As residents of the Ryan Rd area of Pakenham we are particularly concerned about how the proposed design will impact our current way of life. It is our view that the proposed design is flawed in that it has materially underestimated and underappreciated the adverse impact it will have on the Ryan Rd area and its residents - our current lifestyle, the value of our properties and the environment which surrounds us.

We have particular concerns including:

- Excessive traffic volumes on Ryan Rd
- Excessive noise pollution
- Excessive vehicle pollution
- Increased robberies/theft, and
- Failure to respect and protect the environment of the area.

We respectfully object to the proposed development plan on the following basis:

a) Using Ryan Rd as a major connector road is inappropriate, based on inaccurate data and will produce an outcome contrary to stated objectives

b) The proposed redesign/development of Ryan Rd is deficient, based on inaccurate data and will produce an outcome contrary to stated objectives

c) Existing design deficiencies on Ryan Rd are not addressed or intended to be rectified

d) The proposed rezoning and/or design of properties fronting Ryan Rd is inappropriate, fails to consider relevant matters and has an outcome contrary to stated objectives

e) The proposed design fails to adequately provide for bicycle users and therefore has an outcome contrary to stated objectives, and

f) The proposed design fails to adequately address important environmental issues and therefore has an outcome contrary to stated objectives

g) There was a failure to ensure all directly affected residents were notified and granted reasonably sufficient time to lodge a submission.

We expand on each of these points as follows:
Use of Ryan Rd as a major connector road is materially flawed

The entire Ryan Rd area is currently zoned low residential, and the current landowners intentionally chose to live in this area due to its relaxed, more rural atmosphere.

We estimate the existing Ryan Rd area will house - once built out to current council zonings - approximately 200 households.

The north end of Ryan Rd is the only way in and out of this area since the southern end was closed (due to the construction of the Pakenham bypass).

The ambience of this area will be totally destroyed by the proposed development. The sheer volume of vehicles plus the resulting traffic noise and pollution is not in keeping with a quiet, low density area. Its impacts will most keenly be felt by the households facing Ryan Rd itself and particularly by those in the section north of Canty Lane, where we have estimated traffic volume will go up nearly 11 times (1100%) current levels.

The published TFV/Vicroads Traffic Analysis Report 21/08/17 (Sidra Report) indicates approximately 900 cars per hour will use this road just in peak hours. Applying a 2hr morning and 2hr afternoon peak period (per the traffic reports) this suggests approximately 3,600 cars per day will use Ryan road, just in peak times.

We have been unable to extract from the SIDRA report, or obtain from the VPA themselves, the predicted total number of vehicles in a complete 24hr period.

Assuming that 50% of all daily traffic flow occurs in peak times, we conclude that Sidra modeling results in approximately 7,200 vehicles/day. This is potentially on top of the 1,000 vehicles/day that already use Ryan Rd – a total of 8,200 vehicles/day.

The VPA have confirmed that the proposed redesign of Ryan Rd will allow for traffic flow of 3,000-7,000 vehicles/day. As a secondary road (understood to be its current design), Ryan Rd is only designed to carry 2,000-3,000 vehicles/day.

Accordingly, it is clear that the capacity of Ryan Rd will be exceeded regardless of design and the sheer volume will not preserve the existing amenity of the area.

It is interesting to note that the Sidra modeling shows that the traffic volume exiting Ryan Rd at peak times is equal to the Connector B intersection and some 28% higher than the Connector C intersection (and not far behind those for the Connector A intersection). Yet Ryan Rd is supposed to be respected as a low density area.

Compounding our concerns is the identification of errors in both the Sidra Report and the Pakenham East Interchange Comparative Traffic Modelling Assessment (ICTMA) Report base data that clearly result in a material underestimation of the number of vehicles that will use Ryan Rd (and the rest of the development area).
With regard to the Sidra Report:

a) There is no evidence that the following factors have been considered:

   a. Canty Lane's connection to the main boulevard, which will allow households within the main development area to use Ryan Rd to avoid all the lights on the Princes Hwy

   b. The primary school and local convenience centre proposed for Canty Lane (only the main shopping centre is acknowledged), which will increase traffic flow beyond that attributable to the number of houses in the development,

   c. The second larger school and recreation area in close proximity to the intersection of Canty Lane and the main boulevard, which will increase traffic flow beyond that attributable to the number of houses in the development,

   d. Heavy vehicle usage - both trucks and buses - particularly given Ryan Rd is planned to be part of key bus routes, and

   e. Traffic flows from the existing area serviced by Ryan Rd.

