

C205 Lindum Vale Hume City Council Submissions Summary & VPA response								
Version: 5-Feb-18								
Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	Action	
9	1 Main Submission		Development density and approximate development yield	Remove reference to the PSP facilitating a minimum average dwelling density of 16.5 dwellings per Net Developable Hectare.	PSP guidelines require at least 15 dwellings per hectare (net developable area). A dwelling density of 16.5 dwellings per Net Developable Hectare is a feasible objective for the area. Assessment of viable density with interface conditions proposed (see comment #2) in response to Council's submission suggest a target of 16.5 dwellings per Net Developable Hectare is achievable.	Unresolved - it is still considered inappropriate that this PSP include a density target that is higher than the PSP guidelines baseline given its context in the Hume growth corridor - which has approximately 1400 NDA of already approved and largely unconstrained land (and better positioned for higher density) in surrounding PSPs.	Refer to panel	
9	2 Main Submission			Include an objective and requirement for the provision of larger lots (of between 800-1200m <sup>2</sup> ): - along the Mickleham Road frontage south of the east-west connector street. - fronting the north-south boulevard connector street south of the east-west connector street.	In response to Council's submission as well as extensive discussion with Council and Satterley, the VPA proposes that the sensitive interface along Mt Ridley Road between Mickleham Road and the boulevard connector and along Mickleham Road between Mt Ridley Road and the local access street be identified on Plan 5 Image, Character and Housing. The VPA does not support the identification of the boulevard connector as a sensitive interface.  A new requirement will be introduced to 3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces:  Unless otherwise agreed to by the responsible authority, the first two rows of lots identified on Plan 5 as sensitive interfaces along Mount Ridley Road and Mickleham Road must: - Achieve a minimum 5 metre setback from the rear and one side of the property boundary; - Be a single dwelling on a lot; and - Allow for the planting of canopy trees on each lot.  In addition, a bullet point will be added to requirement 43 that the street layout must "Ensure views across the site to open space and to significant trees are maintained". This will encourage the creation of a street layout that creates breaks in built form and views to open space. This will help to create a sense of openness and permeability in the built environment.  Requirement 6 will be updated to "Landscaping, including native strip planting, along Mickleham Road must respond to the Avenue of Honour, existing native vegetation interface and key views into and across the site."  The provision of larger lots on Mt Ridley Road and the eastern interface are addressed in R18, which will be updated to "Residential subdivision must achieve dwelling diversity through the delivery of a range of lot sizes. This should include the provision of larger lots along the eastern interface with existing rural living lots and the southern interface with Mount Ridley Road."	Partially resolved - support interface response to Mickleham Road (including extent), however maintain the same development controls should be applied to north-south boulevard connector interface to reinforce the precincts 'unique character'. Support amendments to R6/43. HCC maintains the PSP should include development restrictions within the setbacks.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	3 Main Submission			Include a requirement for all larger lots along the Mickleham Road frontage and the north-south boulevard connector street to include a 5m setback from the rear boundary and from one side boundary. No built form should be allowed in the setback.	See comment #2.	Partially resolved - see comment to #2	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	4 Main Submission			Include an objective and requirement for the provision of larger lots (of between 1200-1500m <sup>2</sup> ): - along the Mount Ridley Road frontage. - along the eastern interface to the existing rural residential development.	See comment #2.  The reconfiguration of the drainage system and open space has minimised the area adjacent to the rural living zone that will be impacted by residential development. The requirements for this interface will be updated to include G7 as a requirement to ensure 10m rear and 3m side setbacks.	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	5 Main Submission			Include a requirement for all larger lots along the Mount Ridley Road frontage and the eastern interface to include a 10m setback from all sides.	See comment #2.	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	6 Main Submission			Include requirement for single dwelling restrictions in all areas with larger lots (i.e. lots over 800 m <sup>2</sup> ).	See comment #2.	Partially resolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	7 Main Submission			Reduce the anticipated development yield in the PSP to reflect provision of larger lots in areas of the PSP (identified above).	Taking into account the reductions in drainage reserve that will be achieved through decentralisation of the retarding basin layout, the anticipated development yield of 1500 lots is a feasible objective.	Unresolved - 1500 lots may be feasible, however until the interface areas sorted we will not know if this is an appropriate development outcome.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	8 Main Submission	Design response to key interfaces		Include a concept plan in the PSP and design guidelines in the UG29 for the Mount Ridley Road frontage which reflects the earlier VPA design concept (October 2014).	A cross section has been developed for Mt Ridley Rd, in consultation with Council, to be included in Section 3.1.2. This cross section will note that planting in the landscaped zone should include scattered trees with bare trunks and no shrubbery.	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	9 Main Submission			Include concept plan in the PSP and design guidelines in the UG29 for development along the eastern interface to the existing rural residential development which provides for generous setbacks from the PSP boundary and between dwellings within the PSP along the eastern boundary.	See comment #2.	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	10 Main Submission	Heritage - Parnell's Inn		Extend 'heritage overlay interface area' to show a minimum buffer of 10m from the southern boundary of 1920 Mickleham Road.	The VPA understands that Council was given advice from a heritage consultant in 2015 that the current overlay is inadequate and does not provide an appropriate interface to Parnell's Inn. The interface area has been revised and extended 10m from the south of the property boundary.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	11 Main Submission			Update the 'heritage reserve - post contact' in the land use budget to match the above.	The inclusion of post contact heritage reserve in the land use budget is an error. There is currently no open space specifically dedicated to post contact heritage a requirement is included for its incorporation into open space and road reserves (see comment #12). Post contact heritage will be removed from the land use budget.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	12 Main Submission	Dry Stone Walls		Provide an objective and requirement for drystone walls to be retained in open space or road reserve.	In response to comment #12 and #97, the VPA proposes that G11 be made a requirement and reworded as follows:  Dry stone walls identified on Plan 5 Image, Character and Housing as 'Dry stone walls to be retained and repaired – rating 2-3 (moderate to high value)' must be retained unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority. Dry stone walls to be retained must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Be situated within public open space or road reserve to the satisfaction of the responsible authority;</li><li>• Have a suitable landscape interface;</li><li>• Be checked by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones and risk to public safety. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions;</li><li>• Retain post and wire or post and rail fences situated within the walls, with any wire protruding beyond the vertical face of the wall reinstated to its original position or removed; and</li><li>• Be incorporated into subdivision design to minimise disturbance to the walls (e.g. utilisation of existing openings for vehicle and pedestrian access).</li></ul>	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	13 Main Submission			Provide a mechanism that records the removal of drystone walls in accordance with Heritage Victoria recording standards.	As discussed in our meeting on 30 October 2017, rating 1 dry stone walls do not require recording of their removal and the removal of rating 2 - 3 dry stone walls is subject to permit so Council can ensure their removal is recorded through this process. The schedule to clause 52.37 has been drafted to exempt dry stone walls within Lindum Vale with a 'low' retention value from requiring a permit for their removal. As there is an exemption in place, these walls should not require recording of their removal.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	14 Main Submission	The PSP and NVPP do not satisfactorily deal with the species and communities within the site that are listed under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). In particular known occurrences of Golden Sun Moth and Grassy Eucalypt Woodland of the Victoria Volcanic Plains.		Finalise EPBC Act approval prior to referring the PSP to a planning panel process. In the absence of receiving EPBC Act approval prior to approving the PSP, the PSP should state that separate EPBC Act approval is required and that this may result in changes to the future urban structure and land budget. A further planning scheme amendment may be required to implement any changes.	The landowner of 1960 Mickleham Road, Mickleham is seeking to obtain approval from the Federal government for removal of native vegetation, as the site is a known Golden Sun Moth habitat. Approval is also required as the south eastern remnant vegetation meets the definition of the critically endangered Grassy Eucalypt Woodlands. The landowner has applied for approval under the EPBC Act and it is expected that a decision will be made by the Federal Government within 6 months. This decision will not halt the PSP process, however, no development may occur on the land until approval under the EPBC Act is obtained.	Unresolved, but understand VPA position	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	15 Main Submission			Provide consistency in discussion on Golden Sun Moth and Plains Grassy Woodland between the PSP and NVPP.	The Golden Sun Moth and Plains Grassy woodland are addressed in section 2.1 Biodiversity Assets and section 3.3.1 in relation to EPBC approval in the NVPP, and they are addressed in section 1.2 in the PSP. Please clarify where consistency is lacking.	Unresolved - the NVPP implies a level of approval when EPBC Act approval has not been gained. HCC maintains the position that the NVPP should not be approved in the absence of this approval.	Further review/discussion required	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	16 Main Submission	Conservation area boundary		Extend the boundary of Grassy Eucalypt Woodland to include H22 patch.	The VPA proposes that the conservation reserve boundary be revised to include some of the H22 patch. LP-01 will be removed and LV-12 will become part of CR-01 as well as the area between LV-12 and CR-01 as shown in revised future urban structure. The land budget will be updated accordingly.	Unresolved - HCC maintains that all of the LP-01 land should be included in the conservation area.