident)					
LR31	SBK1	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 Assessment 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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR31	SBK2	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
LR31	SBK3	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	No	No action	Unresolved
LR31	SBK4	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR31	SBK5	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
LR31	SBK6	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
LR31	SBK7	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
LR31	SBK8	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
LR31	SBK9	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR31	SBK10	Believes that this development will only create high density cheaply made housing that developers will turn over quickly and spit out without a second thought. Only to then walk away from what will become an overcrowded town with not enough infrastructure to support it. This is nothing more than a quick money making project that will not create jobs for Sunbury people but will bring thousands more to an area that already cannot sustain the growing population as it is.	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
LR31	SBK11	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
32	Bryce Letcher (Sunbury resident)					
LR32	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	Unresolved
LR32	BL2	Does not believe that the VPA have adequately responded to queries during the public exhibition period.	The VPA has done its best to respond to all queries received in a reasonable timeframe.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR32	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 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
LR32	BL4	This area has the highest documented population of Platypus in the state, queries where they will go. Queries what measures are being proposed to care for the animals which currently inhabit the area.	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
LR32	BL5	The Jacksons Creek valley from Rupertswood to the Wetlands is a very historic area and should be preserved. This area will be destroyed with a road and bridge running right up 60 metre escarpment along Cannon Gully.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Cannon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR32	BL6	Concerned about timing of infrastructure delivery.	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
LR32	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.	Comment noted. No change to the amendment requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR32	BL8	Notes that the Bully Bypass construction was 'imminent' in 1978 and has not yet been delivered.	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
LR32	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
LR32	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR32	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
33	RL and WA Walters (Sunbury residents)					
LR33	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
LR33	RWW2	The heritage significance of the Emu Bottom wetlands must be addressed.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
34	Kleiner Family					
LR34	RK1	The residential concept described in Figure 1 is an appropriate solution to accommodate future residential subdivision while utilising existing infrastructure and road layouts. It also appears that there has been significant thought given to the existing lot boundaries and house locations.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR34	RK2	This submission would support the inclusion of higher density housing surrounding the Balbethan Convenience Centre to encourage convenience for a greater proportion of the community within a walkable area of say 100-200 metres from the centre, similar to the designation found in Figures 2 and 3 of the other two Activity Centres.	The revised concept plan will nominate an area for medium density development adjacent to the local convenience centre.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR34	RK3	Notes that the PSP presents a sensible development configuration detailed in the Lancefield Road PSP. The future community of the area will be well served by significant areas of open space and the incorporation and preservation of natural features in addition to the many education, retail, public transport and medical opportunities.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
35	Sustainability Victoria					
LR35	SV1	No comments provided on C208.	N/A	No	No action	Resolved
36	DELWP (Integrated Water Management)					
LR36	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
LR36	DELWPIWM2	Support incorporating their provided GIS data for water, sewer and alternative water infrastructure into C208 Plans 11 and 12 (page 42 and 44).	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR36	DELWPIWM3	Support adopting comments they have made on the requirements and guidelines listed in 3.5 Integrated Water Management and Utilities (C208 page 43 to 46).	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR36	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
37	Jacksons Creek EcoNetwork, Friends of Holden Flora Reserve and Friends of Emu Bottom Wetlands Reserve					
LR37	JCEN1	Strongly support the proposed designation of most of the Jacksons Creek Corridor as Conservation Zone. The area between Emu Bottom and the existing township that has been reserved is considerable, would like to see a broadening of the area where it abuts Racecourse Road so that the full width of the valley is protected (see below).	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN2	Jacksons Creek Valley from Emu Bottom to Macedon St - This landscape is a very important aspect of this area for a variety of reasons and should not be spoiled or destroyed. It is an area of significant cultural heritage, both Aboriginal and post-contact.	Please refer to JCEN1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN3	Proposed development along Racecourse Road runs too far north and cuts off much of the valley at that end. It runs hard onto the drainage channel just south of Emu Bottom Wetlands Reserve, thus impinging on the valley floor and on flood-prone areas. This is inconsistent with your reservation of areas further downstream and is in marked contrast with housing on the Eastern side of the creek, where it is setback by 40m from the edge of the escarpment so that it does not impinge on the view of the valley. Here we have housing actually taking over the valley. A similar sensitivity is needed on the western side.	Please refer to JCEN1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN4	a. View lines need to be set on this side of the creek, so that houses similarly do not impinge on the vista. Your objectives state that urban development should “respond sympathetically to the unique, high landscape values of the precinct, protecting the natural landscape qualities of the Jacksons and Emu Creek, and providing a usable network of open space adjacent to the creeks and above the break of slope.” Break of slope should be defined according to your contour maps and certainly does not occur where the edge of development is marked.	Please refer to JCEN1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN5	b. Housing must not be visible from the meeting rings.	Please refer to JCEN1 response above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR37	JCEN6	c. To be in harmony with the rural nature of the area, "lots capable of supporting lower density housing" (G15) are needed throughout, not just on areas of greater slope.	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 may be opportunities to deliver some lower density lots throughout the precinct, however these will need to be balanced to deliver the desired density outcomes.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN7	Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge across Jacksons Creek - We are not convinced that this road will serve a useful purpose. The bridge, if built, must provide for passage of wild life, including kangaroos, wallabies, possums, echidnas and other smaller creatures, not just Growling Grass frog habitat.	Please refer to Part A report for strategic need for the Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge. The design of the Northern Crossing of Jacksons Creek will need to respond to many environmental and landscape constraints. The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning and Melbourne Water have provided in-principle support for a creek-crossing generally in accordance with the alignment shown in the PSP, however the detailed design of the bridge will need to mitigate potential impacts on the environment and waterways, including the potential impact on fauna.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN8	It is essential that the new bridge spanning Jacksons Creek 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.	Please refer response to JCEN7 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN9	Rope overpasses for possums crossing the road should be considered.	This level of detail will be included in the detailed design of the crossing. The PSP is a high level strategic planning document that does not prescribe this level of detail.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN10	The design of the bridge must be sympathetic to the surrounding landscape.	Agree. The PSP includes a requirement (R64) that 'The Jacksons Creek road crossing must respond sensitively to landform, amenity and cultural and heritage values.' It is therefore a requirement that this is an important consideration in the bridge design.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN11	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.	This level of detail will be included in the detailed design of the crossing, and in the Construction Environmental Management Plan for the project. The PSP is a high level strategic planning document that does not prescribe this level of detail.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN12	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.	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 platypus habitat, within the two precincts, from urban development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR37	JCEN13	Cannon Gully and the ZigZag track that gives access to it must be avoided and preserved.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR37	JCEN14	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.	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
38	Michael McMahon (Sunbury Resident)					
LR38	MMc1	It is suggested that prior to finalizing the PSP that a detailed study of the extension of Elizabeth Drive be completed to the extent that a complete alignment be defined and shown on the PSP so that variations resultant from review can be achieved.	Agree	Yes	No action	Resolved
39	Sunbury Community Progress Association					
LR39	SCPA1	Duplicated 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
LR39	SCPA2	Jacksons Hill & Goonawarra need alternate roads out of town before construction has started to ease the burden of traffic through Sunbury's CBD.	A range of key transport infrastructure priorities have been identified to ease existing pressure on the Sunbury CBD. These include two additional road crossings of the Jacksons Creek, as well as three additional grade separated rail crossings, In particular, the southern Jacksons Creek Crossing has been identified as a key priority for early delivery.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR39	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.	<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
LR39	SCPA4	CFA / SES and Ambulance Stations will need to be placed in Lancefield Road development early one 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
LR39	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
LR39	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.	The Network Development Plan defines improvement to services in the Sunbury area.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR39	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR39	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR39	SPCA9	Better bus connections to facilities throughout Hume (Craigieburn & Broad meadows).	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
LR39	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
LR39	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	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
40	Kevin Houston (Sunbury Resident)					
LR40	KH1	Submits that the entire Jackson Creek Valley north of Salesian College needs to be protected in whole due to its historical significance importance to Victoria.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR40	KH2	Submits that current infrastructure, along with the Bulla Bypass, needs to be delivered first.	Planning is well advanced in relation to a number of 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
41	Bart Simes (Sunbury Resident)					
LR41	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
LR41	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.	The Lancefield Road PSP has provision of land for a potential TAFE / Hospital however the delivery of a hospital is beyond the scope of the PSP.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR41	BS3	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. A Development Services Scheme is a masterplan for future management of stormwater within the catchment. Under the DSS, developers are required (among a number of things) to construct drainage infrastructure to service future residential development. Erosion has been considered as a significant factor in future urban run-off and the DSS have been designed to protect waterways and tributaries from erosion.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR41	BS4	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
LR41	BS5	4. Parking: This is particularly an issue at Sunbury Train Station and already showing signs of becoming an issue at Sunbury Square and	Car parking Sunbury CBD	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR41	BS6	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
LR41	BS7	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
LR41	BS8	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
LR41	BS9	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
LR41	BS10	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
LR41	BS11	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
LR41	BS12	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR42	MC1	Support the adoption of the Urban Structure Plan and the Balbethan Residential Concept Plan to guide the future development of the Balbethan Precinct.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR42	MC2	It is essential to include a link from the Rolling Meadows Estate and are supportive of the proposed location of the Local Convenience Centre at 10 Balbethan Drive.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR42	MC3	QOD will represent submitter at the Panel Hearing.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
43	Australian Property Partnership OBO 10 Balbethan Drive (affected Landowner)					
LR43	APP1	The allocation of the Local Convenience Centre on the subject site is supported due to location on major intersection, and between the Yellow Gum and Emu Creek town centres and its ability to offer convenience retailing opportunity for the future community in the short term.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR43	APP2	It is noted that the potential layout of the Balbethan Local Convenience Centre has been workshopped with both the VPA and Hume Council staff over the past 12 months. A plan that meets a range of desired objectives including ingress/egress, parking, connectivity to surrounding community, major tenant positioning, loading and landscaping has been prepared.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
LR43	APP3	it is understood that the company QOD represents a large number of land owners within the Balbethan Residential Area. This submission also supports QOD's endeavours to develop the Balbethan Residential area in the short term, utilising and complimenting existing infrastructure generally in accordance with Figure 1, pg19 in the PSP.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
44	Spiire on behalf of Lawrence and Kerrie Paratz (adjacent landowners)					
LR44	LKP1	The submission relates to the property at 149 Williamsons Road, which abuts the Precinct to the north. The Conservation Area within the northern part of the PSP area should be reduced in size in order to provide additional development opportunities, based on latest available information.	Agree. This is currently being considered by the Commonwealth, and we expect approval prior to the panel hearing	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR44	LKP3	Request that the PSP note that the identified Conservation Area is not likely to extend northwards into the future Sunbury North PSP area. based on latest survey undertaken by Ecology and Heritage	Disagree. This has not yet been considered, and it would be premature to suggest that the Conservation Area will not remain at least in part on the subject property	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR44	LKP4	To ensure consistency with R44, amend figure 5 to show a 20m conservation interface zone (not 30m).	The Conservation Interface Zone related to an area surrounding conservation areas where particular interface/design responses are to apply. It does not relate to a buffer per se. Therefore there is no conflict between to CACP and R44	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR44	LKP5	EITHER amend Figure 5 to acknowledge that the illustrated Conservation Area boundary is “subject to review” (consistent with the annotation included on Plan 3) OR amend and finalise the extent of the Conservation Area in accordance with the findings of a formal boundary review.	Agree. The CACP will be updated to reflect revised boundaries as approved by the Commonwealth, prior to panel	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR44	LKP6	Amend Figure 5 by extending the east-west aligned ‘proposed shared path’ located at the north of the Conservation Area 18 westwards so that it connects to the north south Connector Road. The path, including its connection to the Connector Road, should be wholly located within the LRPSP land area.	Agree. Updated concept plan will extend the shared path through the Conservation Area to its western boundary	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR44	LPK7	Concerned that the sheer amount of undevelopable land that is proposed in the LRPSP is inefficient in the context of a strategically identified growth corridor. Also concerned about the practical ability for Council and other authorities to adequately maintain such extensive areas of open space. We believe that smaller areas of better maintained open space are preferable to large areas of unmaintained / under-maintained open space. Request the VPA review the overall extent of Open Space provided for by the LRPSP with a view to reducing / rationalising the quantum of open spaces and increasing the net amount of developable land.	Disagree. The amount of open space within the PSP is in large part a consequence of the features of the precinct, including heavily incised creek corridors/valleys, conservation areas, and a large number of wetlands/retarding basins given the complexity of storm water management across the precinct. Only around 6.7% of the total precinct NDA is earmarked for sporting fields and local parks, in recognition of the higher than average level of encumbered open space	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR44	LPK8	Ensure that in making any changes to the exhibited LRPSP (for example in revising the extent of the Conservation Area) that the northern Connector Road continues to provide the most direct possible connection between Bindara and the future Yellow Gum Town Centre.	Agree. This connector road alignment has been adjusted to reflect the revised Conservation Area boundary, however it remains the key local access opportunity to Sunbury North	No	No action	Resolved
LR44	LPK9	Add a further Requirement to section 3.4.1, requiring any subdivision of Parcel 1 to incorporate multiple north-south future street connections to Bindara.	Agree. A new requirement will be added.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR44	LPK10	Amend ‘Plan 9 – Street Network’ to show indicative future street connections to Bindara (refer image below).	Agree in part. An annotation on Plan 9 will identify the need for local street connectivity at this interface, but will not show specific locations.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
45	Lee Zerafa (Sunbury resident)					
LR45	LZ1	Objection is to the Racecourse Road Development (P18854)	Noted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR45	LZ2	The land was gifted to Salesian College for educational purposes, therefore should not be sold to developers, but kept as public land for enjoyment and use for all.	The history of land ownership to the site is not a matter relevant to consideration as part of the preparation of the PSP. The PSP has been prepared having regard for state and local planning policy.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR45	LZ3	There is historical significance to indigenous people with the rare aboriginal rings, that are Heritage Listed. The landscape is of scientific and environmental significance because of vegetation that exists in the area, that is increasing lost in other areas due to development and growth. Sacred land should be respected.	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, which will ensure that any known or discovered sites are appropriately respected	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR45	LZ4	There is historical significance to the Sunbury community - George Evans, Clarke, and the Rupertswood station. The valley should be preserved.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR45	LZ5	There is significant wildlife, including endangered animals such as platypus, and wedge-tailed Eagles that need protecting for future generations.	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
LR45	LZ6	Emu Bottom is an original green wedge zone, and the reason we bought our property here. We don't want to be surrounded by 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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR45	LZ7	The ridge line needs to be protected and contradicts council's rule that you can't build on a highpoint in the area.	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
46	APP on behalf of WinCity (landowner and Permit applicant)					