Their absence from the Sidra report Point 3 parameters suggest they haven't.

b) The underlying data used to estimate car volumes appears to contain an anomaly resulting in a significant underestimation of vehicle movements not just for Ryan Rd but potentially across the entire development.

At Point 3 of the Sidra report the traffic generation rate of medium density lots is stated at only 5 trips per lot, whereas for every other size listed (both larger and smaller) it is 9 trips per lot. Although the Background report suggests this is based on NSW modeling data it appears to be a peculiar anomaly, particularly given these lot sizes are quoted at a density of 25 p/Ha (400sqm).

Upon closer inspection, this is a material modeling error.

The NSW RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments Report, Version 2.2 Oct 2002 (NSW Report) states at point 3.3.1 the trip rate for ALL dwelling houses is 9 trips/day. The Sidra report "Medium Density Lot" figure of 5 trips/day clearly comes from point 3.3.2 of the NSW report which pertains specifically to "Medium density residential flat building ... smaller unit and flats (up to two bedrooms)".

These 1-2 bedroom units tend to be in higher density areas where blocks are much smaller than 400sqm.

A 400sqm block today commonly accommodates a fully detached family house with a 3-4 bedroom design and more one car.

We believe that there will be a significant number of these sized blocks in the development area (VPA were unable to provide specific information with regard to this), and many residents of these will ultimately use Ryan Rd.
Due to this error we believe traffic volumes from all medium density lots has been underestimated by nearly 50%, resulting in the Sidra report underestimating actual traffic flows for Ryan Rd (and the entire development).

With regard to the ICA report:

a) There are notable discrepancies between traffic volumes estimated in the ICA report and the Sidra report.

For example, the Sidra report estimates westbound traffic for the AM peak period approaching the Ryan Rd intersection at 1,560 vehicles (Point 3). However, if the measurement point as per the ICA report 'west of Dore Rd' (Point 4.1, p.10) is accepted as being at the mid point between Ryan Rd and Windermere Blvd (considered as logical as this point picks up all traffic travelling west from the development from all collectors) then the volume travelling west in the AM peak per the Sidra report is 2,158 (1,500 + 496 + 162) verses the ICA report volume of 1,800. Nb. there is no opportunity for vehicles to divert to another route between these two points.

Although the Sidra report total volume is higher than the ICA report this variance of 16.6% is not insignificant.

b) The core modelling data relied upon is inconsistent with data in the Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSP</th>
<th>ICA Report (Table 2)</th>
<th>Variance to PSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>20,014-22,158</td>
<td>18,850</td>
<td>-5 to -15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Table 3, p.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>7,148 (Table 3, p.24)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>1,313 (Table 5, p.28)</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>-33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Enrolments</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Unable to ascertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Enrolments</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Unable to ascertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By basing its projections on such inaccurate data – each major ICA category an underestimate - the ICA report analysis is clearly wrong to the extent that the conclusions reached therein are highly questionable.

Actual actual traffic volumes will be much higher than calculated and the benefits of the southern interconnector consequently underestimated.

b) There is questionable reliance on future events occurring without taking into account other relevant future events.

The reliance that the ICA report places on the future development of Racecourse Rd and McGregor Rd (including fixing train crossings) needs to be questioned. Despite statements in the Pakenham Precinct Structure Plan of a 10-15 year estimated timeframe there is no guarantee when these developments will be completed - all timeframes are questionable as they are dependent on future funding of relevant bodies. Examples of how long it has taken to fix known congestion points such as Clyde Rd Berwick suggest we will be waiting a long time, longer than projected.
It goes without saying that by the time they are completed further developments around Pakenham will have increased traffic volumes beyond what they are currently (e.g. Pakenham Precinct development itself). There is no indication that the ICA report has factored the impact of any future growth across Pakenham or localities north of Pakenham such as Gembrook and Cockatoo into traffic estimates for either Racecourse Rd or McGregor Rd.

