Victorian Planning Authority  
35 Collins Street  
Melbourne.

Ref. Precinct Structure Plan for Pakenham East

Please accept the following contribution to the public consultation response towards the Cardinia Shire Council (CSC) and Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) jointly prepared draft Precinct Structure Plan for Pakenham East. CSC planning application Amendment C234 was not out for public viewing, therefore no comment is possible.

I have listened to community group discussions, talked with affected residents plus other interested ratepayers also, and shared viewpoints with environmentally concerned people, none of whom were in favour of the proposed development of Pakenham East.

Ryan Road residential community. The Plan has not adequately considered the potential impact on the valuable residential amenity of surrounding established properties west of Ryan Road (former Urban Growth Boundary) with its common use being the only access to Princes Highway. Long established properties on the eastern side of Ryan Road are being now restricted to no more than 800 metres, and no appropriate transitional landscape plan has been proposed towards sudden density of urban development and loss of environmental advantage.

With the urban growth boundary now being at Mt. Ararat Road, it is very disappointing that there is no appropriate transitional strategy proposed for the adjoining rural community of Nar Nar Goon which clearly will be seriously impacted by the close proximity of dense urban development. The PSP map has shown the little known extension of the urban growth boundary beyond a section of overhead transmission lines as a result of Logical Inclusion process in 2012. This is now included in the northern location of the proposed PSP urban development plan but considered a very irregular process.

The impact of inevitable increased traffic through Nar Nar Goon and absence of public transport to service Pakenham East urban development has not been seriously considered, nor has the already saturated traffic density in and around Pakenham during peak hours, which is already increasing due to more development both north and south of Princes Highway, eastward toward Nar Nar Goon, and south towards Koo Wee Rup.

The most serious impact of the residential expansion promoted by a precinct structure plan for Pakenham East is the massive environmental destruction that is proposed. The widely planned and permitted removal of native vegetation described in the native vegetation precinct plan will destroy a huge amount of valuable habitat. This will be a serious loss, regardless of offset excuses. Presence and variety of wildlife species throughout the site has been described in the ecological evaluation background reports, including some possible rescue strategies that might succeed.
At the time of Cardinia Shire Council July 2016 draft plan, there was a very thorough groundwater study with some cautionary items to consider, but recently a federal government EPBC biodiversity clearance was received.

It would be interesting to know the extent to which community residents have accessed the large amount of background information additional to the publicly available Precinct Structure plan and accompanying information.

The justification for the current plan that it “enables the transition of non-urban land to urban land” was a reported urgent need for more residential housing. While that may have been a stated purpose for the Logical Inclusion process in 2012/13, it is my view, and that of many others, that over six years now Cardinia Shire has well met its responsibility for provision of housing as a growth corridor, has provided enormous urban residential development in every direction, and has met its target for growth.

In 2018, it is now a greater priority to preserve environmentally valuable green and vegetated farmland for future sustainability and allow our rural towns to do likewise. We do not need a “new community at the foot of the Dandenong Ranges”. Pakenham in Cardinia Shire needs residential stability, less traffic congestion, continued social cohesion and less anti-social behaviour and manageable population increase.

I have studied much of the background information provided, travelled through the PSP site where possible, and spoken with a number of Cardinia Shire residents, plus a former councillor, and asked information from council staff.

I now consider Pakenham East PSP is an unsatisfactory and destructive plan, it is not socially or ecologically sustainable, and I strongly object to it.