## CONTENTS

1 Introduction ........................................................................................................................................... 1  
1.1 Application of the Amendment ................................................................................................. 1  
1.2 Formal Response to Submissions ............................................................................................ 1  
1.3 Panel Directions – Preliminary Issues Raised ......................................................................... 1  
1.4 Whole of Government Position .................................................................................................. 2  
2 Background to the amendment ........................................................................................................ 3  
2.1 Chronology of the Amendment ............................................................................................... 3  
2.2 Purpose of the Amendment ....................................................................................................... 3  
2.3 Amendment C228 to Casey Planning Scheme ......................................................................... 3  
2.4 Public Exhibition and Engagement ......................................................................................... 4  
2.5 Background Documents ........................................................................................................... 5  
3 Strategic Context and Assessment ............................................................................................... 7  
3.1 Plan Melbourne 2017 – 2050 and South East Growth Corridor Plan .................................. 7  
3.2 Precinct Structure Planning and the Urban Growth Zone ...................................................... 9  
3.3 Melbourne’s Strategic Assessment and Biodiversity Conservation ...................................... 11  
3.4 Biodiversity Conservation Strategy ........................................................................................ 11  
3.5 State Planning Policy Framework ............................................................................................ 12  
3.6 Ministerial Directions ............................................................................................................... 12  
3.7 Urban Development Program .................................................................................................. 12  
4 Local Context ................................................................................................................................... 14  
4.1 Surrounding Precincts and Structure Plans ........................................................................... 14  
5 Minta Farm Precinct Structure Plan ............................................................................................. 16  
5.1 Role and Function of the Plan .................................................................................................. 16  
5.2 Objectives for the Precinct ...................................................................................................... 16  
5.3 Vision for Minta Farm Precinct ............................................................................................... 18  
5.4 Descriptions of the Plan .......................................................................................................... 18  
6 Section 96A Planning Permit Application .................................................................................... 25  
6.1 Proposed Permit Application .................................................................................................. 25
6.2 Merits of the Permit Application ................................................................. 25

7 Summary of the issues and outstanding matters .................................................. 27

7.1 Submissions on the draft Plan ........................................................................ 27

7.2 Submissions on the Section 96A Permit Application ........................................ 27

7.3 Key Issues raised by Submissions and Outstanding Matters ............................ 27

8 Proposed Changes to Amendment Documentation .............................................. 38

8.1 Changes to the Amendment documentation in response to submissions .......... 38

APPENDIX

Appendix 1 - Summary Of Submissions Table .................................................... 44
Appendix 2 - Key Changes Table ....................................................................... 45
Appendix 3 – Revised Future Urban Structure .................................................. 46
Appendix 4 – Summary Of Submissions (State Agencies And Utility Providers) 47
Appendix 5 – Summary Of Submission (City Of Casey) ....................................... 48
Appendix 6 – Summary Of Submission (Cardinia Council) ................................. 49
Appendix 7 – Summary Of Submission (The Minta Group) ................................. 50
Appendix 8 – Summary Of Submission (Stockland) ............................................ 51
Appendix 9 – Summary Of Submission (15 Adrian Dabraio) ............................... 52
Appendix 10 – Summary Of Submission (32 Carole And Guenther Haberle) ...... 53
Appendix 11 – Summary Of Submission (30 Dellium Advisory) ........................ 54
Appendix 12 – Summary Of Submission (41 Brad And Kellie Hurren) ............... 55
Appendix 13 – Summary Of Submission (18 Raymond Micallef) ....................... 56
Appendix 14 – Summary Of Submission (33 Sasikumar Mani) ............................ 57

TABLES

Table 1 Exhibited Applied Zone Areas ................................................................. 19
Table 2 Land Balance Summary – Revised Future Urban Structure 38
Table 3 Proposed Changes to Local Park Provision ........................................... 41

FIGURES

Figure 1 Public Exhibition Notification Area .................................................... 5
Figure 2 Precinct Location Plan Melbourne Implementation Plan 2017 – Southern Region 8
Figure 3 South East Growth Corridor and Minta Farm Precinct 9
Figure 4 Urban Growth Zone Application 2012 .............................................. 10
Figure 5 Surrounding Precincts and Structure Plans
Figure 6 Exhibited Minta Farm Future Urban Structure
Figure 7 Exhibited Net Developable Area
Figure 8 Street Network
Figure 9 Integrated Water Management
Figure 10 Minta Farm Section 96A Permit Application – Proposed Subdivision Layout
Figure 11 Revised Future Urban Structure
INTRODUCTION

This Part A submission is made on behalf of the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) to support the Planning Panel Hearing for Amendment C228.

The VPA is the Planning Authority for Amendment C228 to the Casey Planning Scheme (the Amendment).