Accordingly any benefits anticipated from these road upgrades should be totally disregarded from the modeling exercise.

c) Due to the errors highlighted above, the value of the southern connector has been underestimated.

It was noted the ICA report considered a southern connector to the freeway (Option B). It is our view that if this option is taken a significant amount of traffic will be drawn from all points across the development area to that connector. As a result the amount of traffic using Ryan Rd will reduce. This is desired by all Ryan Rd residents.

Furthermore, if this alternative is designed such that the southern feeder road flows past the main commercial district we believe there will be a significant increase in the amount of people visiting the shopping centre, bringing great benefit to both those businesses and the environment. The long term 'quality of life' value these elements would provide to residents and business operators within the development area as well as to the surrounding residents appears to have been totally ignored (exclusive focus appears to be only on the cost to the developer, which is simply passed on anyway).

As a result we believe the ICA report reached the incorrect conclusion (being that a new freeway connector may not be worth the cost). We believe it will be of great benefit to both everyone living and working within the development area as well as to the surrounding existing residents.

By relying on inaccurate data (as demonstrated above) it is reasonable to conclude that the both the Sidra report and the ICA Report materially underestimate overall traffic volumes in the entire development.

Our own attempts to estimate traffic flows on Ryan Rd suggest this underestimation cannot, and should not, be dismissed. We believe that actual daily volumes could be close to 50-100% higher that estimated in the traffic analysis reports once correct data is used and all relevant factors are taken into account. This takes the volume well beyond Ryan Rd’s proposed design capacity and well outside what is suited to the surrounding area).

The methodology we applied is as follows:

- Existing area: Once Ryan Rd is fully developed (to 1acre blocks) there will be approximately 200 properties using Ryan Rd. Applying the relevant traffic generation rate per Sidra Point 3, p.10 (9 trips per lot) the existing area will generate volume of 1,800 vehicles/day. This figure is supported by actual measured volume of 1,000 vehicles/day (2015) and the fact that at that time there would have roughly been 100 houses in the area (if not less).
- Housing Density: Per PSP Report Table 3, p.24 the dwelling density in the housing areas in the southwest corner of the development is likely to be around 17 houses/Ha. Per the NSW Report point 3.3.1 each dwelling will have a daily traffic rate of 9 trips. The area in question - being the almost rectangle area bordered by Ryan Rd to the west, Canty Lane to the north, Princes Fwy to the south and the eastern boundary running due south from the east side of the Canty Lane primary school, all of which appears designed to feed into Ryan Rd, appears to be approximately 55 hectares. On this data we estimate this will generate traffic flow of 8,415 cars p/day (17 x 55 x 9).

Assuming a southern freeway connector is not installed we believe it is also likely that a number of houses in the broader southern area of the development who wish to travel toward Pakenham particularly those on the south side of the main boulevard between the Canty Lane primary school and the recreational area/secondary school - will exploit the opportunity Canty Lane-Ryan Rd offers to avoid every traffic light on the highway. This area is estimated to be approximately 18 hectares. On the assumption that 20% of all houses this area utilize Canty Lane and applying the same housing density rates and traffic generation rates as above we estimate an additional 550 cars/day (18 x 17 x 9 x 20%) on Ryan Rd.

- Impact of the Canty Lane school: The ICA report estimates 900 primary school enrolments. The PSP provides for 2 primary schools. Accordingly, we believe the primary school on Canty Lane will hold around 450 children, plus 40 school staff (PSP Table 4, p.28). The vast majority of children today are transported by car. We anticipate that most parents and staff will utilize Canty Lane-Ryan Rd to enter and exit the estate on the simple logic that by using this route (and the left slip lane at the end of Ryan Rd) they can avoid being caught at all of the traffic lights on the highway. This is common driver behaviour. Encouraging this direction of flow is the childcare centre on Ryan Rd - many parents with children at both venues will use Ryan Rd as it is a natural uninterrupted trip.

