

Sub. #	Comment #	Affected property / properties	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Satterley Comment (31 January 2018) / Proposed Outcome	Further review/discussion required	Decision pending further review
							Refer to panel	Awaiting response from submitter
							Change the amendment	Unresolved
							Refer to panel	Unresolved
							No action	Resolved
Sub. #	Comment #	Affected property / properties	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Satterley Comment (31 January 2018) / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
5	1	Satterley	<p>1. Review the central drainage reserve and relocate some of the drainage assets along the eastern boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces the excessively large amount of land set aside for drainage purposes:</li> <li>Avoids significant earthworks in close proximity to the trees as proposed in the PSP's centralised stormwater approach.</li> <li>Locating the drainage assets along the eastern boundary would also provide an enhanced outcome for the rural-residential land to the east by providing large setbacks between dwellings.</li> <li>Strengthens the north-south connections through the site by linking to the conservation reserve</li> </ul>	<p>Yes - Change current central drainage reserve to three separate drainage reserves wetland/basin reserve in the north, a single wetland/basin reserve in the central open space area and a wetland/basin reserve in the south.</p> <p>Land set aside for drainage should have an appropriate zone applied rather than General Residential Zone.</p>	<p>Following discussion with relevant stakeholders, the VPA supports the relocation of the decentralisation of the drainage system into three separate drainage reserves with a wetland/basin reserve in the north, a single wetland/basin reserve in the central open space area and a wetland/basin reserve in the south. The VPA agrees that this would enhance the outcome for the rural residential interface and strengthens the north-south connections.</p> <p>At discussions on 11 December 2017, it was agreed that a primary flow path designated as drainage reserve between the north-south boulevard connector and the central retarding basin is required. Alluvium have confirmed that the required width of this reserve is 60 metres. The PSP will be updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The land set aside for drainage is zoned as Urban Growth Zone as is the standard approach for all PSPs.</p>	<p>Location of wetlands and width of drainage reserve generally resolved subject to review of final drainage strategy.</p>	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	2		<p>2. Rationalise the open space provision, enhance the north-south connections, and take a contemporary approach to the interurban break:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PSP proposes an exceptionally high amount of open space, with 8.17% (7.94ha) of credited local parks and an additional 12.43% (12.09ha) of uncredited landscape values land, in addition to the conservation reserve and uncredited "kickabout" spaces in the drainage reserve.</li> <li>Apply a contemporary approach to the outdated inter-urban break by utilising landscaping rather than parkland and setbacks to define the interface.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes - reduce passive open space from 8.17% to 3 or at most 4%</p> <p>Parkland along Mt Ridley Rd should be removed and replaced with a landscaped strip adjacent to the road.</p>	<p>The landscape features of the area offer an opportunity to enhance the future community and protect the biodiversity and heritage values of the area. The retention of a high amount of open space within the PSP reflects these opportunities.</p> <p>It also reflects Hume City Council's Inter Urban Break policy, the objective of which is to create a sense of openness and permeability in the urban environment that differs from standard approaches to urban development. The provision of large areas of open space have been feature of discussion and planning for Lindum Vale since it was identified as a logical inclusion.</p> <p>However, the VPA agrees that there are options for the reconfiguration of open space. It has been agreed that local park along Mt Ridley Rd between Mickleham Road and the boulevard connector (LP-02) should be removed in favour of a different approach to this interface. A cross section has been created for Mt Ridley Rd that includes a 10m landscaped strip to help create a buffer between the arterial and the homes of future residents and to encourage a sense of openness.</p> <p>The VPA proposes some of this local park be reconfigured to create a 30m wide linear park along part of the southern section of the eastern interface, to further enhance the outcome for residents in the rural living zone and improve north south open space connectivity. A park will also be introduced in the north east corner to create a north-south open space link.</p> <p>These changes and others shown in the revised future urban structure result in a decrease in credited local park to 4.96% and landscape values land to 11.47%.</p>	<p>Satterley will make submissions in relation to open space issues.</p>	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	3		<p>3. Retain the native vegetation in reserves which better integrate with urban development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rationalise the extent and boundaries of retained native vegetation by keeping less trees in reserves that have more regular boundaries to allow for frontage roads</li> </ul>		<p>As noted above, the retention of native vegetation is a key goal and defining feature of the PSP. The future urban structure has been revised to reduce the amount of reserves for native vegetation and create more regular boundaries in some areas. While there is still a large amount of open space allocated to landscape values in the PSP, this is a reflection of Council's strategic planning goals for the area and has been a feature of discussion and planning for Lindum Vale since it was identified as a logical inclusion. Where possible, boundaries of open space have been made more regular. However, in other areas the irregular boundaries are a result of basing the land allocated to landscape values to tree protection zones of native vegetation to be retained in these areas.