

## Amendment C228 - Minta Farm PSP 11- Submission summary - 2018

### Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
<b>Submission 44 - Casey Council</b>					
44.01	Expresses concern about the traffic on Soldiers, O'Shea and Greaves Roads in the absence of critical road infrastructure such as the O'Shea Road extension and connection to the Monash Freeway interchange.	Roads & Transport	Noted	Noted. Both Council and VPA have strongly advocated for the timely delivery of the project and is waiting upon its announcement within the near future. The O'Shea Road extension is a State Government project and VicRoads is responsible for its delivery, thus the VPA cannot confirm the timing of its delivery. The exhibited PSP is expected to accelerate this process.	Comment only or no viable resolution through Amendment
44.02	Construction of the North-South Arterial is likely to trigger the need for an immediate declaration of the O'Shea Road extension and connection to the Monash Freeway interchange.	Roads & Transport	Noted	<p>Noted. The ICP includes the interim arrangements for the North South Arterial to ensure contributions are made toward these items. The proposed 1,000 lot cap ensures that no further development of the precinct can proceed until the North South Arterial Road is delivered. The contributions made up to 1,000 lots is estimated to sufficiently provide for these interim arrangements. The timing and staging of road improvements will be tested as part of the additional traffic assessment and transport planning works, and will form part of the final PSP and Precinct Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>An announcement was made by the Premier on the 18th March for the Monash Freeway Upgrade Stage 2, which includes funding for a new connection at Beaconsfield and lines to a new, duplicated O'Shea Road. Construction on the broader package of Stage 2 works will begin in late 2018. Further details will be provided by Transport for Victoria in due course.</p>	Resolved
44.03	Expresses concern for the timely delivery of the plan's road infrastructure to address the traffic concerns and vehicle movement.	Infrastructure Sequencing	Noted	Noted. The final plan will be supported by a Precinct Infrastructure Plan to guide the appropriate timing and staging of community infrastructure and road improvements. VPA is undertaking further work as apart of a revised traffic assessment to guide the prioritisation and sequencing of necessary improvements.	Resolved
44.04	Rejects the recommended 1,000 lot cap due the traffic study's flawed methodology and unbearable traffic volumes on Soldiers Road.	Traffic	Needs further review	The initial traffic assessment has identified a lot quantum that will allow for adequate contributions to fund the north south arterial road whilst seeking to achieve a reasonable performance level of the surrounding network. The VPA is progressing additional traffic assessment to test noted congestion issues and intersection performance along Soldiers Road. The proposed 1,000 lot cap will be reviewed once the additional transport and traffic assessments are completed.	Decision pending
44.05	Expresses concern regarding the data application, methodology, analysis and assumptions in the Traffic Engineering Assessment for Minta Farm as noted within submission.	Traffic	Noted	VPA is aware and understand Council's concerns with regards to the data and methodology used within the exhibited Traffic Assessment. The VPA has commissioned further traffic and transport studies to address these issues and will review the transport aspects of the PSP once the assessments are finalised.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.06	Traffic counts were taken on 29 march 2017 (two days before the end of school term). Consider traffic volumes may be higher and requests that counts be undertaken again during the mid-school term.	Traffic	Noted	The revised assessments have used 2018 data provided by Council and recent 2018 tube counts undertaken by Traffix Group.	Resolved
44.07	Confirm SCATS data dates.	Traffic	Noted	As above.	Resolved
44.08	Does not support 25% reduction to daily traffic generation as there are no 'destinations' within the initial development area to warrant decrease.	Traffic	Agree	Noted. The assumption is being removed. A revised traffic generation rate of 8 trips/dwelling/day and 0.8 trips/dwelling/peak hour have been adopted for the revised assessment.	Resolved
44.09	Considers 2011 census data inadequate as there are likely to be some 'east' movements not captured. Review assumptions.	Traffic	Agree	Noted. Data from the 2016 ABS Census has been used for the revised analysis.	Resolved
44.10	Rejects recommendation that Soldiers Road and Chase Boulevard can carry traffic above their classification (as per council road register). Does not support early development proposal based on projected traffic impacts.	Traffic	Disagree	<p>Recent traffic counts indicate that Soldiers Road is already carrying traffic volumes substantially above its connector street classification.</p> <p>It is expected that these volumes to continue to grow without any contribution from the Minta Farm site.</p> <p>TraffixGroup's analysis indicates that the proposed 96A applications will contribute a small level to the expected daily volumes by 2022 (approximately 10%). TraffixGroup believes that this is reasonable, considering Minta Farm has frontage along the whole east/north side of the road.</p> <p>The solution to this issue is the construction of the N-S Arterial Road. However, sufficient funding cannot be sourced from the ICP until lots are constructed on the Minta Farm site. Outside of external funding from State Government and Council, this has implications that a reasonable lot cap is required to develop the N-S arterial, manage traffic in the interim and quickly relieve the demand for Soldiers Road.</p>	Unresolved
44.11	No average delay and 95th percentile queue lengths included in report as part of SIDRA analysis.	Traffic	Noted	Modelling has been revised without the usage of SIDRA.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.12	Considers that the modelling should be based on the current road network and intersection layouts (and not include upgrades for O'Shea and intersections for Clyde, Skyline, Bridgewater, and Soldiers as these are not funded).	Traffic	Disagree	The horizon year for the assessments is 2022, which is the expected completion date for Monash Freeway Upgrade - Stage 2 works recently announced.	Unresolved
44.13	Considers that modelling should consider implications during construction period during the 1-1500 lot period	Traffic	Disagree	<p>Disagree. The traffic impacts of construction generated traffic volumes are typically off-set by the occupation of dwellings. For example, the dwellings being constructed are not occupied when construction is occurring, therefore, the volumes largely off-set each other.</p> <p>Whilst there are some periods when construction activity at individual houses may generate volumes higher than the residential allowance, all of the houses in the estate would not experience these construction peaks at the same time. In view of the above, it is not typical practice to undertake traffic assessments for construction periods.</p> <p>The traffic consultants have been tasked to consider the staging and timing of road improvements, including traffic management measures to address traffic implications during construction.</p>	Unresolved
44.14	Asserts that the traffic modelling should have considered bus, cycling and walking infrastructure.	Traffic	Noted	Noted. The traffic assessment and modelling applies vehicle generation rate assumptions for each land use (i.e. car trips generated per household - not total trips generated per household). This baseline assumption consider an active transport mode assumption. This comment is considered out of scope of the traffic assessment scope.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.15	Council has commissioned its own traffic assessment to inform its position on infrastructure within the precinct. A final version of this assessment will be provided to the VPA when available (submission includes high level scope).	Traffic	Noted	Noted.	Resolved