On the basis of 50% of all children and staff at the primary school utilizing this route (the balance using Connector A) we estimate 980 car movements per day (450 x 50% x 4 trips + 40 x 2 trips).

This results in a total of 11,745 vehicles/day using Ryan Rd.

Even if a 25% discount for internal trips (per NSW Report) is applied to the housing density figures estimated above the result only reduces to 9,503 vehicles/day (1,800 + (8,415 – 25%) + (550 – 25%) + 980).

However, we believe this 25% discount factor to be excessive given the location of the development and its remoteness to employment opportunities, the train station and the main centre of Pakenham. It will not be surrounded by other developments.

All the discount achieves is that it eliminates any ability for the resulting road network to accommodate traffic volumes towards (or exceeding) the modelled range - as profit motives ensure nothing more than the absolute minimum required is ever built.

The well known traffic congestion already in Pakenham, and across other parts of Melbourne, suggest that this discount factor should not be applied/relied upon at all.
Note, our estimate has not taken into account:

- Vehicles utilizing Canty Lane as an access point for the southern recreational reserve and the secondary school (which appears to be twice the size of the primary school),

- Heavy vehicle movements – trucks servicing the convenience centre, primary school etc are likely to use Ryan Rd. to avoid traffic lights, or

- Buses – Ryan Rd is intended to form part of the bus route.

Given there are a number of factors which we have not taken into account, all of which will increase traffic volume, we conclude a volume of 9,800 – 12,000 vehicles/day for Ryan Rd.

As confirmed by VPA themselves, Ryan Rd is only designed to carry 3,000-7,000 vehicles/day in its proposed form.

It is clear that Ryan Rd will not, even after being upgraded, be capable of carrying what we regard as a more realistic volume of traffic resulting from the current design.

It is also relevant to note that the entire Ryan Rd area is currently low density residential. Its zoning is intended to, and currently does, provide a location which is quiet and relaxed, free from people and traffic noise. It is also one that has encouraged native wildlife, particularly birds, to reside in or periodically visit the area.

Ryan Rd is also regarded as a premium area of Pakenham for these very reasons.

The proposed design plan totally destroys this.

Objective 1 of the proposal states in part it is "... ensuring appropriate development with the interface to the existing residential development to the west of the precinct".

How can the total destruction of the existing ambience along Ryan Rd by such a large increase in traffic be regarded as achieving this objective?

The PSP also fails to achieve many of its stated objectives:

- Objective 07 is to “provide a sensitive interface to existing adjoining development”. The traffic flow certainly does not.

- Objective 5 of the proposed plan states in part “The precinct will improve the existing road network by providing new local roads linking to the existing Pakenham Township”. Apart from one bridge on the north side of the Princes Hwy there is no evidence of any new local roads being created that link to any part of the existing “Pakenham township itself” (read as the existing commercial parts of Pakenham).

We do not regard the Ryan Rd residential area to be part of the "Pakenham township" – by virtue of the physical separation provided by the golf course and the fact that Ryan Rd currently connects to nothing other than the Princes Hwy the area is completely isolated from all other parts of Pakenham.
We do not accept how exploiting Ryan Rd - rather than establishing more roads within the bounds of the new development - will “improve the existing road network” in any way at all.

In order to rectify this issue we recommend:

- Truncating Canty Lane somewhere between Ryan Rd and the primary school, to force all school traffic (primary and secondary) to use the main boulevard within the estate (this may also increase the traffic flowing past the commercial district, with potential benefits for the shop owners)

- Eliminating all other roads feeding out onto Ryan Rd and redesigning all roads within the development area to force traffic back to the main boulevard

- Only allowing those properties with road frontage to Canty Lane and Ryan Rd to access Ryan Rd (all other houses within the development area to flow back to the main boulevard)

- Establishing a southern interface with the Princes Fwy as considered in the Interchange Report (Option B).

**Redesign/development of Ryan Rd is flawed**

The plans for Ryan Rd north of Canty Lane propose major changes to the road including off-street parking, footpaths and bicycle paths.

It is noted the proposed redesign of Ryan Rd as per PSP report p.88 schematics state the road is 25m wide, yet the header at the bottom of the page refers to “Connector Street (24m)”.