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	17 Main Submission			Include the local park and landscape value area (LP-01 and LV-12) adjacent to Mount Ridley Road and east of the boulevard connector in the conservation reserve (CR-01).	See comment #16	Unresolved - see comment to #16	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	18 Main Submission			Update the 'conservation reserve' and 'credited open space' in the land use budget to match the above.	The land use budget will be updated according to the extension of the conservation reserve boundary.	Partially resolved - support action but not the updated area to be included in revised land budget.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	19 Main Submission		Retention of trees outside of open space areas	Amend the PSP (and possibly NVPP) to include a third category for tree retention as 'trees to be retained for practical retention' outside of open space areas, noting retention is for landscape and amenity purposes only.	<p>Following extensive discussion regarding trees to be retained for landscape value, the VPA proposes these trees no longer be identified as trees retained for landscape value in the PSP and instead be included in the NVPP as trees to be retained.</p> <p>As agreed with Council, the following changes to trees shown to be retained/removed will be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees 23, 53, 89, 205, 209, 212, 216, currently shown as to be retained in the NVPP will now be shown as to be removed.</li> <li>• Trees 257, 221, &amp; 96, which are currently identified as trees to be retained for landscape values, will be shown as to be removed.</li> <li>• Tree 85, currently shown as to be removed, will be retained.</li> <li>• Tree 131, 153, 159, 162, 163, 177, 178, 179, 180 &amp; 193 (currently shown as to be removed) are planted trees and should not be included in the NVPP.</li> </ul> <p>A note will be made that trees retained outside of open space should be retained wherever possible for their landscape values, however, permits for their removal should take their location outside of open space into consideration.</p> <p>Following the panel hearing, the format of the NVPP will be updated according to the new DELWP guidelines and template published in December 2017. A plan showing trees to be removed and retained will be distributed with the VPA's Part A submission.</p>	Partially resolved - HCC maintains that the trees identified for retention within the retarding basin areas should be shown as retained in NVPP (with removal dealt with at permit stage if necessary).	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	20 Main Submission			Provide a mechanism that provides a permit trigger to remove trees identified for 'practical retention'.	See comment #19	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	21 Main Submission	Drainage		Include an objective and requirement for the passive irrigation of open space areas that will sustain ongoing health and protect the longevity of retained native vegetation.	R30 will be updated to: The design and construction of drainage infrastructure must include measures to protect and enhance the long term viability of vegetation, particularly the River Red Gums, through the use of Water Sensitive Urban Design and passive watering initiatives. This design must be based on a vegetation survey and assessment undertaken in conjunction with Council.	Unresolved - support rewording of R30 and G36 and moving G36 to requirements.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	22 Main Submission			Include requirements for the provision of environmental culvert works on Mickleham Road to divert the overland flow path from the west through the open space network in the PSP.	This level of detail is beyond the scope of the PSP and should be included in the drainage strategy.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	23 Main Submission	Road network		Remove the direct road connection between the north-south boulevard connector street and Callaway Drive to avoid direct traffic connections. Clarified during phone call 14/11/2017. Council does not wish to have a direct connection between the rural living zone and the boulevard connector but does wish for there to be road connections linking rural living zone with the PSP.	PSP will be amended to show a road connecting from Callaway Drive and Cooinda Avenue with an arrow in. Two new requirements will be included in Section 3.5.1:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The extension of roads from the rural living zone into the PSP must not connect directly to the north south boulevard connector but should connect to other local access streets which provide a connection to the boulevard.</li> <li>- The street network must provide the potential for a future road connection to Billabong Close.</li> </ul>	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	24 Main Submission			Add requirement for the subdivision layout to provide road ends connecting to the road network in the adjoining rural-residential area to the east and in line with the end of ends at Billabong Close and Vanessa Drive to maintain potential for future road connections.	See comment #23.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	25 Main Submission	Public Transport		Include a requirement for the intersection of Mount Ridley Road and the boulevard connector street to include bus priority signals.	If bus priority upgrades are required in future the intersection has the capacity to be retrofitted with appropriate infrastructure. While this level of detail is not included in the PSP, it does not inhibit the outcome.	Resolved - however HCC notes that this comment was made regarding the identification of the intended high level strategic transport network, rather than a detailed design matter.	No action	Resolved
9	26 Main Submission			Identify the intersection at Mount Ridley Road and the boulevard connector street as a 'bus priority' intersection in the public transport and path network and street network plan.	See comment #25.	Resolved - see comment to #25	No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	27 Main Submission	Provision of community infrastructure	Update the list of community projects in the infrastructure table in the PSP to include contributions to the expansion of the Southern Community Hub in Merrifield West PSP.		It is understood that the Southern Community Hub was fully funded through the Merrifield West DCP but Council wishes to include it in the Lindum Vale ICP to accommodate its expansion due to increased demand created by the Lindum Vale PSP. The VPA does not support its inclusion as increased demand has already been accommodated in the Lindum Vale ICP through the inclusion of contributions for the Craigieburn West Northern Community Hub and the Library in Mickleham Town Centre.	Unresolved - this outcome does not reflect Council's catchment planning analysis, and will leave the Lindum Vale community with a shortfall in community infrastructure in the short-medium term.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	28 Main Submission	Zones and Overlays	Include all the PSP within the Urban Growth Zone (UGZ) with Public Conservation and Resources Zone (PCRZ) as the applied zone along with the retention of the Environmental Significance Overlays, Schedule 5 (ES05) and 11 (ES011) for land in the conservation area.		The PCRZ is not an appropriate zone to apply to the area. The area has been identified for residential use and the PCRZ is not a zone which encourages this nor are its aims aligned with current policy. Rezoning the area to this zone, is contrary to existing policy including the Northern Growth Corridor plan.  By retaining the ES05 and ES011, any native vegetation removal requires a planning permit and as a result defeats the purpose of the NVPP. The NVPP can be updated to include more requirements from these overlays. Further detail from the relevant ES05 (5 and 11) can be included in the NVPP if Council wishes. Please clarify which details Council would like incorporated.	Unresolved - HCC maintains that the conservation area should be included within the UGZ with an underlying zone of PCRZ (with the remainder of the PSP having an underlying zone of GR2). This will be a public reserve and therefore is the most transparent planning tool.  HCC maintains that the ESO's should be retained as they respond to all of the landscape considerations in the broader planning scheme and the wider strategic context of the inter urban break (as opposed the NVPP which only considers the requirements of Clause 52.16). However we support the overlays being reduced to the areas protected by NVPP only. The NVPP is only an incorporated document, retention of the ESO's provides planning policy transparency for the precinct.  If the ESO's are removed, we would want some wording to be incorporated in NVPP. Council to follow up wording.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	29 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	2.5 Construction of a dwelling adjacent to the east boundary	Expand to include requirements for all areas with larger lots as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2		Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	30 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	2.5 Construction of a dwelling adjacent to the east boundary	Include requirement for single dwellings restrictions to be applied to these areas.	See comment #2		Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	31 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	2.5 Construction of a dwelling adjacent to the east boundary	Include requirements for built form setback (including out buildings) as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2		Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	32 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	3.0 Subdivision - Residential Developments  "An arboricultural report identifying all trees on the site and a tree retention plan identifying how the application responds to Map 2 - Trees to be Retained and Removed in the incorporated Lindum Vale Native Vegetation Precinct Plan, October 2016 - and any tree protection requirements and guidelines within the Lindum Vale Precinct Structure Plan, October 2016."	Replace "and guidelines within the Lindum Vale Precinct Structure Plan, October 2016." with "works required to reduce public risk".		Proposed wording is unclear, please clarify. PSP should refer to Australian Standards. Where is 'public risk' defined? Andrea to confirm this following discussion on 6 November 2017.	Resolved - leave wording as is.	No action	Resolved