LR46	WinCity1	Supportive of the incorporation of the 'Lancefield Rd Precinct Structure Plan' (the PSP) into the Hume Scheme and the rezoning of the Wincity land parcel to Urban Growth Zone (UGZ) – Schedule 10 and Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ). Further clarification and suggested changes are detailed in this submission.	Support noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR46	WinCity2	Considering the Biosis assessment of the site's environmental values, as well as the sites topography and waterways Wincity has submitted to the VPA and DELWP that some areas currently zoned RCZ should be UGZ and conversely some areas of UGZ should be RCZ, as previously discussed with the VPA and DELWP. REFER submission for plans.	The majority of these areas are outside the GGF corridor, and hence no adjustment to the boundary of the corridor is required - the exhibited amendment already proposes to rezone a significant portion of this land to UGZ. Portions of the middle section proposed to be included within the UGZ will be able to be considered for development, subject to a satisfactory localised drainage response. A small portion of the southern section is currently inside the GGF corridor, and VPA are discussing changes in this locations with DELWP. It is expected that a formal application for GGF adjustments will be submitted to DELWP for assessment following Panel, but prior to adoption of the PSP	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR46	WinCity3	40m setback from the escarpment is noted as a requirement of a setback from the break of slope even though the zoning is reliant on this topographical change. A more flexible approach should be considered that is responsive to a variety of on-site conditions and outcomes, via the adoption of a range of appropriate road cross sections. Details of this and comments about the requirements are shown further in this submission (REFER submission for requested alternate cross-section details).	The 40m 'interface with escarpment (visual)' has been applied to avoid the visual impact of development from within the creek corridor, adjacent to the creek itself. The VPA agree that where the creek corridor is less narrowly/clearly defined (e.g. where a gully/tributary extends from the creek), the 40m setback may not achieve this. The VPA are currently reviewing the application of the 40m mandatory setback in these locations, and will provide more information on our final position as part of our Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR46	WinCity4	The BAL rating should be confirmed as per the local conditions, and an appropriate road cross section (as supplied) adopted to meet the defensible space setback. This should not exclude the option of increased setbacks within lots or appropriate building envelopes.	The PSP does not define standard BAL rating requirement for housing abutting the escarpment. There will therefore be scope for a range of bushfire management treatments. The Building Code of Australia was updated in May 2010 to provide greater protection for new housing constructed in areas of potential bushfire threat. The bushfire residential building standards covers the construction of new homes and alterations and additions to a house in the State of Victoria if the building is located in a mapped Bushfire Prone Area or Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO). This provides a higher minimum standard for bushfire resistant construction, affording new housing much stronger protection than was the case prior to 2010.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity5	Plan 5 - incorrectly labels 'interface with railway' on subject property.	This will be corrected.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR46	WinCity6	Cross section 'Regionally Significant Landscape: Escarpment top – 4.7. visually sensitive' implies that you must have 25.2 metres buffer distance to a carriageway easement from break of slope. There is a lack of clarity as to why this distance is required given that under this scenario, houses are in excess of 40 metres setback from the break of slope, even though visually that 40 metres includes substantial landscaping, shared path, and a 7.3 metres road carriageway. Where is the impact coming from? Additional clarity needs to be given as to whose view line is being protected and why.	See WinCity 3 above. The view lines being protected are from within the creek corridor itself.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity7	R44 - why within Cross section 'Regionally Significant Landscape: Escarpment top – visually sensitive' have the roads have been excluded from this 20 metres.	See above. The setback apply to development	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity8	It appears Figures 4-7 are plans and not cross sections and there is no reference within the PSP document, which we can find, to 'Interface Cross Section' diagrams. These need to be made clear if they're referred to in the PSP.	Interface Cross Sections will be included, as per DELWP's submission	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR46	WinCity9	What is the purpose / specific requirement for the 30m 'conservation interface zone' as referred to on Figure 7? This is a poor use of serviceable land and should be deleted from the PSP and mapping.	The Conservation Interface Zone refers only to those areas within 30m of a conservation area boundary. It does not imply no development nor a specific buffer treatment	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR46	WinCity10	Suggest the notation on the determination of the break of slope line to be detained via survey rather than an arbitrary line on the plan as currently shown.	The break of slope line has been redefined based on a virtual 'Walk through' of the site, undertaken by the VPA, Council and Melbourne Water. It is therefore not considered necessary to enable any further refinements through a notation of this type. It is also important that the break of slope is defined in the PSP as the basis for determining zone boundaries in certain locations	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity11	Suggest the wording relating to the Linear open space within the Visually Sensitive Cross section is currently not adding towards the sites open space contribution and this is not acceptable.	The setback from the break of slope required in the visually sensitive cross section is required to allow urban development in a location with high landscape values. The development setback is for therefore principally for landscape reasons.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity12	Plan 10 and Figure 7 – The sheer number of shared paths within proximity to each other on our client's property appears to be excessive and insufficiently justified. It is suggested a consolidated plan showing shared path network to ensure clear and sensible movement patterns.	The shared path network shown within the conservation areas on the Conservation Area Management Plan is indicative, and will be not be required as subdivisional works. The required shared path network as part of subdivisional works is limited to that shown on Plan 10	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity13	Compared to other properties within the PSP, the Wincity is encumbered by a considerably greater area of wetlands / retarding basins that any other parcel within the precinct. It is noted that WL-13, WL-14 & WL-15 provide storm water retardation and quality treatment for external catchments or land outside the subject land and should be allocated for funding as these are a region resource for other upstream.	The DSS are designed based on Melbourne Water's 'Principles for Provision of Waterway and Drainage Services for Urban Growth' (16 principles). Melbourne Water has had extensive consultation and engagement with the drainage consultants of Wincity. Melbourne Water has outlined the process for designing Development Services Schemes and provided a detailed response to proposed changes to asset location. Based on extensive discussions, Melbourne Water is hopeful that WinCity can submit a proposed drainage layout which meets the objectives and requirements of the DSS. It must be noted that the current Section 96A application is not in accordance with the DSS and this position was outlined to the applicant in writing on 10th February, 2017.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR46	WinCity14	WL-13 is at least 10-15 years away from development as it relies on Wincity's land being developed to create the need for its water retarding function. This will impact on the timing and development of other upstream land parcels located outside of Wincity's land holding.	Melbourne Water advises that temporary works can be provided on upstream properties if development occurs out of sequence (i.e. from top of catchment to the bottom). In isolation, this is not a sufficient reason to change the location of the DSS asset because there are many factors which have been considered in the location of this asset (topography, geomorphology etc.)	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity15	It is also noted that these are uncredited in the Land budget (section 2.3) as open space as is the considerable area of Landscape Values that remains unclear as to its location and why this is not a credited item given it is unusable land that can be adequately serviced.	Drainage assets required under a DSS are paid for by that DSS, and are therefore not credited through the ICP. The Landscape values areas are considered undevelopable for slope, water quality, or landscape reasons, however the VPA and MW are refining the landscape values areas to identify additional areas that may be able to be developed, subject to a localised drainage response	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR46	WinCity16	In order to achieve a more equitable spread of assets and realize the benefits 5.15. of other storm water quality treatment technology on the subject land the following amendments to the Integrated Water Management Plan (and MW DDS) are proposed: a) Relocation of WL-12 into the south-east corner of the land located at 250 Lancefield Road.	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity17	b) Relocation of WL-14 immediately to the west of the location shown in the PSP which could eliminate a separate drainage and sewerage sub catchment on the subject land and potentially remove the requirement for WL-16 (Sediment basin);	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity18	c) Relocate the component of WL-13 (or part thereof) which caters for the existing and proposed development on the western side of Lancefield Road to the western side of Lancefield Road;	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity19	d) Relocate WL-15 downstream to the confluence of the two existing watercourses with the provision of a linear wetland or bio-retention cell / retarding basin which better responds the existing topography and vegetation to be retained;	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity20	e) Re-orientation of WL-17 to better respond to the existing topography of this area (the longitudinal axis of the treatment / retarding basin should be oriented parallel to the contours);	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity21	f) Consolidate WL-18 with WL-19 and relocate WL-19 either to the south east or south west of the location shown in the PSP which could eliminate a separate drainage and sewerage sub-catchment on the subject land;	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity23	WL-13 is at least 10 -15 years away from development as it relies on Balbethan 5.17 and Huntley Lodge being developed to create they need for its water retarding function. Wincity should not be held to ransom given the long time frame for development to the north of its catchment.	See Win City 13	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity24	It is also noted that these are uncredited in the Land budget (section 2.3) as open space as is the considerable area of Landscape Values that remains unclear as to its location and why this is not a credited item given it is unusable land that can be adequately service.	Repeated item. See Wincity 15	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR46	WinCity25	It is considered that bio-retention cells and / or floating wetlands respond to the opportunities and constraints on the subject land and would be more appropriate than traditional constructed wetlands. The following justification is provided:	Melbourne Water has considered the submission for alternative treatment types. Melbourne Water would not support the use of bio retention systems for catchment areas greater than 10 Hectares, consistent with the Melbourne Water 'MUSIC Guidelines' (2016) (pg. 19). Melbourne Water is required to provide a robust, cost-effective plan to manage the quality and increased quantity stormwater run-off as the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority. Based on the 'Principles for Provision of Waterway and Drainage Services for Urban Growth', Melbourne Water MUSIC Guidelines, constructability, future maintenance implications, we have developed a robust DSS.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity26	It is considered that due to the extent of overland flows from an external catchment to the west of Lancefield Road flowing through the southern-most parcel of land being 45 Gellies Road, that this property should be incorporated into the Oldbury MW DSS or funds made available to in the ICP to undertake some rehabilitation of the existing watercourse environs.	Based on the description, this property is located within the Sunningdale Avenue Development Services Scheme. Works must be in accordance with the DSS. The scheme boundaries (and works) are based on the 'Principles for Provision of Waterway and Drainage Services for Urban Growth'. It is noted that waterways are not an ICP item.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity27	Plan 7 – SR-03 should be located further north. This park is an impost that locates too much open space within Wincity's lands.	While there is a significant amount of drainage land on the submitters site, this is a product of the natural drainage of the land, with a number of significant tributaries of the Emu Creek crossing the land. Given the scale of the landholdings relative to the broader PSP, the planned, credited open space network across the site is not considered excessive.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity30	With specific regard to the Bulla Bypass, our client supports the VPA and Hume City Council (HCC) in their advocacy of the timing and delivery of the bypass, and is looking forward to seeing it pushed into earlier State budgeting cycles.	Noted. 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	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR46	WinCity31	UGZ10, point 3.11: Applications on land abutting Fire Threat Edge, reference is made to Plan 5 of the PSP documentation which is stated to show a 'Fire Threat Edge'. However this seems to be omitted from Plan 5 as we are unable to identify it. In addition, R17 also mentions a 'fire threat edge' defined on Plan 5 and refers to appropriate development setbacks. Clarification on where the fire threat edge is located will be essential in understanding the impact of development setbacks on yield. In addition, there also seems to be features missing from the legend such as identification of the primary school site on property number 23.	Following the receipt of additional work on bushfire, the fire threat edge will be deleted from the PSP and UGZ schedule.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR46	WinCity32	Section 4.9: Bushfire Risk of Schedule 10 to the UGZ requires a Site Management Plan assessing bushfire risk for any stage of subdivision. It is our view that the requirement for a SMP that addresses bushfire risk should be limited to those stages of subdivision abutting the RCZ only.	This is a standard requirement that relates to all stages of greenfield subdivision. Whilst the RCZ might represent a permanent fire threat, undeveloped land earmarked for future development will present a potential fire threat until such time as it is developed. A Site Management Plan is required to ensure that this threat is managed in the interim	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR46	WinCity33	We also query the UGZ Decision Guidelines which reference the 'Sunbury Infrastructure Coordination and Delivery Strategy'. We are unclear of the status of this report or its contents.	The Sunbury Infrastructure Co-ordination and Delivery Strategy was exhibited along side the PSP. However in response to other submissions, the VPA now propose to remove formal reference to this strategy in the PSP and the UGZ Schedule, and to treat this as a background document only	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR46	WinCity34	In accordance with the amendments sought under section 3.2 of this submission, the boundary of the Incorporated Plan Overlay Schedules 3 and 4 will need to be altered in accordance with any boundary alterations between the RCZ and UGZ.	Agreed. The IPO will be modified to reflect changes in zone boundaries.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
47	Louise Attard (Sunbury resident)					
LR47	LA1	Objects to the proposed development relating to the area around Emu Bottom wetlands and Racecourse Rd, Sunbury due to but not limited to: The absence of a CHMP in the documents. This is a significant area and contains cultural ceremonial rings yet no CHMP is available in the documents available online.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR47	LA2	The Historical value of this area is totally ignored with a proposal to build a bridge through the significant Cannons Gully.	Refer to response LA1 above.	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR47	LA3	No Heritage report is available within the documents available online.	The heritage reports were included online with other background documentation.	No	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR47	LA4	Development in this location threatens the habitat of the Platypus colony in the area and the conservation area of the emu Bottom wetlands, an area which many Sunbury residents enjoy.	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 platypus habitat, within the two precincts, from urban development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
48	Joe and Tina Scarfo (affected Landowners)					
LR48	JTS1	Support the adoption of the Urban Structure Plan and the Balbethan Residential Concept Plan to guide the future development of the Balbethan Precinct. We feel it is essential to include a link from the Rolling Meadows Estate and we are supportive of the proposed location of the Local Convenience Centre at 10 Balbethan Drive.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR48	JTS2	The submitter has appointed QOD to represent their interests at the Panel Hearing.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
49	Lisa and Wesley Bakker (affected Landowners)					
LR49	LWB1	We support the adoption of the Urban Structure Plan and the Balbethan Residential Concept Plan to guide the future development of the Balbethan Precinct. We feel it is essential to include a link from the Rolling Meadows Estate and we are supportive of the proposed location of the Local Convenience Centre at 10 Balbethan Drive.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR49	LWB2	The submitter has appointed QOD to represent their interests at the Panel Hearing.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR49	LWB3	The Balbethan Precinct was originally a rural residential subdivision which was inadvertently included in the Green Wedge in 2004. We have been waiting many years for this error to be rectified and we should be provided every assistance now in order that development can proceed as soon as possible.	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
50	Kane and Jayde Lambert (resident)					
LR50	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 Assessment 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
LR50	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR50	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
LR50	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR50	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
LR50	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
LR50	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
LR50	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
LR50	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
LR50	KJL10	Believes that this development will only create high density cheaply made housing that developers will turn over quickly and spit out without a second thought. Only to then walk away from what will become an overcrowded town with not enough infrastructure to support it. This is nothing more than a quick money making project that will not create jobs for Sunbury people but will bring thousands more to an area that already cannot sustain the growing population as it is.	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	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR50	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
51	Victoria Mack (consultant OBO affected Landowner - 25 St Ronans Ct)					
LR51	VM1	On Page 19, Figure 1: Balbethan Residential Concept shows an area of open space along the south east corner of the site. We do not agree with the location of this open space area given that a large area of credited open space is already proposed on the neighbouring site immediately to the west (LP-17) which would create two open space areas approximately 100m from each other. Request this small area of open space on the south east corner of 25 St Ronans Court in Figure 1 Balbethan Residential Concept be removed as it is not consistent with the PSP and which appears to be a clerical error. The location of the small open space is also redundant given there is a larger credited open space area on the neighbouring lot which will service the surrounding area sufficiently.	Agree. The Concept Plan will be amended to remove the area of open space from this location.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
52	Beveridge Williams OBO 295 Lancefield Road JV Pty Ltd (optioned purchaser)					
LR52	LRJV1	The realignment of the Conservation Area 18 boundary is supported by DELWP and is currently being formalised. If the Conservation Area amendment is not finalised before completion of the PSP, additional text, similar to the approach taken in R39 and R40 should be included.	Agree. The realignment of CA 18 is currently being considered by the Commonwealth, and we expect approval prior to the panel hearing	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR52	LRJV2	Eight indigenous trees (out of 14) were not recorded by Ecology and Heritage Partners in their scattered tree assessment which informed the PSP. The identified patches of native vegetation do not reflect those that were identified in the Ecolink surveys. The Ecolink Consulting report represents a more accurate assessment of vegetation on the site, and should be used to inform the PSP including Plan 8, and Figure 5.	These have been provided to DELWP, who will include them in the scattered tree assessment.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR52	LRJV3	Submit that through the reduction of the Conservation Area it is possible to achieve more developable area on the site. This will require updating on all plans throughout the PSP. In particular, Plan 8 – Native Vegetation Removal and Retention will require updating to show additional areas of native vegetation that can be removed. It is submitted that the patches of native vegetation identified by Ecolink, being of very low quality, warrant removal. Scattered trees could be retained in the context of development if necessary though it is noted that the approach for the Lancefield Road PSP appears to have been generally for removal as shown in Plan 8.	Agree. The Future Urban Structure and Plan 8 will be updated accordingly following the approval of the Conservation Area boundary realignment.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR52	LRJV4	The proposed zones and overlays need to be adjusted in accordance with the amendments to the boundary of the Conservation Area.	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
LR52	LRJV5	There are references to the Conservation Area no's but these are not labelled anywhere in the PSP. It is submitted that they should be labelled on the plans for reference.	Agree. Conservation Area numbers will be added through annotations of the relevant CACPs	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR52	LRJV6	Section 3.3.3 of the PSP at R44 requires a 20m buffer to Conservation Area 18, 19, and 20 and provides guidelines as to what can and cannot be constructed within this buffer. Figure 4 and Figure 5 illustrate a '30m interface zone' which is not defined in the text. This should be amended on the plans to be consistent with R44, being a 20m buffer.	The Conservation Interface Zone related to an area surrounding conservation areas where particular interface/design responses are to apply. It does not relate to a buffer per se. Therefore there is no conflict between to CACP and R44	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR52	LRJV7	The scale bar on the maps are incorrect.	To review and correct as necessary.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR52	LRJV8	The stormwater quality assets shown on Plan 11 are noted to be subject to a Drainage Strategy being confirmed by Melbourne Water. Whilst none of these assets are shown on the subject land, we understand through discussions with Melbourne Water that this could change. Accordingly, we reserve the right to make further submissions related to drainage pending the release of that further work.	Noted.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
