

VPA

Level 25-35 Collins Street
MELBOURNE

Dear Ben,

Re: Pakenham East - C234

I write in reference to the above PSP and would like to forward the following comments as a landowner.

- The noise barriers which will benefit most of the southern side of Princes Highway properties in the PSP, based on the reports provided and diagrams shown are left to the individual land owner's obligation to construct, as opposed to being included in the ICP and therefore shared throughout the benefiting area. A fairer outcome.
- The road network which includes the Main Boulevard, East-West road on the south side, are not included in the ICP when in a high volume of traffic from the area will be utilising it. Being included would be a fairer outcome.
- Canty Lane alignment is being changed yet the significance in the reports don't indicate high or very high conservation value. The road alignment has been used over a long period of time and should the road reserve have been well maintained over the years, this would not have been raised. Why would there need to be a change? Seems unusual to say the least and unnecessary.
- Ryan Road has been constructed in the two parts over the years. Firstly when the subdivision was approved immediately east of the Ryan Road to Canty Lane. Secondly under a special scheme to Pinehill Drive. Therefore this portion would have been built to standard specifications and I assume satisfactory to Council to have "ticked" off the ultimate construction and delivery of the road. The obligation of the properties fronting Ryan Road would be their half of the road construction while the balance would be from all the other users as per special scheme adopted previously. It would seem only fair for this to occur – the existing proposal seems very lop sided – is it fair and reasonable, the proposed obligation? – I don't think so.
- The density of housing was shown in more detail in the council adopted plan 18th July 2016 (ATT*2) yet the current document has density at 17 per ha, 22 per ha and interface at 14 per ha. The land use should clearly show the density – standard, medium, high – as per previous PSP's adopted in the area.

- Development north of the powerlines seems inadequate on the basis of the cost to develop as opposed to any benefit to the landowner to develop.
I suggest that development currently would not progress past the high tension powerlines at the juncture in time. It would be worth looking at this area again in the future.
- Bike paths could be along the gas reserve to ensure the benefit to the community and utilise an area that otherwise grass is to be slashed only.
- The transport link and the bus route between the Connector Boulevard and Canty Lane; I believe it would be better served heading north from the Canty Lane Primary School site as Canty Lane is detailed as only a future collector street. Is there a need to have a roundabout as traffic would be therefore likely to head down the North-South collector boulevard not via this intersection?
- Open space area should be a credited land area as it benefits more than the site it is located on. Is it fair not to compensate the individual landowner? Doesn't seem to be from the layman's point of view.
- Parks on the highest point seems to be contrary as most parks that are on level ground and therefore more accessible to more people – especially families with younger children.
- Drainage catchment areas are shown (i.e. Ryan DSS, Dore DSS), yet the obligation is the landowners to develop. ICP should address their parts to share the obligation and look to fair and reasonable outcomes for all parties and properties.
- The area located south of Canty Lane in regards the 1:100 flood level may not be correctly detailed. The site has had for over 12 years soil placed on the land which sits over the natural surface level, which therefore would suggest to me it is above the 1:100 level, which alters the plans shown in your reports.
- Sports ovals generally in the area are well utilised with parking surrounding the oval. The "New Model" is to have car parking in one area and people get out of their cars. This is not always the best practise for some of the users (i.e. Elderly people, wet days, safer drop off – pickup, saves cost of infrastructure/covers/stands, for people to be somewhat comfortable. E.g. Casey Fields/Toomuc Reserve.
- The power obligation to be placed underground by the developer seems unjust as there are other users on these above power suppliers throughout Ryan Road, Canty Lane, Mt Ararat Road and Dore Road.

Handwritten text, possibly a signature or name, is visible at the top of the page.

- Should the sewer, noise barriers and any other service have the ability to be placed in the Freeway Reserve so as to utilise the land to greater benefit?

In conclusion we all understand there are issues that we would like changed to and have ideas about, but at the end of the day – is it fair and reasonable to expect some landowners to bear the brunt for others who will benefit?!