</p>	<p>Satterley will make submissions in relation to native vegetation and landscape issues.</p>	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	4		<p>4. Achieve a density of 16.5 dwellings/nda through efficient development outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requiring undefined 'large lots' along the eastern and southern boundaries will have significant implications for the achievement of the 16.5 dwellings/nda sought in the PSP. Large stretches of low density lots will necessitate the development of significant tracts of medium density development elsewhere, yet this PSP does not contain any of the features normally associated with medium density development (e.g. town centres, schools or active open space) aside from a local convenience centre.</li> <li>Rather than large lots, require design guidelines to be prepared for lots adjacent to the southern and eastern boundaries that consider design and landscape treatments.</li> </ul>	<p>Change requirement R18 so that larger lots are not required on the eastern and southern interface. Replace with design guidelines and landscape treatments for lots on these boundaries.</p>	<p>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 suggest a target of 16.5 dwellings per Net Developable Hectare is achievable.</p> <p>Interface conditions are provided to guide development so that it responds to the landscape features and character of the area. Following 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.</p> <p>A new requirement will be introduced to 3.1.2 Integration and Interfaces:</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieve a minimum 5 metre setback from the rear and one side of the property boundary;</li> <li>Be a single dwelling on a lot; and</li> <li>Allow for the planting of canopy trees on each lot.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>Requirement 6 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."</p> <p>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."</p>	<p>Satterley supports the density target of 16.5 dw/ha. Satterley will make submissions on the interface issues.</p>	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	5		<p>5. Ensure the retained dry stone walls don't inhibit access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only retain high quality walls subject to permit.</li> <li>Allow for breaks in the walls for access.</li> </ul>		<p>Plan 5 shows dry stone walls that are of moderate to high value. These dry stone walls are to be retained subject to permit for their removal (in whole or in part) under clause 52.37. Breaks for pedestrian and vehicle access should be kept to a minimum and are also subject to a planning permit. G11 indicates that dry stone walls of moderate-high value should be incorporated into open space, conservation reserves or road verges. Following discussion with Council, G11 will be made a requirement to ensure this outcome is achieved.</p>	<p>Satterley will make submissions in relation to the drystone walls.</p>	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel

Sub. #	Comment #	Affected property / properties	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Satterley Comment (31 January 2018) / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
5	6		Clarification on tree retention requirements in the PSP and NVPP, particularly with regard to trees retained for landscape value in plan 5 of the PSP.	Trees shown as "trees retained for landscape value" on Plan 5 of the PSP should be relabelled as "trees to potentially be retained for landscape value" in recognition that other matters such as the density of development require consideration as well.	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.  As agreed with Council, the following changes to trees shown to be retained/removed will be made:  • 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. • Trees 257, 221, & 96, which are currently identified as trees to be retained for landscape values, will be shown as to be removed. • Tree 85, currently shown as to be removed, will be retained. • Tree 131, 153, 159, 162, 163, 177, 178, 179, 180 & 193 (currently shown as to be removed) are planted trees and should not be included in the NVPP.  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.  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 VPAs Part A submission.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to tree retention and removal.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	7	Plan 2	Public acquisition overlay along Mt Ridley Road is missing sections.	Add the missing grey hatched public acquisition overlay shading under the area of Aboriginal cultural heritage sensitivity and the grassy eucalypt woodland shading.	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	8	Plan 3	The Future Urban Structure should be revised as per our submission.	We will provide a masterplan illustrating our requested changes once we have further clarification on the other matters.	The Future Urban Structure will be revised in response to all submissions to the exhibited PSP.	Generally resolved. Satterley will make submissions on some elements of the Future Urban Structure.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	9	Plan 3	Plans 3, 5 and 8 are inconsistent in regards to classification of the internal road links.	