53	Insight Planning OBO 280 Lancefield Road					
LR53	IP1	Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to realign the Precinct Boundary to include all land on 280 and 330 Lancefield Road that is inside the Urban Growth Boundary.	Disagree. This represents a significant addition to the precinct, and it is considered that the form of development for this land is more appropriate to consider in the context of Sunbury North, given the conservation area effectively defines new neighbourhoods.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR53	IP2	Amend Plan 2 – Precinct Features to align the 'existing conservation / habitat area' with the current Rural Conservation Zone. Site inspection of this area reveals that there does not appear to be any special environmental characteristics worth 'conserving' in this location. From discussions with the VPA it is understood that DELWP were reviewing the specifics of the Conservation Area and it is strongly recommended that this area also be reviewed.	This area comprises Conservation Area 19 in the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Corridors (BCS). The boundary of this area cannot be adjusted based on the conditions of approval of the BCS. No change is proposed.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR53	IP3	Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to remove the areas of 'regionally significant landscape values' from Properties 8 and 13 (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'.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR53	IP4	Plan 3 also shows a 'local park' on Property 8 (LP 08) which further reduces the net developable area of the land. Put simply, there is a significant double up of land that is set aside for open space purposes that will provide general amenity to the future community and therefore if the land is required to provide amenity for the broader community it should be 'credited open space'. Amend Plan 7 – Open Space to reflect the above change and remove Local Park LP-08; 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.	Regionally significant landscape values will not be classified as credited open space. VPA will liaise with Hume City Council to discuss minor variations to the local park network.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR53	IP5	Amend Plan 3 – Future Urban Structure to re-orientate the Government Secondary School to run along the northern boundary of Property 8 between the arterial road and wetlands so as to provide less of a barrier between the residential areas to its east and the town centre to the west.	Both the Department of Education and Training and VicRoads have advised that the government secondary school should not have direct abuttal to Lancefield Road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR53	IP6	Undertake an onsite review of the 'regionally significant landscape value' areas and amend the Land Budget and property Specific Land Budget to better reflect the Net Developable Area that exists on this site and across the precinct.	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 land budget will reflect these changes.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR53	IP7	Amend Table 10 – Precinct Infrastructure Plan to include all local parks as infrastructure projects.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR53	IP8	Amend the Regionally Significant Landscape: Escarpment top – Visually Sensitive to: - Reduce the width of the cross section by removing the duplication of landscaping / revegetation areas; OR Include the 'linear open space' land (i.e. 20.2 metre strip) as 'credited open space' in the Property Specific Land Budget, Table 6 and Table 10 of the PSP. The application of this cross section to Properties 8 and 13 is inappropriate. The extent of the cross section (40 metres to lot boundary) is inappropriate. The duplication of landscaping areas between the nature strip, linear open space and revegetation is unnecessary. Further, if the desire is to create 'linear open space' corridors these areas should be included as 'credited open space' and funded through the ICP.	The 40m 'interface with escarpment (visual)' has been applied to avoid the visual impact of development from within the creek corridor, adjacent to the creek itself. The VPA agree that where the creek corridor is less narrowly/clearly defined (e.g. where a gully/tributary extends from the creek), the 40m setback may not achieve this. The VPA are currently reviewing the application of the 40m mandatory setback in these locations, and will provide more information on our final position as part of our Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR53	IP9	At this stage, we have not had the opportunity to complete a full assessment of the wetland requirements however reserve the right to provide further information as the planning process proceeds.	Noted	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	HCC1	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC4	Extend the Harpers Creek sensitive residential area further south.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	HCC5	Remove the fourth dot point from subclause 3.4 within the Sunbury South and Lancefield Road PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	HCC21	The intersection immediately adjacent the rail crossing is not	Agree. Revised Concept Plan to be included in PSP, to be provided as part of VPA's Part B submission.	Yes	Change the	Decision pending
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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 LPO3 consistent with Plan 7.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC49	Amend O7 (both PSPs) to include reference to sensitive/prominent view lines.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC53	Include G20 and G21 (Lancefield Road) in the Sunbury South PSP.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
	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
	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC74	o A reduction in the size of the town centre site consistent with the 6,000m ² 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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	HCC92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for easy vehicular and pedestrian movement to all restricted retail tenancies within the centre or area. Provide integrated car parking with dedicated pedestrian routes that enables access to all tenancies and a 'park once' approach. Limit fencing and landscaping which prohibits vehicular and pedestrian movement between tenancies. 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. Be separated from residential and other sensitive uses by a local road. Be designed to minimise impact on amenity of adjoining uses including appropriate siting of buildings, height controls, landscaping and use of materials. Respond to slope and minimise cut and fill." 	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC95	Show 5m wide landscape buffers along Vineyard Road consistent with R37.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC103	Amend Plan 7 of both PSPs consistent with Attachments 1 and 2 .	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC105	Amend the description to cricket/senior AFL/Cricket ovals for Sunbury South SR03.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	HCC106	Amend the description to soccer/rugby for Sunbury South SR04.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC109	Amend description to include netball for Lancefield Road SR02	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	HCC114	The Redstone Hill 96A should be amended to address the UGZ9 Redstone Hill height controls.	Agree	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC125	Amend CACPs/Plan 10 to ensure consistency between the plans.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC135	Amend R44 (Lancefield Road) to remove the word 'zone' it confuses the intent of this requirement.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	HCC149	Amend Plan 9/10 to show the location of the various cross sections.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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 Attachments 3 and 4.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR54	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
LR54	HCC161	Ensure consistency between Plan 10 and the CACPs.	Agree. As per HCC125 above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR54	HCC162	Insert public transport requirements and guidelines in the Sunbury South PSPs.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	HCC163	Amend the UGZ schedule to remove the exemption for buildings and works abutting Railway Corridor.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC176	Remove the land subject to the high voltage electricity easement from SUZ9.	Disagree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR54	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
LR54	HCC178	o Remove Convenience Shop, Place of Assembly and Transfer Station from the list of Section 2 uses.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC193	Amend Table 3 in UGZ9 to include 45 Fox Hollow Drive, Sunbury	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	HCC194	Amend SUZ10 to include environmental site assessment requirements.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	HCC200	Service Placement Guidelines - Amend drainage to 'preferred' under nature strips.	VPA to advise.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
LR54	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
55	Beveridge Williams OBO Jinding United Sunbury (optioned purchaser)					
LR55	JUS1	Lot 1 (Property 6) is noted in the land budget as being some 15.12 hectares in total size, with almost half of this (6.33 hectares) being existing road reserve. It is believed that the total size area is smaller, more like approximately 9 hectares, and there is no existing arterial road on the site. The land budget should be updated to accurately reflect the proposed urban structure.	Agree. Property Specific Land Budget to be reviewed	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR55	JUS2	The PSP also incorrectly identifies Lot 3 as being existing road reserve, and labels it as 'Clark Court'. It is requested that the land budget be updated to accurately reflect the Lot 3 status as private land and not existing road reserve. The western portion is subject to intersection works under the ICP, and the eastern portion is shown as developable area. The western part of this land therefore should be identified in the land budget as being required for 'Non-Arterial Road – New / Widening / Intersection Flaring' and 'ICP Non-Arterial Roads Widening / Intersection Flaring' and the eastern part as developable area.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR55	JUS3	It appears that these additional landscape values areas are already nominated in the PSP as having regionally significant landscape values. We understand that as such, there will be no change required to the PSP as a result of the changes to Conservation Area 18. We request that this be confirmed, or further information be provided as to how the extent of these areas has been derived and further information regarding the values it seeks to retain. There does not appear to be any supporting flora and fauna report or landscape values assessment which justifies this area being included. Accordingly, we reserve the right to make further submissions on this matter upon the provision of this information.	This is correct. Any adjustments to the conservation area will however be reflected in the PSP	No	No action	Resolved
LR55	JUS4	R44 requires a 20m buffer to Conservation Area 18, 19, and 20 and provides guidelines as to what can and cannot be constructed within this buffer. Figure 4 and Figure 5 illustrate a '30m interface zone' which is not defined in the text. This should be amended on the plans to be consistent with R44, being a 20m buffer, and which is consistent with the EPBC requirements.	The Conservation Interface Zone related to an area surrounding conservation areas where particular interface/design responses are to apply. It does not relate to a buffer per se. Therefore there is no conflict between to CACP and R44	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR55	JUS5	Drainage Asset WI-09, being a Retarding Basin, was nominated to be located in Property 8 to the south of the subject site. However we also understand that Melbourne Water are currently undertaking a Drainage Strategy for the PSP which could see the Retarding Basin located in Property 7. Our client strongly opposes the relocation of the retarding basin to their site. Accordingly, we reserve the right to make further submissions related to drainage pending the release of that further work.	Noted	No	No action	Unresolved
56	Beveridge Williams OBO 295 Lancefield Road JV Pty Ltd (optioned purchaser)					
LR56	LRJV1	The Yellow Gum Town Centre should be 16,000sqm, in line with Urbis advice (provided).	The concept plan will provide for the capacity for further expansion of the centre to this scale, however the as-of-right shop floor space provided for the centre to remain 10,000sqm. Future permit applications for floor space beyond this will need to justify this scale.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR56	LRJV2	Yellow Gum LTC - Areas allocated to retail, particularly the footprint of the supermarket are too small and the sites are not of a sufficient size to accommodate the necessary elements of those uses.	The Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) is still considering your submission, particularly in relation to the Yellow Gum Local Town Centre. Please note that the VPA is currently reviewing the Local Town Centre concept plan, with the intention of including an updated concept plan in the PSP. The VPA is considering the points raised in your submission in the review, and will include the updated concept plan in our Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR56	LRJV3	Yellow Gum LTC - The current plan splits the retail offer across three blocks (both sides of the north-south road), and north of the major road linking Melbourne-Lancefield Road across the proposed rail line extension. The ability for the retail space to be spread across multiple blocks depends on scale of centre. Many smaller greenfield centres split by a road, particularly a significantly busy road, have been shown to underperform. A larger centre would address this issue, particularly if the major anchor retail supermarkets are separated each side of the road and the necessary traffic and pedestrian measures implemented to link the area.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV4	Yellow Gum LTC - Current retail is too dispersed and there is no clear delineation of which one is the Main Street.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV5	Yellow Gum LTC - The current retail spread over north and south of main East/west road could result in a poorly activated and framed town square.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV6	Yellow Gum LTC - The Town Square and a handful of specialties are segregated from both the community hub and future potential TAFE/Hospital. These elements are separate and don't relate appropriately.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV7	Yellow Gum LTC - The town park is fairly central to residential areas and misses an opportunity to connect to TAFE and community super lots.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV8	Yellow Gum LTC - MD or child care is too low density for the corner gateway location and fails to take advantage of the commercial location.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV9	Clarke Hopkins Clarke have prepared an alternative town centre concept plan, which provides for a town centre totalling 28,000sqm (16,000sqm retail floor space) and addresses the issues outlined above. Request that this be included in the PSP.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV10	The submitter has had traffic modelling undertaken on the revised town centre concept and submits that the proposal incorporating an expanded town centre area can be supported on traffic grounds.	As per LRJV2	Yes	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR56	LRJV10	R59 includes a typo – 'whether of whether'	Correct typo	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR56	LRJV11	Plan 9 of the PSP shows a Boulevard Connector Street extending along the southern boundary of the subject site, through the town centre. Cross Section 8 is provided for a Boulevard Connector at Appendix 4.2 to the PSP and includes separate off-road bike lanes and pedestrian paths (no shared paths). Plan 10 shows this road as having on-road bike lanes, and off road shared paths, which is inconsistent with the cross sections. This requires amending for consistency.	Legend to be amended to clarify the provision of protected off-road bicycle lanes within the road reserve	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR56	LRJV12	R68 refers to 'edge streets with landscape buffers'. This is inconsistent with R58 and R65 which refers to 'frontage streets' and the cross section at Appendix 4.2 which refers to 'Local Access Street Interface with Rail Reserve'. This should be consistent throughout the PSP to ensure that expectations are clear.	Not sure that these provisions are strictly inconsistent however R68 will be reworded for clarity	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
57	Juliette O'Kelly (Sunbury resident)					
LR57	JOK1	Concerned about the impact on wildlife in the wetlands, through housing density, increased traffic and roads, destruction of food source and suburban lighting.	Concern noted. No change to the amendment is requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK2	The northern crossing will destroy the appeal of the area.	the PSP includes a requirement (R64) that 'The Jacksons Creek road crossing must respond sensitively to landform, amenity and cultural and heritage values.' It is therefore a requirement that the impact on the landscape is an important consideration in the bridge design.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK3	The new development between Lancefield Road and Racecourse Road will be unsafe and encourage anti-social behaviour.	Concern noted. No change to the amendment is requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK4	Traffic increase along Racecourse Road and Elizabeth Drive will result in these roads needing to be main arterial roads. The increase in traffic along the proposed bridge and Racecourse road will detrimentally impact the lifestyles of residents along Racecourse Road.	Noted. Increased traffic is an unavoidable consequence of growth.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK5	The increased population will increase air and noise pollution, which the people who live in Emu Bottom have tried to escape from.	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
LR57	JOK6	The Emu Bottom area is attracting a more affluent buyer at the moment, however these will go to Woodend or Gisborne if this development proceeds. Fears that the new area will be an area of low cost high density housing and Emu Bottom will lose its appeal.	Concern noted. No change to the amendment is requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK7	The historical homestead will be hidden within a high density area.	The Emu Bottom homestead is located a significant distant from the PSP area and is not expected to be impacted by development.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK8	The congestion on Sunbury Road and Calder Freeway will drive people of higher economic standing out of the area.	Concern noted. No change to the amendment is requested.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK9	The aboriginal rings that should be kept within their present setting not put aside as an afterthought to development.	The aboriginal rings will be located within a conservation area and will be protected from development. New development will be located significantly further from the rings than existing residential development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK10	The Historical Emu bottom homestead and its significance in the settle history of Victoria.	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR57	JOK11	The grounds and setting on the Rupertswood mansion and its history both sporting and its relationship with the development of Sunbury as a town.	The Rupertswood mansion is located outside of the Precincts.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK12	The gifted grounds at Salesian College meant for learning not profit.	This is a matter for the private land owners rather than State Government.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK13	The area between Racecourse Road and Lancefield Road is bordered by areas of increased fire risk and putting extra housing down the gully would in my opinion be an increased danger as wind funnels through the area. If the surrounding area needed to be evacuated this would place an extra burden on the available escape routes and over extended road infrastructure.	The revised road layout, including additional crossings of Jacksons Creek will provide for improved access in and out of the Emu Bottom area. The Building Code of Australia was updated in May 2010 to provide greater protection for new housing constructed in areas of potential bushfire threat. The bushfire residential building standards covers the construction of new homes and alterations and additions to a house in the State of Victoria if the building is located in a mapped Bushfire Prone Area or Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO). This provides a higher minimum standard for bushfire resistant construction, affording new housing much stronger protection than was the case prior to 2010.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR57	JOK14	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
58	Ange Witzke (Sunbury Resident)					
LR58	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.	In relation to the concerns raised in your submission relating to infrastructure in the CBD, particularly the car parking, we advise that 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 traffic issues (including the early delivery of a southern road crossing of the Jacksons Creek). The plan responds to, and is intended to enhance, the existing township of Sunbury. The ultimate delivery of the precincts will result in many improvements to the local transport and activity centre networks, and will provide many benefits to existing residents including access to new recreation facilities, an extensive path network, access to two new train stations, and more local jobs.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR58	AW2	Would like to see larger block sizes of 500m2+ across the PSP areas, and in the Sherwood Estate the minimum lot sizes should be 1000m2.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details. The setbacks provided for within the revised controls will result in larger lot sizes in the Sherwood Estate area.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR58	AW3	The addition of approximately 3000 cars entering onto Racecourse Road from 2 new estates will increase the fire escape risk for anyone using Racecourse Road for their escape route.	The revised road layout, including additional crossings of Jacksons Creek will provide for improved access in and out of the Emu Bottom area.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR58	AW4	Requests a review of the northern crossing, second station and high density housing, as it will destroy the Sunbury Wetlands reserve.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details. The second station is located some distance from the wetlands and on an existing rail line. The VPA is unclear of what impact this may have.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