9	33 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	3.0 Subdivision - Residential Developments  "An assessment of the existing surface and subsurface drainage conditions on the site, including any potential impacts on the proposed development, prepared by a suitably qualified professional. The assessment must include any measures required to mitigate the impacts of the development on groundwater and drainage."	Include requirements for IWM strategy which passively irrigates the open space network and retained native vegetation.	See comment #21.		Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	34 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	3.0 Subdivision - Residential Developments  Subdivision and Housing Design Guidelines, prepared to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, which demonstrate how the proposal responds to and achieves the objectives and planning and design requirements and guidelines shown within the 'Interface treatment' at Section 3.1.2 of the Lindum Vale Precinct Structure Plan, June 2017 incorporated in this scheme.	Amend to align with changes requested in the submission.	See comment #2.		Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	35 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	3.0 Public Infrastructure Plan  A stormwater management strategy that makes provision for the staging and timing of stormwater drainage works, including temporary outfall provisions, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water	Add "and Hume City Council"	Supported.		Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	36 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	3.0 Heritage Assessment – Parnell's Inn  Include the provision of sufficient space around the heritage building to allow its adaptive reuse to comply with other planning requirements, such as car parking and landscaping.	Add "and landscape buffers to protect views into and out of the heritage place."	The southern section of the heritage interface at Parnell's Inn has been extended in response to this matter.		Resolved	No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	37 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	4.0 Condition – Subdivision and housing design guidelines	The specific built form requirements arising out of the design guidelines prepared as part of the application for subdivision for lots adjacent to the eastern boundary of the precinct must be implemented via a restriction on title or any other alternative deemed satisfactory by the responsible authority.	Amend to align with changes requested in the submission.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	38 SCHEDULE 9 TO CLAUSE 37.07 URBAN GROWTH ZONE	4.0 Protection of conservation areas and native vegetation during construction	Minimum distance from scattered tree as shown in table: change from: "The distance as shown in the incorporated Lindum Vale Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (Section 8)" to "2 metres from the edge of the Tree Protection Zone".		Amend UG2 'scattered tree' distance to state the minimum distance from element to be "Twice the distance between the tree trunk and the edge of the tree canopy"	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	39 SCHEDULE 3 TO CLAUSE 43.03 INCORPORATED PLAN OVERLAY	SCHEDULE 3 TO CLAUSE 43.03 INCORPORATED PLAN OVERLAY	3.0 Protection of conservation areas and native vegetation during construction	Minimum distance from scattered tree as shown in table: change from: "The distance as shown in the incorporated Lindum Vale Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (Section 8)" to "2 metres from the edge of the Tree Protection Zone".	Amend 'scattered tree' distance to state the minimum distance from element to be "Twice the distance between the tree trunk and the edge of the tree canopy"	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	40 NVPP	2.0 Purpose	The purpose should also be to address the requirements of the ESO as it is likely that the ESO will be removed through the planning scheme amendment processes.		The amendment proposes to delete ESO5 and ESO11 from within the precinct. However, the introduction of the NVPP will remove the need for an ESO in order to streamline the planning process by managing native vegetation within the precinct rather than site by site. As stated in the NVPP, its purpose is to ensure the biodiversity assets of the precinct are protected and managed in accordance with the PSP. This removes the need to address the requirements of the ESO. Further detail regarding context and significance from the relevant ESOs (5 and 11) can be included in the NVPP if Council wishes. Please clarify which details Council would like incorporated.	Partially resolved - support is ESO wording to be incorporated in NVPP. Council to follow up wording.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	41 NVPP	2.0 Purpose	As every tree should require a permit for removal as detailed in the submission, remove point: "Apply a holistic, landscape wide approach to retention and removal of native vegetation, within the Lindum Vale NVPP area as identified on Map 1."		The NVPP requires the retention of trees which are considered biodiversity assets. The retention of these trees has been decided based on a holistic approach to the PSP. The protection of these trees through the NVPP removes the need for permit requirements on every tree. A permit will be required for the removal of any trees identified as to be retained in the NVPP but not for those trees identified as to be removed.  The NVPP will be updated as per comment #19.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	42 NVPP	2.4 Vegetation protection objectives to be achieved	The vegetation protection objective should make reference to all local (ESO's), state and federal (EPBC Act) significant species and communities.		Significant species are mentioned in 2.1 Biodiversity Assets.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	43 NVPP	3.1 Native Vegetation Patches Required to be Retained	Remove third paragraph. Permanently protected offset sites are now required to be set back 150 metres from housing (which is the width of the conservation reserve) as such it is unsuitable for use as an offset site and should just be a local conservation reserve		The VPA is unaware of any requirements for offset sites to be setback 150 metres from housing. Please clarify the source of this requirement.  The VPA will update the new NVPP template, section 5.2.2, to reflect the requested wording: "Any vegetation offsets desired to be achieved within retained vegetation must meet the eligibility requirements of the Native Vegetation gain scoring manual. Specific management responsibilities and actions apply to areas of native vegetation to be retained that will also be protected as an on-site offset. These areas will be managed in accordance with the offset site management plan."	Resolved - support if wording is amended to: "Any vegetation offsets desired to be achieved within retained vegetation must meet the eligibility requirements of the Native Vegetation gain scoring manual. Specific management responsibilities and actions apply to areas of native vegetation to be retained that will also be protected as an on-site offset. These areas will be managed in accordance with the offset site management plan."	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	44 NVPP	Map 2	A number of trees shown within this plan are not indigenous. Only indigenous trees should be shown within the NVPP. There is a lack of consistency with the trees shown between Map 2 of the PSP and Plan 2 of the PSP. If any maps should show the non-indigenous trees it should be the PSP not the NVPP.		See comment #19.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	45 NVPP	Changes requested to Map 2, Section 5 and Table 3:	There should be no trees shown as permitted to be removed within the NVPP. All trees are to be investigated for retention within road reserves and tree reserves within the detailed design phase of the subsequent planning permit. As stated in the submission, this is the approach taken within the Woodlands PSP and what has been discussed with the VPA and previous developers to date for Lindum Vale.		See comment #41	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	46 NVPP	3.0 NATIVE VEGETATION & TREES REQUIRED TO BE RETAINED	Local and Federal significance are not listed anywhere within the NVPP. In particular local values, the ESO's are not included and impacts to EPBC listed species and communities are not listed. Nor is reference made that EPBC approval is still outstanding. Please amend to align with comments made in submission.		See comment #15 and #40	Unresolved - see comment #15 and #40	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	47 NVPP	3.0 NATIVE VEGETATION & TREES REQUIRED TO BE RETAINED	Table 1	Reference should be made to the fact that habitat zones 5 and 6 are habitat zones due to tree canopy connectivity rather than the presence of indigenous understorey species.	Resolved with Council that no amendment is required.	Resolved	No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	48 NVPP		3.0 NATIVE VEGETATION & TREES REQUIRED TO BE RETAINED	Limit hectare sizes to three decimals.	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	49 NVPP		Table 1 4.0 Table 3	Please clarify why the Strategic Biodiversity Score of each zone is shown within the table when the total offset calculation is calculated as a total and shown in section 6. This appears to be irrelevant information and it would be better to show some other attribute of the trees (such as DBH). In addition it is odd the SBS is consistent for all patches and trees to be retained but is altered for each line for the removed vegetation.	The SBS for each zone is shown as the DELWP template for NVPPs has been used and SBS data is supplied by DELWP. Following the updated guidelines and template for NVPP's published by DELWP in December 2017, the Lindum Vale NVPP will be updated to reflect the new guidelines.		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	50 NVPP		5.3 Conditions	This section is very difficult to ensure enforcement without the trigger for a planning permit. Amend to align with comments detailed in submission.	Clause 52.16-3 states that a permit is required to remove, destroy or lop any native vegetation, including dead native vegetation, unless a listed exemption applies. Once an NVPP is an incorporated document, the requirements and conditions apply.		Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	51 NVPP		5.3 Conditions	Change Department of Environment and primary Industries to Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning	The NVPP will be updated according to the new guidelines and template.		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	52 NVPP		Appendix 7.4	As detailed in the submission, H22 within the open space area LP-01 should be shown as retained. The entire H22 within the open space should be re-classified as a conservation reserve. There is little to no value in showing this remnant vegetation to be removed when it can easily be a conservation reserve rather than a passive open space reserve. Particularly given the unencumbered open space is already greater than 5% (8.2%) and no compensation is going to be provided for the additional 3.2%. See R29 of the PSP so the reclassification this would have no significant impact on the land budget and would result in lower offset costs for the development. The presence of NV is one of the key objectives within the Interurban Break policy that this front set back reserve is aiming to retain.	See comment #16		Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	53 PSP		Table 4 Powerline Easement Possible Use and Development	Delete	Table 4 will be deleted.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	54 PSP		Contents: Figure 4 Central Open Space Concept Plan	Change name to Retarding basin/Wetland Concept Plan	Due to the reconfiguration of the drainage system and relocation of retarding basins, Figure 4 will be removed from the PSP.	Resolved - however see comment to #112 in regards to landscape master plan requirement.	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	55 PSP		Plan 2	Include full extent of 'grassy eucalypt woodland' (H21 and H22 patches)	See comment #16	Unresolved - HCC maintains that the H22 patches should be shown, particularly as some of it is within the conservation area.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	56 PSP		1.3 Infrastructure Contributions Plan	"The Lindum Vale ICP contributes funds towards the development of several projects outside of the precinct, including land for a library in the Merrifield Major Town Centre, a sporting facility and community facility within the Craigieburn West precinct to the south"	Add "and the expansion of a community facility within the Merrifield West precinct to the north."	See comment #27	Unresolved - see comment to #27  Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	57 PSP		1.4 Native Vegetation Precinct Plan	As stated in the submission, we do not want the PSP and NVPP to allow trees to be removed without a permit as we want to retain additional trees within the streetscape, and have control over the process and timing of removal if they cannot be retained.	See comments #19 & #41	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	58 PSP		Plan 3	Expand the boundary of the conservation reserve to align with changes requested in the submission.	See comment #16	Unresolved - see comment in #16	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	59 PSP		Plan 3	Identify areas for "larger lots" along: - Mt Ridley Road frontage; - Eastern interface to the rural residential development; - Micklem Road frontage, south of the connector street; and - North-south boulevard connector street, south of the drainage reserve.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	60 PSP		Plan 3	Confirm if connections to Callaway Drive and Coondoo Avenue are supposed to be "pedestrian/cycle link" or "local access street".	See comment #23	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	61 PSP	Plan 3		Remove the direct road connection between Callaway Drive and the boulevard connector street and show as the link at Coondra avenue. As stated in the submission, we do not want to provide a direct connection between the boulevard connector and non-urban grade roads.	See comment #23	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	62 PSP	Plan 3		Identify the intersection of Mt Ridley Road and the boulevard connector street as a "bus priority intersection".	See comment #25.	Resolved - see comment in #25	No action	Resolved