44.16	Requires functional designs (including land take requirements, dimensions, interim layouts and ultimate layouts) for the transport project outlined in Appendix 4.1 of the PSP to complete Council's own transport assessment. Must consider Topography. Intersection Concept Plans located at Appendix 4.9 of the PSP are inadequate as they do not illustrate the land take requirements, dimensions or interim layouts.	Roads & Transport	Disagree	Disagree. This matter is considered to be resolved as the ICP framework for standard levy ICP's no longer requires the preparation of functional level designs. However, a functional level design is being prepared for an ultimate North South Arterial to inform the land take requirements. The proponent must deliver the interim first carriageway and intersections and will provide the functional designs for these to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Under the new ICP framework the PSPs do not provide functional designs as developers will often regrade land to suit design needs rendering them irrelevant. This occurred in Thompsons Road / Clyde Road. The ultimate and interim requirements are being revised inline with a 'First Principles' approach to evaluate additional treatments to these intersections. This process, along with the revised traffic assessment, will guide the interim requirements.	Resolved
44.17	Supports the two options set out for IN-01 in principle. Option 2 of the IN-01 project requires a functional design to confirm the scope and cost of the project. This design is critical to confirm that this option will ultimately be approved by VicRoads.	Roads & Transport	Needs further review	Noted. More clarity will be required on interim access requirements to Beaconsfield Interchange (IN01 Option 2) in light of the announcement for O'Shea Road. The VPA will be working with Transport for Victoria to ensure both options for the intersection project meets the satisfaction of VicRoads.	Decision pending
44.18	The PSP should not be approved until the functional design and delivery requirements of IN-01 has been resolved.	Roads & Transport	Disagree	Noted. Assumes this is in relation to IN-01 Option 2. The functional design of IN-01 Option 1 is endorsed by Transport for Victoria. The indicative functional design of IN-01 Option 2 will be confirmed by Transport for Victoria. This is now considered resolved following the announcement of the O'Shea Road duplication and Beaconsfield interchange. Functional design requirements for interim arrangements are not required under the ICP Framework. Any interim arrangements would also be subject to VicRoads satisfaction.	Resolved
44.19	The Minta Farm PSP – Employment Land Review (October 2017, VPA) fails to consider market drivers in its analysis of the future potential employment capability of Minta Farm, nor any timing for the future development to eventuate. Council has engaged Lucid Economics to address this gap.	Employment	Noted	Noted. VPA will work to further test the employment land planning assumptions and allocations to support the final plan.	Comment only or no viable resolution through Amendment
44.20	Expresses concern that the proposed job density assumption for the commercial office sub-precinct is ambitious, compared to other suburban development, particularly given the distance from the CBD.	Employment	Needs further review	Noted. The engaged employment specialist will inform a view of assumptions proposed.	Decision pending

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.21	Expresses concern about the large portion of employment land dedication to commercial office uses in Minta Farm, relative to the current and likely future market for office and commercial development. Is concerned that it may take up to 12 years before any commercial office development will take place in Minta Farm based on preliminary assessment. Seeks controls to ensure that interim development does not prejudice the delivery of high density product in the long term.	Employment	Needs further review	Noted. The engaged employment specialist will inform a view. Statutory team to inform options on interim controls.	Decision pending
44.22	Preliminary analysis demonstrate that there is a demand for light industries and that the land within the Innovation, Technology and Business sub-precinct may be exhausted within 6 years. Submits that a review and redistribution of employment land allocations is warranted.	Employment	Needs further review	Noted. The VPA will consider to revise the employment precinct once Council's economic study is completed and ready for circulation. It should be noted that the VPA worked closely with DEDJTR in planning the proposed land use intake within the employment precinct. Any changes to the employment precinct will be subject for DEDJTR's review and approval.	Decision pending
44.23	If 10,000 jobs cannot be achieved within the area currently allocated for employment, an expanded employment area with lower job densities should be considered. If the VPA does not revise the PSP, land allocation and job densities to facilitate the delivery of a viable employment precinct of 10,000 jobs, Council requests that the VPA detail how these 'lost' jobs will be delivered or redistributed within the Casey-Cardinia region.	Employment	Agree in partial	Noted. The engaged employment specialist will inform a view on ultimate employment land requirements. This will form part of a whole of government view of employment planning for the South East Growth Corridor.	Decision pending
44.24	Council also recommends that the VPA, together with Council, DEDJTR and the landowners, jointly consider how the timeframe for development within the employment precinct can be accelerated.	Employment	Noted	Noted and supported.	Resolved
44.25	Council submits that the open space contribution in the residential area must be increased from 9.83% to at least 10% to meet the standard set out in the PSP Guidelines with respect to the planned high employment and residential density.	Open Space	Agree	Noted. It should be noted that standard S2 (element 5) of the Precinct Structure Plan guidelines states that "in residential areas, approximately 10% of the net developable area as total public open space..". The proposed 9.83% generally meets this standard. However, the VPA is willing to meet the 10% requirement.	Resolved
44.26	Proposes that the linear park (LP-05) be removed and replaced with employment land. A local access road be provided as the border between the Mixed Use and Innovation and Technology Business Sub-Precincts.	Open Space	Needs further review	Will be considered in context of open space review.	Decision pending
44.27	Council submitted that a linear park should be provided through the Innovation and Technology Business Sub-Precinct to enhance amenity for employees and to improve the pedestrian and cycle path network. A park with a minimum width of 25 metres was requested	Open Space	Needs further review	VPA will test this option against 10% credited open space allocation.	Decision pending
44.28	Proposes that the east of the north-south arterial, the Boulevard Connector and Industrial Connector roads be replaced with an 'Industrial Boulevard Connector' cross-section as noted in submission.	Roads & Transport	Agree in partial	An Industrial Boulevard Connector is being tested in this location.	Decision pending
44.29	Proposes that the connector road within the employment precinct to be rationalised as a curved road through the centre of the sub-precinct and to adjoin LP-03. In addition to the curving the connecting road, a shared path should be provided along the north of the local access street to improve accessibility for employees to the conservation area.	Roads & Transport	Disagree	Disagree. This can be achieved through 'generally in accordance' as council provides comment on detailed planning. This needs to be considered in the context of adjacent development needs and lot size / shape outcomes.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.30	Council will not accept the proposed ICP as they are concerned that the ICP will provide insufficient funding to deliver the identified road improvements. Need to ensure that the standard transport road infrastructure project costs consider the topography and the scope and design of IN-01, which has not been confirmed by VicRoads. Council submits that the proposed Amendment C228 Planning Panel hearing should not occur until Council is satisfied that a supplementary levy is not required.	Roads & Transport	Disagree	The ICP framework is a streamlined process to remove the need for detailed costings to be undertaken for each PSP. In preparing a draft PSP, detailed costings prepared for similar items in the local government area are applied to determine costing estimates. The costings attributed are not formally contestable under the Standard Levy arrangements. The VPA will revise the ICP and prepare an Precinct Infrastructure Plan based on the revised and final PSP. The ICP will be updated to reflect the identified and agreed road improvements for the precinct following the updated traffic assessment. Should this result in a Supplementary Levy, the ICP items will be costed in detail and will be publically exhibited.	Unresolved