59	QOD Property Group (Developers in Balbethan)					
LR59	QOD1	Support the adoption of the Urban Structure Plan and the Balbethan Residential Concept Plan to guide the future development of the Balbethan Precinct. Feel it is essential to include a link from the Rolling Meadows Estate and we are supportive of the proposed location of the Local Convenience Centre at 10 Balbethan Drive.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR59	QOD2	Consideration will need to be provided to existing residents in order to minimise impacts during the construction phase.	Agreed.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR59	QOD3	Consideration must also be given to the interface between the existing Rolling Meadows Estate and the Balbethan Precinct.	Agreed. This objective is to be strengthened/ more clearly articulated in the revised concept plan.	No	Change the amendment	Decision pending further review
LR59	QOD4	QOD has been working with land owners in the Balbethan Precinct for many years and will seek to submit to the Panel Hearing in support of this submission. We are likely to call on expert evidence for Urban Design, Planning, Traffic and Services and we will speak to a more detailed development plan which will be generally in accordance with the Balbethan Residential Concept that forms part of the exhibition material for PSP 1075.	The VPA would appreciate seeing any material prior to the panel hearing, as if there is general consensus then there may not be the need to present this material at the Panel hearing.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
LR59	QOD5	Consider that the upgrade of Stockwell Dr should be considered a short term rather than a medium term project.	Disagree that this is required in the short term. Expect that development is likely to roll out relatively slowly in this part of the precinct.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
60	Spiire on behalf of 280 Lancefield Road (interested purchasers)					
LR60	SPI1	Review the extent of credited and uncredited Open Space areas provided for on the subject site, and across the wider PSP area, with a view to reducing / rationalising the total amount of Open Space and increasing the net amount of developable land. Amend the Property Specific Land Use Land Budget accordingly.	Disagree. The amount of open space within the PSP is in large part a consequence of the features of the precinct, including heavily incised creek corridors/valleys, conservation areas, and a large number of wetlands/retarding basins given the complexity of storm water management across the precinct. Only around 6.7% of the total precinct NDA is earmarked for sporting fields and local parks, in recognition of the higher than average level of encumbered open space	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR60	SPI2	Update the Conservation Area Concept Plan to require a 20m buffer zone, consistent with requirement R44.	The Conservation Interface Zone related to an area surrounding conservation areas where particular interface/design responses are to apply. It does not relate to a buffer per se. Therefore there is no conflict between to CACP and R44	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR60	SPI3	Add cross-sections to the LRPSP to clarify and detail the preferred interface with Emu Creek.	Conservation Area 21 is generally well below the break of slope, and therefore a conservation interface plan is not required. The cross section will be amended to show an indicative location of the conservation area down from the break of slope, with acknowledgement that the location varies	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
LR60	SPI4	Provide additional discretion and flexibility with regards to interface treatments to the Jacksons Creek and Emu Creek corridors.	The VPA is undertaking a review of the application of the Interface with Escarpment (visual) areas. The proposed approach will be detailed in our Part B submission to Panel	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR60	SPI5	Review and reduce the setback distances that are required in relation to 'sensitive interfaces'.	As above.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR60	SPI6	Re-position the Government Secondary School site so that it immediately abuts both Lancefield Road and the northern boundary of property 8, and re-orientate the School so that it extends in an east-west direction.	Both the Department of Education and Training and VicRoads have advised that the government secondary school should not have direct abuttal to Lancefield Road.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR60	SPI7	EITHER Amend Plan 8 (Native Vegetation Removal and Retention) to allow for the removal of the trees located in the southwest corner of Property 13 OR Amend Plan 7 (Open Space) to include the same trees within LP-11 (or alternative creditable open space area).	Agree that these trees will be removed from Plan 8, on the basis that they are not in fact native vegetation	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR60	SPI8	Identify a LI/LO access to 280 Lancefield Road.	Intersections with local level roads are not to be depicted in the PSP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR60	SPI9	Reduce the walkable catchment density requirements in R10 to 16.5 dwellings/NDHa	Disagree. There is sufficient capacity to provide a range of densities across the broader walkable catchment area	Yes	No action	Unresolved
61	National Trust of Australia (Victoria)					
LR61	NTA1	The National Trust of Australia (Victoria) is in the process of nominating the Sunbury Rings Cultural Landscape to the Victorian Heritage Register	It is understood that this nomination has now been withdrawn.	No	No action	Resolved
LR61	NTA2	We submit that the proposed multi-lot subdivision proposed to the west of Racecourse Road would adversely impact the significance of the SRLC. In particular, Stages 5, 7 and 8 encroach on areas of identified cultural and natural heritage significance, and potentially impact on significant views and landscape values.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR61	NTA3	The proposed extent of rezoning from Rural Conservation Zone to urban Growth Zone is not supported, and in our view a planning overlay should be applied to the SRLC in its entirety to ensure that the new development is managed within the context of the landscape as a whole. Instruments which may be appropriate include but are not limited to Rural Conservation Zone or Significant Landscape Overlay, and will be the subject of further submissions by the National Trust at Planning Panel stage.	The VPA agrees that additional controls are required for this area of land, however do not agree that a Significant Landscape Overlay is the best tool for achieving this. New controls, as outlined in the Part A report, are proposed for inclusion within the PSP and UGZ schedule.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR61	NTA4	We have significant concerns regarding the proposed location of the Jacksons Creek Crossing, which is indicated in the Precinct Structure Plan November 2016 as connecting with Elizabeth Drive. The construction of any crossing within the National Trust classified Sunbury Rings Cultural Landscape would have an adverse effect on the ability to read the landscape as a whole. North-south views along the creek and valley, which connect the significant elements of the SRCL including the Aboriginal Earth Rings, Rupertswood, Canon Gully, and Emu Bottom, would also be adversely impacted.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR61	NTA5	Notes that no CHMP has been prepared for the Villawood subdivision.	A CHMP has now been completed and provided to the VPA.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR61	NTA6	Oppose the construction of a crossing within the SRLC, but if a crossing in this location is found to be unavoidable, we advocate for a sympathetic and high quality design response which responds to the significant values of the landscape and mitigates impacts on views along the Jacksons Creek corridor as much as possible.	Please refer to Part A report for strategic need for the Elizabeth Drive extension and bridge. The design of the Northern Crossing of Jacksons Creek will need to respond to many environmental and landscape constraints, and the VPA agree that a sympathetic and high quality response is required. The PSP includes a requirement (R64) that 'The Jacksons Creek road crossing must respond sensitively to landform, amenity and cultural and heritage values.' It is therefore a requirement that this is an important consideration in the bridge design.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
62	Erina Reddan					
LR62	ER1	Opposes the development of the land between Racecourse Road and Lancefield Road on cultural, environmental and heritage grounds.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
63	Arnie Azaris					
LR63	AA1	The Jacksons Creek Valley and Emu Bottom wetlands have significant Aboriginal and European Heritage values that must not be destroyed. Submits that this land is not appropriate for residential development of any kind.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR63	AA2	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.	Refer to response AA2 above.	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR63	AA3	Submits that this is not an unbiased proposal but developer led.	Concern noted. This process has been led by the Victorian Planning Authority, which is a government agency with no developer interests.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR63	AA4	Community consultation has been inadequate as community views are not evidenced in the proposed plans.	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. These have all been subject to extensive community consultation.	No	No action	Unresolved
64	Joe and Jenny Wallner					
LR64	JJW1	Refers to previous (informal) submission received by VPA 6 February 2015 (TRIM REF COR/15/1236)	Noted and reviewed.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR64	JJW2	Think that the QOD development proposals are out of character with the area.	The concept plan is being updated to avoid impacting on the footprint of existing dwellings, and to better acknowledge significant vegetation.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR64	JJW4	Area has been denoted as a sensitive area but with no clear guidelines or consideration of existing developed properties. The Balbethan Residential Concept appears to be a product of the wishes of developer QOD and has been devised without any consultation with land owners, that we know of. The Hume Planning Department should have a clear set of guidelines when considering a planning application for this sensitive area.	Concept Plans are currently being review to provide additional site specific objectives, requirements and guidelines. This will provide additional guidance to Hume Council when assessing applications, and the proposed approach will be tabled in our Part B submission	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR64	JJW5	Balbethan Drive has been fast tracked for upgrade. The only conclusion is that it is a reward for QOD for their contribution to the PSP development. Request an explanation for this rationale.	Balbethan Drive has been identified as a short term priority for improvement as it acts as a key gateway to this part of the precinct, and ultimately to the area west of the rail line (in association with a grade separation). As an existing road, it will see use increase as soon as development commences in this part of the precinct.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR64	JJW6	The proposed five additional intersections for Lancefield Road will mean that the ever expanding municipalities of Romsey and Lancefield will have their main commuter link to Sunbury and Melbourne severely restricted. There will be calls for an expensive bypass road in the future because of poor foresight/design now.	Noted. 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
65	Sunbury Historical and Heritage Society					
LR65	SHHS1	Opposes any development on the Racecourse Road development land owned by Salesian College due the heritage significance, given the presence of the Sunbury Earth Rings, Emu Bottom (Victoria's oldest homestead), Ruperstwood and Canon Gully.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
66	Western Water					
LR66	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR66	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"> • Shepherds Lane WPS upgrade • Emu Creek SPS • Hi Quality SPS • Buckland Way SPS • Redstone Hill WPS and tank <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.</p> <p>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	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR66	WW3	<p>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.</p>	This relates solely to Sunbury South	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR66	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"> • Dual alternative water supply pipes • Gravity trunk sewer main • Trunk potable water main • Possible reticulated mains for potable and alternative water <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
LR66	WW5	<p>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.</p>	This relates solely to Sunbury South	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR66	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	Resolved
LR66	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
LR66	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"	This is already included in a condition at 4.12 of the UGZ10.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR66	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 (delete) alternative water supply for toilet flushing and garden watering use should it become available."	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR66	WW11	Please change all references of recycled water to alternative water.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR66	WW12	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. Reference to alternative water to be included	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR66	WW13	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 his 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
LR66	WW14	Would like the Class B recycled water network to extend into the PSP areas.	Noted. Capacity for this to occur	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
67	Leanne Morgan (Sunbury Resident)					
LR67	LM1	Opposes the development of the land on environmental (views, air pollution from vehicles, biodiversity), community and heritage grounds.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR67	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
68	DEDJTR (Transport)					
LR68	DEDJTRT1	The proposed bus network for the Lancefield Road PSP is generally satisfactory.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT2	Cross sections as submitted in the Lancefield PSP for the arterial and connector roads are considered satisfactory. Cycling and shared paths have been adequately considered, arterial and connector roads will also adequately allow for buses.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT3	Plan 10 - The rail station should be labelled as a 'potential future rail station'. The potential for the future station is considered to be a long term opportunity, with a limited service by regional trains with a similar stopping pattern to Clarkefield. All other references in the PSP should also be amended to 'potential future rail station'.	Agree. All references will be modified accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT4	G67 should be amended: Where noise walls or mounds are proposed, they should be designed to contribute to an attractive neighbourhood. Alternative uses, such as open space, car parking and play areas should be provided to minimise the need for noise walls or mounds where practical and safe to do so.	Agree. G67 to be updated to include the words "where practical and safe to do so"	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR68	DEDJTRT5	3.6.3 - add 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.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT6	P18855 - 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	Awaiting further information from VicRoads.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR68	DEDJTRT7	VicRoads template planning permit conditions provided for inclusion with the 96A permit.	Noted, the template conditions have been included in the submission, awaiting specific conditions for this permit.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR68	DEDJTRT8	P18858 and P18855 - Planning Permit conditions from PTV are provided within the submission.	Noted. See below for action.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR68	DEDJTRT9	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.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT10	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).	Agreed	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT11	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.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR68	DEDJTRT12	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.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT13	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.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR68	DEDJTRT14	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.	Agreed.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
69	DELWP (Environment)					
LR69	DELWP2	UGZ10 - Clause 4.6 - Condition - Environmental Management Plans - Change reference to PSPs to Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP3	UGZ10 - Clause 4.6 - 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	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP4	Land Management Co-operative Agreement - conservation area categorised as nature conservation or open space 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
LR69	DELWP5	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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR69	DELWP6	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
LR69	DELWP7	IPO3 and IPO4 - Land Management Co-operative Agreement- conservation area categorised as nature conservation or open space - 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
LR69	DELWP8	IPO3 and IPO4 - As areas covered by schedules 4 & 5 of the IPO will not be subject to future residential development DELWP 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
LR69	DELWP9	Significant proportions of the precinct is identified as 'regionally significant landscape values' and 'service open space/retarding basin'. DEL WP would like to ask for advice on the extent of non-residential development that is likely to be located in these areas. Areas where future development is likely to occur should be represented in the precinct structure plan.	None of these areas as exhibited involved any potential urban development, beyond basic infrastructure and improvements to open space. Some of these areas have now been redefined for potential development, subject to a locally responsive drainage strategy	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR69	DELWP10	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
LR69	DELWP11	The PSP does not currently show a Conservation Area Interface Plan. The PSP must include a Conservation Area Interface Plan consistent with the requirements of the Guidance Note.	Agree to include Conservation Area Interface Plans.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP12	• DELWP's preference is for only one conservation area layer to be shown and for 'drainage/waterway in conservation area' to be changed to 'drainage/waterway' with a lighter hatching to clearly show it existing within the conservation area. • It appears the alignment of a north-south connector road encroaches into a section of Conservation Area 19 (see highlighted plan below). This road must be shown as located wholly outside of the conservation area.	Agree to change.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR69	DELWP13	Plan 4 - The legend to refer to 'conservation area' instead of 'conservation reserve'.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP14	Plan 8 - The wording in the legend should refer to 'scattered trees' instead of 'existing trees';	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP15	Plan 8 - The scattered tree points don't represent DELWP's final scattered tree layer. DELWP to provide VPA with final scattered tree layer	Noted. This will be updated with DELWPs final scattered tree layer.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP16	Plan 8 - 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
LR69	DELWP17	Plan 8 - The extent of native vegetation shown outside of conservation areas is missing a number of patches. The missing patches seem to be shown in dark green which does not seem to be represented in the legend.	Dark Green layer to be deleted. This was an error.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP18	It is unclear what the dark green shapes represent. In some cases they correlate with native vegetation (as above) however in other cases seem to represent non-native tree lines.	Dark Green layer to be deleted. This was an error.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP19	R43 to be amended as follows "Native vegetation may be removed as illustrated on Plan 8 provided it is carried out in accordance with the..."	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP20	R45 - Correct reference to Interface Cross Section (Appendix 4) to be inserted (as raised above Conservation Interface Plans need to be prepared for all conservation are interfaces and include in Appendix 4.	Agree. See above	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR69	DELWP21	R46 - The final sentence to finish with the following: "to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning"	Agree. FYI, this will also need to be to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP22	Figure 4, 5, 6 and 7 - To ensure clause 4.7 of UGZ schedule 10 (land management cooperative agreement for conservation area) is able to be implemented it is important that the PSP identifies the extent of each conservation area number. DEL WP requests the legend in the CACP's identify the number of each conservation area.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP23	Figure 4, 5, 6 and 7 - Update with scattered trees and AIS mapping provided.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP24	Figure 4, 5, 6 and 7 - In a number of areas, native vegetation identified in the time stamping data layer is not shown in the CACP's. An example is provided below - native vegetation exists within areas highlighted however is not represented in the CACP.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A large sections of the conservation areas (particularly 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)" 	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR69	DELWP26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site surveys have recently been undertaken with conservation areas 18 and 20. DELWP requests that the extent of native vegetation shown in the CACP's is based on data from these site surveys rather than the time stamping data layer (note that Plan 8 must show only native vegetation extent as per the timestamping data layer). DELWP to provide VPA with site survey native vegetation extent data for these conservation areas. 	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP27	There are a number of cases where shared paths are aligned through patches of site surveyed native vegetation (i.e. where timestamping is based on site assessments). These are highlighted below- note in some cases the true native vegetation extent is not represented in the plan. DELWP requests shared paths be realigned in these areas to avoid native vegetation.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP28	Plan 10 - 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 not shown in the CACP's.	Agree. Shared Path network on Plan to be modified to reflect indicative path network through conservation areas as defined in relevant Conservation Area Concept Plans	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP29	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. DELWP requests spatial data files for the location of stormwater assets to determine their suitability with respect to Conservation Area 21.	Further discussion required.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR69	DELWP30	Plan 11 proposes sewer infrastructure within Conservation Area 21 at a location where it has the potential to impact 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.	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	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR69	DELWP31	DELWP requests further information to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether there is a necessity for locating utilities within Conservation Area 21 and whether alternative options exists (both within and outside of the conservation area. What the impacts of this infrastructure would be (related to construction method and footprint). 	See above	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR69	DELWP32	3.5.2 - Add requirement - 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