9	63 PSP	2.1 Vision	"The precinct will accommodate approximately 1,500 dwellings on a range of lot sizes."	Change to "The precinct will accommodate a range of lot sizes, including larger lots that reflects the sites strategic location in the Inter Urban Break."	See comment #2.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	64 PSP	"A conservation area in the south-east corner protects and enhances native grasses and Golden Sun Moth habitat, protected by the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (the EPBC Act)."		This discussion about the EPBC listed species and communities and how they are protected and retained is premature in the absence of EPBC Act approval. As stated in the submission, the site should receive EPBC Act approval prior to the approval of the PSP.  If the PSP is approved prior to receiving EPBC Act approvals, it should be stated here that a separate EPBC Act approval process for the site is still required, and this may result in amending the PSP.	See comment #14	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	65 PSP	Key Objective 01: Create a high amenity urban environment through the provision of well-designed and integrated housing, pedestrian and cycle friendly streets and attractive open spaces and park networks.		Change to:  "Create a high amenity urban environment through the provision of well-designed and integrated housing, pedestrian and cycle friendly streets and attractive open spaces and park networks that protect indigenous trees, conservation areas and cultural heritage."	The VPA proposes objective 1 be changed to "Create a high amenity urban environment through the provision of well-designed and integrated housing, pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, attractive open space, conservation and park networks, and protection of indigenous trees (identified for retention in NVPP) and high value cultural heritage."	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	66 PSP	Key Objective 02: "Retained native grasslands and indigenous trees, predominately River Red Gums and Grey Box Gums;"		Change to "Retained and protected native grasslands and indigenous trees, predominately River Red Gums and Grey Box Gums;"	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	67 PSP	Key Objective 02:		Add "Avenue of Honour along Mickleham Road."	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	68 PSP	Key Objective 03: - Creation of an appropriate landscape character along Mount Ridley Road that softens the visual prominence of development from Mount Ridley Road, and - Enhancement of the existing native vegetation landscape along Mickleham Road that defines the extent of the Urban Growth Boundary		Change to:  "- Creation of an appropriate landscape character and subdivision pattern along Mount Ridley Road that reflects the site's natural landscape and development character to the east of the precinct, and softens the visual prominence of development from Mount Ridley Road; - Creation of landscape and subdivision character along the north-south boulevard connector that creates a sense of identity for the precinct and references the lands rural history; and - Enhancement of the existing native vegetation landscape along Mickleham Road to soften the visual prominence of development from Mickleham Road."	See comment #2.	Unresolved - HCC maintain that these objectives should be included as they clearly state the intent of the precincts 'unique character' and define what this is.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	69 PSP	Key Objective 06: Provide a range of lot sizes that respond appropriately to the surrounding rural context of the precinct.		Change to: "Provide a range of lot sizes, including larger lots in visually prominent areas of the precinct that respond appropriately to the surrounding rural context of the precinct."	See comment #2.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	70 PSP	Key Objective 08: Create a passive recreation network via the high voltage electricity transmission easement and series of local parks linking the Mount Ridley Woodland Nature Conservation Reserve to the north and the BCS conservation areas to the south of the PSP area.		Change to: "Create a shared path network along the edge (not within) of the high voltage electricity transmission easement and series of local parks linking the Mount Ridley Woodland Nature Conservation Reserve to the north and the BCS conservation areas to the south of the PSP area."	The VPA does not support this change as it would preclude the future incorporation of paths into these areas and limit potential future uses. It is also noted that the path network is shown as running externally along the edge of the conservation reserve in Plan 7 and Figure 5.	Unresolved - HCC does not support shared paths in the easement, or any infrastructure within the easement that implies Council will accept maintenance responsibilities for the easement.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	71 PSP	Key Objective 010: Retain indigenous trees, where possible, to preserve the ecological, landscape and cultural values of the precinct through sensitive subdivision and street layout design.		Agree, but as stated in the submission, it will be impossible to achieve this objective if the PSP does not require a permit for the removal of trees retained for landscape value.	See comment #19	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	72 PSP	Key Objective 016: "Link to the road network in adjacent residential areas;"		Add "in an appropriate manner"	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	73 PSP		Key Objective 019: Ensure irrigation of parks and open space that sustain the health of retained biodiversity values, particularly River Red Gums through subdivision design and innovative Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) practices.	Change to "Ensure passive irrigation"	This is not supported as there may be areas of park and open space where ensuring passive irrigation is not possible.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	74 PSP		Key Objective 020: Divert current catchment through the open space network to maximise the retention of natural flow	Change to: "Divert current catchment from the west of the precinct through the open space network to maximise the retention of natural flow paths."	This level of detail is beyond the scope of a key objective and should be included in the drainage strategy.	Unresolved - see comment to #22	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	75 PSP	Plan 4 Land Use Budget		Expand the boundary of the conservation reserve to align with changes requested in the submission.	See comment #16	Unresolved - see comment to #16	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	76 PSP	Table 1 Summary Land Use Budget		Amend Table 1 to include LP-01/LV-12 in the conservation reserve.	See comment #16	Unresolved - see comment to #16	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	77 PSP	Plan 5		Thicken blue line on eastern boundary to better highlight the existing residential interface.	supported.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	78	Plan 5		Identify areas for "larger lots" along: - Mt Ridley Road frontage; - Eastern interface to the rural residential development; - Mickleham Road frontage, south of the connector street; and - North-south boulevard connector street, south of the drainage reserve.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	79	Plan 5		Provide a different notation and show all drystone walls in open space as "Drystone walls to be repaired and retained in open space where possible" in all locations where these occur.	Agreed on 20 November 2017 that the retention of rating 1 dry stone walls is not required and that should Council have concerns that those identified as rating 1 in the PSP should be rating 2-3, they will provide evidence of this.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	80	Plan 5		Provide a different notation and show "Drystone walls potentially repaired and retained adjacent to road reserve" along western connector and central connector.	As above.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	81	Plan 5		Show areas of Aboriginal Cultural Heritage to be retained.	Areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage are already shown on Plan 2. Areas that require retention will be located within open space. The design and management of these sites will be addressed through the CHMP and in consultation with the RAP. Agreed in our meeting on 30 October 2017.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	82 PSP	3.1.1 Landscape Character		Include landscape buffer to Mickleham Road; open woodland character to Mount Ridley Road; and rural landscape to north-south.	See comment #2	Unresolved - see comment in #68	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	83 PSP	R3: Street trees must be provided on both sides of all roads and streets (excluding laneways) at regular intervals appropriate to tree size at maturity and not exceeding: • 8 – 10 metre intervals for trees with a canopy of less than 10 metres; • 10 – 12 metre intervals for trees with a canopy of between 10-15 metres; or • 12 – 15 metre intervals for trees with a canopy greater than 15 metres		Change to "Street trees must be provided on both sides of all roads and streets (excluding laneways), and where necessary road widths are to be increased to accommodate the required car parking without loss of street trees."	This is a standard requirement for PSPs. R3 will be updated to make reference to the Hume City Council Street & Reserve Tree Policy to ensure consistency with Council policy.  R3: Street trees must be provided on both sides of all roads and streets (excluding laneways) in accordance with Council's Street and Reserve Tree Policy and at regular intervals appropriate to tree size at maturity and not exceeding: • 8 – 10 metre intervals for trees with a canopy of less than 10 metres; • 10 – 12 metre intervals for trees with a canopy of between 10-15 metres; or • 12 – 15 metre intervals for trees with a canopy greater than 15 metres	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	84 PSP	3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces		Include requirements for larger lots as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	85 PSP	3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces		Include requirement for single dwellings restrictions to be applied to areas detailed in the submission.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	86 PSP		3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces	Include requirements for built form setback (including out buildings) as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	87 PSP		3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces	Include concept plans for the Mt Ridley Road frontage and eastern interface as detailed in the submission.	See comments #4 and #8.	Unresolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	88 PSP	R6: Development along Mickleham Road must respond to the existing native vegetation interface with appropriate landscaping and built form.	Change to "Development along Mickleham Road must respond to the Avenue on Honour and existing native vegetation interface with appropriate landscaping and built form."	R6 will be updated to "Landscaping, including nature strip planting, along Mickleham Road must respond to the Avenue of Honour, existing native vegetation interface and key views into and across the site."	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	89 PSP		3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces	Include requirement for all lots to be oriented to face Mickleham Road	While we support the orientation of lots towards Mickleham Road and Mt Ridley Road, we believe that R19 addresses this.  R19 states:  Lots must front where possible, and where not possible side: • Local parks, conservation area, drainage waterways and large easements; and • Arterial and connector roads	Resolved		No action