44.31	Proposes that some projects (IN-06 and IN-04) could potentially be removed from the ICP, provided that the PSP / UGZ14 includes a requirement or permit condition to require the relevant developer/ landowner to deliver these intersections.	ICP	Disagree	Not supported. There is a priority to deliver the interim arrangements for the North South Arterial. <i>The Ministerial Direction on the Preparation and Content of Infrastructure Contributions Plans</i> , Table 3: Transport construction standard levy allowable items:  Intersections (traffic signals or roundabouts) with council or declared State arterial roads. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• arterial and arterial road intersections; and</li> <li>• arterial and connector road intersections.</li> </ul> The ICP typically includes all intersections of these descriptions - there has not been justification provided to exclude IN-04 and IN-06 from the ICP.	Unresolved
44.32	Council is concerned with the ability for it to properly manage an ICP in advance of approval of the Planning and Environment Amendment (Public Land Contributions) Bill 2017. It is submitted that approval of the PSP and ICP should be delayed until this important legislation is implemented.	ICP	Noted	<b>The Land Bill Amendment has been passed. The ICP will be updated accordingly to the changes to the final future urban structure. The final ICP and PSP will be delivered concurrently.</b>	Resolved
44.33	The exhibited Section 96A Masterplan prepared by Charlton Degg should be amended to identify the pedestrian crossing opportunities identified in Figure 9 – Internal Road Network Layout of the Transport Impact Assessment	96A	Agree	<b>The 96A permit will include a condition requiring amended plans to be submitted to identify pedestrian crossing opportunities.</b>	Resolved
44.34	The applicant of Section 96A must submit a Cultural Heritage Management Plan approved by Aboriginal Victoria in support of the application prior to the panel hearing.	96A	Disagree	The CHMP is required to be approved prior to the issue of the planning permit, not prior to the panel hearing. However, CHMP No. 15150 was on approved 3 November 2017 in relation to the land affected by the planning permit under the <i>Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006</i> .	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.35	The VPA has not adopted recommended conditions 4 and 5 of Council's correspondence dated 5 October 2017. Council reaffirms its position that these conditions must be included on the planning permit. If these conditions are not included on the planning permit, Council objects to the planning application under Section 96A.	96A	Agree in partial	<p><b>Condition 4:</b> VPA agrees in part to recommendations to Condition 4 – please see proposed S96A Ordinance Changes.</p> <p>Council has provided a conventional PIP implementation condition. The VPA does not oppose its inclusion, as it allows for the various land transfers in the precinct to occur by agreement, including the timing. However, the inclusion of condition 4a) specifically references the north-south road and intersections, which are covered in the generic conditions 4b)-4d). It is not clear why the specific sub-condition is needed and the VPA's view is that 4a) is unnecessary and should not be included.</p> <p><b>Condition 5:</b> Council's proposed condition 5 would appear to pre-empt the agreement provided for in condition 4 in relation to the transfer of land for relevant infrastructure items. The VPA does not accept condition 5, as 5a) is considered to be unreasonable in that, while it is on the same land, it is disproportionate to the residential subdivision proposed under this application. 5b) is unnecessary on the basis that only Casey City Council is the development agency for the project and need not make their construction conditional on VicRoads' satisfaction - it is well within Casey's power to consult with VicRoads as relevant without resorting to a condition.</p> <p>The final position of the north-south road is yet to be confirmed and entering into an agreement for this permit may unnecessarily restrict planning of the future stages of the development site, closer to the road.</p>	Unresolved
44.36	The exhibited planning permit conditions do not incorporate recommended condition 23 of Council's correspondence dated 5 October 2017. Recommended condition 23 must be included in the permit. Once the CHMP approved by Aboriginal Victoria has been received, a condition of the planning permit should require the implementation of the recommendations of the approved CHMP.	96A	Disagree	A CHMP is approved and enforced under its own legislation (Aboriginal Heritage Act). There is no need to duplicate this in a planning permit.	Resolved
44.37	The relevant conditions of the exhibited planning permit should be amended to reflect the current wording of the corresponding conditions detailed in Clause 4 of Schedule 14 to Clause 37.07 of the Casey Planning Scheme, exhibited with the Section 96A application.	96A	Agree	Any permit conditions noted in the UGZ14 will be included on the 96A permit, as relevant.	Resolved
44.38	The exhibited planning permit conditions do not incorporate conditions from referral authorities APT, AusNet Electricity Services, Country Fire Authority, Public Transport Victoria and South East Water under Clause 66 of the Casey Planning Scheme. Conditions from referral authorities must be included on the permit, as appropriate.	96A	Agree	<p>Conditions from service providers have not been provided in their submissions. The VPA is in the process of following up service providers for their submissions. In any event, general conditions from service providers (Model Conditions for Growth Areas publication, GAA) will be included on the permit.</p> <p>While we will continue to seek permit conditions from the referral authorities, however, should they not reply, the generic conditions under Clause 66.01-1 can be included.</p>	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.39	Section 2.1 (Vision) should be amended as per submission to include the Myer House, Worker's Quarters and landscape amenity of the Cardinia Creek Corridor.	PSP text change	Agree in partial	Accept changes with the exception of the Worker's Quarters. The VPA's Heritage Consultant have conducted a peer review of Council's Context report. Their preliminary findings conclude that the Workers' Quarters do not meet the threshold for inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay within the Casey Planning Scheme. Refer to their report for further details.	Resolved
44.40	Amend Objective O6 to promote a range of housing types, including apartments as per submission.	PSP objective	Agree	Accept changes. Objective O6 should be revised to: Promote housing choice through a range of lot sizes and built form capable of accommodating a variety of dwelling types.	Resolved
44.41	Amend Objective O10 as per submission to ensure a minimum of 10,000 jobs is achieved.	PSP objective	Agree in partial	Objectives / jobs targets will be reviewed inline with re-tested employment outcomes.	Decision pending
44.42	Amend Objective O11 to include linear corridors and provide amenity for residents and employees as per submission.	PSP objective	Agree	Accept changes. Deliver an integrated and linked network of local parks, sports reserves, linear corridors, waterways, conservation areas and community infrastructure that meets the needs of the new community, including residents and employees.	Resolved
44.43	Amend Objective O19 to provide amenity for employees as much as residents as per submission.	PSP objective	Agree	Accept changes. Objective O19 should be revised to: Create a comprehensive pedestrian and cycling network that allows residents and employees to be active and travel safely and directly through the precinct between key destinations, local parks and Cardinia Creek.	Resolved
44.44	To include a new objective "Ensure that existing vegetation of high aesthetic value is protected and retained" under 'Biodiversity, Threatened Species & Bushfire Management'.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes.	Resolved