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR69	DELWP33	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 areas. This includes areas of strategic importance for Growling Grass Frog as identified by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR69	DELWP34	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 Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan."	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
70	Catholic Education Melbourne					
LR70	CEM1	Request inclusion in background report: "A site for a Catholic primary school site 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
LR70	CEM2	Support the location of the non-govt primary school site.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR70	CEM3	The non-government primary site should be amended to be as close to 2.6 hectares as possible whilst retaining 40 to 60 lot width to depth ratio, not the 3.0 hectares that we understand is depicted on the current plan and reflected in the property specific land budget. This shows a total of 10 hectares for non-government schools.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR70	CEM4	The location of the non-government secondary site (future Salesian College campus) is supported provided that the location of the Melbourne Water facility immediately south of the proposed site is amended so that it does not prevent a connection between the two campus' of the Salesian College and abuttal to the escarpment and conservation area. The Melbourne Water drainage should be relocated slightly east to the area at the top of 'cannon gully' and between the relocated Jacksons Creek crossing road and the proposed non-government school.	Include Melbourne Water Response	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR70	CEM5	A direct visual connection with the existing campus (Rupertswood) is an important aspect, as is retaining a connection with the land. The separation of the secondary school site from the escarpment is not desired.	See CEM4	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR70	CEM6	The College has a strong preference for the Villawood plan arising from the stakeholder meeting, which took place at Salesian College on 18 May 2015, with modifications as necessary to provide for the relocated Jacksons Creek crossing road. The non-government secondary school should be 7 hectares and as close to the escarpment as possible, whilst still maintaining pedestrian access along the break in slope and around the future college.	See CEM4	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
71	Mesh on behalf of Villawood					
LR71	VW1	Villawood seek to engage with VPA and Hume about the cross-section for Elizabeth Drive, and its connections to the Racecourse Road roundabout and Jacksons Creek crossing. Key aspects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the size of the median, noting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o that the road is no longer planned to be duplicated; and o Hume’s maintenance requirements relating to landscaping in medians, parking lane widths, bike path location, and trees in kerb outstands. 	For further discussion, however the 7m median has been provided to preserve potential duplication in the ultimate. Villawood to confirm whether they still plan to submit revised cross section for consideration.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW2	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"> the offset is located wholly within RCZ land (i.e. not subject to GAIC and ICP payments), any edge road is permitted within the 40m offset, 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 drainage facilities are wherever possible located within the RCZ (and in limited situations partially within conservation areas with the agreement of the relevant authorities) 	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. Where land is already within the UGZ, no rezoning is proposed, as this is a reasonable constraint of the land. 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. 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)	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR71	VW3	Seeks amendments to the PSP to provide for passive open space nodes along the creek edge, within the RCZ, rather than concentrated in a single area of otherwise developable land.	This will be informed by ongoing review of the development envelope for the Racecourse Road site, and the associated 96A permit application.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW4	Villawood seeks clarification from VPA on the proposed approach to collection of contributions for open space at which time Villawood would seek to make further submissions on this matter. 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.	The planning permit conditions are incorrect. 52.01 will not be utilised for the collection of funds, as the land for local open space will be funded through the ICP.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW5	Villawood requests that the PSP be updated to refine drainage areas as work with Melbourne Water continues, and for the school to be relocated adjacent to the escarpment edge. Villawood also seeks confirmation that, post PSP approval, should any further refinements to drainage areas occur, that remaining land will revert to developable land.	The PSP will be updated to reflect ongoing refinement of the DSS. The PSP will include a notation on Plan 11 that drainage areas are subject to refinement through detailed design, to the satisfaction of MW and HCC, and that areas not used for drainage can be considered for development as part of planning permit applications (provided they are subject to the UGZ)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW6	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"> Density targets should be specifically lowered in areas of greater slope (for example, greater than 7.5%); and The overall density target/yield assumptions for Sunbury may need to be reduced having regard to topography and Sunbury's peri-urban location. 	15 dwellings per hectare is considered an appropriate density target for the precincts overall, noting that 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 will further consider whether there are any areas that require stronger descriptions around likely density outcomes, such as the Sherwood area, and will refine the walkable catchment boundary so that areas with challenging topography are excluded	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW7	Villawood requests that the PSP provide more specific direction in relation to implementation of streetscape diversity, having specific regard to likely maintenance-based responses. Key concerns are about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation and implementation of these objectives at the permit stage (for example, when maintenance considerations are overlaid); and The conflicting nature of these objectives with a number of other objectives contained within the PSP (refer to submission table in relation to R5, R43,R59, Plan 10, Table 8 and submissions in relation 	Advice being sought from Hume City Council in relation to the design parameters for streetscape diversity that will involve outcomes they are prepared to support. Potential to include these parameters in revisions to R49	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW8	Villawood requests that buffers to GGF areas be removed, and that buffers to other BCS areas be amended to 20m (once BCS areas have been adjusted in accordance with DELWP agreements).	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	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW9	Villawood requests minor changes to the RCZ boundary once the PSP plan is finalised, to align correctly with undevelopable land along the Jacksons Creek.	The RCZ boundary will be modified following the finalisation of the PSP plan.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW10	Include a PAO over the alignment of RD-03 where it affects private property.	Hume City Council, who would be the acquiring authority, do not support the introduction of a PAO over this land.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW11	Villawood requests that the cross-section relevant to slope include notations that enable flexibility in implementation, including use of front, rear and side retaining walls where appropriate.	The VPA are currently reviewing the full suite of slope controls, in response to a range of submissions on this matter. The VPAs Part B submission will outline any proposed modifications to slope controls	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
		Plan based submissions - Racecourse Road (refer submission)				
LR71	VW12	Correction required to zone and drainage boundary. RCZ boundary overlaid as green dashed line.		Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW13	Request relocation of drainage reserve as shown - as per Villawood concept subject to detailed design with Melbourne Water and in accordance with DELWP agreement.	Melbourne Water's updated DSS has revised the shape of the drainage asset in this location, although not in the manner requested by Villawood. Submitter to progress with Melbourne Water.	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW14	Request redistribution of credited open space to areas shown on plan.	To be informed by ongoing discussions around development envelope for the Racecourse Road site	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW15	Request areas shown with asterisk as credited open space as per Note 3a	To be informed by ongoing discussions around development envelope for the Racecourse Road site	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW16	Request waterway and zone boundary to be adjusted subject to discussion with Melbourne Water.	Melbourne Water have advised that they are not prepared to support this change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW17	Existing reserve doesn't serve a natural waterway function and request piping on section of waterway above dam. SP14 not required.	Melbourne Water have advised that they are not prepared to support this change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW18	Landscape values area to align with development boundary as shown. Confirm 40m setback not required in this location.	Agree. 40m setback not required, however 20m setback from conservation area boundary will be required	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW19	Request information to what is driving the alignment of Elizabeth Drive, and flexibility to minor realignment noting roundabout calls for duplicated Elizabeth Drive is unlikely to be required in the interim. Refer to notes regarding cross section 8.	VPA is in ongoing discussions with Villawood in relation to this.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW20	Correction required to zoning boundary to reflect Villawood concept.	To be informed by ongoing discussions around development envelope for the Racecourse Road site	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
		Plan based submissions - Raes Road (refer submission)				
LR71	VW21	Confirm flexibility in final location, shape and distribution of parks, generally in accordance with PSP	R32 of the exhibited PSP provides for the alternative provision/distribution of local open space to be considered as part of a planning permit application	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW22	Adjust PSP to reflect revised PSP conservation reserve boundary	VPA agree that the PSP will be updated to reflect the adjusted conservation boundary, provided the changes are approved by the Commonwealth / DELWP (as applicable).	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW23	As part of adjustment of conservation reserve, request that active open space moves north adjacent to conservation reserve. Request reduction in size of active open space given its colocation with conservation reserve and subject to masterplan	Do not support the reduction in size, as the conservation reserve does not have capacity to provide any active recreational uses. Do support the concept of direct abuttal to the conservation reserve	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW24	Request flexibility in final location of north-south road to respond to reshaping of conservation reserve and active open space	Agree. There will be a need to review the alignment of the north-south road to reflect decisions on the boundary of the conservation area. The final alignment of this road would always be informed by subdivision design at a permit stage.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW25	Adjust PSP to reflect outcomes of discussions with Melbourne Water re location, size and shape of the drainage reserve. Preferred location shown with asterisk	PSP will be updated to reflect ongoing refinement of the DSS. Melbourne Water have indicated that they do not currently support the change requested	No	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW26	Request to move school south to the edge of the escarpment	See above	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW27	Positioning of the Jacksons Creek crossing subject to further information	This has been subject to ongoing discussions. Alignment of crossing will be updated to reflect additional design work	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW28	Seeking consistency to alignment of escarpment and zone boundary, with the RCZ to include road and setback	Not supported. See VW2	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW29	Confirm parks are located wholly within RCZ (within setback of escarpment)	These parks are located within the 40m visual setback, however they will not be included within the RCZ	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW30	Request clarification regarding the possible heritage site. Villawood are unaware of any heritage values in this area	VPA are in discussions with Hume City Council and are continuing to review whether this site should continue to be nominated as a potential heritage site. The VPA will advise further within their Part B submission to Panel.	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW31	Clarify methodology for extent of walkable catchment shown in PSP. Catchment differs from catchments shown on Plan 5	This has been subject to further discussions, and the basis of defining the walkable catchment is generally set out at R10. It is therefore different to the catchments defined on Plan 5	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
		Specific matters				
LR71	VW32	Plan 2 - It is considered that the following amendments should be made to this plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that waterbody on Sherwood Heights site is a man made dam Clarify what is meant by the term 'strategic views' Adjust conservation area boundary on Raes Road site as per revised boundary approved by DELWP Remove the 'potential heritage site' - the home identified from aerial photography no longer exists on site (as already identified in the Context technical background report) Villawood to provide a report from a qualified expert to confirm no remaining heritage values in that location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that the waterbody is man made. Nevertheless, it is an existing feature of the precinct. Strategic views is intended to define key view lines of important landscape features within the precinct, or long range views to key features outside the precincts. It does not have any statutory effect on its own Agree. The conservation area boundary will be reviewed once approved by the Commonwealth. Villawood to provide report. 	Yes	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW33	Plan 3 - Amend plan in accordance with separate written submission and enclosed plan	See Plan Based Submission responses above	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR71	VW34	O2 - Amend objective or add additional objective to be specific about using connector roads as being opportunities for high-amenity landscape outcomes through street tree planting and varied cross-sections.	Agree. O2 will be amended to generally reflect this	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW35	O6 - Amend objective to acknowledge other factors as noted, should acknowledge that there are other conditions and requirements that may need to also be considered and balanced in combination with objectives seeking higher densification.	O6 is being amended 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." O7 will be amended to reflect that lower density outcomes may be appropriate in locations with slope.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW36	O9 - This objective is supported, however, Villawood have concerns regarding its implementation. Refer to written submission (Strategic Issues) for further detail.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW37	O11 - No change to objective sought. Change to Plan 3 sought to include credited open space within Jacksons Creek setback.	Based on confirmation from Hume City Council, Plan 3 will be updated to include passive nodes as credited open space, within the Jacksons Creek setback.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW38	O18 - Objective should recognise opportunity for sensitive multi-use of conservation and adjacent 'landscape' and drainage land for open space purposes. Objective should be amended to clarify that buffer requirements do not apply to conservation area 21.	Disagree. Whilst the Objective does relate to nature conservation areas, the principles still apply to the GGF corridor, and a setback is still required to this corridor within the PSP. The Objective does not specifically make reference to a buffer requirement.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW39	O31 - Amend objective to include reference to connector roads and key local character roads.	Objective will be modified to include 'and along connector and local roads, as appropriate' at the end of the sentence	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW40	O34 - Amend the objective to include 'where appropriate'.	This wording has been provided by DELWP's IWM, and they support its retention, as worded.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW41	O38 - This objective is supported by Villawood. It is noted that this project is identified in the Infrastructure Strategy as a medium term project. Villawood supports the PSP's objectives, on the understanding that it provides flexibility to bring this project forward if required.	Support noted.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW42	2.3 - Include acknowledgement that a 15 dwellings per ha target will not be achievable across the entire PSP area	The VPA consider 15 dwellings per hectare to be an appropriate density target for these PSPs. This is lower than most other growth corridors, and reflects that there are areas which will require lower density outcomes. This figure is an average yield, incorporating both the higher density and lower density outcomes sought in various areas of the Precincts.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW43	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. Refer to Strategic Issues for further detail.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW44	G3 - Amend objective to remove 'consistent' and instead acknowledge that street tree planting themes can be used to differentiate neighbourhood character.	To amend to include the sentence: "Variations in street tree planting themes can be used to differentiate neighbourhood character, where agreed with the responsible authority.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW45	R10 - Amend requirement to be a guideline, noting it is necessary to balance the objective for higher density with other considerations and objectives.	Disagree. Noting that there are many areas of the precincts which may deliver lower densities, the VPA consider it important to ensure that these densities are achieved where the conditions are appropriate to do so. It should be noted that the PSP does not mandate a minimum density outside the walkable catchment boundary	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW46	R10 - As per the above, this is an example of a requirement that must be balanced against objectives relating to density targets.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW48	R14 - Redraft as a guideline given the varying conditions and outcomes, and to better align with use of the term 'minimise'.	Disagree. Given the sensitivities around building on slope, the VPA consider that it is appropriate to mandate for these principles to be adhered to.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW49	R16 - Redraft as guideline, clarify interaction with G13	Agree. To be redefined as a guideline. Do not believe this is in conflict with G13, as it specifically sets out the priority order of frontage.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW50	G13 - Clarify interaction with R16.	See VW49	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW51	G14 - Amend guideline or Plan 5 to define 'significant slope' Villawood to supply updated cross-sections to indicate potential for retaining, etc.	Plan 5 will be updated with a heading of 'Significant Slope' to include land shown as '10-15% slope" and "15-20% slope. Villawood to provide cross-sections.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW52	G15 - Amend guideline to acknowledge impact on density target	Agree. Guideline will specifically acknowledge the density implications associated with this	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW53	G17 - Consider amending the guideline such that it applies only to land where slope is less than 7.5%, or only to the upper level of homes.	The Guideline will be amended to include 'where practical' at the end of the first sentence.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW54	Plan 6 - Amend plan to show 400m catchments to local town centres	Disagree. The 1km catchments do not have a specific relationship to requirements and guidelines within the PSP - they are a demonstration of the consistency of the PSP with the relevant standard in the PSP Guidelines requiring 80-90% of households to be within 1km of a supermarket-anchored town centre	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW55	Plan 7 - Amend Plan 7 to reflect requested changes to Plan 5	Plan 7 will ultimately be updated to reflect final decisions in relation to the location of open space on the Future Urban Structure	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW56	R32 - 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).	