9	90 PSP		3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces	Include requirement for all lots to be oriented to face Mt Ridley Road	See comment #89.	Resolved		No action
9	91 PSP	R7: Development along Mount Ridley Road must create an appropriate interface that reflects the natural features of the precinct and softens the visual prominence of development along Mount Ridley Road.	Change to "Development along Mount Ridley Road must create an appropriate interface that reflects the natural features and openness of the precinct and softens the visual prominence of development along Mount Ridley Road."	Change to R7 supported.  See comment #89 regarding orientation of lots to Mt Ridley Rd.	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	92 PSP	R8: Development along the eastern boundary of the precinct must have regard to the privacy and amenity of the adjacent rural living lots and minimise visual impact on the adjacent rural living lots through the use of: • Appropriate use of screening vegetation, fencing and landscape buffers that accommodates trees and understorey species to screen the new dwelling from adjoining rural residential lot; and • Appropriate building materials and setbacks that minimise the visual impact on adjoining rural residential lot.	Add "10m built form setback to all property boundaries;"  Change "Appropriate building materials that minimise the visual impact on adjoining rural residential lot." to "Appropriate building materials and setbacks that minimise the visual impact on adjoining rural residential lot."	See comment #4.	Unresolved		Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	93 PSP	R10	Change "Provide a buffer between the southern façade and the building and new dwellings;" to "Provide a road and landscape buffer between the southern façade and the building and new dwellings;" Delete	See comment #36.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	94 PSP	G7: Dwellings on lots adjacent to the east boundary of the precinct should achieve: • A 10 metre setback from rear property boundaries; and • A 3 metre setback from side property boundaries.		See comment #4.	Unresolved		Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	95 PSP	3.1.3 Heritage	Dry stone wall to be retained should be located in POS or public road reserves.	The VPA agrees that rating 2-3 dry stone wall should be retained in road reserves and open space where possible and this is addressed in comment #12.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	96 PSP	R11: The proponent must consult the Registered Aboriginal Party to ascertain how development can protect significant cultural sites and whether the heritage interpretation is appropriate in the identified areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage sensitivity in Plan 2.	Change to "The proponent must consult the Registered Aboriginal Party and Council..."  The protection of Aboriginal Heritage places must be discussed with both the Registered Aboriginal Party and Council to ensure there is a clear understanding of the protection and conservation objectives of future management. This will inform the appropriate urban design interfaces with these important places.  Where cultural heritage is located within open space clear design and management responsibilities must be determined prior to the finalisation of the PSP.	The VPA supports the inclusion of consultation with Council in R11. However, details of cultural heritage design and management do not need to be directly addressed in the PSP as this is to be dealt with by the proponent in consultation with the RAP and Council as stated in R11.	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS		
9	97 PSP		G11: Dry stone walls identified on Plan 5 Image, Character and Housing as 'Dry stone walls to be retained and repaired – rating 2-3 (moderate to high value)' should be retained in open space and road reserves where possible and should:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a suitable landscape interface;</li> <li>• Be checked by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions;</li> <li>• Retain post and wire or post and rail fences situated within the walls, with any wire protruding beyond the vertical face of the wall reinstated to its original position or removed; and</li> <li>• Be incorporated into subdivision design to minimise disturbance to the walls (e.g. utilisation of existing openings for vehicle and pedestrian access).</li> </ul> <p>All to the satisfaction of the responsible authority</p>	<p>G11 should be moved into the requirements section.</p> <p>Change "Have a suitable landscape interface;" to "Remove all wire and posts within rock walls that pose a risk to public safety".</p> <p>Change "Be checked by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions;" to "Be checked by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones and structural integrity. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions;"</p>	See comment #12.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved	
9	98 PSP	Figure 1. Mickleham Road Interface			<p>The proposed cross section is similar to the cross section developed by VicRoads, however there are some inconsistencies. Figure 1 should be updated to show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• existing electricity power poles located between 2.5m to 3m from the property boundary, therefore trees cannot be located in the verge between the shared path and the local frontage road.</li> <li>• reference to the Avenue of Honour and include note: 'Avenue of Honour trees must be retained and other existing vegetation to be retained where possible'.</li> <li>• The proposed shared path should meander between the existing trees and to be located 1m from the power poles.</li> <li>• A W-Beam guard fence or wire rope safety barrier to be located in the kerb of the main road carriageway</li> <li>• According to VicRoads, the distance between the property boundary and the kerb of the main carriageway is approximately 27m. Show how this area will be distributed as it is not clear where the shared path and tree and vegetation zones are to be located.</li> <li>• show the location of the existing road reserve and property boundary.</li> </ul> <p>A 1m verge needs to be provided between the existing road reserve boundary and the kerb of the local frontage road.</p> <p>All local frontage roads along Mickleham Road are going to be loop roads and not service roads, therefore all roads will operate as two way roads. Local frontage roads should be 14m wide with a 7.3m pavement.</p>	<p>Following discussion with Council and the developer, Figure 1, Mickleham Road Interface, has been revised.</p> <p>It has been revised in consultation with VicRoads and Transport for Victoria to ensure it is consistent with their plans.</p> <p>The overhead powerlines have been added and the location of the shared path and trees adjusted accordingly. This has been discussed with the electricity provider, Jemena.</p> <p>The Avenue of Honour will be identified in the Mickleham Road reserve. The protection of these trees will not be noted in the interface plan, however, this will be addressed in R6 (see comment #67). It will also be identified on Plan 2 - Precinct Features and Plan 5 - Image, Character and Housing.</p> <p>The shared path should be a two way bike path, as per the standard cross section for a six lane arterial, and the cross section will be updated to show this. While the cross section does not show the bike path as meandering, it does not preclude it. Construction of this path will be the responsibility of Council and VicRoads, unless otherwise agreed with the developer, so Council will be able to manage its location in relation to trees and vegetation at a later stage. Similarly, a safety guard can be included if necessary.</p> <p>The cross section notes that this is a one way local frontage road, however this is an error. It will be updated to state that it is a local frontage road.</p>	<p>Partially resolved - Cross-section should note that the Avenue of Honour trees are to be retained. In accordance with Council's standards, the road pavement should be 5.5m for 'one way service road' or 7.3m for 'two way loop road'. If it's to be called a local road the road pavement should be shown as 7.3m.</p>	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel	
9	99 PSP	3.2 Housing			Include requirements for larger lots fronting Mickleham Road and fronting the north-south boulevard connector as well.	See comment #2 and #89.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved	
9	100	3.2 Housing			Include requirement for single dwellings restrictions to be applied in all of these areas as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved	
9	101 PSP	3.2 Housing	R19: Subdivision must deliver a minimum average dwelling density of 16.5 dwellings per Net Developable Hectare. Where a subdivision proposal presents a single stage or limited number of stages, proponents should demonstrate how the subdivision will contribute to the eventual satisfaction of the minimum average density through further stages of development. Lots must front where possible, and where not possible side: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Local parks, conservation area, drainage waterways and large easements; and</li><li>• Arterial and connector roads.</li></ul>	Delete to align with requested changes	The VPA does not support the deletion of R19.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel		
9	102 PSP	3.2 Housing	Table 2	Amend table to include category for 800-1200m <sup>2</sup> and 1200-1500m <sup>2</sup> as detailed in the submission.	See comment #2	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel		
9	103 PSP	Plan 6 Open Space		Identify these lot categories as including detached houses only. Show all stone walls in proposed open space as 'Stone walls to be retained in open space where possible'.	As agreed on 20 November 2017, rating 1 stone walls are not to be retained and will not be shown as to be retained in open space.	Resolved	No action	Resolved		
9	104 PSP	Plan 6 Open Space		Show the location of all the Major and Minor Recreation Nodes as proposed by Council in agency comments.	It is appropriate to apply all of R79 to "tree reserves" (landscape values areas). Trees to be retained with 'landscape values' have appropriate protection measures outlined in the NVPP.	see comment in #108	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel		
9	105 PSP	Plan 6 Open Space		Show LP22 (as in table) as an open space link to Merrifield PSP on eastern boundary.	There is no LP-22 in Plan 6 or Table 3, please clarify.	Resolved	No action	Resolved		
9	106 PSP	Plan 6 Open Space		Show the Aboriginal Heritage Reserves and places referred to in R11.	See comment #81.	Resolved	No action	Resolved		