44.45	Seeks to change: "minimum 4 metre front setbacks" of R22 and R23 to a guideline to allow flexibility and discretion into the planning process.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	The exhibited requirement aims to prevent the development of parking spaces in front of lots and include a written intent of the prescribed setback. It should be noted that none of the sub-employment precincts directly front the conservation area, thus R23 and R30 will be amended to be guidelines to encourage an appropriate interface with open space.  Propose to keep R22 as a requirement and amend it to the following: - Maximum 4 metre front setbacks (for landscaping to soften building edges and provide vegetative landscape character).	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.46	<p>Seeks to change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-maximum 8 metre street wall height</li> <li>-0 to 3 metre front setbacks</li> <li>-minimum 3m upper level setbacks above a second storey of R26 to guidelines.</li> </ul>	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	<p>Generally agree. Propose to amend R26 to:</p> <p>Change the following requirements to guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 metre maximum street wall heights (to manage visual bulk)</li> <li>- 0 to 3 metre front setbacks (to prevent the development of car parking space in front of buildings, allow landscaping to soften building edges and provide a vegetative landscape character)</li> <li>- Upper level setbacks of at least 3 metres above a second storey (to manage visual bulk)</li> <li>-Low-scale and visually permeable front fencing, if any</li> <li>- Articulated and visually interesting facades</li> <li>- Active ground level facade</li> </ul> <p>Add the following requirement in section 3.2.3 Employment - General Requirements "Buildings fronting residential land must have rear-loaded car park entries".</p> <p>Remove the requirement for "articulated and visually interesting facades" as per response to submission item 44.95.</p>	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.47	Seeks to change: -maximum 8m street wall heights - 0m ground floor front setbacks - minimum 3m upper level setbacks above a first storey - minimum 70% of the ground floor façade clear glazing that is unobstructed of R27 to guidelines	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	<p>Agree. Propose to amend R27 to:</p> <p>Change the following requirements to guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 8 metre maximum street wall heights (to manage visual bulk)</li> <li>- 0 metre ground floor front setbacks (buildings constructed to the boundary to create an active frontage and promote pedestrian activity)</li> <li>- Upper level setbacks of at least 3 metres above a first storey (to manage visual bulk)</li> <li>- Buildings with commercial uses at ground floor should have a minimum 70% of the ground floor facade clear glazing that is unobstructed to provide opportunities for passive and informal surveillance of the public realm.</li> </ul> <p>Delete the requirement for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rear- loaded car park entries</li> </ul>	Resolved
44.48	Amend the last requirement of R27 to the following: "Buildings with commercial uses at ground floor must provide clear unobstructed glazing to 70% of the width of the street frontage of each individual occupancy used for a shop, commercial use or food and drink use."	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	See response to submission item 44.47 (above).	Resolved
44.49	Seeks to change R29 to a guideline to allow flexibility and discretion into the planning process.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	R29 will remain to establish a fine grain built form. However, the requirement of an 8 metres wide section will be removed to provide flexibility. Requirement R29 will be amended to the following: <i>"Ground level facades fronting residential land must be broken into sections to create a vertical rhythm and establish a fine grain built form."</i>	Resolved
44.50	Seeks to change: - minimum 4 metre front setbacks of R30 to a guideline.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	<p>Mixed-Use areas do not abut the Conservation Area, thus this requirement is no longer required. However, a Mixed-Use area does front open space. R30 will be amended as below to be a guideline to encourage an appropriate interface between Mixed-Use buildings and Open Space areas for landscaping:</p> <p>Buildings fronting open space should have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 metre minimum front setbacks (for landscaping and to provide an interface with the open space).</li> <li>- Materials that are non-reflective and neutral in colour</li> </ul>	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.51	Seeks to change R32, R33 and R34 to guidelines to allow flexibility and discretion into the planning process.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Maintain as a requirement, update figure 4,5 and 6 with additional potential street wall heights and indicate the gateway sites on concept plans and other relevant plans.	Resolved
44.52	Front setback Guidelines should specify a preferred range to accommodate some flexibility and guide discretion. For example, the Guidelines could specify "up to 3m for front landscaping to soften building edges and provide a treed landscape character" or to "avoid excessive front setback as this may be encourage front setback being used for car parking areas which will be an unattractive outcome" etc.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agreed. Propose to add additional text to provide intent of setback requirement and guidelines where applicable.  See response to submission items 44.45,44.46 and 44.47.	Resolved
44.53	Guidelines in relation to Street Wall Heights could be accompanied by performance based standards such as: "-Street Wall Heights should establish pedestrian scaled public spaces and respond to its street width. - Limit maximum street wall to street width ratio to 2:1 to ensure that taller buildings do not dominate the street, compromising pedestrian experience"	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Amend G28 to reflect Council's desire for performance based objectives: Buildings along the connector street should: - Ensure street Wall Heights should establish pedestrian scaled public spaces and respond to its street width - Ensure that taller buildings do not dominate the street, compromising pedestrian experience - Have an 8 metre minimum street walls (to create a visible street edge).	Resolved
44.54	Change the 'Commercial and Office Sub-Precinct' from 2 to 6 storeys to 4 or more storeys in Plan 6.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	The proposed minimum 2 storey building height aims to facilitate early development of employment areas. The VPA is concerned that the proposed minimum 4 storey building height will delay development and growth of the Commercial and Office sub-precinct.  Accept to remove maximum building heights but retain minimum building height requirements to allow short term development flexibility. To view the proposed changes to Plan 6, refer to the response to submission item 44.59.	Resolved
44.55	Active ground floor planes should be encouraged (particularly on the frontage to major roads, open space, town centres and community facilities) within the SLEP area and Commercial and Office sub-precinct.	Land Use	Agree in partial	To add the text below within the 'employment' section of the PSP as general guidelines.  "Active ground floor <u>uses</u> is encouraged (particularly on the frontage to major roads, open space, town centres and community facilities) within the SLEP area and Commercial and Office sub-precinct."	Resolved
44.56	Change the 'Commercial and Office Sub-Precinct' to remove retail from the list of appropriate land uses in Plan 6.	Land Use	Agree in partial	Plan 6 will be updated as part of the review to address clarity around example uses. Schedule 14 defines permitted uses in each sub-precinct. The schedule 14 turns Restricted retail premises into a Section 2 use. Retail is already a Section 2 use in the C2Z.	Resolved
44.57	Change the 'Mixed Use Sub-Precinct' to note that residential is only encouraged on upper levels in Plan 6.	Land Use	Agree	Plan 6 will be updated to include the following note for the Mixed-Use sub-precinct: "Buildings must provide retail and or office at ground level with residential on the upper levels"	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.58	Change the 'Local Town Centre' from 1 to 3 storeys to 2 to 6 storeys in Plan 6.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	Generally accepted. Refer to 44.54, Plan 6 will be updated. Note that the building maximum will be removed but minimum building height will remain to allow for short term development flexibility.	Resolved
44.59	Clarify if the storeys identified on Plan 6 refers to building heights or street wall heights and ensure consistency with the Requirements and Guidelines on pages 25-27 of the PSP.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	Propose the following changes:  Include a new requirement in section 3.2.3 Employment - "Building heights within each employment sub-precinct and street wall heights along the North-South Arterial must be in accordance with Plan 6."  Plan 6 will provide information about: - the minimum building height (in storeys) requirements in each sub-precinct - the location of the required minimum street wall heights (in metres) along the North-South Arterial - location and minimum street wall heights (in metres) of key gateway and key intersection sites - the location for upper level setbacks for buildings adjacent to O'Shea Road to manage visual bulk in response to submission item 18.06.	Resolved