Actual measurements between boundaries at our location alone show 23m.

This clear disregard for accuracy brings the integrity of all design elements into question, which is very concerning for all Ryan Rd residents as their lives will be the most impacted.

Not only is the plan inaccurate but off-street parking, footpaths and bicycle paths are totally inappropriate developments for a low density residential area.

There is absolutely no need for off-street parking in this area. Cars will only stop in this area to visit the existing landowners, and their vehicles can be accommodated on those properties.

Realistically speaking, the only people who will utilise the off-street parking are likely to be:

a) those who wish to case the properties for theft. This should be discouraged (no parking opportunities makes such people more easily identifiable), and

b) workers at the existing Ryan Rd childcare centre, who currently park along Ryan Rd during break times due to policies in force at the centre (which already causes angst with residents).
The desire for off-street parking also clearly indicates very large traffic volumes are anticipated on Ryan Rd (with on-road parking causing problems), much more than is being marketed to existing landowners. One has to wonder whether they will in fact be closer to those we have calculated above...

We also note that the current Ryan Rd design contains the narrowest nature strip widths in the entire PSP area, by over 17%.

All this flies in the face of the stated PSP objectives, particularly those relating to establishing a respectful interface between the existing Ryan Rd area and the new development.

Assuming the properties north of the Deep Creek bridge remain zoned as low density residential the encroachment of non-residents into this area should be subtly discouraged (this will help retain the low density character). To achieve this objective the need for footpaths on both sides of the road warrants review – one path and a cycle path on the eastern side of Ryan Rd would suffice (provided those on the western side could safely manage to cross the road given the volume of traffic).

Also, PSP Plan 5, p.18 refers to the area south of Canty Lane as "interface housing area 1". The area north of Canty Lane is referred to as "interface area 2". We note the following in relation to these areas:

- The lot sizes of "interface housing area 1" are not mentioned anywhere in Point 3.1.3 (pp.21-22).

- "interface housing area 2" Point 3.1.3 R14 lists an average minimum lot size of 800sqm (it goes without saying all blocks will end up around this size). We note (from experience and PSP Plan 2, p.8) this area floods and have recent photographic evidence flooding of these properties extending to the Ryan Rd boundary (far in excess of the flood zone line marked on PSP Plan 09, p.56).

We object to any rezoning of "interface housing area 2" on the basis that it is flood zone and the fact that an independent panel recently denied a proposed rezoning of properties on the immediate opposite (western) side of Ryan Rd down to 0.2Ha (Amendment C209). Any rezoning permitted below 0.2Ha will be inconsistent with the outcome of Amendment C209.

As for "interface housing area 1", at the recent public exhibitions (Pakenham Library) we were advised that these blocks will be 0.2Ha in size. We could not find any references in the PSP that supported that view.

We submit that unless blocks in "interface housing area 1" are a minimum of 4000sqm the current proposal fails to achieve stated Objective 1 of "...ensuring appropriate development with the interface to the existing residential development to the west of the precinct" or Objective 2 "To create greater housing choice" (there is very limited choice over 600-700sqm).

In order to rectify this issue we recommend:

- Abandoning all rezoning and subdivision of "interface housing area 2"

- Redesigning the Ryan Rd streetscape using correct measurements and genuinely in line with the objectives of retaining the current ambience of the area
• Removing all provision for off street parking along Ryan Rd

• Removing all footpaths and bicycle lanes from the west side of Ryan Rd

• Increasing lot sizes for all new properties south of Canty Lane that front Ryan Rd to a minimum size of 4000sqm (1 acre), or

• An immediate rezoning of all existing properties facing Ryan Rd (western side) allowing them to be subdivided down to the same size as being permitted to the Pakenham East developer (ie mirror the development on the other side of the road) - given this will suit the new ambience of the area.

**Existing design deficiencies on Ryan Rd are not addressed**

The bridge over Deep Creek is much narrower than the rest of Ryan Rd, to the extent that it currently effectively operates as a single lane bridge (it is less than 6m wide). No comment was identified stating the developer will widen it. Given the increased traffic volumes planned, this is a major oversight on safety grounds alone.