The Amendment consists of the proposed implementation of a Precinct Structure Plan and Planning Scheme Schedules to allow development to occur within the precinct. In addition, a 296A Permit Application was concurrently exhibited for the proposed subdivision of the first stage of development for 231 lots adjacent to Soldiers Road.

The Amendment has been prepared by the VPA in collaboration with Casey City Council, government agencies and relevant stakeholders, and landowners.

Formal exhibition of the Amendment commenced on 19 October 2017, and concluded on 4 December 2017. A total of 48 submissions have been received. The VPA has worked diligently with all stakeholders to resolve as many of the submissions as practicable.

A summary of unresolved submissions are noted in Section 7 and detailed in Appendix 1 - Summary Of Submissions Table and will now be considered by Planning Panels Victoria to inform directions on the exhibited Plan.

1.1 Application of the Amendment

The Amendment applies to the Minta Farm precinct, which is an area of approximately 285 hectares and generally bounded by the Princes Freeway and O’Shea Road reservation to the north, Cardinia Creek to the east, Grices Road to the south and Soldiers Road to the west, in Berwick Victoria (see Figure 3).

The site sits within the South East Growth Corridor and is currently zoned Urban Growth Zone intended to support future urban uses implemented via the Amendment. The Amendment will provide applied zoning provisions to support future uses in accordance with the draft Plan.

1.2 Formal Response to Submissions

The VPA provided a written response to all submitters regarding their matters raised between November 2017 and February 2018, and where necessary, has also discussed these matters verbally.

A table outlining a Summary of Submissions and their status is included at Appendix 1 - Summary Of Submissions Table.

An updated Key Changes Table outlining specific changes proposed to the amendment documentation and ordinance in response to submissions or further refinement is included in Appendix 2 - Key Changes Table.

1.3 Panel Directions – Preliminary Issues Raised

A Panel Directions Hearing was held on the 2 March 2018. The Panel Directions outlined a number of matters for the VPA to address in this Part A submission being:

- Background to the Amendment
- Chronology of events
- Strategic context and assessment
- Identification of issues raised in submissions and VPA’s response
- Changes to the amendment documentation proposed as a result of the issues raised in the submissions.

These items are outlined in subsequent sections of this submission.
1.4 Whole of Government Position

The position presented by the VPA in this submission where possible represents a whole of government submission. The VPA received submissions from several State government agencies and departments, and the following submission represents the agreed position (unless otherwise stated within this submission) of the following:

- Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DEWLP)
- Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR)
- Public Transport Victoria and VicRoads (TfV)
- Department of Education and Training (DET)
- Melbourne Water (MW)
- Country Fire Authority (CFA).
2 BACKGROUND TO THE AMENDMENT

2.1 Chronology of the Amendment

The following provides a timeline for the preparation of the PSP and C228 Amendment to the Casey Planning Scheme.

- **2014:** The project commenced as part of 2014 Growth Areas Authority program. VPA undertook informal consultation with government agencies and relevant stakeholders, and commenced background studies to prepare the PSP and Future Urban Structure options.
- **August 2017:** Formal agency consultation on the draft Plan and proposed Ordinance.
- **August 2017 to September 2017:** Additional testing of employment, transport and traffic was undertaken to inform the exhibited PSP and Infrastructure Contributions Plan.
- **5 October 2017:** VPA formally submitted the proposed Amendment C228 to DELWP for the Minister for Planning to consider and release for public exhibition.
- **19 October 2017 to 4 December 2017:** VPA formally exhibited Amendment C228 to the Casey Planning Scheme.
- **December 2017 to April 2018:** VPA considered submissions on the Amendment, refined the PSP and Ordinance, and worked to resolve outstanding issues. Additional technical assessment of traffic, employment and drainage was progressed.
- **January 2018:** The VPA formally requested a Planning Panel and to refer submissions (resolved and unresolved) to Planning Panels Victoria.
- **2 March 2018:** Panel direction hearing was held.
- **5 March 2018:** The VPA circulated a revised Future Urban Structure as part of the Part A Submission; the Key Changes Matrix; and the Summary of all Submissions on the Exhibited PSP to submitters and affected landowners.
- **19 April 2018:** C228 Amendment - Planning Panel hearing is scheduled to commence.

2.2 Purpose of the Amendment

The Amendment is a combined planning scheme amendment and planning permit application under section 96A of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (the Act), to give effect to the Minta Farm Precinct Structure Plan to allow future development to be delivered in accordance with the Plan; and consider the proposed first stage of subdivision (see Figure 10).

The Amendment makes changes to the Casey Planning Scheme to facilitate use and development of land within the Minta Farm PSP area (being the “amendment land”). The Amendment will introduce the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 14 (UGZ14) to the Casey Planning Scheme and apply it to the PSP area.