44.60	Requirement R14 should be changed to a Guideline, and reworded as follows: Uses within each employment sub-precinct <u>should</u> be generally consistent with the uses listed in Plan 6.	Employment	Agree	Agreed. Propose the change R14 to a guideline and be amended to: "Uses within each employment sub-precinct should be generally consistent with the objectives listed in Plan 6."	Resolved
44.61	Proposes that the exhibited UGZ should include application requirements for subdivision of employment land in the Commercial and Office or Innovation and Technology Business sub-precincts as per submission.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agree	UGZ14 will be amended to include Subdivision Application requirements under Clause 3.0. Would be titled Subdivision - Innovation and technology business sub-precinct and commercial and office sub-precinct. Will include application requirements as proposed in council's submission:  - A land budget table in the same format and methodology as those within the precinct structure plan applying to the land, setting out the amount of land allocated to the proposed uses and expected job yield; - A demonstration of how the property will contribute to the achievement of the employment/job creation yields in the Minta Farm PSP applying to the land. - A written statement that sets out how the proposal implements the objectives and planning and design requirements and guidelines in accordance with the incorporated Minta Farm PSP. - A mobility plan that demonstrates how the local street and movement network integrates with adjacent urban development or is capable of integrating with future development on adjacent land parcels;	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.62	Requests for further guidance within the PSP on the land use objectives and activities that are supported within the Mixed Use, Commercial and Office, and the Innovation and Technology sub-precincts.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agree in partial	Expert evidence will provide short term and long term view of opportunities. Linked to changes to Plan 6 - Provide guidance within the PSP on the preferred activities and types of employment generating uses that should be encouraged within these precincts.	Resolved
44.63	Clarification sought regarding the purpose and intent of Guideline G11	Planning scheme ordinance	Needs further review	Needs discussion. Previously intended as a direction to support the use of the LCC in supporting a broader catchment. Economic Expert to advise on need for LCC.	Decision pending
44.64	Guidelines G29 and G30 both relate to fine grain development and should be merged.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agreed. Amend G29 to read: Subdivision design and layout should encourage fine grain development through the creation of lots sizes between 100 square metres and 250 square metres in area, and to accommodate a mix of uses.	Resolved
44.65	Guideline G33 should be corrected to: Subdivision and development should <b>be</b> fine grain to accommodate a mix of uses.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes.	Resolved
44.66	Requirements R63 and R69 are inconsistent. R63 should be deleted.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes.	Resolved
44.67	Amend Table 4 – Town Centre Retail Hierarchy: - The heading to the third column in Table 4 (Town Centre Hierarchy) should be amended to "Minimum Commercial Floor Space". - Encourage apartments above retail and commercial in the Local Town Centre. - Encourage shop-top housing in the Local Convenience.	Land Use	Agree	<p>The proposed amendment of "Minimum Commercial Floor Space" will be considered by economic experts.</p> <p>Propose to amend Table 4 to: -Change the title to Town Centre Hierarchy Objectives. -Amend the last sentence of the LTC to, "The centre will cater for a full range of community, business, residential uses and <b>encourage residential uses above retail and commercial.</b>" - Amend the last sentence of the LCC to, " The centre will cater for convenience needs of local residents and employees, <b>as well as encouraging shop-top housing within the Local Convenience Centre.</b>"</p> <p>Amend R10 and R12 to include reference to Table 4.</p> <p>Propose to amend R10 to: Development proposals within the local town centre area must be generally in accordance with the concept plan illustrated in Figure 2, <b>town centre hierarchy objectives in Table 4</b> and must address the design principles outlined in Appendix 4.3.</p> <p>Propose to amend R12 to: Development proposals within the local convenience centre area must be generally in accordance with Figure 3, <b>town centre hierarchy objectives in Table 4</b> and must address the design principles outlined in Appendix 4.4.</p>	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.68	Plan 8 should be amended to identify scattered trees for retention and protection. There should be direction given to highlight that retained vegetation should be protected. A requirement should be included in the PSP stating: <i>Native vegetation shown for retention must be retained unless a permit has been granted for the removal of the vegetation.</i>	Vegetation	Disagree	Exhibited Plan 8 does identify scattered trees for retention and protection, shown on the bottom right corner there are three trees that are to be retained within the Conservation Area.  The proposed requirement is not needed as trees for retention are within the Conservation Area and the proposed ESO6 includes triggered controls to protect vegetation. This matter is considered to be resolved as ESO6 achieves the desired outcomes.	Resolved
44.69	Previous iterations of the PSP included Notes at Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan). The exhibited PSP have removed these notes and they should be again be included either at Figure 7 or as a separate Requirement, as noted in submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	The request to include the proposed notes is deemed as not necessary by DELWP. Propose to include the following note within the Conservation Area Concept Plan: "The conservation area provides for the protection and management of matters of state and national environment significance".  In correspondence with DELWP, the notes proposed by Council are not supported for the following reasons: -Conservation objectives of the Conservation Area is not needed as all the necessary requirements are listed as requirements within the PSP document, not as a note. In addition, all the objectives of all Conservations Areas are outlined in the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Corridors (BCS). - The Conservation Area provides for the protection of matters of state and national environmental significance, not just the Growling Grass Frog. The proposed note only has emphasis on the Growling Grass Frog, hence the above note has been proposed to correct this. - The Conservation Area will not be designed or managed as a 'dog off lead' area to ensure the protection of state and nationally significant birds. Dogs are likely to be required on leads at all times within the conservation area. - The note regarding the "planting and revegetation" is already covered within the Biodiversity requirements in the PSP.	Unresolved
44.70	A note should be added to Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan) of the PSP considering the management of vegetation within the conservation area - particularly the need for weed control, the removal of the cypress trees, and the designating responsibility for their management and maintenance.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Not supported. Any detail regarding the future management of the Minta Farm is considered to be inappropriate within the Conservation Area Concept Plan and PSP in general. The intent of the PSP is to direct future land-use and development, with the management responsibility for the Conservation Area being the responsibility of DELWP if and when the land within the Conservation Area is transferred to the crown. This action is supported by DELWP.	Unresolved
44.71	Amend Requirement R1 read as the following at the end of the sentence: <u>to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</u>	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes.	Resolved