In addition, Ryan Rd already suffers an excessive speed problem (as confirmed by VPA measurements showed the 85th percentile speed exceeded the stated limit by over 10%). An increased volume of traffic without controls simply amplifies this problem. Simply lowering the speed limit will not solve it (people will simply continue to ignore the limit). There is no indication of what speed mitigation elements are to be put in place.

In order to address these concerns we recommend:

• Putting appropriate requirements in place that the developer must comply with

**Inappropriate rezoning and/or design of properties on Ryan Rd**

As mentioned above, we object to any rezoning of “interface housing area 2” (eastern side of Ryan Rd north of Canty Lane).

The graduated approach principle between lower and higher density residential areas is understood and supported. However, it is submitted that this is achieved naturally in this area due to the presence of the Deep Creek reserve.

It is also noted that a circular access street is proposed to service the rear of these properties, presumably to deal with the ‘multiple battle axe block’ situation that will arise from the rezoning. Interestingly, it appears the northern exit appears to be set very close to the Ryan Rd – Princes Hwy intersection and immediately opposite the existing child care centre. This will create significant congestion right at the traffic lights on what will be a very busy road. It is reasonable to expect a major spike of traffic in this area from all directions at school times as well as the morning and afternoon peaks. Have the designers learned nothing from the well known high accident and frustrating local junction of Main St-McGregor Rd-Princes Hwy (which the Pakenham Precinct Plan indicates will be fixed)?
It is also noted that the southern end of this service road is intended to exit just north of Deep Creek, which will place that intersection very close to the major Canty Lane roundabout. Both intersections will only be separated by a (narrow) bridge. Isn’t there supposed to be a minimum distance between intersections?

It was also noted that a pedestrian bridge is proposed to join this service road to the east side of Deep Creek. It is submitted that all this will do is increase:

- the number of robberies in the northern Ryan Rd area as perpetrators can easily disappear into the new estate, and
- the amount of foot traffic in the north Ryan Rd area, which will further destroy the ambience established under the low residential zoning and increase pressure on native fauna in this area (both contrary to stated objectives).

To rectify this problem we recommend:

- Excluding all properties in “interface housing area 2” from all rezoning, leaving them under a low density residential classification,
- Deleting the service road between these properties and Deep Creek,
- Deleting the walking track on the western side of Deep Creek between Princes Hwy and Ryan Rd, and
- Deleting the foot bridge over Deep Creek.

If these properties are rezoned as proposed, we request the independent panel be requested to reverse their decision on amendment C209 and permit Council’s reclassification to occur in its entirety.

**Failure to adequate incorporate bushfire safety for residents into the design**

As recognized in the PSP plan, the development is in a recognized fire risk area. Although Point 2.2 objective O21 (p.14) states that “... bushfire ... protection measures are considered in the layout and design of the ... street network...” the proposal glibly addresses this by stating it “… will be principally managed through the Building Regulations… at the time of house construction…”

This is simply passing the buck.

The current predominant fire authority recommendation is to “lock and leave”. Establishing the southern exit to the Princes Freeway would provide residents with the ability to evacuate via a safe route - a southerly direction is usually the safest way to head in such events - and it would also take traffic away from the Princes Hwy, which would likely be heavily occupied by emergency vehicles at such a time (who would be travelling in both directions).

To rectify this problem we recommend:

- Establishing the southern link to the Princes Freeway as per ICA report Option B.
Failure to adequately provide for bicycle users

It was heartening to see that the current design provided for several bike paths throughout the estate. However, it is very disappointing to see that very low consideration was given to ensuring all bike paths actually connect the estate to the main centre of Pakenham.

It is acknowledged that the plan includes a proposed bike path from Ryan Rd to Racecourse Rd that runs parallel with the train line. However, there is a major oversight for those paths that follow the Princes Hwy, being the fact that there is no paths (foot or bike) at all on the southern side of the highway, and only partial unconnected footpaths on the north side, between Ryan Rd and Racecourse Rd.