The links from Callaway Drive and Cooida Ave and the links across the linear open space west of Billabong Court and Jolly Lane are shown in different categories on different plans. On Plan 3 some are streets and some are pedestrian/cycle links, on Plan 5 they are all pedestrian/cycle links, and on Plan 8 some are classified as Level 2 local access streets and some as Level 1 access streets). They should all be classified as local access streets on all plans for consistency.	Plans will be revised to ensure consistency.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	10	Table 1	Errors in open space measurements	Delete "Heritage Reserve - Post Contact" row, amend "Utilities Easements" from 12.09ha to 4.56ha, amend "Other" from 33.80ha to 12.09ha (or preferably a lower amount as per our other submission points), and amend "Sub-total Service Open Space" to 33.80ha (or preferable a lower amount as per our other submission points).	"Heritage Reserve - Post Contact" will be removed and the table updated accordingly.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	11	Plan 5	Plans 3, 5 and 8 are inconsistent in regards to classification of the internal road links.	The links from Callaway Drive and Cooida Ave and the links across the linear open space west of Billabong Court and Jolly Lane are shown in different categories on different plans. On Plan 3 some are streets and some are pedestrian/cycle links, on Plan 5 they are all pedestrian/cycle links, and on Plan 8 some are classified as Level 2 local access streets and some as Level 1 access streets). They should all be classified as local access streets on all plans for consistency.	Plans will be revised to ensure consistency.	DUPLICATED FROM 2 LINES ABOVE	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	12	Plan 5	Too many trees to be retained, resulting in impacts on development densities	Amend the second legend item to "trees to potentially be retained for landscape values" and amend Guideline G4 as detailed below.	See comment #6	Satterley will make submissions in relation to tree retention and removal.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	13	Guideline G4	States that the trees labelled as "trees retained for landscape values" should be retained unless removal cannot be avoided.	Amend to "River Red Gums and Grey Box Trees labelled as "trees to potentially be retained for landscape value" on Plan 5 should be retained if feasible. A proposal to remove "trees retained for landscape value" should describe why removal cannot be avoided to the satisfaction of the responsible authority."	See comment #6	Satterley will make submissions in relation to tree retention and removal.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	14	Requirement R6	Refers to retaining an undefined "existing native vegetation interface" along Mickleham Road whereas there is very little native vegetation at present, and refers to "appropriate landscaping and built form".	Delete as there is very little existing native vegetation along Mickleham Road, the PSP boundary excludes Mickleham Road, and it is unclear how built form could respond to this.	See comment #4 update to requirement 6.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to the interface issues.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	15	Requirement R7	Refers to development along Mt Ridley Road creating an appropriate interface that "reflects the natural features of the precinct", however it is unclear how this could be achieved via built form.	Amend to "Development Landscaping along Mt Ridley Road must create an appropriate interface..."	R7 relates to achieving the objectives of openness along the Mt Ridley Interface. R7 will be updated 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."	As above.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	16	Requirement R10	Refers to retaining Parnell's Inn on a parcel that contains "appropriate curtilage"	We seek clarification that the curtilage will only involve land on property 3 and will not include any land on property 2.	Agreed on 10 November 2017 that heritage interface will be extended 10m south of property boundary.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Affected property / properties	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Satterley Comment (31 January 2018) / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
5	17	Guideline G7	Requires large setbacks for dwellings adjoining the eastern boundary which will make achieving a density of 16.5 dwellings per hectare difficult.	Delete Guideline G7.	Following discussion with Council, G7 will be made a requirement.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to the interface issues.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	18	Guideline G12	This guideline seeks for dry stone walls to be retained in open space, conservation reserves or road verges.	Delete Guideline G12.	The VPA does not support the deletion of G12. The incorporation of dry stone walls of moderate-high heritage value into open space, conservation reserves or road verges will improve the amenity of the PSP.	Not resolved	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	19	Figure 1	The Mickleham Road interface plan shows a shared path and vegetation in the Mickleham Road reserve. We note that this land is outside the area of the PSP. The interface plan also shows trees planted on the property boundary where a Telstra cable is located.	We seek clarification that landscaping within the Mickleham Road boundary will be the responsibility of VicRoads and Council. This land is not inside the PSP. It is not feasible to plant trees on the boundary due to the presence of a Telstra cable. Figure 1 should be amended so that the landscaping between the shared path and the one way road consists of a grassed area with no trees.	