44.72	Guideline G16, which states that variation in street tree species should be used, should be deleted.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.73	All cross-sections within the PSP must be amended to replace the notes regarding minimum street tree heights with a note stating: <i>Street tree planting of a medium to large size appropriate for the width and function of the street.</i>	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.74	Amend Appendix 4.4 (Grices Road Local Convenience Centre – Design Principles, Requirements and Guidelines), under Principle 4 to: “Car parking areas <b>must</b> provide for appropriate landscaping...”.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.75	LP-01 must be increased from 0.2 hectares to 0.8 hectares.	Open Space	Agree in partial	The VPA will revise the open space plan to consider Council's recommendations.	Decision pending
44.76	LP-03 must be located adjacent to the linear open space proposed by Council at Part 1, Section 4 of this Submission.	Open Space	Needs further review	The VPA will revise the open space plan to consider Council's recommendations.	Decision pending
44.77	LP-05 (Linear Park) be reduced from 1.3 hectares to 0.88 hectares and relocated to the north, to run adjacent to the connector street which links from the arterial road to Cardinia Creek	Open Space	Needs further review	The VPA will revise the open space plan to consider Council's recommendations.	Decision pending
44.78	A revised cross section should be included in the PSP, generally according with Figure 1 of this Submission. The Linear Open Space is required to be a minimum of 10 metres width and run adjacent to the revised Road Reserve.	Graphics and mapping	Needs further review	Results from the VPA's review of the open space plan will determine if a revised cross section plan is required.	Decision pending
44.79	LP-06 must be increased from 0.49 hectares to 1.0 hectares.	Open Space	Agree in partial	The VPA will revise the open space plan to consider Council's recommendations.	Decision pending
44.80	The City of Casey submits that a further reduction of LP-07 should be considered, if possible whilst retaining trees, should it be necessary to ensure other parks are of an appropriate size.	Open Space	Needs further review	The VPA will revise the open space plan to consider Council's recommendations.	Decision pending
44.81	Amend the Open Space “Type” identified in Table 6 – Credited Open Space Delivery Guide of LP-01, LP02, LP-03 and LP-06 from “Neighbourhood” to “Local”.	Open Space	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.82	Remove the word “extensive” from Requirement R38.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.83	The shared path in Figure 7 Conservation Area Concept Plan" should loop around water bodies.	Conservation	Disagree	The looping of the shared path around water bodies is not supported as DEWLP require any path located within the conservation area to avoid all native vegetation. In this instance, the proposed shared path would affect the growling grass frog conservation area. Please note that all paths (shared and equestrian) are indicative and may be subject to change during the implementation stage and future changes to the drainage strategy from Melbourne Water.	Unresolved
44.84	Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan) must align with the Clyde North PSP Cardinia Creek Master Plan. The Equestrian Trail illustrated on Plan 9 (Public Transport and Path Network), must be illustrated on Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan) with requirements as noted in submission.	Graphics and mapping	Agree	Agree. Update Conservation Area Concept Plan with equestrian trail.	Resolved
44.85	Amend Requirement R92 to not include above ground utilities in public space or conservation land, as per submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree. Amend R92 to read: Above ground utilities must be identified in subdivision plans and integrated with the surrounding neighbourhood and designed to minimise amenity impacts to the satisfaction of the relevant authority. Above ground utilities must not be located in public open space or conservation land unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authorities.	Resolved
44.86	Amend Requirement R100 to allow the construction of up to 2.5m pathways around public open space to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, as per submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.87	Amend two Tables in Appendix 4.7.3 to change the classification of open space to align with the ones used in Council's Open Space Strategy.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree. Propose to amend Appendix 4.7.3 "Sub category and scale of open spaces" to "City of Casey Open Space Core Service Level Standards" and replace text with an updated open space function and hierarchy guide to be consistent with the McPherson PSP.	Resolved
44.88	The UDF for the Local Town Centre should be expanded to include all land west of the north-south arterial and the community facilities. R11 should then be amended to include the following: - The interface between residential and the heritage place - The interface between residential and community facilities - Provision for pedestrian connectivity between the main street and community facilities	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes.	Resolved
44.89	Council also requests that the provision permitting the Urban Design Framework to be prepared in stages also be removed.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Not supported. As per Clause 2.5 - Specific provisions of Schedule 14, "The responsible authority may allow an urban design framework to be prepared in stages", this gives Council the ability to refuse an application that requests for a UDF to be prepared in stages. As Council may refuse the Urban Design Framework to be prepared in stages, this submission is considered to be resolved.  In addition, as stated in Clause 2.6 of Schedule 14, any application where works exceed \$500,000 are referred to the VPA for comment. Should an application be put to Council which is staged inappropriately, Council has the ability to not allow it and the VPA can provide advice on the matter.  The VPA will maintain the exhibited Clause 2.5 as it is consistent with the approach that have been used in other PSPs.	Resolved
44.90	Requirement R11 should include a requirement for the UDF to include a landscape masterplan.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	To amend R11 to: - A public space plan <b>and landscape masterplan</b> that identifies a hierarchy of public spaces including local parks, pedestrian and cycling links, urban spaces and landscape nodes, showing links to the broader open space network	Resolved
44.91	Requirement R11 should be revised to require the UDF to consider Council's recommendations as noted in submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	The elements proposed by Council should be considered if the UDF is no longer required. These recommendations are broadly addressed by R10 which also references to the 'design principles, requirements and guidelines' in Appendix 4.3.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.92	Appendices 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 provide design principles and requirements and guidelines for the local town centre, local convenience centre and employment precincts. Clarification is sought regarding the use and intent of the terms "Requirements and Guidelines" as to whether items under this heading are mandatory or discretionary matters.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	R10 and R12 specifies that development within the Local Town Centre and the Local Convenience Centre should address the design principles outlined by their respective Appendices.  The appendices provide guidance on how the development of the respective area should be. The heading of each appendix will be amended from "Design Principles, Requirements and Guidelines" to "Design Principles and Guidelines" and the table header from "Requirements and Guidelines" to "Guidelines", thus items within the appendices will be discretionary matters when Council is assessing permit applications. There will be a new requirement within section 3.2.2 which will refer to Appendix 4.5 - "Employment precinct - design principles".	Resolved
44.93	Figure 2 (Local Town Centre Concept Plan) should be revised to include Council's recommendations as noted in submission.	Town Centre Design	Agree in partial	VPA have provided Council a revised Local Town Centre Concept Plan with the consideration of points made in submission and an urban design workshop held on 27/02/2018. VPA waiting on Council to provide feedback and comments.	Decision pending
44.94	Figure 3 (Local Convenience Centre Concept Plan) should be revised to include Council's recommendations as noted submission.	Town Centre Design	Agree in partial	VPA will consider these recommendations and revise for further consideration. Economic expert to provide advice on the need for a Local Convenience Centre in response to the proponent's submission to remove the Local Convenience Centre.	Decision pending