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	107 PSP	3.3 Open Space and Natural Systems	Delete "Council is responsible for the management of these open spaces."		Following our discussions, it is understood Council is concerned that it should be made clearer that while Council will ultimately become responsible for the management of these open spaces, it is the developer's responsibility to deliver them. The VPA proposes changing this to "Following the delivery of these open spaces, Council is responsible for their management".	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	108 PSP	3.3 Open Space and Natural Systems  Table 3 Open Space Delivery Guide	See separate sheet		The requested changes to the Open Space Delivery Guide include a high level of detail that is inappropriate for the purposes of the PSP. It was agreed in our meeting on 30 October 2017 that this level of detail is not required. Such details are to be negotiated between Council and the developer through the subdivision process. This is addressed in R79, which requires all parks to be finished to a standard that satisfies the requirements of the responsible authority prior to the transfer of the public open space.  Following discussion with Council, R79 will be updated to "All local parks and tree reserves must be finished to a standard that satisfies the requirements of the responsible authority..."	Partially resolved - support if R79 is amended to: "All local parks and tree reserves must be finished to a standard that satisfies the requirements of the RA..."	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	109 PSP	Table 3 Open Space Delivery Guide	Add Drainage reserve		The drainage reserve should not be included in the Open Space Delivery Guide as land required for drainage will be a Melbourne Water asset and not open space.	Resolved - however note that this is not the case given significant changes to drainage infrastructure and Council is likely to have management responsibilities for two of the basins.	No action	Resolved
9	110 PSP	Table 3 Open Space Delivery Guide	Add Dry Stone Wall open space		G11 indicates DSW is to be retained in open space or road reserves where possible. Including this in the Open Space Delivery Guide would restrict the way this outcome is achieved.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	111 PSP	Table 3 Open Space Delivery Guide	Add Aboriginal Heritage Reserves and Places		An Aboriginal Heritage reserve has been included in the revised FUS and this will be reflected in the Open Space Delivery Guide.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	112 PSP	3.3.1 Open Space	Include the following requirements for the design of open space:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Major Recreation Nodes to include provision for play, shelter, picnic areas, seating, bike racks, drinking fountain, paths, tree planting and landscaping (may also include kickabout area/goals, BBQs and toilets as outlined in Table 3 amendments).</li> <li>- Minor Recreation Node to include seating/picnic areas, seats, bike racks, paths, tree planting and landscaping.</li> <li>- Stone walls to be repaired and appropriately incorporated into open space and road reserves with landscape interface, paths, seating and interpretation.</li> <li>- Conservation reserves to include landscape buffers, fencing and interpretation, with shared path linkages within adjacent road reserves.</li> <li>- Aboriginal Heritage Reserves and Places to managed in accordance with the CHMP.</li> </ul>	<p>As indicated above, the inclusion of specific equipment for open space is not within the parameters of the PSP. Requirement 79 states that "All local parks must be finished to a standard that satisfies the requirements of the responsible authority prior to the transfer of the public open space" and includes relevant information.</p> <p>Further, Clause 62.02-2 (Buildings and works not requiring a permit unless specifically required by the planning scheme) states the following do not require a permit, unless specifically required:</p> <p>Park furniture including seating, tables, shelters, rubbish bins, playground equipment, barbeques, shade sails, drinking fountains and public toilets.</p> <p>The repair and incorporation of dry stone walls is addressed in section 3.1.3.</p> <p>The conservation reserve interface is addressed in G3, R35, R24 and Figure 5. Landscape buffers are addressed in section 3.3.</p> <p>R11 addresses the requirement for the developer to consult with the RAP regarding areas of cultural heritage significance. It is also a legal requirement that the developer manage these places in accordance with a mandatory CHMP. The inclusion of a requirement regarding this is not necessary.</p> <p>The draft UG29 includes application requirements relating to tree retention and requires response to the PSP and NVPP</p>	Partially resolved - support if more detail is provided in R79 to include the following elements: picnic areas, seating, bike racks, drinking fountains and paths.  Partially resolved – support if following is added to UG29 schedule under 3.0 Application requirements – Subdivision – Residential Development (following sixth dot point): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A landscape master plan for open space, conservation, drainage reserves and areas with landscape values that shows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The integration of spaces throughout the network;</li> <li>- Provides a diverse range of recreational opportunities;</li> <li>- Provides buffers and fencing</li> <li>- To protect conservation values; and</li> <li>- Protects and interprets the natural and cultural heritage values across the site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	113 PSP	R22: Open space must be provided generally in accordance with Plan 6 and Table 3, unless otherwise approved by the responsible authority. An alternative provision of land for passive open space to that illustrated on Plan 6 is considered to be generally in accordance with this plan provided the passive open space: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensures all trees identified as being retained for their landscape value are retained;</li> <li>• Is located so as to not reduce the walkable access to local parks demonstrated on Plan 6;</li> <li>• Does not diminish the quality or usability of the space for passive recreation; and</li> <li>• Is equal to or more than the passive open space provision within the ICP.</li> </ul>	Add:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Achieves the passive irrigation requirements for retained native vegetation</li> </ul>	This matter will be addressed through the updates outlined in comment #21.	Unresolved - HCC maintains that WSUD and passive irrigation needs to be considered in a holistic manner in the planning of the PSP (as it talks to primary objective for the planning of the area), which includes design consideration for open space areas.	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	114 PSP		R25: Parks and open spaces must contain extensive planting of large canopy scale trees, native, indigenous and exotic, that are suitable for urban environments, the local climate, soil conditions, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.	Change to "Parks and open spaces must contain extensive planting of large canopy scale native, indigenous and exotic trees, that are suitable for urban environments, the local climate, soil conditions, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority."	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	115 PSP		G17 Open spaces should have a road frontage to the majority of edges and where a road is not provided a paper road should be provided between lots and open spaces.	Make G17 a requirement and change to "Open spaces should have a road frontage to all boundaries unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority."	<p>Due to the large amount of open space and its irregular layout, it may not be possible to have road frontage to all boundaries in some areas. The guideline ensures that the developer achieves this where possible and include a paper road where it is not. Adding "unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority" may unnecessarily complicate this process. The subdivision plan will ultimately require the approval of the responsible authority at which stage this can be addressed.</p> <p>Clarified with Council on 6 November 2017 that the intention here is to ensure that tall rear and side fences do not front open space. To address this concern, R27 will be amended to "Fencing around open spaces is to be avoided, other than vehicle exclusion bollards or pedestrian exclusion fencing to prevent access to conservation areas or tree reserves. Where fencing is required it must be low scale and/or visually permeable to facilitate public safety and surveillance."</p>	Unresolved - implies developers have a right to not have road frontage to open space. This is a matter of details that should be addressed at subdivision stage. Importantly, paper roads allow service authorities to undertake construction works in the vicinity of trees.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	116 PSP		G20: Development of land in the power transmission easement should be utilised for open space, recreation including those outlined in Table 4 - Powerlines Easement Possible Use and Development and other activities permitted by the relevant electricity authority.	Change to "Shared paths and WSUD may be located within reserves adjacent to the Powerline Easement to the satisfaction of the Council and electricity authority."	<p>The VPA does not support this change, however, reference to Table 4 will be removed. G20 will be updated to:</p> <p>Development of land in the power transmission easement should be utilised for open space and recreation activities as permitted by the relevant electricity authority.</p>	Unresolved - HCC does not support the use of the power easement for recreation uses and drainage.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	117 PSP		G21: Where landscaping in the powerlines easement is required as part of subdivision, treatment should include provision of a shared path and extensive planting of indigenous grasses and shrubs to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and in accordance with Figure 2 - Powerline Easement Concept, Table 4 - Powerline Easement Possible Use and Development and Appendix D - Service Placement Guidelines and the SP AusNet – A Guide to Living with Transmission Easements.	Delete objective, Council will not take on the maintenance responsibility for landscape maintenance of the Power Transmission Easement.	<p>The VPA does not support the deletion of G21, however, reference to Table 4 will be removed. G21 will be updated to:</p> <p>Where landscaping in the powerlines easement is required as part of subdivision, treatment should include provision of a shared path and extensive planting of indigenous grasses and shrubs to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and in accordance with Figure 2 - Powerline Easement Concept and Appendix D - Service Placement Guidelines and the SP AusNet – A Guide to Living with Transmission Easements.</p>	Unresolved - HCC does not support the use of the power easement for recreation uses and drainage. Council will not approve landscaping or accept maintenance responsibility for the power easement.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	118 PSP		3.3.3 Open space and stormwater management	Change "Figure 3" to "Figure 4"	<p>As Figure 4 is to be deleted, reference to it will be removed from R29. R29 will be updated to:</p> <p>Design and layout of retarding basins, wetlands and any other encumbered open space must maximise the potential for integration of recreation uses where this does not conflict with the primary function of the land, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and Melbourne Water. Figure 3 provides an illustration of how the central open space may be designed to integrate the drainage, recreation and conservation functions of this open space.