2.3 Amendment C228 to Casey Planning Scheme

Amendment C228 to the Casey Planning Schemes proposes to make a number of changes to facilitate the development and use of land within the Minta Farm PSP.

The following list is reflective of the exhibited amendment changes to the Casey Planning Scheme:

Specifically, the Amendment seeks to:

- Amend Clause 22.01 to include the Minta Farm Local Town Centre and Local Convenience Centre.
• Insert Schedule 14 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ) into the Casey Planning Scheme and rezone part of the land from UGZ (no schedule) to UGZ Schedule 14 (UGZ14). Schedule 14 to the UGZ sets out the land use and development controls for the PSP area and requires land use and development within the PSP area to be generally in accordance with the Minta Farm PSP.

• Rezone part of the PSP area from UGZ (no schedule) to Rural Conservation Zone (RCZ) being land within Conservation Area 36 and generally located along the eastern boundary of the PSP area;

• Apply Schedule 6 to the Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO6) to the land zoned as RCZ;

• Insert Schedule 2 to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO2) into the Casey Planning Scheme and apply it to the land zoned as RCZ;

• Amend the schedule to the Heritage Overlay to include the application of HO209;

• Apply Heritage Overlay Schedule 209 (HO209) to part of one land parcel;

• Increase the extent of Schedule 1 of Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO1) to allow for the intersection of O’Shea Road and Soldiers Road;

• Amend the Schedule to Clause 52.17 to identify native vegetation exempt from requiring a planning permit within the PSP area;

• Amend the Schedule to Clause 61.03 to update the relevant Planning Scheme maps;

• Amend the Schedule to Clause 66.04 to include a referral provision to the Victorian Planning Authority; and

• Amend the Schedule to Clause 81.01 to include a new incorporated document titled “Minta Farm Precinct Structure Plan, October 2017”.

Note:

• The Minta Farm Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) will be incorporated into the Casey Planning Scheme via a separate amendment which will introduce the associated Infrastructure Contributions Plan Overlay and Schedule 1 (ICPO1) into the Casey Planning Scheme and apply it to the PSP area.

2.4 Public Exhibition and Engagement

Agency, council and landowner consultation progressed throughout the preparation of the draft PSP, including those at public and post exhibition periods.

Stakeholders and the broader community were formally notified of the Public Exhibition by the following:

• Public notices in local circulating newspapers (Berwick Star – 19 Oct 2017 edition; and the Berwick Leader – 23 Oct 2017 edition);

• Notification letter and a Newsletter sent to home owners and tenants within the notification area (see notification area – Figure 1 Public Exhibition Notification Area);

• Email notification to government agencies, council and landowners to coincide with the announcement.

• Media Release and Government website updates.

Two community drop-in sessions were held at the Gwendoline Community Centre in Berwick, on 1st and 14th November 2017 and attended by around 75 community members.

A total of 48 submissions have been received, including a number of late submissions. The VPA worked to resolve these submissions where possible prior to the Panel hearing amendment, however less than half of the submissions remain partially unresolved due to the nature of the concerns regarding objection to growth or strategic objectives to the amendment; including those requiring additional assessment to appropriately form a response (e.g. Traffic and Drainage), which is ongoing.

The VPA provided all submissions (resolved and unresolved) to Panel prior to the Directions Hearing and Panel Hearing.
2.5 Background Documents

The Amendment is supported by a number of background reports, including those detailed by their references:

- State and local planning policy framework, including the Casey Planning Scheme;
- Minta Farm Draft Precinct Structure Plan – Background Report, VPA, October 2017;
- Minta Farm PSP Employment Precinct Land Review, VPA, October 2017;
- Minta Farm Arboricultural Assessment, Tree Logic, December 2016;
- Minta Farm PSP Surface Water Management Strategy, Engeny, October 2017;
- Minta Farm PSP Stage 1 and 2 Desktop Environmental, Hydrogeological and Geotechnical Assessment, SKM, February 2011;
- C21 Business Park Biodiversity Assessment Report, Practical Ecology, November 2011;
- Clyde North. C21 Business Park and Cranbourne North (Stage 2) Precincts, Arboricultural Assessment, December 2008;
- Heritage Advice for the Myer House, Minta Farm, Berwick (Stages 1, 2 and 3), GJM, April, May and July 2017;
- Minta Farm Historic Cultural Heritage Assessment, Tardis Enterprises, February 2011;
- Strategic Transport Modelling Assessment (Ultimate Scenario), Cardno, August 2015;
- Minta Farm PSP Concept Road Design Report, Traffic Works, October 2017;
- Traffic Engineering Assessment – Additional Traffic Modelling, Traffix Group, September 2017.