As Jason is a cyclist who regularly travels along the Princes Hwy between Ryan Rd and Racecourse Rd we can confirm it is never safe, even if you ride on the extreme far left area of the - sometimes very narrow - shoulder (not wise as the loose gravel, sticks and general rubbish always there can destabilise you). He has personally experienced several near misses from trucks and cars yet has been more fortunate than the two cyclists who have been killed on the Princes Hwy between Army Rd and Bessie Creek Rd in very recent times. It is not an area we recommend anyone, particularly children, ride along.

The risks are significantly amplified at night due to the total lack of street lighting on the highway east of Army Rd.

The only reason he rides on the highway is simply because there is currently no alternative, and the current plan indicates the same will continue to be experienced by cyclists (and any walkers) heading west from the central and northern sections of the development.

It is interesting to note that the development incorporates a path running along the train line to Racecourse Rd (outside the development boundary). So why hasn’t the proposal also provided for the completion of paths along either/both the northern and southern sides of the Princes Hwy to Pakenham centre (or at least Racecourse Rd)?

Objective 5 of the development states in part “The cycle and walking trail network is deliberately aimed at providing ... adequate connections into the Pakenham Township.” Only one connection will be complete, the rest useless. From the documents inspected there doesn’t even appear be a connection to the nearest neighbouring commercial precinct (Windemere Blvd). How is this “adequate”?

In order to rectify this issue we recommend:

- The development include the completion of a continuous, unbroken bike and walking path link on both the northern and southern sides of the Princes Hwy between Deep Creek and Racecourse Rd.
**Adverse Environmental Impact**

The current low density environment of Ryan Rd (and Deep Creek) has resulted in a significant amount of native flora and fauna to become established in the area. For example, we have regular attendances by eastern rosellas, crimson rosellas, rainbow lorikeets, sulphur crested cockatoos, corellas, gang gang cockatoos, yellow tailed black cockatoos, king parrots, noisy miners (not to be confused with indian mynas), magpies, butcherbirds, currawongs, fairy wrens, fantails, red wattlebirds, new holland honeyeaters, tawny frogmouths and microbats, just to name a few.

We also regularly hear frogs (although the type I do not know).

The increased traffic volume and noise along Ryan Rd plus the increased human, cat, dog and Indian Myna bird presence along Ryan Rd and Deep Creek from the new housing will place significant pressure on these species. It goes without saying that you just don’t find such diversity in suburbia.

We also note that the VPA Background Report acknowledges the presence of the growling grass frog in the Deep Creek area and recommends environmental protection accordingly.

We find the current design plan to be curiously different to the plan published in the local Gazette on 21st September 2011. That plan showed a flood line travelling from Deep Creek in a rough south-south-east direction to the Princes Freeway, between the ridgeline on Ryan Rd and the main north-south ridge in the development area (we have a copy of the said article if required). No housing development was proposed in that area in the original design (it is in the current proposal).

The fact that the environmental report failed to locate well established growling grass frog populations in any part of the development area apart from Deep Creek is a peculiar anomaly, particularly given this frog has been located in other low lying farmland in the area.

The environmental study that was done supports our view that the lower lying parts of the development area are, or could easily be returned to, suitable habitat for the growling grass frog.

The fact that the study found low numbers of the frog in parts of the development area is only part of the equation, and can potentially be attributed to the current extensive (and intensive) farming operations.

Just because the numbers are low doesn’t mean that we should not give the growling grass frog a chance to re-establish itself by destroying its habitat forever. The Pakenham area is well accepted as an important frog habitat and it lives in Deep Creek. It will expand to neighbouring areas if it has the chance to. Allowing the entire area to go under housing runs contrary of the objective to helping an endangered species to survive. In fact, it guarantees its destruction.

We have only one chance to give this frog a chance to survive. Squander it and it is lost forever.

To rectify this problem we recommend:

- Preserve all lower lying areas and reduce the area to go under housing, bringing both closer to the design proposal as displayed in the paper back in 2011.
Failure to adequately advise affected residents and allow sufficient time to lodge comments on the proposed design

From our discussions with local residents it appears that many did not receive correspondence from the VPA advising of the release of the design plan. Accordingly, many were either totally unaware of the submission deadline or were unable to prepare a submission by the deadline and/or did not understand the process of applying for an extension prior to the deadline expiring.