44.95	Requirements R26, R27 and R35 require that buildings fronting residential land must have an articulated and visually interesting façade. These requirements should be changed to a guideline.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Accept changes. Amend R26, R27 and R35 to remove the requirement of 'articulated and visually interesting facades' and be added as a new guideline in section 3.2.3 Employment - General Requirements: "Buildings fronting residential land should have articulated and visually interesting facades."	Resolved
44.96	Proposes to include the following recommendations as guidelines: - Encourage a finer grain style of commercial and industrial buildings at the interface with residential - Suggest appropriate land uses at these transition points.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Propose the inclusion of an additional Guideline in Employment General - The design of buildings at interface areas should reflect appropriate consideration of the transition between employment and residential areas by encouraging a finer grain style of buildings.	Resolved
44.97	Proposes to include a new Guideline under section 3.1.1 – Image and Character that: "Scale and design of buildings including roof form should provide a good response to the natural topography and long distances view lines"	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.98	"Gateway" locations and "Key Intersection Sites" should be illustrated on Plan 5 – Image, Character, Heritage and Housing.	Graphics and mapping	Agree in partial	Propose to update Plan 6 to include locations for key intersection and gateway sites. This will be consistent with the employment section of the PSP and aligns with the part of the Plan's 6 purpose to illustrate minimum building and street wall height requirements,	Resolved
44.99	Table 3 in the PSP should be amended to increase the household size from 2.8 persons per dwelling to 3.1 persons per dwelling. Subsequent revisions are required throughout the PSP to reflect this revised population forecast.	PSP text change	Disagree	Not supported. The use of 2.8 persons per dwelling is a standard that is applied to all PSPs within growth areas. The VPA recognises that there may be a need to revise this standard with the recent release of the 2016 ABS data, which will have implications to separate works to revise the applied standard for the broader growth area. Potential additional works will consider sensitivity tests to ensure that the appropriate community infrastructure is provided to accommodate the demographic make-up.	Unresolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.100	Apply a consistent approach to the Cardinia Creek and Transitional Housing area as per the panel endorsed view for McPherson PSP.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	<p>Proposed to amend R8 to the following:</p> <p>Development within the Transitional Housing area fronting the conservation area, as identified in Plan 5 and illustrated on Figure 1, must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be a single dwelling on a lot fronting the conservation area.</li> <li>- Have a minimum front setback of 4 metres.</li> <li>- Have no front fence and side fence to be greater than 1.2 metres within the first 3 metres of the lot.</li> <li>- Have a minimum lot size of 500 square metres.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 1 will be updated to reflect these changes and be consistent with the McPherson PSP.</p>	Resolved
44.101	Section 3 (Application Requirements) of the UGZ Schedule, under 'Subdivision – Residential development' should include a requirement for: A demonstration of how the subdivision will respond to existing topography.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agree	Agree.	Resolved
44.102	A new guideline should be inserted in Section 3.1.2 of the PSP to encourage residential development to meet the Dwelling / NDHA rate specified at Table 3.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree. Amend G6 to include "... and seek to achieve densities set out in Table 3."	Resolved
44.103	Table 7 (Stormwater Drainage and Water Quality Treatment Infrastructure) should identify the existing constructed waterway corridor identified on Plan 11 (Integrated Water Management) and allocate management responsibility accordingly.	Graphics and mapping	Agree	This is identified as Item WW1.	Resolved
44.104	Stormwater harvesting infrastructure should be designed and constructed for the active sports grounds (SR-01) adjacent to wetland (WL2). Irrigation infrastructure to support this should be provided with the construction of the sports grounds. A requirement should be included at Section 3.6.1 and it should also be referenced at Requirement R101.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	<p>Agree. Propose to include a new requirement: "The development of active sports reserves must include irrigation infrastructure to support the harvesting and use of stormwater. "</p> <p>Add the following text to R101: "Include irrigation infrastructure to support the harvesting and use of stormwater."</p>	Resolved
44.105	R82 should refer to SEPP (F8) guidelines. Suggested wording below: Stormwater runoff from development must meet or exceed the performance objectives of the Stormwater Environmental Protection Policy (Waters for Victoria) including suspended solid load reduction of 85% prior to discharge to Cardinia Creek, unless otherwise approved by Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	Agree, in partial. Amend R82 to read: Development must meet best practice stormwater quality treatment standards (including performance objectives of the Stormwater Environmental Protection Policy - Waters for Victoria) prior to discharge to receiving waterways and as illustrated on Plan 11, including suspended solid loads of 85 percent reduction prior to the discharge to Cardinia Creek, unless otherwise approved by Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.106	Amend Guideline G62 to <u>require</u> a diversified water supply as per submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Not accepted. This is generally addressed by existing Requirements and Guidelines. R82 sets out requirements for best practice and G62 gives guidance on the expected implementation for initiatives to diversify water supply etc.	Unresolved
44.107	Amend Guideline G61 for boulevard roads to have road runoff directed to the centre median as per submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	<b>Noted. Amendment to R95 is not required as per Cross-Section Connector Boulevard (pg. 79 of the Minta Farm PSP) the central median provides opportunity for Water Sensitive Urban Design. Specifically, the last Note of the Cross-Section states:</b> "Variations to indicative cross-section may include water sensitive urban design (WSUD) outcome. These could include but are not limited to bio retention tree planter systems and/or median bio retention swales. Such variations must be to the satisfaction of the responsible authority."	Resolved
44.108	Amend Requirement R95 to include laundry use for recycled water purposes as per submission.	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree	Agree. Amend R95 to read: "...unless the building incorporates dual plumbing for the use of recycled water in toilet flushing, <u>laundry use</u> , and garden watering should it become available.	Resolved
44.109	Apply the Heritage Overlay (HO210) to the Workers' Quarters, Minta Farm, 2-106 Soldiers Road, Berwick. The proposed curtilage for HO210 is shown below: 	Heritage	Disagree	Not required as the Workers Quarters should not be included within the heritage overlay for the following reasons: - The Worker's Quarters was built in 2 stages with whatever materials that was salvaged at the time of construction due to the shortage of building materials after World War II. - The inclusion of the Worker's Quarters without the homestead will devoid of any meaningful or environmental context. - No architectural involvement with the build of the structure as it was made of materials that were readily available at the time. - Berwick was not known for wool- production, thus the Worker's Quarters does not reflect a period of prosperity in the wool industry in Victoria in the post-war era.  Further details can be found within the heritage report provided on 5 April 2018.	Unresolved
44.110	Is unclear on the location of the Workers' Quarters heritage curtilage relative to the nearby open space (LP-07). This should be clearly shown on the plan. The Heritage Overlay (HO210) should logically be adjacent to LP-07.	Heritage	Disagree	Refer to response to submission item 44.110.	Unresolved
