



Transport for Victoria

Department of Economic Development,
Jobs, Transport and Resources

GPO Box 2392
Melbourne, VIC 3001 Australia
Telephone: +61 3 9651 9999
www.transport.vic.gov.au
DX 210074

Ref: COR/18/257

Mr Paul Cassidy
Director, Greenfields
Victorian Planning Authority
Level 25, 35 Collins Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

Dear Mr Cassidy

EXHIBITION OF AMENDMENT C234 TO THE CARDINIA PLANNING SCHEME (PAKENHAM EAST PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN & NATIVE VEGETATION PRECINCT PLAN)

I refer to your letter dated 11 January 2018, referring the exhibition of Amendment C234 to the Cardinia Planning Scheme to implement the Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) and Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP).

Transport for Victoria (TfV) has consulted with VicRoads Metro South East region in preparing this response and has reviewed the Precinct Structure Plan and background documentation. TfV supports the intended vision for the precinct.

TfV is keen to work collaboratively with the Shire of Cardinia and the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) to resolve a few outstanding issues outlined below and ensure that the transport network can support the development of the precinct as anticipated in the Structure Plan.

General comments and issues requiring clarification are outlined below and the detailed comments are in Attachment A.

General comments

From review of the Precinct Structure Plan, TfV is supportive of the following objectives:

- O22: Provide a high-amenity, low speed and permeable local road network that prioritises community access and safety;
- O23: Establish an integrated and permeable transport network to encourage public transport, walking and cycling, reduced car dependency and safety and connectivity for all road users;
- O24: Promote public transport movements by providing a bus capable network that services key destinations throughout the precinct, particularly the local town centre.

Within the Transport and Movement section 3.5 of the report, TfV notes the following:

- R71: Vehicle access to lots fronting arterial roads must be provided from a local internal loop road, rear lane, or service road to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority.
- R77: Roundabouts must be designed to slow vehicles, provide for pedestrian visibility and safety, and ensure connectivity/continuity of shared paths and bicycle paths.
- R80: Any changes required to the design of roads and intersections in the PSP at the time of development must be accommodated within the land take identified in Plan 4 – Land use Budget and Appendix A: Property Specific Land use Budget.
- R81: Deep Creek Road must be closed to public vehicle access once an alternative road access is provided to Deep Creek Road, in accordance with the proposed network shown on Plan 7 – Road Network and to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and Melbourne Water.
- G47: Slip lanes should be avoided in areas of high pedestrian activity and only be provided at any other intersection between connector roads and arterial roads where they are necessitated by high traffic volumes, to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority.

TfV does not support the inclusion of item R80 and requests that it be removed. TfV notes that the land take for major intersections defined in the PSP is based on concept plans prepared by SMEC that may not have fully considered topography, swept path analysis and road safety audits. It is considered an unnecessary restriction that limits the flexibility to satisfactorily accommodate these design considerations and achieve the agreed intersection layouts. Further, the land take budget should also include a contingency to allow for intersection refinements and minor alterations to the intersection footprint.

TfV additionally requests a specific notation within R104 to ensure commitment to the shared path along the northern side of the rail corridor connecting the southern portion of the PSP to Pakenham town centre. This ensures R104 is consistent with obligation P-03 within the Infrastructure Contributions Plan. TfV suggests wording be amended to read:

*R104: Local shared, pedestrian and bicycle paths along local arterial roads, connector roads, **rail corridors**, utilities easements, local streets, waterways and within local parks including bridges, intersections, and barrier crossing points (except where otherwise included in the ICP);*

Transport Assessment and issues

The configurations and extents of four proposed signalised intersections on Princes Highway have been agreed as defined in Appendix C: Intersections 1 & 2 on page 95 and intersections 3 & 4 on page 96. It is assumed that the total land requirement stated in the PSP is reflective of these layouts and the associated land budget includes an appropriate contingency.

