

Melissa Allan

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 22 February 2018 10:33 PM
To: amendments
Subject: Submission re Precinct Structure Plan Pakenham East.

To the Responsible Officer, Victorian Planning Authority.

My name is [REDACTED] and I reside at [REDACTED] My email is [REDACTED]

Please accept my Submission regarding the proposed development of "Pakenham East" as a largely residential suburb of Pakenham, to which it will have little physical connection.

This Development will not only affect my enjoyment of the area, but also falls short of delivering for its immediate inhabitants, as well as the present population of Pakenham and surrounds, because of the points made below.

- Lack of consideration for any future transition between urban Pakenham East precinct and the more rural NNG region along the eastern boundary.
- Narrow focus of the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) and Council in relation to the PSP and only development works within that boundary.
- Very little if any consideration of Disaster Response, i.e. Bushfire, or preparatory measures required in an area containing 23000 people with no direct road links to the South, only East/West. The prospect of being caught in Traffic trying to access Pakenham via the highway near a major gas interchange, during a Bush fire event does not appeal.
- Lack of any basic forecasting of traffic flow and the potential impact on rural road network e.g. Dore road to Gembrook. On the topic of Dore road as the speed limit in the subdivision will immediately drop to 50 Km/hr will Dore rd revert to a 100 Km/hr limit North of the Transmission lines? What is the proposed road treatment in the subdivision and how will the paved to dirt road transition be handled? I suggest a roundabout arrangement at Seymour road to prevent serious collisions and immediate acceleration on a slippery surface.
- Lack of any basic forecasting on the use of the VR railway station at Nar Nar Goon and its car park. Also impact on existing schools and kindergarten, while infrastructure resources are built (presumably).
- Assumption made by VPA representative that majority of movement will be to the west towards Pakenham township without any basic modelling/presentation.
- No Foot or bike paths connecting east towards NNG township, one would be naive not to expect that a portion of the population would want/need to travel west other than by car. Also NNG residents may benefit from interchange. Or will a Passport be required? Walking/cycling paths are already proposed to connect west towards Pakenham via railway reservation, a positive measure.
- Any development of the precinct must be in conjunction with state and local government infrastructure coming on line. Failure to do so will put pressure on the limited rural services available in NNG including schools, public transport and sporting facilities, but also increase traffic flow through Pakenham to its facilities, bringing back the "good old days" when the town was virtually cut in half by traffic on the Princes Highway when it was THE ONLY way to travel through.
- Deliberate omission of proposed development bordering the PSP within the Cardinia Lakes estate bordered by Deep Creek (east), Atlantic Drive/ Abrehart Rd (west), Superior Waters (north) and Princes Highway (south). This does not enable the community to take a cohesive overall perspective of the development of this area.
- Development of land north of the transmission lines. I don't believe this was the agreed edge of the Green Wedge when Council made its application for abolition to establish Pakenham East. As there is an arbitrary boundary to the east (Mt Ararat ridge line), there should be a northern boundary. This should remain the transmission line easement that currently exists westward towards the Pakenham township. The current max block area of around 880 sq metre abutting properties whose current minimum subdivision is 40 Hectares seems incongruous in the extreme.
- Loss of significant vegetation and habitat, particularly along the Princes Hwy to make room for road duplication and 4 x traffic signalled intersections.
- No proposal for a Pakenham East train station to service precinct and a lost opportunity to work in conjunction with the PTV train maintenance yard currently under construction directly to the south. A complete ignorance of the

current and future traffic issues created by the building of the Train yards and the future rail traffic generated at the Racecourse road crossing affecting entrance/egress of the Freeway at Kooweerup road interchange.

- Visual impact of the multi storey high density housing proposed (up to 4 storeys). Preference for this type of development not to be sighted on high ground. Lack of assurance as to the quality and appearance of these dwellings. I am of the understanding that types of buildings i.e. commercial/industrial facilities is to be at the discretion of Council officers, this is not reassuring as to the future quality/amenity of this estate, in the past decisions have appeared to be arbitrary and not harmonious with the original concept advanced.

- A serious lack of freeway access to directly service the Pakenham East precinct. There is only one way out by vehicle from this estate i.e.

Princes Highway. Are we to have our own Point Cook in the South East?

- Short time frame in which a submission can be made in particular toward the end of the summer holiday period.

Not good form and projects an impression of evading public scrutiny.

-Lack of any meaningful link to public transport principally rail. There appears to be no serious consideration of where the people from this estate will park their cars when they try to access MET rail at Pakenham. There is the suggestion that a "Smart Bus" network will service this Suburb. I'm yet to see any truly intelligent/predictable/reliable road based Public transport system that effectively interfaces with rail.

In the hope these matters are seriously considered.

Sincerely