Whether this was due to a mailing error or what we do not know.

Compounding the matter was the:

a) Very short timeframe between when the plans were made available for viewing at the Pakenham library and the deadline for lodging a submission (there was only 8 days between the second session and the submission deadline), and

b) The timing of the displays at the Pakenham Library – as well known, most Pakenham residents have to travel outside the shire for work. But viewing sessions closed no later than 7pm resulting in a significant number people being unable to get there in time after finishing work.

We request the VPA accept this submission as not only made by us, but also as a valid separate submission from each of those whose signatures are attached.

Other Comments

- The Sidra report at Point 5 states that the proposed layout of all intersections is per the displayed image. The wording is a little vague in that it is not clear whether this will in fact be the actual design or representative example only.

- We noted that the aforementioned image shows Princes Hwy as having 3 lanes each way and Ryan Rd being a divided road. Neither of these road designs is correct. Princes Hwy is two lane each way and the centre median strip in Ryan Rd appears to be inconsistent with the PSP proposed design.
SUMMARY

To address our concerns we request the proposed plan be amended to:

i) Establish the southern connector to the Princes Fwy
ii) Retain the existing properties sitting between Deep Creek and Ryan Rd under the current Low Density Residential Zoning
iii) Eliminate the service road and walking tracks abutting the rear of the abovementioned properties
iv) Eliminate the Deep Creek footbridge at the rear of the abovementioned properties
v) Preserve Canty Lane as a no through road and allow it to be only used to service houses facing Canty Lane
vi) Ensure that only properties with a street frontage facing Ryan Rd and Canty Lane can use Ryan Rd as a connector road
vii) Ensure that all proposed development properties apart from those facing Ryan Rd and Canty Lane cannot access Ryan Rd
viii) Ensure that all new properties facing Ryan Rd and Canty Lane have a minimum size of 4,000sqm
ix) Require completed bike paths be installed on both the north and south sides of the Princes Hwy all the way to Racecourse Rd, and
x) Preserve all flood plains and similar low lying areas within the development area as undeveloped land for environmental benefits.

We thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. We hope that our suggestions will be incorporated into the proposed plan as they will bring increased benefits to all current and future residents within and around the development area.

Yours sincerely
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PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PAKENHAM EAST (C324)

We the undersigned have read the attached submission and have the same concerns as has been outlined therein. Accordingly, we request the VPA accept it as a joint submission and representative of our concerns.

NAME: [Redacted]
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PHONE No. [Redacted]

SIGNATURE: [Redacted]
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We have great concerns regarding the number of vehicles that will be using Ryan Rd and how we will be able to safely exit our home. This will also create excessive noise and pollution which will change our area from quiet to very noisy.
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We the undersigned have read the attached submission and have the same concerns as has been outlined therein. Accordingly, we request the VPA accept it as a joint submission and representative of our concerns.
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Having bought only recently and not being aware of this development, I strongly object to any development of Ryan Road to be used as access to this development. This is low density and should remain so.
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We noted that the image shows Princes Hwy as having 3 lanes each way and Ryan Rd being a divided road. Neither of these road designs is correct. Princes Hwy is two lane each way and the centre median strip in Ryan Rd appears to be consistent with the PSP proposed design.

We thank you for the opportunity to make this submission and hope that the suggestions will be incorporated into the proposed plan as they will bring increased benefits to all current and future residents.

Yours sincerely
SUBMISSION
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We the undersigned have read the attached submission and have the same concerns as has been outlined therein. Accordingly, we request the VPA accept it as a joint submission and representative of our concerns.
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SIGNATURE:
REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO LODGE SUBMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PAKENHAM EAST (C324)

We the undersigned respectfully request the VPA to grant us an extended due date to lodge a submission in response to the Pakenham East development plan.

We request an extension until cob Friday 9th March 2018.

We are seeking an extension on the simple basis that we did not receive the correspondence/notification about the development that some of the other residents in the local area did. If you sent us mail we can only speculate as to why it was not received. It took us some time to become aware of what had occurred and as a result we understand we have missed the original submission deadline.

We look forward to your favourable response. Our contact details are below:
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