For Ryan Road intersection, it is unclear if the land take and land use budget includes land for intersection flaring/widening, within and outside the PSP area. The ultimate land and interim construction specifies only 50% apportionment to the ICP without indicating how the remaining 50% will be apportioned. As the Ryan Road/Princes Highway works are considered PSP enabling, 100% of an interim design, incorporating signals, land take and the intersection southern leg should be included in the ICP. We acknowledge the northern leg should not be included within the Pakenham East PSP.

All road and intersection projects in the precinct infrastructure plan relate to connector roads, which are local infrastructure and should be wholly funded through the ICP. They will be

constructed in their ultimate state in accordance with the concept plans, except for the future additional lanes on the Princes Highway. The Precinct Infrastructure tables should be amended to reflect ultimate construction included in the ICP, and that Cardinia Shire Council (not VicRoads) is the lead agency as per normal practice in growth area precincts.

The proposed pedestrian crossing on Princes Highway between Connector A and Connector B has been agreed.

It is noted that the concept plans for the four intersections on Princes Highway prepared by SMEC do not form part of the exhibited documents but inform agreed intersection layouts and land requirements for the four intersections.

We appreciate the opportunity to engage in this process. If you have any query, please contact Iain Lawrie, Senior Place Planner on 03 8392 8835 or Michael Bayley, Team Leader Land Use & Transport Planning - Metro South East Region on 03 9881 8864.

Yours sincerely



MARK BURTON

Manager, Place Planning and Referrals

28/02/2018

ATTACHMENT A: DETAILED COMMENTS

Intersection design and delivery issues

TfV agrees with the proposed intersection layouts at Ryan Road, Connector A, Connector B and Connector C as shown on pages 95 & 96.

- Table 8 Precinct Infrastructure on pages 68-70 incorrectly lists VicRoads as lead agency for the four Princes Highway Intersection Projects (IN-01 to IN-04) and the Pedestrian Crossing Project (PS-01). The lead agency should be Cardinia Shire Council in all cases, implementing these projects using funds collected through the ICP.
- All road and intersection projects are connector roads, which will be funded fully by the ICP and constructed in their ultimate state. Table 8 Precinct Infrastructure, Component included in ICP should be assigned as: Interim construction – N/A, Ultimate construction – Yes. Only the future additional lanes on Princes Highway will be funded by the State.
- Plan 4 on page 16 – Land Use Budget does not show any land allocation for Ryan Road intersection, while Table 8 Precinct Infrastructure on page 68 shows 50% ultimate land. Allowance for land acquisition outside of the PSP should be included in the ICP to provide 100% ultimate land component.
- Relating to the previous comment, Table 8 Precinct Infrastructure apportions 50% of the interim construction to the ICP; 100% interim construction should be included in the ICP.
- Item 2.3 on page 17, Table 1 Summary land use budget – does not include land allocation for widening/intersection flaring, as shown on Plan 4.
- Item 4.1 – Appendix A: Table 9 Property-Specific Land Use Budget on pages 76-80 indicates PSP property ID but no property ID map is provided to confirm which properties are affected.
- The proposed intersection layouts on pages 95 & 96 show the storage length of the turning lanes. It is assumed that the concept plans that have informed the land take and land use budget include deceleration plus storage length.

Environmental issues

- Under section 3.5 Transport and Movement or a suitable location, the following requirement should be included: Noise attenuation measures are to be undertaken along Princes Freeway in accordance with the report prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics consultant and to the satisfaction of VicRoads.

Concept plans prepared recently by SMEC (not included in exhibited documents)

- The placement of intended bus bays along Princes Highway on the departure side of the intersections with Ryan Rd, Connector A, Connector B and Connector C is supported.

Schedule 5 to Clause 37.07 the Urban Growth Zone

Under section 3.0 please add the following heading and sentence:

Access to subdivision

- No direct access is permitted to the subdivision from Princes Highway unless otherwise approved by VicRoads.