Agree. An additional dot point will be included to define the positive broader community outcomes alternative open space provision models will need to demonstrate.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW57	G44 - Amend guideline to 'should', and also to provide flexibility for other positive co-location opportunities.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW58	Plan 8 - Amend plan to include conservation area number reference and updated conservation area boundaries. _edit retained tree layout appropriately.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW59	Figure 4-7 - Amend the CACP to remove the buffer to conservation area 21 - the application of an additional buffer to this reserve is considered inappropriate. Amend the buffer to other reserves to reduce it to 20m, in accordance with previous PSPs.	The 30m conservation interface zone is not a buffer - a buffer of 20m only will apply to the open space conservation areas. Additional cross sections will be included to clarify the effect of the conservation interface zone, however these will in part include development.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW60	Plan 9 - Villawood request further details about the proposed Jackson Creek crossing alignment (e.g. 3D modelling) in order to make submissions on this matter.	These have now been provided and discussions are ongoing	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW61	R49 - This requirement is supported in principle, however actual implementation can be challenging in the context of Council's requirements, particularly in relation to landscape restrictions and maintenance. Refer to written submission (Strategic Issues)	Given the difficulty associated with monitoring compliance with this requirement, it is proposed to be changed to a guideline	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW62	Plan 10 - Amend plan to indicate a noise amenity 'interface' along the rail	This will be deleted from Plan 10, as the interface is shown on Plan 5.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW63	G61 - Delete guideline or clarify how it is to be balanced with other objectives.	This is a guideline only, and considered appropriate for inclusion. The words "Where practical" will be added.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW64	R70 - In practical terms, it is unclear how this requirement will be applied. Typically restrictions are implemented on title requiring the party undertaking construction to provide for any applicable noise standard (which might result from a noise report undertaken at subdivision stage) during construction of buildings. Clarify intended application of this requirement or otherwise revise it to be a guideline.	The intention is here that Council would address this through permit conditions, which might well involve restrictions on titles. This requirement, together with the associated application requirements in the UGZ Schedule will provide sufficient information to Council to determine how most appropriately to apply this requirement.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW65	R72 - Delete requirement	Disagree. This is considered an appropriate cost to be borne by the developer. This Requirement can be re-worded to make it clear that it only applies where an appropriate fence does not already exist	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW66	G65 - Amend guideline to provide for alternative and diverse interfaces	Disagree, this is a guideline only and indicates the preferred (but not only) outcome.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW67	Table 8 - Amend table to provide additional information regarding potential streetscape variations. Amend table to reflect any revised cross-sections (i.e. Boulevard Connector alternate proposal if adopted), or provide for localised variations for existing services, etc.	Table pre-amble will be updated to acknowledge the potential need for local variations, base on site conditions etc.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW68	Plan 11 - Amend Plan 11 to accord with annotations on enclosed Plan 3	Plan 11 will be updated with the DSS provided to the VPA by Melbourne Water.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW69	R73 - Amend PSP plans to accord with the refined wetland arrangements for Sherwood Height application area in accordance with current subdivision plan (amended) and DELWP agreement.	Melbourne Water is not satisfied with the overall drainage layout in the subdivision and this was communicated to the applicant in writing on 10th February 2017. Melbourne Water has not agreed to the subdivision layout proposed. The application must be amended to accord with the updated Devon Park Development Services Scheme. Of particular concern is inadequate provision of the high value waterway corridor on the southern side of the site.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW70	R77 - Amend the requirement to be a guideline.	Melbourne Water have advised that they are not prepared to support this change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW71	G70 - Amend guideline to refer to high value natural waterways, and include guidance on when alternative solutions might be accepted.	Melbourne Water have advised that they are not prepared to support this change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW72	G73 - Amend the guideline to specifically note the need to: • adjust designs to reflect local conditions (including the use of retaining where appropriate). • require integrated water management systems to be designed wherever possible to minimise their scale and associated impact on any areas of otherwise developable land. • be located in areas that are otherwise undevelopable where doing so would be unlikely to adversely impact on conservation areas.	Melbourne Water have advised that they are not prepared to support this change	Yes	No action	Unresolved
	VW73	R83 - Request that the provision of conduits should be an ICP cost.	The provision of services is a developer cost which will not be funded by the ICP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW74	Table 9 - Update table with refined areas following discussions with Melbourne Water	Agree. The table will be updated to reflect updated DSS.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW75	<p>Table 10 - Amend table: RD02 - includes an asterisk on timeframe. Definition of the asterisk is not provided. BR-01 - unclear what the U timeframe means BR-03 - States a medium timeframe. Villawood request that this be amended to short term to provide flexibility in bringing forward this item to facilitate delivery of the Salesian College site (refer to written submission). IN-05 - A significantly upgraded Racecourse Road intersection is already nearing completion. Given it appears that new section of Elizabeth Drive to the east is now never to be duplicated (the cross-section appears not to provide for it?), it is unclear why IN-05 is included in the PIP and the ICP. • Add a new short term item to cover the connector road between BR-03 and RD-02 - this link is critical to early delivery of a new campus for the Salesian College, which is currently at capacity (and as such delivery of a new campus early will significantly reduce pressure on delivery of community infrastructure elsewhere). It is also noted that it will likely be many years until BR-02 is delivered, meaning this link could perform a significant function for many years.</p> <p>Refer to separate submission on Infrastructure Delivery Strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •RD02 - The asterisk is intended to denote the fact that the road in its entirety will be delivered over a number of stages. The VPA now propose to define the road a series of separate discrete projects, with less ambiguous indicative timing. •BR-01 - The U timeframe is intended to imply 'Ultimate' however following review based on other submissions, it is now intended to include these items as 'Long' term timing. •BR-03 - Project will be reclassified as 'S-M' •IN-05 - As discussed, this project involves adding a fourth leg to the intersection recently constructed. The VPA are happy to remove this from the ICP, and clarify in the PIP that the works involve only an additional leg to the intersection. •Additional connector road - Disagree. This is genuinely a connector road providing for local access. If it needs to be delivered early to provide access to the Salesian Campus, the cost should be borne by the development of the campus (with potential for some interim form of connection) 	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW76	<p>Sunbury Ring Road - Elizabeth Drive Extension Connector Road - Racecourse Road Local Access Street (all sloping cross-sections) - Villawood propose to present an alternative cross-section for discussion with VPA/Hume.</p>	See VW1	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW77	4.3 - Land budget - Amend table to identify sub-column totals and to include revised land areas following plan-based changes	Agreed. Table will be updated accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
Planning Permit Conditions						
LR71	VW65	Condition 1a - clarify	A subdivision application affects all of the lot, not just the area proposed for residential development.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW66	1b) It is assumed this is requesting the full parent title lot be shown on the plan. It is noted that this includes some land on the east side of Jacksons Creek that is not subject to the current subdivision permit. Preceding GAIC exempt subdivisions have also been lodged with HCC and may affect the final outcomes here.	As per VW65 above.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW67	1c) It is noted that the BCS boundary has been amended as per the Villawood proposed development footprint, however the drainage land does not seem to reflect this agreement. Refer to previous comments and the written submission.	Noted. Awaiting review of the PSP.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW68	1d) Supply further information regarding the Jacksons Creek crossing location	VPA supplied updated 3 dimensional plans of the Jacksons Creek crossing in June 2017.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW69	1e) Refer to written submission in response to drainage. An alternative response to that submitted in the 96A application is being negotiated with Melbourne Water and will be submitted in the form of an amended plan shortly.	Noted.	No	No action	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW70	1f) Delete condition, or amend to reflect revised approach to credit for several smaller nodes along the interface with Jacksons Creek, and perhaps one larger one, subject to relocation of proposed Melbourne Water drainage to DELWP approved locations.	Further discussion required following revision of the PSP.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW71	1g) Clarify intent and operation. Villawood's preferred outcome is to amend the condition to refer only to existing walls (i.e. no cut or fill or retaining within 1m of those walls constructed during subdivision works).	Further review required, subject to review of planning controls for Racecourse Road area.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR71	VW72	1h) As per the written submission, Villawood is reviewing this cross-section, and will seek to discuss an alternative cross-section with VPA/Hume.	Noted.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR71	VW73	1i) Delete condition	Agree to delete condition. No longer necessary as Sunbury Fields has constructed shared path.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW74	Condition 13 b) vi) Delete condition - it is inappropriate prefer an outcome that imposes additional unnecessary costs, and which is addressed through other standards in any event. Provision of services at the rear (where appropriate) is a well-proven and cost effective option.	Do not agree.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW75	15) Amend condition to state prior to commencement of construction works	Agree to include timing trigger in Condition as requested.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW76	16) Confirm conditions, delete salvage condition	Mandatory condition of the scheme.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW77	17) Amend condition timing trigger	Adjust the timing to allow for submission of detailed landscape plans before completion of civil works.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW78	18c) Amend condition wording 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
LR71	VW79	18h) Amend working of condition to a should, rather than must requirements. In addition, it is noted that 3m wide cross-overs are not practical. Villawood's experience is that cross-overs need to be a minimum of 4m to avoid people driving over the nature strip, and must be 5-5.5m at the boundary to provide access to properties.	Condition to be deleted with the exception of "A vehicular crossing to each lot".	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
		18p) Change the condition to only refer to roundabouts on designated bus routes.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW80	22) Amend wording of condition to 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, which already have buffer areas included within their boundary.	Do not agree, this is a mandatory condition of the scheme.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW81	23e) Delete Condition	Condition requires supervision by an ecologist or arborist of works. However, this does not mean direct supervision of all works. The VPA consider that the condition is reasonable and will be retained.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW82	24c) Further detail regarding the proposed valuation methodology is sought. Note that the reference to R36 appears incorrect. Refer to written submission querying the intended method of open space contribution collection - via Clause 52.01 or via the ICP. Villawood will make a submission on this matter once it is clarified.	Condition to be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW83	25) This condition appear 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
LR71	VW84	26) As per above comment	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW85	36) Delete condition	Mandatory condition, to be retained.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
		SICADS submission				
LR71	VW86	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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 • Thirdly, larger projects have the capacity to reduce Council's financial risk by delivering key infrastructure items as works in kind 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree, however the VPA consider this discussion is better placed at 1.3 • Disagree. This is too broad a generalisation as to the likely priority associated with early infrastructure delivery, and in fact a number of projects associated with earlier stages of development would not meet this test. • Agree, however the VPA consider this discussion is better placed at 1.3 	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW87	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	Resolved
LR71	VW88	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	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW89	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the draft strategy recognize that the need for delivery of the project is created by regional traffic demand; the draft strategy recognize that developers of land in Sunbury cannot control delivery of the Bulla Bypass project; clarification be provided by the VPA regarding any relationship between timing of delivery of the Bulla Bypass and potential lot release beyond stage 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree Agree Disagree. The role of the strategy is to provide some direction around the strategic need for infrastructure projects, relative the distribution and level of development. Whilst the strategy identifies 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. 	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR71	VW90	To improve the efficiency of delivery of the intersections and upgrade of the arterial road network it is requested that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft strategy recognise the need to achieve efficiencies with regard to delivery of key transport infrastructure; 	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW91	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	Resolved
LR71	VW92	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	Resolved
LR71	VW93	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	No action	Resolved
LR71	VW94	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 process is currently underway, and will result in a revised optimal cross section for Sunbury Road (with greater acknowledgement of the need for local variation)	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW95	It is requested that consideration be given to the inclusion of the activity centre connector road / Sunbury road intersection as an ICP project.	Disagree. This is not identified as a signalised intersection within the PSP. The need for any interim signalised function to this intersection would be demonstrated by the applicant as part of a planning permit application, and would be solely for the purpose of providing safe access to the site in the event that the ultimate signalised network has not been sufficiently rolled out to support this.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR71	VW96	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	Agreed. VPA would appreciate the opportunity to view the surveyed corridor and consider alternatives, based on previous discussions	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR71	VW97	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).	Further discussion around the capacity to consider some credit for Redstone Hill through the ICP, subject to understanding an agreed (Willawood and Council) schedule of works for improvements to the park	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR71	VW98	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"> • The potential benefit of delivery of the infrastructure to existing and future communities; and • The timing of credits for brought forward infrastructure relative to other priorities. 	Agreed. The Strategy will be updated to incorporate this discussion	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
72	Melbourne Water - Sherwood Heights					
LR72	MWPP1	Melbourne Water objects to the above 96A Planning Permit Application for staged subdivision on the following grounds:	Noted. Refer Part A report for further detail.	Yes	No action	Decision pending further review
LR72	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
LR72	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
LR72	MWPP4	3. The subdivision does not provide an adequate setback between the lots and the waterways to allow for appropriate landscaping, access, amenity and vegetated visual buffers.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP5	4. The planning permit application is premature and conflicts with the draft PSP and Development Services Scheme (planned drainage infrastructure) for the PSP area.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP6	5. The subdivision does not advance the objectives of proper and orderly planning in Victoria.	Noted.	No	No action	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP7	Melbourne Water has fundamental concerns with the proposed subdivision layout and the conflicts with the draft Devon Park Development Services Scheme - Melbourne Water's masterplan for future drainage of the area. Additionally, the application undermines our objectives to protect waterways and ensure that lots have an appropriate buffer distance and interface to waterway corridors. Melbourne Water provided a written objection to the Victorian Planning Authority at Agency Consultation (1st March, 2016 - Appendix 1), however the issues have not been addressed.	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR72	MWPP8	Despite the changes made by Melbourne Water to accommodate many aspects of the subdivision layout (comparing Figure 2 and Figure 3), there remains significant discrepancies between the Sherwood Heights masterplan and Melbourne Water's current draft DSS design. These are summarised in four key points below (refer submission for plans):	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP9	1. (Pink circles) - Lots and roads are proposed over Melbourne Water's designated waterway corridor. Roads and lots must be located outside Melbourne Water's waterway corridor.	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP10	2. (Yellow circle) - Lots and roads are proposed over asset WI-05a. Roads and lots must not be proposed within the area required for drainage assets under the draft Devon Park DSS.	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP11	3. (Black circle) - No provision has been made for the required waterway corridor (south-west to Jacksons Creek). A waterway and associated corridor are essential in this location (in accordance with the PSP and DSS).	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP12	4. (Blue circle) - The waterway corridor is not wide enough and terminates at a high-point in the landscape. This is labelled linear park in the subdivision masterplan, but the required function is a drainage asset. As with 3. above, the subdivision must make provision for this essential waterway corridor and WI-07. In addition, the masterplan also shows lots that are shown backing on to the waterway in this section. This is unacceptable as per Requirement R55.	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR72	MWPP13	Melbourne Water submits that the application for staged subdivision under Section 96A must be amended and re-submitted for consideration to be consistent with the current Devon Park DSS layout. The amended application must address the critical concerns outlined.	Please refer to the Part A report for the VPA's response to Melbourne Water's submission.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
73	Daryl Foster (Sunbury resident)					
LR73	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	Unresolved
LR73	DF2	Concerned about the visual and character impact of development on Racecourse Road.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR73	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 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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR73	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
LR73	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	Unresolved
LR73	DF6	Has consideration been made of the short to medium term issues caused in the CBD with the large increase in population?	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
LR73	DF7	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.	As above.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR73	DF8	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	Unresolved
LR73	DF9	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
LR73	DF10	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	Unresolved
74	Melbourne Water - PSP					