</p>	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	119 PSP		R30: Drainage infrastructure (i.e. wetlands and retarding basins) must maximise water use efficiency and long term viability of vegetation, particularly the River Red Gums, through the use of Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives, including use of locally treated stormwater for irrigation purposes, where practical.	Delete "where practical".	The VPA does not support this as there may be instances where it is not practical to comply with this requirement.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	120 PSP		R31: Design of drainage infrastructure must minimise earthworks and impact on the retained River Red Gums.	Change to "Design of drainage infrastructure must protect the retained River Red Gums."	The VPA does not support this change as it is possible there will be instances where impacts to River Red Gums are unavoidable. It is noted that the removal of such trees is subject to permit so Council will be able to ensure their removal only takes place where necessary to ensure the best drainage outcomes.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	121 PSP		R32: Design and layout of wetland and any other encumbered open space must maximise the potential for integration of recreation uses where this does not conflict with the primary function of the land.	Change to "Design and layout of wetland and any other encumbered open space must maximise the potential for integration of recreation uses where this does not conflict with the primary function of the land."	R32 will be deleted as recreation uses in encumbered open space are addressed in R29.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	122 PSP		Figure 2 Powerline Easement Concept	Amend Figure 2 to show distinct and separate reserve adjacent to the power easement for the provision of a shared path and possible WSUD, but not within the easement.	The VPA does not support this change.	Unresolved - see comment to #70	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	123 PSP		Table 4 Powerline Easement Possible Use and Development	Remove Table 4 as Council does not support these uses within the easement, will not maintain the powerline easement.	Table 4 will be removed.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	124 PSP		Figure 3 Open Space Interface	Note that this concept does not apply to open space along Mt Ridley Road, and include separated design concept to guide development along the Mt Ridley Road interface and the eastern interface as detailed in the submission.	See comments #2 and #4.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	125 PSP		Figure 4 Retarding Basin / Wetland Concept Plan	Changes requested to Figure 4:	Due to the reconfiguration of the drainage system and relocation of retarding basins, Figure 4 will be removed from the PSP.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	126 PSP		Figure 5 Native Grassland Conservation Reserve Interface Plan	Amend OS1, OS2 and OS 8 to current reserve labelling system: LV-01, LV-02, LV-0	Show playground in parkland north of LV-0, and show playground, BBQ, and toilets in LV-02 as per comments on Table 3 and Council requirements for a District level open space reserve.			
				Remove all shared paths and off road bike paths within tree protection zones and conservation areas.				
				Removed shared path from Snow Gum Lane Conservation reserve and show it along the eastern boundary within the PSP.				
				Change to "Figure 5 Conservation Reserve Interface Plan"	Agreed.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	127 PSP	Figure 5 Native Grassland Conservation Reserve Interface Plan	Cross Section is-inconsistent with the NVPP required set backs (2 metres from conservation reserve). Trees should be shown on the reserve side to provide shading to people on shared path.	The NVPP states that protective fencing must be erected 2 metres from the conservation reserve prior to the commencement of works. This is a protective measure for the duration of works rather than a setback.  The VPA supports a revision of the interface to show trees in the nature strip adjacent to the reserve. Figure 5 will be updated to reflect this.	Resolved - support updated cross-section.		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	128 PSP	Figure 5 Native Grassland Conservation Reserve Interface Plan	Show street tree in nature strip on conservation reserve side. Add shared path adjacent to nature strip and 1m buffer planting to conservation reserve edge into road reserve.	Figure 5 will be updated to show a street tree in the nature strip on the conservation side with the shared path adjacent an offset area between the shared path and conservation reserve. Buffer planting will not be shown but a one metre offset will be provided should Council wish to incorporate this.	Resolved - supported if one metre buffer is included.		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	129 PSP	R35: Subdivision and development abutting a conservation area, including roads and dwellings, must be in accordance with Figure 5.	No public paths or infrastructure are to be located within conservation areas	The VPA does not support the inclusion of a requirement that no public paths or infrastructure are to be located within conservation reserves. Figure 5 shows that the public path will be located outside of the conservation reserve. The PSP should, however, be flexible in allowing for paths to be built through the conservation reserve as this can create a sense of ownership within the community resulting in community care for the area.	Unresolved - understand VPA position (which is an outcome Council's allows in some of its conservation reserves) however no shared path will be allowed in this particular reserve because of the specific environmental values. A shared will be located around the edge and integration will be achieved through landscaping. The community won't be discouraged from entering - there just won't be a path leading them specifically through it. Council's environment team do an amazing job building community ownership of these spaces through a number of other mechanisms, e.g. nature walks.		Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	130 PSP	R38: Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) principles must be used so that excess stormwater run-off from within, or where appropriate, external to the park, is directed to support park planting and/or rain gardens, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Any WSUD must complement the open space function and quality.	Change to: "Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) principles must be used so that excess stormwater run-off from within and external to the park, is directed to support park planting and/or rain gardens, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Any WSUD must complement the open space function and quality."	R38 requires that WSUD principles be used to satisfaction of the responsible authority therefore Council will be able to assess whether the excess run-off external to the park has been adequately incorporated.	Unresolved		Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	131 PSP	G22: Existing Indigenous trees retained outside of local parks or conservation areas should be located in tree reserves in accordance with the Australian Standard (AS4970 – 2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites).	Change to: "Existing Indigenous trees retained outside of local parks or conservation areas should be located in public tree reserves in accordance with the Australian Standard (AS4970 – 2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites)."	Supported.	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	132 PSP	R40: The Local Convenience Centre must have direct vehicular access to a connector road and must be well connected to the walking, cycling and public transport network.	Change to "R40: The Local Convenience Centre must have direct vehicular access to a connector road and must be located adjacent to the walking, cycling and public transport network."	Agreed in discussion with Andrea on 6 November 2017 that R40 will remain as it is.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	133 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Identify the intersection of Mt Ridley Road and the boulevard connector street as a "bus priority intersection".	See comment #25.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	134 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	As stated in the submission, we do not want to provide a direct connection between the boulevard connector and non-urban grade roads.	See comment #23	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	135 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Identify off-road shared path along the powerlines easement along road (not within the easement).	See comment #70.	Unresolved - see comment to #70		Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	136 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Remove off road shared path from open space proposed to be conservation reserve in south eastern section of PSP and show within road reserve.	The off road shared path is shown in Plan 7 and Figure 5 as external to the conservation reserve.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	137 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Remove off road shared path from Council's existing conservation area (outside of the PSP) and realign to run north-south on the eastern edge of the PSP within the drainage reserve.	The shared path network will be updated according to the revised open space layout and a shared path will be shown to run north-south on the eastern edge of the PSP within the drainage reserve.	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	138 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Show shared path within the road reserve along eastern edge of north-south boulevard connector, instead of off-road bike path as shown.	The boulevard connector will have an off road two-way bicycle path with separate pedestrian paths. As the connector street is likely to be used by commuters it is important to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety through the provision of separated bike paths and pedestrian paths.	Resolved		No action	Resolved
9	139 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Show a Two-Way bicycle path along north-south boulevard connector instead of an on-road bicycle lane in order to be consistent with the cross section shown in Appendix B.	On-road bike lane will be removed from boulevard connectors.	Resolved		Change the amendment	Resolved