Landscaping within the road reserve will be the responsibility of Council and VicRoads unless otherwise agreed by the developer. We have investigated the location of the Telstra cable and, while Telstra are unable to determine it's exact location, the cross section will be updated to safeguard against disruption to the cable should it be located on the property boundary.  Creating screening through the planting of trees and other vegetation is an approach identified by Council as important to achieving their aims for this interface and as such will be required in the nature strip between the shared path and one way road. As agreed in our meeting on 10 November 2017, the location of the nature strip will be adjusted so that it sits within the property boundary in the revised interface plan.  Following discussion with Council and the developer, Figure 1, Mickleham Road Interface, has been revised.  It has been revised in consultation with VicRoads and Transport for Victoria to ensure it is consistent with their plans.  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.  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.  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.  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.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to the interface issues.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	20	Requirement R18	Refers to the provision of "larger lots" along the eastern and southern interfaces	Define "larger lots" as lots over 600 sqm to ensure that there is no expectation that very large lots (e.g. 2,000 sqm) are expected.	See comment #5.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to the interface issues.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	21	Plan 6	Too much landscape values land	Reduce the amount of landscape values land by making smaller areas with regular boundaries.	See comment #3.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to open space.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	22	Plan 6	Requirement R22 refers to walkable catchments on Plan 6 but none are shown.	Add walkable catchments to Plan 6.	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	23	Requirement R23	Refers to using encumbered land for recreational opportunities.	We seek clarification that this will not be interpreted as using encumbered land as a quasi-local park with similar levels of public infrastructure.	It is not the intention that this land should be delivered to the same standard as local park but to ensure amenity value.	Satterley will make submissions in relation to open space.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	24	Requirement R30	Using drainage infrastructure to maximise the viability of River Red Gums	We seek clarification that this refers to the use of WSUD techniques only.	As agreed on 11 December 2017, the PSP will be updated to ensure that a requirement for passive irrigation is linked to the detailed drainage design and there is a sufficient trigger at subdivision stage.  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.  G36 will be converted to a requirement and updated to: "Development must 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, where practical."	Pending the content of the final drainage strategy and revised PSP, Satterley may make submissions on drainage and irrigation issues.	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	25	Table 4	Refers to hardstand areas, community gardens etc.	Delete first two columns or include a note that these are potential future opportunities, i.e. that developers will not be expected to construct these.	Table 4 will be deleted.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	26	Figure 4	Demonstrates how design is inefficient and not viable, with large tracts of land for uncredited local park functions, and significant earthworks required near the trees	Adopt Satterley's stormwater concept.	Satterley's stormwater concept will be adopted, subject to revisions discussed on 11 December 2017. Figure 4 will be deleted.	Pending the content of the final drainage strategy, Satterley may make submissions on this issue.	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	27	Figure 5	It is not clear where the conservation reserve boundary is	The conservation area boundary should be labelled adjacent to the nature strip rather than where the low fence is located. We note that locating shared paths in conservation areas is allowable.	The conservation reserve boundary is clearly demarcated by the low fence. Shared paths are allowed to pass through the conservation area, however this does not mean it is allowable for the shared path to run along the inside of the conservation boundary.	Satterley may make submissions in relation to the conservation reserve.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	28	Plan 7	Depicts both an on-road bike lane and off-road shared path along the connector roads	Delete the on-road bike lanes from the connector roads.	On-road bike lane will be deleted from Plan 7.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	29	Plan 7	Depicts an off-road shared path along Mickleham Road	We seek clarification that the construction of this shared path will be the responsibility of VicRoads and Council as it is not located in the PSP.	The construction of the off-road bike path along Mickleham Road will be the responsibility of Council and VicRoads unless otherwise agreed by the developer.	Resolved	No action	Resolved

Sub. #	Comment #	Affected property / properties	Issue Raised	Is a change to the amendment requested?	VPA Comment / Proposed Outcome	Satterley Comment (31 January 2018) / Proposed Outcome	ACTION	STATUS