LR74	MW1	Table 9 - Minor adjustment required to the land areas for Water Infrastructure. The latest version of Melb Water GIS files (Water Infrastructure and Tributary Corridors) have also been provided. The areas provided in the GIS file (Attachment 3) are consistent with the areas in the column adjacent.	Table 9 will be comprehensively updated to reflect the revised DSS.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW2	Table 9 WI-05a not included in exhibited version of Table 9. Add WI-05a = 1.09 ha	Table 9 will be comprehensively updated to reflect the revised DSS.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW3	MW to provide correct GIS shape of proposed wetland WI-06 in Plan 11 and VPA to adopt this shape for all plans showing proposed drainage infrastructure.	The VPA understands that this asset is still the subject of discussions between Villawood and Melbourne Water. At this stage, the VPA propose to update the FUS and Plan 11 to reflect the revised DSS provided by Melbourne Water (as circulated).	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR74	MW4	Plan 3 - "Regionally significant landscape values" line should be clearly differentiated with the waterway corridor line. This should be changed on all plans. Replace "Service open space / retarding basin" with "Waterway/drainage reserve"	Agree. All plans will be updated to use the 'Waterway/drainage reserve' reference. Further discussion required in relation to the 'landscape values' layer, with wording to make it clear that this land cannot be appropriately drained based upon DSS	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW5	Table 9 - Retarding Basins - Re-name "Stormwater Quality Treatment"	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW6	Table 9 - Under the heading 'Type', each must be changed to 'Stormwater Quality Treatment'.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW7	Section 2.1. – Vision (last paragraph) - Change paragraph to read: "Future development will sensitively nestle between the key regional environmental and landscape features of the Jacksons and Emu Creek corridor. Urban development in the precinct is planned to respond to these key features, to preserve and enhance their biodiversity and waterway values, and to protect the sensitive geomorphological values of the creeks themselves and their significant tributaries."	Agree. Paragraph will be changed accordingly.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW8	O3 - 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".	Agree. Objective will be changed accordingly	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW9	O11 - 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	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW10	R60 - The design and construction of any crossing of the Jacksons Creek must be consistent with the 'Design and construction standards for Growling Grass Frog passage structures' (DELWP 2016) to the satisfaction of (Melbourne Water) and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.	Agree	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW11	R54 - "Road crossings of waterways must respond sensitively to landform, environment and the amenity of the waterway subject to Melbourne Water approval".	Melbourne Water approval will be required for road crossings of waterways in any event. The responsibility for assessing the degree to which a road crossing of a waterway responds specifically to the elements of this requirement should rest with Council as the Responsible Authority	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR74	MW12	Plan 11 - Plan should note that it is subject to change to align with the IWM Plan requirements as stipulated by Western Water and Melbourne Water	Agree. Note will be prepared to incorporate this discussion (as well as submissions from other parties).	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR74	MW13	Plan 11 - Consider inclusion of draft stormwater harvesting network which has been developed with Western Water Addition of wording to read: "Sunbury's urban growth will bring many challenges for not only water supply, security and resilience, but also in managing the potential future detrimental impacts of stormwater and wastewater on the highly valuable Emu and Jacksons Creek catchments. This coupled with the unique landscape of Sunbury means that a holistic approach to water management is necessary."	This text is included at Section 3.5.1. Repetition of this text is not considered necessary on Plan 11.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR74	MW14	3.5.2 - 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 recycled (delete) alternative water supply for toilet flushing and garden watering use should it become available	Agree. Word 'recycled' will be replaced by 'alternative'.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW15	R76 - Include additional Requirement with reference to protection of significant geomorphic values. "Stormwater conveyance and treatment must ensure impacts to identified significant geomorphic values are minimised to the greatest feasible extent."	Agree. Requirement to be added	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW16	R76 - Change last sentence: Regional stormwater conveyance and treatment must be in accordance with the Development Services Scheme.	Agree. Requirement to be modified	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW17	G70 - Change to a Requirement: "Subdivision in areas containing natural waterways should, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority: <input type="checkbox"/> Minimise earthworks and changes to the existing landform; <input type="checkbox"/> Retain existing native vegetation <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> Make provision for appropriate revegetation of indigenous species to improve waterway values	Disagree. There may be limited instances where it is impossible or undesirable to comply with all the outcomes set out in this guideline. If this were changed to a requirement, no discretion could be exercised.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR74	MW18	Section 2.2 Add new objective: "Manage urban stormwater to best practice outcomes (TSS, N, P) to minimise the impacts upon downstream waterway receiving environments and Port Philip Bay.	Agree. Additional objective to be included	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW19	G74 - Make G74 a Requirement and remove reference to lots facing directly onto waterway: "Streets should be the primary interface between development and waterways. Public open space and lots with a (delete) direct frontage may be provided as a minor component of the waterway interface only where necessary for logical subdivision design. 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, 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	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR74	MW20	Section 3.6.2 - Ensure wording is clear that more than 1 DSS is proposed for the PSP area. 'MW is producing DSS's"	Agree. Section will be modified	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW21	G70 - Suggested modification to G70 second point: "Retain existing vegetation within waterway corridors"	Agree. Guideline to be modified	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR74	MW22	R43 - Modify wording - Native vegetation may be removed as illustrated on Plan 8 and in accordance with the 'Final approval for urban development in three growth corridors under the Melbourne urban growth program strategic assessment, 5 September 2013' pursuant to section 146B of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth). This Requirement does not apply to the removal of native vegetation within designated waterway and drainage reserves, where removal is subject to approval by the relevant authority.	Plan 8 will be amended to no longer show trees within waterways as 'native vegetation that can be removed'. Given that the vegetation referred to in this request is already subject to approval by Melbourne Water as the relevant authority under other means, the VPA is of the view that an additional planning permit trigger is not necessary.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR74	MW23	Melbourne Water objects to the Section 96A Applications. See separate objections attached.	Noted.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
75	CFA					
LR75	CFA1	Any proposals to increase the degree of predominant vegetation within the precinct must be carefully considered. Replanting or re-vegetation 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
LR75	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.	Yes	No action	Resolved
LR75	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
LR75	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	Awaiting response from submitter
LR75	CFA5	CFA supports the amendment in its current form.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
76	Department of Justice and Regulation					
LR76	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.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
77	Margaret and Norman Gray (Balbethan Resident)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR77	MNG1	The Balbethan area is more suited to a low density subdivision rather than rural residential given similarities with the adjacent established neighbourhood of Rolling Meadows.	The concept plan and associated principles, objectives, requirements and guidelines will be updated to indicate that this concept plan area is unlikely to yield the 15 dwellings per hectare, and that a lower residential density in parts of the concept plan area is likely. The revised controls will clearly describe that properties abutting Rolling Meadows must provide for a transition in lot sizes.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR77	MNG2	Appreciate that the Balbethan Drive Residential Concept is provided for illustrative purposes and note it is subject to further development, but no process for consultation regarding this development is detailed and there are no clear objectives described to achieve this orderly and sensitive transition.	Additional Design Guidelines, specific to the Balbethan area, will be included within the PSP (see MBG1)	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR77	MNG3	Given that UGZ10, 3.4 C208 states that Sensitive Residential Areas require an indicative subdivision concept design of the entire area, we ask how this will be coordinated, given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations. It would be expected that all landowners, who may in time be developers, have the opportunity to be included in any discussions.	This will be reworded to request: "An indicative subdivision concept design which demonstrates consistency with the relevant concept plan in the Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan."	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR77	MNG4	The published proposal needs review given that it makes no consideration for existing dwellings or much significant vegetation.	The concept plan is being updated to avoid impacting on the footprint of existing dwellings, and to better acknowledge significant vegetation.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR77	MNG5	Clause 3.4 seems unclear in that it asks for demonstration of how a subdivision application will deliver "opportunities for higher density housing". What does this mean?	This will be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR77	MNG6	Clause 3.4 - asks for staging and indicative development timing – this is difficult to estimate given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations.	Further advice will be provided on this matter as part of the VPA's Part B submission to Panel.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR77	MNG7	Clause 3.4 - last paragraph offer even less clarity, with the rider "unless if, in the opinion of the Responsible Authority (Council) the permit implements the objectives for the area set out in the (PSP)". Are we right to assume these are O37 and O40? However, there are many other general Objectives to be met, including but not restricted to R92 which identifies the importance of safe and proper access into Lancefield Rd.	The assumption is correct that the permit must meet all of the specific and general objectives of the PSP. Additionally, as per response to MNG2, there will be additional design guidelines / objectives specific to each sensitive residential area added into the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR77	MNG8	We understand the concept of staged development and the need for an orderly and sensitive transition to a new (low) density. With the significant availability of land in the surrounding area we believe there is an opportunity to achieve this over time but in a way that addresses the fragmented land ownership. We therefore suggest this will need stronger direction regarding the graduation of lot sizes and that development would be triggered by the delivery of other relevant infrastructure e.g. rail overpass, Lancefield Road upgrade.	A range of infrastructure will be required to support development in all parts of the precinct, and not just within the Balbethan concept plan area. Requirements and Guidelines associated with the Balbethan Concept Plan area will set out the need for local road upgrades in support of development	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR77	MNG9	We are concerned about the potential for speculators to perhaps inappropriately influence current landholders if the development process is not clear and ask that council consider management strategies such as rate caps to help facilitate sensitive transition until land availability pressure becomes an issue.	Rate caps is a matter for Council and cannot be implemented through this amendment.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR77	MNG10	Concerned about safety issues on Lancefield Road as subdivision generally will occur in the Lancefield Rd area before a significant road upgrade. This is an issue not just for Sunbury residents but those who live in the developing north.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes. VicRoads, as the responsible authority for roads, will need to address any safety matters.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
78	Hazel and John Alexander (Sunbury Residents - Emu Bottom)					
LR78	HJA1	The full width of the Racecourse Road (Emu Bottom) area should be protected, for historical, wildlife protection and visual reasons.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR78	HJA2	Housing is inappropriate all the way to the drainage channel between Albert Road and Emu Road, as it represents the bottom of the valley - elsewhere you have reserved a broad strip either side of the valley. Housing should be withdrawn, preferably to end where the steep area occurs on the contour map south of Emu Road.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR78	HJA3	The Creek crossing must take full account of local wildlife. Requests a wildlife corridor is needed.	The design of the Northern Crossing of Jacksons Creek will need to respond to many environmental and landscape constraints. The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning and Melbourne Water have provided in-principle support for a creek-crossing generally in accordance with the alignment shown in the PSP, however the detailed design of the bridge will need to mitigate potential impacts on the environment and waterways, including the potential impact on fauna.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR78	HJA4	Cannon Gully must not be disturbed.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns. No urban development is proposed within the Heritage Overlay to Canon Gully.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
79	Kayleen and James Grover (Affected landowner)					
LR79	KJG1	The Balbethan area is more suited to a low density subdivision rather than rural residential given similarities with the adjacent established neighbourhood of Rolling Meadows.	The concept plan and associated principles, objectives, requirements and guidelines will be updated to indicate that this concept plan area is unlikely to yield the 15 dwellings per hectare, and that a lower residential density in parts of the concept plan area is likely. The revised controls will clearly describe that properties abutting Rolling Meadows must provide for a transition in lot sizes.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR79	KJG2	Appreciate that the Balbethan Drive Residential Concept is provided for illustrative purposes and note it is subject to further development, but no process for consultation regarding this development is detailed and there are no clear objectives described to achieve this orderly and sensitive transition.	Additional Design Guidelines, specific to the Balbethan area, will be included within the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR79	KJG3	Given that UGZ10, 3.4 C208 states that Sensitive Residential Areas require an indicative subdivision concept design of the entire area, we ask how this will be coordinated, given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations. It would be expected that all landowners, who may in time be developers, have the opportunity to be included in any discussions.	This will be reworded to request: "An indicative subdivision concept design which demonstrates consistency with the relevant concept plan in the Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan."	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR79	KJG4	The published proposal needs review given that it makes no consideration for existing dwellings or much significant vegetation.	The concept plan is being updated to avoid impacting on the footprint of existing dwellings, and to better acknowledge significant vegetation.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR79	KJG5	Clause 3.4 seems unclear in that it asks for demonstration of how a subdivision application will deliver "opportunities for higher density housing". What does this mean?	This will be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR79	KJG6	Clause 3.4 - asks for staging and indicative development timing – this is difficult to estimate given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations.	Further advice will be provided on this matter as part of the VPA's Part B submission to Panel.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR79	KJG7	Clause 3.4 - last paragraph offer even less clarity, with the rider "unless if, in the opinion of the Responsible Authority (Council) the permit implements the objectives for the area set out in the (PSP)". Are we right to assume these are O37 and O40? However, there are many other general Objectives to be met, including but not restricted to R92 which identifies the importance of safe and proper access into Lancefield Rd.	The assumption is correct that the permit must meet all of the specific and general objectives of the PSP. Additional, as per response to KJG1, there will be additional design guidelines / objectives specific to each sensitive residential area added into the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR79	KJG8	We understand the concept of staged development and the need for an orderly and sensitive transition to a new (low) density. With the significant availability of land in the surrounding area we believe there is an opportunity to achieve this over time but in a way that addresses the fragmented land ownership. We therefore suggest this will need stronger direction regarding the graduation of lot sizes and that development would be triggered by the delivery of other relevant infrastructure e.g. rail overpass, Lancefield Road upgrade.	A range of infrastructure will be required to support development in all parts of the precinct, and not just within the Balbethan concept plan area. Requirements and Guidelines associated with the Balbethan Concept Plan area will set out the need for local road upgrades in support of development	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR79	KJG9	We are concerned about the potential for speculators to perhaps inappropriately influence current landholders if the development process is not clear and ask that council consider management strategies such as rate caps to help facilitate sensitive transition until land availability pressure becomes an issue.	Rate caps is a matter for Council and cannot be implemented through this amendment.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR79	KJG10	Concerned about safety issues on Lancefield Road as subdivision generally will occur in the Lancefield Rd area before a significant road upgrade. This is an issue not just for Sunbury residents but those who live in the developing north.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes. VicRoads, as the responsible authority for roads, will need to address any safety matters.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
80	Melbourne Water - P18855					
LR80	MWKF1	Melbourne Water objects to the above 96A Planning Permit Application for staged subdivision on the following grounds: 1. The subdivision is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to the protection of waterways, the natural environment and River Health.	Noted.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR80	MWKF2	2. The subdivision is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to drainage and floodplain management.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR80	MWKF3	3. The subdivision does not provide an adequate setback between the lots and the waterway to allow for appropriate landscaping, access, amenity and vegetated visual buffers.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR80	MWKF4	4. The planning permit application is premature and conflicts with the draft PSP and Development Services Scheme (planned drainage infrastructure) for the PSP area.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR80	MWKF5	5. The subdivision does not advance the objectives of proper and orderly planning in Victoria.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR80	MWKF6	Melbourne Water submits that the application for staged subdivision under Section 96A must be amended and re-submitted for consideration to be consistent with the current Oldbury DSS layout.	Noted. Advice passed on to applicant. As of 7/6, applicant in process of revising plan to respond to the DSS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR80	MWKF7	WI-17 - this asset needs to be provided for in the application, in the location and size shown in the DSS.	Noted. Advice passed on to applicant. As of 7/6, applicant in process of revising plan to respond to the DSS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR80	MWKF8	WI-15 - inadequate land has been provided for this asset. The asset needs to be 3.40ha.	Noted. Advice passed on to applicant. As of 7/6, applicant in process of revising plan to respond to the DSS.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Awaiting response from submitter
LR80	MWKF9	The super lots do not address R55 of the PSP and do not have a positive interface to the waterway.	The VPA consider that the plans adequately addresses R55. Super lots adjacent the gully are capable of providing a suitable interface to the gully.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
81	Macedon Ranges Shire Council					
LR81	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR81	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.	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: 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. 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. 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 support the existing connections to Sunbury and Melbourne from regional Victoria.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR81	MRSC3	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.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes. VicRoads, as the responsible authority for roads, will need to address any safety matters.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR81	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	Unresolved
LR81	MRSC5	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	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR81	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>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR81	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	Unresolved