44.111	Add reference to Workers Quarters as 'post contact heritage site' on Plan 2 (Precinct Location & Features), Plan 3 (Future Urban Structure) and Plan 5 (Image, Character, Heritage & Housing).	Heritage	Disagree	Refer to response to submission item 44.110.	Unresolved
44.112	Section 3 (Application Requirements) of the UGZ schedule should be amended to include the Worker's Quarters (Heritage Overlay - HO210) and their respective surrounding areas.	Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree	Refer to response to submission item 44.110.	Unresolved
44.113	Requirement R9 should be amended to include: "and Workers' Quarters are key and visible components"	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Refer to response to submission item 44.110.	Unresolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.114	<p>Proposes to extend the proposed Heritage Overlay curtilage for the Myer House as below:</p>  <p>1 by www.land.vic.gov.au.</p>	Heritage	Disagree	<p>Not supported. VPA's Heritage Expert, GJM Heritage finds that the exhibited heritage controls for the Myer House are appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Myer House is significant as a rare and historically important example of a pre-fabricated house, not because of the operational history of the farm.</li> <li>- The location and surrounding context of the Myer House does not contribute to the significance of the place. Therefore is unreasonable to include the English Oak and Hawthorn Edge within the Heritage Overlay.</li> <li>- The propose curtilage is consistent with other pre-fabricated Myer Houses and comparable Beaufort Houses within Victoria.</li> </ul> <p>Further details can be found within the heritage report provided on 5 April 2018.</p>	Unresolved
44.115	Figure 2 (Local Town Centre Concept Plan) is inconsistent with other plans within the PSP with regards to the location of the Myer House. Either Figure 2 or all other plans within the PSP need to be revised to consistently identify the correct location of the heritage property.	Graphics and mapping	Agree	Agree. Some plans show site asterisk on left side, Figure 2 on right. Should be located to the left - PSP to update figure 2.	Resolved
44.116	<p>The UGZ Schedule should include a condition for permits relating to heritage places requiring that prior to the issue of Statement of Compliance for the first stage of subdivision, the owner must enter into an agreement with the responsible authority made pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 which provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Works to the heritage place(s) for the purposes of restoration and repair in accordance with the timeframes and requirements of the Conservation Management Plan.</li> <li>- The ongoing management and works to the heritage place(s) as identified in the Conservation Management Plan.</li> </ul>	Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree	<p>Not supported. The amendment includes a Heritage Overlay HO209 for the Myer House. The HO provides comprehensive protection for the heritage place and detailed application requirements for subdivision and development.</p> <p>The UGZ14 heritage assessment requirements should be deleted as the Conservation Management Plan is unnecessary with the inclusion of the HO.</p>	Unresolved
44.117	The UGZ Schedule includes application requirements for heritage assessment. The heading of this section should be changed from "Heritage Assessment – Myer House" to "Heritage Places".	Planning scheme ordinance	Needs further review	Will be updated inline with panel outcomes for heritage site.	Decision pending

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.118	Requirement R44 which requires the sharing of complementary infrastructure including car parking should be changed to a Guideline.	Requirements & Guidelines	Disagree	Not supported. This is a standard requirement supported by DET. The sharing of integrated facilities and assets is supported. VPA notes that permits are not required for schools. DET has requested a requirement to ensure the school and community facility is delivered in an integrated way. It is proposed to amend G42 to read: The design and layout of schools and community facilities should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the integration of schools, early childhood and other community facilities where they are co-located.</li> <li>• Include extensive canopy tree planting.</li> <li>• Be integrated with neighbouring facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise fencing to encourage out-of-hours use.</li> <li>• Provide safe and convenient pedestrian and shared paths.</li> </ul>	Unresolved
44.119	The final adopted map associated with Clause 22.01 will need to be amended by the City of Casey.	Graphics and mapping	Agree	Agree. VPA to seek amended mapping from council based on the final form of the amendment. Follow up with Casey regarding process.	Resolved
44.120	A special provision should be included (as per submission) in the UGZ Schedule to trigger a permit for earthworks prior to subdivision for land in an applied residential zone.	Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree	VPA notes Casey's concern regarding a suitable permit trigger for earthworks. As this matter relates to altering standard controls set out by Victorian Planning Provisions, this matter is more appropriately raised with DELWP.	Unresolved
44.121	The UGZ Schedule includes a specific provision for the use of land for a primary school. The provision exempts the requirement for a permit for a primary school on land designated as a future government school site. This provision should be deleted.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agree	Agree. The Department of Education is already exempt from the planning scheme and this provision is therefore unnecessary.	Resolved
44.122	Clause 21.10 must be amended as part of C228. Specifically, Clause 21.10-4 must be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second bullet point under "Use of Policy and the Exercise of Discretion" should be amended to: "Ensuring that the future use and development of land is generally in accordance with the Clyde North Precinct Structure Plan, the Berwick Waterways Precinct Structure Plan and the Minta Farm Precinct Structure Plan"</li> <li>• The Final bullet point in the "Application of Zones and Overlays" should also refer to the Infrastructure Contributions Plan Overlay.</li> <li>• Delete the final two bullet points under Further Strategic Work.</li> </ul> The map under Clause 21.10-5 – Berwick Southern Area Local Map must be updated to reflect the features of the Minta Farm PSP (such as Town Centres, Arterial and Collector Roads, the distribution of employment and residential land etc.).	Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree	Clause 21.10 was not exhibited for any proposed changes for this Amendment. As such, this change is outside the scope of this Amendment. The existing clause is considered to reasonably allow for suggested uses.  Council's Municipal Strategic Statement should be continually reviewed by Council as a separate amendment.	Unresolved
44.123	Revise the applied zoning of open space within the employment area for reasons noted in submission.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agree in partial	Agree in principle. Requires discussion on approach. Need to explore application of appropriate zoning once commercial applied zones are settled.	Decision pending

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
44.124	Revise the applied zoning of the North-Arterial Road. If this applied zoning is removed, an alternative provision must be made to ensure applications are referred to VicRoads. The road is yet to be declared by VicRoads so it cannot have an applied zone of Road Zone Category 1.	Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree	Not supported. VPP 52.29 has been designed to specifically allow municipal roads to be zoned as RDZ1, if it's considered appropriate to implement clause 52.29 (which is primarily about managing access to key roads). By definition, the North South Arterial Road, being a primary arterial, is being planned to become a declared arterial road under the RMA at some point in time when it's functioning as an arterial.	Unresolved
44.125	Provide advice to Council, landowners and other parties on how the exhibition documents may be amended in response to Item No. 11 of the Reforming the Victoria Planning Provisions: A Discussion Paper (October 2017, DELWP). Council, landowners and other parties should have an opportunity to inform this process.	Other	Noted	The PSP and Ordinance would be reviewed and updated in line with any approved directions resulting from the Reforming the Victoria Planning Provisions: A Discussion Paper (October 2017, DEWLP).	Comment only or no viable resolution through Amendment