

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
Submission 35 - The Minta Group					
35.01	Proposes an alternative Future Urban Structure: reducing the overall employment land allocation to 53 hectares; Removing local Convenience Centre; Re-orienting the urban structure; changes to location and shape of local parks and district sports reserves; and associated changes to the road network and hierarchy.	Land Use	Needs further review	Noted. VPA will seek additional information regarding the proposal for elements of merit. VPA considers this proposal as 'untested' from a 'Whole of Government' evaluation.	Unresolved
35.02	Seeks reduction of the employment land use allocation to no more than 53 hectares (including the town centre) in accordance with the attached proposed Future Urban Structure and employment modelling undertaken by Deep End Services.	Employment	Disagree	The reduction to the scale of employment lands is not supported from a 'Whole of Government' view. VPA will peer review the proponents expert evidence to evaluate merit. A conclave is proposed as part of the Panel Hearing for independent 'experts' to discuss and agree on employment density and scale assumptions.	Unresolved
35.03	Asserts that Requirement 14 is inflexible and impractical to achieve the desired employment vision. R14: "Uses within each employment sub-precinct must be generally consistent with the uses listed in Plan 6."	Requirements & Guidelines	Agree in partial	Noted. Schedule 14 is the appropriate mechanism to provide direction on permitted uses and relevant controls. VPA proposes to Amend Plan 6 to provide the envisaged objectives and uses of each employment sub-precinct and propose to 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
35.04	Seeks integration of some residential and mixed-use activity into discrete areas within the Commercial 2 zone area to support activation of contemporary business/employment environments.	Employment	Needs further review	Noted. The VPA considers there is merit in the proponents objective to deliver a high amenity mixed use environment at this location. The exhibited plan provides 10 hectares of Mixed Use Zoning and 3.5 hectares of CZ1 in the Town Centre which can support a residential component nearby the Office and Commercial Sub-precinct. Overall, a reduction in employment land scale is not supported. In regards to the Alternative Proposal and Schedule (14th and 19th March), the VPA requires an applied zone to trigger subdivision and building works requirements for a mixed Commercial type use.	Unresolved
35.05	Seeks inclusion of opportunities for Supermarkets in the Commercial 2 Zone to support localised amenity for offices and employees.	Employment	Needs further review	VPA to test with further evidence. Seeking to explore opportunity for inclusion of small scale "express type supermarkets" to support access for business and employment areas up to 1,500 sqm, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority." Economic expert to advise on scale.	Decision pending
35.06	Seeks removal of permit requirement for restricted retail uses in the Commercial 2 Zone.	Employment	Disagree	Not supported. The permit requirement for restricted retail was implemented to seek to ensure the achievement of desired objectives for the employment sub-precincts (higher order uses) and ensure that applications consider an appropriate location for restricted retail uses. A Permit Requirement does not restrict the use occurring.	Unresolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
35.07	Seeks removal of permit requirement for dwelling uses in the mixed use zone. Seeks opportunity for residential and commercial uses at ground floor. Questions the nature and demand of 10 hectares of ground floor employment uses for the mixed use zone. Seeks clarification on the purpose and operation of the mixed use zone.	Employment	Disagree	The permit requirement was implemented to seek to ensure the achievement of the desired objectives for the Mixed Use zone. The provision and scale of mixed use will be reviewed following further employment land testing (in accordance with 35.02).	Decision pending
35.08	Seeks amendment to the 'Requirements and Guidelines' to reduce 'must' requirements for built form outcomes and include options for greater flexibility provided by the scope of the 'generally in accordance' principle.	Requirements & Guidelines	Noted	<p>Majority of the requirements in relation to the built form of buildings within the employment precinct is proposed to be amended from a requirement to a guideline, with the exception of the requirements in relation to the built form of buildings along the North-South Arterial within the Commercial and Office area. The built form requirements along the North-South Arterial will remain as a requirement to ensure that future development achieves the envisaged vision and objectives for the Commercial and Office Sub-Precinct.</p> <p>The following built form requirements are proposed to be changed to a guideline as per Council's submission: - R23, R26, R27, R30.</p> <p>Built form requirements not mentioned here will be kept to ensure a high-quality public realm is delivered with respect to achieving the job target outcomes.</p>	Resolved