LR81	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.	As per response to MRSC6 above.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR81	MRSC9	Request the inclusion of an ICPO.	The ICPO will be applied through a separate amendment, which is intended to be approved concurrently with C207 and C208, and incorporated the ICP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR81	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.	All these uses have been located proximate to the train station to provide an opportunity for greater access, based upon the potential for rail travel to the centre from the surrounding region. The VPA considers that in all instances these uses are located within a reasonable walking distance from the train station, having regard for the desire to achieve a significant residential catchment within the vicinity of the train station.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR81	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
82	AHB					
LR82	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	Resolved
LR82	AHB2	Advocates for the earlier development of the Sunbury West precinct.	Noted, but outside the scope of the current PSP	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
83	EPA					
LR83	EPA1	The EPA has no significant concerns in relation to C208.	Noted.	No	No action	Resolved
84	Trevor Dance					
LR84	TDA1	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR84	TDA2	Existing infrastructure is at capacity - cites concern, particularly regarding water services and transport infrastructure.	<p>The PSPs provide for a significant number of infrastructure projects, and includes a new major town centre and three new local town centres to service the needs of the new residents.</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> <p>The VPA has consulted with all relevant servicing authorities, and is satisfied that the precincts will be appropriately serviced.</p>	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA3	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.	A range of key transport infrastructure priorities have been identified to ease existing pressure on the Sunbury CBD. These include two additional road crossings of the Jacksons Creek, as well as three additional grade separated rail crossings, In particular, the southern Jacksons Creek Crossing has been identified as a key priority for early delivery. It is unclear why the submitter thinks that those planned by the VPA will not assist with the issue.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA4	The PSPs show no solid new emergency service facilities or medical services.	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
LR84	TDA5	Bulla Bypass is required and is not scheduled for in these plans.	<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
LR84	TDA6	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	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA7	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	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR84	TDA8	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 development outcomes. Additional controls have been proposed for the area of land west of Jacksons Creek (refer Part A submission for further details).	No	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR84	TDA9	Concerned about the lack of protection for endangered flora species and the health of the creek corridors.	The Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ensures the conservation of nationally endangered species, which will also 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.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA10	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	Unresolved
LR84	TDA11	Villawood's Racecourse Road application does not fit into the heritage area. The landscape is of Aboriginal heritage significance, historical, aesthetic, archaeological and scientific (environmental) importance to Victoria. Requests that this area of land is not rezoned from RCZ.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR84	TDA12	The ridge line setbacks need to be a far greater distance than shown in the plan to protect the Heritage Overlay on Emu Bottom Homestead, which was put in place to preserve the visual outlook looking towards the East. They need to be set back to the railway line.	This area has been earmarked for urban development in state planning policy. Setback some 900m plus from the creek line is considered an inefficient use of land, when balanced against a range of objectives around settlement of Melbourne	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA13	Believes that Villawoods early advertising on the Racecourse Road site was misleading and had an effect on the communities willingness to submit on the PSPs.	Noted. No change to the amendment requested. The VPA has not been involved in any advertising on site by Developers, and clearly included reference to the planning permit applications as forming part of the exhibited material as per the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA14	There is already a creek crossing north of Sunbury, on Settlement Road, outside the UGB.	The crossing referred to is located approximately 5km to the north of the precinct and does not fulfil the strategic function of the required creek crossing.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA15	Requests all traffic studies done for Elizabeth Drive, Racecourse Road, Lancefield Road and Riddell Road (from Council).	The submitter has been advised to contact Council in relation to this matter.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA16	The 406 lots in the Sherwood development represent only 2% of the housing planned and would result in the saving of an important historical site.	Noted.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA17	The lots abutting green wedge and RCZ land are too small in the Sherwood development.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR84	TDA18	The northern creek crossing cannot be allowed to occur (historical reasons provided).	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings. This revised alignment was endorsed by the Wurundjeri as having satisfactorily responded to their cultural heritage concerns	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR84	TDA19	Concerned that there has been inadequate consultation on the bridge alignment for the northern creek crossing.	The bridge alignment needs to respond to numerous elements of the landscape. The VPA has engaged with key parties including the Wurundjeri, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Melbourne Water, Hume City Council and others, to propose an alignment which best responds to the differing interests.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA20	Request completion and provision of CHMP.	A CHMP has been completed. The VPA understands that it was a Direction of the Panel that Villawood seek to provide this to the submitter if possible.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA21	Request aesthetic treatment of creek crossing bridge.	The VPA agree that a sympathetic and high quality response is required. The PSP includes a requirement (R64) that 'The Jacksons Creek road crossing must respond sensitively to landform, amenity and cultural and heritage values.' It is therefore a requirement that this is an important consideration in the bridge design.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA22	Concerned that the submissions made to the Commonwealth Govt supporting the removal of 16ha from CA20 are not publicly available.	The Commonwealth has advised that these reports are not publicly available. This is not a matter for the VPA.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA23	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
LR84	TDA24	Concerned about the accuracy of the Biosis reports in relation to the CA20 Boundary change.	The Boundary Change to CA20 was subject to both DELWP and Commonwealth scrutiny.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA25	The PSPs do not incorporate the recommendations (1,3 and 4) of the Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment, Lancefield Road (Heritage Insight), including the need for a CHMP for high impact activities, and within an additional cultural heritage area in proximity to the Sunbury Ring site locations.	The Wurundjeri have endorsed the future urban structure as part of their preparation of a Cultural Landscape Assessment for the precinct. A CHMP is required prior to the issue of a planning permit, and it is considered impractical to prepare one in advance of a full understanding of the specific actions that will impact on aboriginal cultural heritage values	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA26	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR84	TDA27	Cannon Gully Heritage - planned road through the Heritage Overlay can not be allowed.	The review of the creek crossing that the VPA undertook following exhibition of the PSP therefore sought to limit impact on these important values. The updated alignment circulated on 24 July 2017, and based upon a detailed engineering assessment, avoided any direct impact on the Canon Gully site, and continued to avoid the aboriginal ceremonial rings.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR84	TDA28	Recommends extending the national trust recommendation (to extend the heritage listing) to cover Rupertswood Mansion and the home of the ashes.	This is a matter for the National Trust and cannot be addressed through the PSP.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA29	Concerned about the potential for flooding on the Sherwood Heights site.	The site is located within Melbourne Water's Devon Park Development Services Scheme (DSS). The Devon Park DSS provides a masterplan for future drainage and stormwater treatment of the catchment. The exhibited 96A subdivision layout does not meet the intent or conceptual layout of the Devon Park DSS. This has been communicated to the applicant in writing on 10th February, 2017. The VPA has requested that the applicant provide revised plans which address this issue. Please note that the VPA's revised development footprint for this area is also expected to mitigate this issue.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR84	TDA30	Concerned about increased bushfire risk.	The Victorian Planning Authority has engaged with the CFA and other emergency services in the preparation of the Precinct Structure Plans, and has also recently had an additional bushfire study undertaken to inform the plans. It is anticipated that the increased connectivity created through additional grade-separated railway crossings and creek crossings will assist with movement flows and emergency service access.	No	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA31	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
LR84	TDA32	Concerned that Melbourne Water flood mapping is not up to date.	Melbourne Water is satisfied that we have met their requirements as the Regional Floodplain Management and Drainage Authority. Flood mapping has been undertaken in accordance with industry standards.	Yes	No action	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR84	TDA33	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
LR84	TDA34	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	No action	Unresolved
	TDA35	The submitter raised a number of general concerns about the Amendment process.	The VPA has endeavoured to meet the submitters requests through the Amendment process, where possible.	No	No action	Unresolved
	TDA36	The panel should, based on these examples of misrepresentation of the facts and errors or deliberate errors, simply ignore this whole report from GTA.	Comment for Panel	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
	TDA37	Sunbury is not like other main PSPS sites. It has great features that need to be kept and looked after. The current plans do not enhance Sunbury, and degrade it with the same standard planning that has been done everywhere else. No thought or understanding of the area by planners with no vision.	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.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR84	TDA38	Requests that no housing should be built West of the railway line, and the land should be maintained as open space.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
85	Kathleen and Greg Matthies (affected landowner - Balbethan)					
LR85	KM1	The Balbethan area is more suited to a low density subdivision rather than rural residential given similarities with the adjacent established neighbourhood of Rolling Meadows.	The concept plan and associated principles, objectives, requirements and guidelines will be updated to indicate that this concept plan area is unlikely to yield the 15 dwellings per hectare, and that a lower residential density in parts of the concept plan area is likely. The revised controls will clearly describe that properties abutting Rolling Meadows must provide for a transition in lot sizes.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR85	KM2	Appreciate that the Balbethan Drive Residential Concept is provided for illustrative purposes and note it is subject to further development, but no process for consultation regarding this development is detailed and there are no clear objectives described to achieve this orderly and sensitive transition.	Refer response to KM1 above.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR85	KM3	Given that UGZ10, 3.4 C208 states that Sensitive Residential Areas require an indicative subdivision concept design of the entire area, we ask how this will be coordinated, given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations. It would be expected that all landowners, who may in time be developers, have the opportunity to be included in any discussions.	This will be reworded to request: "An indicative subdivision concept design which demonstrates consistency with the relevant concept plan in the Lancefield Road Precinct Structure Plan."	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR85	KM4	The published proposal needs review given that it makes no consideration for existing dwellings or much significant vegetation.	The concept plan is being updated to avoid impacting on the footprint of existing dwellings, and to better acknowledge significant vegetation.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR85	KM5	Clause 3.4 seems unclear in that it asks for demonstration of how a subdivision application will deliver "opportunities for higher density housing". What does this mean?	This will be deleted.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR85	KM6	Clause 3.4 - asks for staging and indicative development timing – this is difficult to estimate given the fragmented land ownership and potential for different landowner aspirations.	Further advice will be provided on this matter as part of the VPA's Part B submission to Panel.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved
LR85	KM7	Clause 3.4 - last paragraph offer even less clarity, with the rider "unless if, in the opinion of the Responsible Authority (Council) the permit implements the objectives for the area set out in the (PSP)". Are we right to assume these are O37 and O40? However, there are many other general Objectives to be met, including but not restricted to R92 which identifies the importance of safe and proper access into Lancefield Rd.	The assumption is correct that the permit must meet all of the specific and general objectives of the PSP. Additionally, as per response to KM1, there will be additional design guidelines / objectives specific to each sensitive residential area added into the PSP.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR85	KM8	We understand the concept of staged development and the need for an orderly and sensitive transition to a new (low) density. With the significant availability of land in the surrounding area we believe there is an opportunity to achieve this over time but in a way that addresses the fragmented land ownership. We therefore suggest this will need stronger direction regarding the graduation of lot sizes and that development would be triggered by the delivery of other relevant infrastructure e.g. rail overpass, Lancefield Road upgrade.	A range of infrastructure will be required to support development in all parts of the precinct, and not just within the Balbethan concept plan area. Requirements and Guidelines associated with the Balbethan Concept Plan area will set out the need for local road upgrades in support of development	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
LR85	KM9	We are concerned about the potential for speculators to perhaps inappropriately influence current landholders if the development process is not clear and ask that council consider management strategies such as rate caps to help facilitate sensitive transition until land availability pressure becomes an issue.	Rate caps is a matter for Council and cannot be implemented through this amendment.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
LR85	KM10	Concerned about safety issues on Lancefield Road as subdivision generally will occur in the Lancefield Rd area before a significant road upgrade. This is an issue not just for Sunbury residents but those who live in the developing north.	Lancefield Road is proposed to be upgraded and duplicated. It will be capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic volumes. VicRoads, as the responsible authority for roads, will need to address any safety matters.	Yes	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR86	MA1	Fully supports the National Trust Submission	Noted.	No	No action	Comment only or No viable resolution through Amendment
LR86	MA2	Submits that the Racecourse Road area should remain open space, and not be developed for housing.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
87	Urban Design and Management OBO 265 and 275 Lancefield Road (Purchasers)					
LR87	UDM1	Submission withdrawn	N/A	No	No action	Withdrawn
88	Department of Education and Training					
LR88	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 Lancefield Road PSP will meet future demand for government school education within that network.	Noted	No	No action	Resolved
LR88	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
LR88	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.	These discussions have been ongoing, and have resulted in a change to the Redstone Hill schools (consolidation of primary and secondary school into a single P12 on a reconfigured site), and potential changes to the Harpers Creek primary school (subject to ongoing review of the relevant LTC concept plan)	No	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
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
89	Katie Pounder					
LR89	KP1	Opposes the development of the northern crossing.	Noted. Please refer to the Part A Report for the strategic need for the Northern Crossing.	Yes	No action	Unresolved
90	Leigh Johnson					
LR90	LJ1	Opposes the development of the Racecourse Road site for environmental and heritage reasons.	The VPA has reviewed the planning controls and development footprint for this area of the precinct (Racecourse Road site). Please refer to Part A report for details.	Yes	Change the amendment	Unresolved
91	Foschia Family					
LR91	FF1	Request the PSP be updated to reflect the proposed changes to the Conservation Area 18 boundary.	This will occur following approval of the CA18 boundary realignment by the Commonwealth. This is anticipated to occur prior to Panel.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR91	FF2	Generally supportive of the FUS.	Support noted.	No	No action	Resolved
LR91	FF3	Supportive of R10, requiring 17 lots per hectare around the Town Centre and the station. This density should be achievable and reflects the township location. Would not support any increase in the density greater than 17 lots per hectare.	Noted. The VPA currently is not considering any increase in this requirement. However it should be noted that the 17 dwellings per hectare is to be achieved across the entirety of the walkable catchment area, and it would be desirable if higher density outcomes were achieved in locations closest to the town centre and stations.	No	No action	Resolved

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR91	FF4	Seek clarification on the conservation interface - R44 requires a 20m conservation interface, however CACP shows a 30m interface. Do not object to 20m conservation interface, but a 30m buffer will result in a loss of developable land.	The 30 metre 'conservation interface zone' is not a prescriptive buffer and does not preclude development. The 20m conservation interface requirement at R44 provides the development guidance.	No	No action	Resolved
LR91	FF5	Seek clarification in relation to how the scattered trees that will be outside the CACP area following the boundary realignment will be treated. Assume they will be shown to be offset noting that the approach as shown on Plan 8 is to retain large groups and rows of trees rather than single, scattered trees.	The assumption that these trees is to be shown as offset is reasonable. The VPA will need to confirm this will DELWP following the Commonwealth approval of the boundary review, however expect that this will be the case.	Yes	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
LR91	FF6	Note that Plan 5 shows patches of native vegetation within the current conservation boundary. Request confirmation that when the boundary is adjusted Figure 5 will be amended and the patches removed from the site.	This is correct. The Conservation Area Concept Plan will be updated to only show the vegetation with the Conservation Area.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR91	FF7	The town square in the Yellow Gum LTC concept plan is very large. If this is to be delivered as public infrastructure for the wider community it should form part of the public land calculations for the landowner and treated as such. The FUS and Table 6 should be updated to reflect the size and location of the town square which ought to be funded through the ICP. If it is not to be funded through the ICP and shown on the FUS, it should be deleted from the Concept Plan at Figure 2.	The VPA agree that the town square shown in the Concept Plan is too large. This town square will be reduced in size and relocated to tie in more closely with the retail elements of the town centre in the revised concept plan. Town squares are considered to form an integral part of a retail based town centre and are to be developer funded. This will not be funded through the ICP, nor deleted from the concept plan. A revised concept plan, with a smaller more integrated town centre, will be circulated prior to the Panel hearing for the Foschia's consideration.	Yes	Change the amendment	Awaiting response from submitter
LR91	FF8	The Yellow Gum LTC concept plan identifies a 'potential private child care / medical clinic' fronting Lancefield Road. Request that this be removed from the plan.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR91	FF9	Query the need to show a building footprint for the medium density housing area along the railway line. Suggest the area is shaded as per the other areas of medium density shown north of the LTC.	Agree.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
LR91	FF10	The medium density area shown on Figure 2 includes shading underneath the medium density sites. Seek clarification on what this means.	This area will be shown as per other medium density areas in the updated concept plan.	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
92	Sunbury West Owners Group (Oliver Hume)					

Sub #	Item	Issue Raised	VPA comment	Change to the Amendment	Action	Status
LR92	SWOG1	<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. 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>	<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.</p>	Yes	Change the amendment	Resolved
93	275 Lancefield Road (Spiire on behalf of landowner)					
LR93	SP1	<p>Broadly supportive of the future urban structure and other details that are set out in the exhibited PSP and wish to remain involved in the PSP process.</p>	Noted	No	No action	Resolved