9	140 PSP	Plan 7 Public Transport and Path Network	Add shared path link from western edge of electrical easement to LP-10 reserve, continuing diagonally to local convenience centre.	This may create an unnecessary disruption to the subdivision layout. Adequate links are shown via the easement, boulevard and Mickieham Road.	Resolved		No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	141 PSP		R49: Configuration of vehicle access to lots must ensure that there is sufficient separation between crossovers to allow for a minimum of one on-street car park for every two residential lots.	Change to: "Configuration of vehicle access to lots must ensure that there is sufficient separation between crossovers to allow for a minimum of one on-street car park for every two residential lots and a minimum of one street tree per lot."	R3 addresses street tree requirements. R3 will be updated to make reference to Council policy which specifies one street tree per lot (see comment #83).  Agreed on 6 November 2017 that R49 would remain unchanged and R3 would be updated to make reference to Council tree planning policy.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	142 PSP		RS1: Create a movement network that connects with Merrifield West to the north, the future Craigieburn West PSP to the south and the adjoining rural-residential area to the east.	Change to: "The subdivision layout must create a movement network that connects with Merrifield West to the north, the future Craigieburn West PSP to the south."	It is agreed that reference should be made to subdivision layout. However, connections to the rural living zone should still be included to ensure the creation of pedestrian and cycle links. Without these connections the rural living zone would be cut off from the PSP area which would impede the residents ability to access its open space and convenience centre. R51 will be updated to "The subdivision layout must create a movement network that connects with Merrifield West to the north, the future Craigieburn West PSP to the south and the adjoining rural-residential area to the east."	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	143 PSP	3.5.1 Street Network		Include additional requirement: The subdivision layout must provide road ends connecting to the road network in the adjoining rural-residential area to the east and in line with the end of ends at Billabong Close and Vanessa Drive to maintain potential for future road connections.	See comment #23.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	144 PSP	G28: Where streets bisect the open space network, they should be designed to allow for the continuation of stormwater to pass through open space areas to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.		Change to: "Where streets bisect the open space network, they should be designed to slow traffic and allow for the continuation of stormwater to pass through open space areas to the satisfaction of the responsible authority."	This requirement is intended to address stormwater in open space areas. R44 already requires the connector street network to provide a safe low speed environment. Agreed with Andrea on 6 November 2017 that new guideline will be introduced to address traffic speed and pedestrian safety in instances where the streets bisect the open space network.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	145 PSP	Plan 8 Street Network		Identify the intersection of Mt Ridley Road and the boulevard connector street as a "bus priority intersection".	See comment #25.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	146 PSP	Plan 8 Street Network		Remove the direct road connection between Callaway Drive and the boulevard connector street and show as the link at Cooinda Avenue. As stated in the submission, we do not want to provide a direct connection between the boulevard connector and non-urban grade roads.	See comment #23.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	147 PSP	Plan 8 Street Network		Show Access Street Level 1 abutting all conservation reserves, open space reserves, stone wall reserves, Aboriginal Heritage reserves and powerline easements where roads are not shown.	See comments #12, #81, #115 and #70.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	148 PSP	3.5.2 Public Transport		Include requirement for bus priority signals at Mt Ridley Road as detailed in the submission.	See comment #25.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	149 PSP	RS4: Bus stop facilities must be designed to the satisfaction of Public Transport Victoria and be located adjacent to the Local Convenience Centre.		Change to "Bus stop facilities must be designed to the satisfaction of Public Transport Victoria and be located adjacent to the Local Convenience Centre."	Clarified with Andrea on 6 November 2017 - when planning bus stops in consultation with PTV that the term "adjacent" is not necessarily taken literally but that bus stop will be as close as practically possible to the convenience centre. Agreed that the current wording is sufficient to support Council when assessing subdivision	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	150 PSP	R57		Suggest addition of shading standard for shared paths.	R3 achieves the outcome of shaded paths by creating canopy cover.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	151 PSP	Plan 9 Integrated Water Management		Identify environmental culvert works on Mickleham Road.	See comment #22	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved
9	152 PSP	3.6.1 Integrated Water Management		Include requirement (above R62): "Design an integrated water management system to Council's satisfaction."	Passive irrigation has been addressed in comment #21	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	153 PSP	3.6.1 Integrated Water Management		Move R67 up to follow the above addition. Include separate requirement: Environmental culvert works must be undertaken within the Mickleham Road reserve adjacent to the left-in/left-out intersection to divert existing external flows from the west into the open space network, and be designed to the satisfaction of VicRoads and the responsible authority. In the absence of this being provided, an overland flow path must be provided along the east-west connector street between the existing culvert in Mickleham Road and the open space network.	See comment #22	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	154 PSP	R67: The design and layout of roads, lots, and public open space must optimise water use efficiency and long-term viability of vegetation (especially existing mature River Red Gums) and public uses through the use of overland flow paths, Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives, such as rain gardens and/or locally treated storm water for irrigation.		Change to "The design and layout of roads, lots, and public open space must utilise passive irrigation to ensure the long-term viability of vegetation, especially the River Red Gums and public uses through the use of overland flow paths, Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives, such as rain gardens and/or locally treated storm water for irrigation."	The VPA proposes that R67 be changed to: "The design and layout of roads, lots, and public open space must optimise water use efficiency and long-term viability of vegetation (especially existing mature River Red Gums) and public uses through the use of passive irrigation, overland flow paths, Water Sensitive Urban Design initiatives, such as rain gardens and/or locally treated storm water for irrigation."	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	155 PSP	G36: Where practical, development should reduce reliance on reticulated non-potable water for irrigation of vegetation, including existing mature River Red Gums, through utilisation of passive irrigation facilitated by appropriate subdivision and road design.		Delete "where practical" and make a requirement.	See comment #21.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	156 PSP	Plan 10 Utilities		Add "Note: All services to be located outside Tree Protection Zones of existing trees."	This is unnecessary as it is already a requirement that services be located outside Tree Protection Zones in R70.	Resolved	No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Submission	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Council Comment / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
9	157 PSP	3.6.2 Utilities		Include requirement for potential environmental culvert works on Mickleham Road as detailed in the submission.	See comment #22.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	158 PSP	Table 6 Precinct Infrastructure Plan		Identify Mount Ridley Road and boulevard connector as bus priority intersection to align with changes requested in the submission.	See comment #25.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	159 PSP	Table 6 Precinct Infrastructure Plan		Amend Table 6 to align with changes requested in the submission regarding the expansion of community hub in Merrifield West PSP.	See comment #27.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	160 PSP	R79		Change "Tree management works required to be undertaken to ensure retained trees are safe for public open space;" to "Tree management works required to be undertaken to maximise tree longevity and ensure retained trees are safe for public open space;"	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	161 PSP	4.2 Appendix B Standard Street cross-sections		Provide an additional cross section showing how stone walls can be retained along edge of road reserve with buffer planting.	Agreed on 6 November 2017 that this level of detail is beyond the scope of the PSP. If Council has concerns regarding the design and layout of stone walls a cross section should be requested at subdivision stage.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	162 PSP	4.2 Appendix B Standard Street cross-sections		Provide cross section for laneways.	Agreed on 6 November 2017 that this level of detail is beyond the scope of the PSP. If Council has concerns regarding the design and layout of laneways a cross section should be requested at subdivision stage.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	163 PSP	4.2 Appendix B Standard Street cross-sections		Provide cross section for road frontage to the power easement to provide direction on the location of services and shared path along the easement.	The location of services and the shared path along the easement is shown in Figure 2.	Unresolved - see comment #70	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	164 PSP	4.2 Appendix B Standard Street cross-sections		All notes deleted.  Clarified with Andrea on 6 November 2017 that notes have been deleted because they provide too great a level of detail.	The notes in these cross sections provide key information regarding the construction and layout of these roads. This information needs to be included to ensure they are constructed to the right standard.	Unresolved - this outcome will be achieved through the detailed design, engineering and statement of compliance process.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	165 PSP	Connector Street (28.0-31.0m) Boulevard		Delete WSUD from central median, show service locations.	This is not supported as it has been agreed that a flow path will be accommodated in the median of the east west boulevard connector. Service locations are identified in Plan 10 Utilities.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
9	166	Connector Street (28.0-31.0m) Boulevard		Notes should be explicit that trees 25,90 and 91 must be incorporated into the design.	It is stated that trees 25, 74, 90 and 91 will be located on the future boulevard street in the NVPP (Section 5.2). Tree 74 should not be included in this as it is located elsewhere and the text will be updated accordingly. The relocation of the boulevard 20m to the east will result in these trees being retained in adjacent pocket parks.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
9	167 PSP	4.3 Appendix C Street cross-section variation examples		Delete all of the cross sections in Appendix C as they are not feasible or acceptable by Council.  Clarified with Andrea on 6 November 2017 - these cross sections are not deliverable. They do not achieve their intended outcome of variation in street scapes.	The inclusion of these cross sections in the PSP is standard as they ensure variations can be accommodated where necessary and that any such variations meet required standards.	Unresolved	Refer to panel	Unresolved Refer to panel
9	168 PSP	4.4 Appendix D: Service Placement Guidelines  GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR SERVICE PLACEMENT		Add: "Where street trees cannot fit into road cross sections due to service location requirements, road widths are to be widened to allow for tree planting."  Clarified with Andrea on 6 November 2017 - issue here is that services gain preference over trees rather than widening the street to accommodate trees. Agreed that a note on a cross section could address this. Andrea to clarify with relevant staff.	The provision of street trees at regular intervals is addressed in requirement 3 which states "Street trees must be provided on both sides of all road and all streets (excluding laneway) at regular intervals..."	Resolved - support same workign to be added to cross-section.	No action	Resolved