35.09	Notes drainage strategy is outstanding. A) Seeks options for flexibility in delivering differing drainage arrangements. Seeks amendment of Plan 11 to note 'areas where change may occur, subject to Melbourne Water input'. B) Seeks provisions within the PSP to provide direction on 'where land is no longer needed for drainage purposes, it can be used for residential or commercial purposes (as relevant).	Drainage	Agree in partial	A) Melbourne Water in conjunction with DEWLP and VPA are currently completing a drainage strategy for the precinct. DEWLP will be the responsible authority to endorse this strategy and any further amendments. Development and drainage related infrastructure or works must be undertaken in accordance with this strategy. B) R83 allows for flexibility in considering adjustments to the drainage strategy, subject to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority. Proposed to Amend R83 to include - "Where the responsible authority is satisfied that land shown as a waterway or drainage asset is unlikely to be used for such purposes, that land may be used for an alternative purpose which is generally consistent with the surrounding land uses and the provisions of the zone applied zone."	Unresolved
35.10	A) Seeking certainty that DEWLP supports co-location of Wetland 1 in the Cardinia Creek Corridor - as generally depicted by the current strategy. B) Seeks additional note on Figure 7 providing that 'Works to the man-made ponds may be undertaken within the conservation area provide that disturbance to native vegetation and habitat is minimised to the extent practicable.	Drainage	Disagree	A) Melbourne Water in conjunction with DEWLP and VPA are currently preparing a drainage strategy for the precinct. DEWLP will be the responsible authority to endorse this strategy and any further variations to this strategy. B) Works to the existing ponds will be undertaken to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and DEWLP in accordance with the final strategy. This comment is considered resolved as DEWLP and Melbourne Water will remain the responsible authorities for endorsement of an agreed drainage strategy and any amendments to this.	Resolved

Item No.	Submission	Sub-Category	VPA Response	VPA Comments	Status
35.11	Requesting review of the Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) for the PSP.	ICP	Disagree	Noted. Under the ICP Framework, as a 'Standard Levy', the ICP not required to be exhibited. Should a 'Supplementary Levy' be triggered, the ICP will be exhibited and specific costings of the items will be required. Standard Levy costings are drawn from existing endorsed costings for items in the region. The ICP will be reviewed inline with the final FUS and necessary infrastructure improvement requirements. This is considered resolved given the streamlined approval process of a 'Standard Levy' ICP.	Resolved
35.12	O'Shea Road - Seeks delivery of O'Shea Road extension upfront to unlock the employment precinct. Does not support the proposal to fund the construction of the O'Shea Road to the freeway interchange as part of the ICP. The land is identified as State infrastructure by virtue of the existing PAO1. State infrastructure cannot be funded through a local ICP.	ICP	Disagree	Noted. The VPA supports the timely delivery of O'Shea Road to activate the precinct. An ICP can provide for interim arrangements on a State PAO to support access and movement requirements. This is outlined by the Ministerial Direction on the Preparation and Content of Infrastructure Contributions Plans, 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"> arterial and arterial road intersections; and arterial and connector road intersections. As a result, this is considered resolved. 	Resolved
35.13	North South Arterial Road - Asserts that the application of the lot cap demonstrates that there is already external demand for the north-south arterial, which is not reflected in the share of apportionment in the ICP. Proposed lot cap is tied to a planning permit for 1,000 lots. Seeking cap to be tied to Statement of Compliance for the 1,000 lot.	Lot Cap	Disagree	Noted. The ICP will provide for the ultimate land take and interim transport infrastructure requirements for the North South Arterial. The North South Arterial connection (as an interim arrangement) will support north south movement within the precinct, including activation of the proposed employment precincts. The lot cap will ensure that initial development does not result in adversely impacting the service performance of the immediate surrounding road network. The lot cap is proposed to be reviewed in line with further traffic modelling to test the impact of initial development on the immediate network and existing traffic volumes.	Unresolved
35.14	Does not support Heritage Overlay to the Myer House. Will provide expert evidence that supports their view.	Heritage	Noted	Noted. Awaiting technical evidence. An independent expert will peer review TMG's Heritage Report, once received.	Decision pending