5	30	Plan 8	Plans 3, 5 and 8 are inconsistent in regards to classification of the internal road links.	The links from Callaway Drive and Cooida Ave and the links across the linear open space west of Billabong Court and Jolly Lane are shown in different categories on different plans. On Plan 3 some are streets and some are pedestrian/cycle links, on Plan 5 they are all pedestrian/cycle links, and on Plan 8 some are classified as Level 2 local access streets and some as Level 1 access streets. They should all be classified as local access streets on all plans for consistency.	Plans will be revised to ensure consistency.	DUPLICATED	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	31	Requirement R58	Requires the delivery of shared paths on both sides of minor waterways as outlined on Plan 7	Plan 7 does not depict the location of minor waterways so it is unclear what this requirement refers to. We seek the deletion of this bullet point as one shared path is sufficient.	Reference to Plan 7 will be removed and this point will be updated to: "Where a shared path is to be delivered on one side of a minor waterway, a path is also to be delivered on the other side of the waterway but may be constructed to a lesser standard;"	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	32	Requirement R60	Lighting along shared, pedestrian and cycle paths	Delete as we understand Council does not want this and neither do we	Following discussion with Council and Satterley, R60 will be updated to:  Lighting must be installed along shared, pedestrian, and cycle paths where they are adjacent to roads, linking to key destinations, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	33	Plan 9	Stormwater strategy is inefficient	Adopt Alluvium strategy instead	Supported following updates to the Alluvium strategy as discussed with Council and Melbourne Water.	Pending the content of the final drainage strategy, Satterley may make submissions on drainage issues.	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	34	Guideline G36	Using drainage infrastructure to maximise the viability of River Red Gums	We seek clarification that this refers to the use of WSUD techniques only.	See comment #24.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
5	35	Requirement R70	Requires services to be located outside tree protection zones	We understand that encroachments of up to 10% are acceptable, so seek deletion of this. As encroachments of more than 10% would mean that the tree is no longer counted as retained, there is a mechanism to assess this anyway.	The VPA proposes changing R70 to "All services must be located outside tree protection zones and in accordance with the Australian Standard (AS4970 – 2009 Protection of Trees on Development Sites)."	Satterley will make submissions in relation to TPZs.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	36	Requirement R76	Does not allow for alternative utility designs to be considered if Melbourne Water and Council are agreeable.	Add "or as otherwise agreed with them"	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	37	Plan 11	Connector road should be an ICP item.	Add connector road.	A Boulevard Connector is only included in an ICP where land ownership within the PSP is fragmented to ensure its consistent delivery. As there is only one landowner within the Lindum Vale PSP, the boulevard connector will not be included as an ICP item. While residents of Merrifield West and, to a limited extent, those in the rural living zone will use the connectors, it will not be to the extent of an arterial road.	Unresolved. Satterley will make submissions on the Connector Road issue.	No action	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	38	Table 6	There are no short term projects and all open space projects are medium term	Amend as follows: • IN-01 = change from M to S • IN-03 = change from M to S • LP-01 to LP-10 = change from M to S-M	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	39	Connector Street cross section	Inefficient provision of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure.	Delete left pedestrian path, change two way bike path to shared path.	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
5	40	NVPP – Map 2	Three scattered trees (25, 90 and 91) shown to be retained are located in the connector road	Show these as to be removed	As agreed, the north south boulevard connector has been moved 20m to the east to accommodate these trees.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
5	41	NVPP – Maps 2 and 3	Tree 1 is shown as to be retained but it is within a path of native vegetation shown for removal and is partially located in PAO	Clarify whether tree 1 is to be removed or retained.	As the VPA propose this area become conservation reserve, tree 1 will be retained.	Resolved	No action	Resolved
5	42	NVPP - Maps 2 and 3	The extent of vegetation shown for retention is excessive and will impact on development outcomes.	Review trees and vegetation patches shown for retention with a view to rationalising these.	See comment #3.	Not resolved. Satterley will make submissions on tree retention and removal.	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel
5	43	2.2 Strategic Biodiversity Context		Replacement of "conservation area" with conservation reserve"	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	44	Appendix 7.4		NVPP Appendix 7.4 should be renamed "Trees to be Retained or Removed South West".	Supported.	Resolved	Change the amendment	Resolved
5	45	Requirement 8	Requirement R8 also requires development along the eastern boundary to utilise screening vegetation, fencing, landscape buffers, building materials and setbacks to minimise the visual impact. We seek clarification that this would be more effectively dealt with via Memorandum of Common Provisions rather than at the subdivision permit stage.	Recommendation that a Memorandum of Common Provision should be used rather than resolution at subdivision permit stage	Not supported.	Not resolved	Change the amendment	Unresolved Refer to panel