The Applicant for the Section 96A Permit Application has also provided technical materials in support of their application, including:
- Minta Farm 96A Application Plan Set 5 October 2017;
- Minta Farm 96A Application Town Planning Report 5 October 2017;
3 STRATEGIC CONTEXT AND ASSESSMENT

Growth area planning is guided by a hierarchy of plans including Plan Melbourne, the Growth Corridor Plans (GCPs), and Commonwealth environmental approvals to provide a framework for growth area planning and development that achieves the objectives of the State Planning Policy Framework.

3.1 Plan Melbourne 2017 – 2050 and South East Growth Corridor Plan

The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) designates the long-term limits of urban development and where non-urban values and land uses should prevail in metropolitan Melbourne, as outlined by Plan Melbourne 2017-2050. The UGB first came into effect in 2002 in conjunction with the release of Melbourne 2030. The metropolitan strategy established a long term plan for land within the UGB, including the intention to review the boundary at an appropriate time in the future.

Melbourne @ 5 million in 2008 identified land for investigation which had the potential to be included within the UGB which included land within the Minta Farm PSP.

On 6 August 2010, VC68 was gazetted which expanded the UGB, rezoning the land in the Casey, Hume, Melton, Mitchell, Whittlesea and Wyndham Planning Schemes. VC68 implemented Melbourne @ 5 million which identified that an additional 600,000 dwellings, including over 284,000 dwellings in growth areas, were needed in Melbourne within a 20 year period.

Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 and the Plan Melbourne Implementation Plan (see Figure 2) outlines a more ambitious target of 1.6 million new homes and 1.5 million new jobs over the next 35 years, and sets a strategy for supporting jobs, housing and transport, while building on Melbourne’s legacy of distinctiveness, liveability and sustainability. Melbourne’s Southern Region is anticipated to deliver 105,000 jobs by 2031 and 125,000 new homes in Greenfields areas up to 2051.
The Growth Corridor Plans (GCP), produced by the Victorian Planning Authority, were released by the Minister for Planning in June 2012. The GCP are high level integrated land use and transport plans that provide a strategy for the development of Melbourne’s growth corridors over the next 30 to 40 years.

These plans guide the delivery of key housing, employment and transport infrastructure and open space in Melbourne’s newest metropolitan suburbs.

The GCP identifies:

- The intended long term pattern of land use and development;
- Committed transport networks as well as network options for investigation;
- Committed regional open space networks as well as investigation sites; and
Opportunities for creating green corridors.

The GCP informs the development and review of local planning schemes and the preparation of future strategies, structure plans and other planning tools. They also provide a strategic basis for infrastructure and service planning as well as sequencing of land release.

The preparation of PSPs is the primary vehicle for the implementation of the GCP.

The South East Growth Corridor which includes the municipalities of Casey and Cardinia, is expected to accommodate a population of 230,000 people with a capacity to provide 86,000 jobs. The City of Casey is expected to accommodate up to 40,000 lots and 136,000 people across approximately 5,000 hectares of land, including the Minta Farm PSP (see Figure 3).

Figure 3 South East Growth Corridor and Minta Farm Precinct

The SEGC also identifies a gross employment land target of around 3,660 ha. This figure is refined through detailed precinct planning, including the interpretation of business with residential land use allocations in response to site specific opportunities and constraints.

3.2 Precinct Structure Planning and the Urban Growth Zone

On 7 October 2009, the former Minister for Planning released the Precinct Structure Planning Guidelines. The Guidelines provide a tool for designing and delivering better quality communities in growth areas. They set out the key objectives of growth area planning and include a step-by-step guide on how to achieve the identified objectives.

The overarching objectives for PSPs as set out in these guidelines are as follows:

- Establish a sense of place and community;
- Create greater housing choice diversity and affordable places to live;
• Create highly accessible and vibrant activity centres;
• Provide local employment and business activity;
• Provide better transport choices;
• Respond to climate change and increase environmental sustainability; and
• Deliver accessible, integrated and adaptable community infrastructure.

The UGZ applies to land that has been identified for future urban development within the UGB (see Figure 4). The UGZ sits within the suite of zones within the Victorian Planning Provisions. It has been specifically designed to implement an incorporated PSP and ensure that future development accords with the approved PSP.

The UGZ includes two parts:
• Part A, which applies to land when no PSP applies; and
• Part B, which applies to land when a PSP applies.

The UGZ includes zone provisions that seek to provide certainty about the nature of future development, streamline the approval process and ensure that any land use and/or development within a Precinct does not prejudice its future growth.

Figure 4 Urban Growth Zone Application 2012

Source: Growth Areas Authority (Now VPA) 2012

A Schedule to the Urban Growth Zone is drafted for each PSP area and can include requirements for land use, buildings and works, application/advertising requirements, decision guidelines and any other conditions/requirements.

The proposed UGZ Schedule 14 has been designed to apply a suite of Victoria Planning Provision zones to guide future use and development of the Precinct through the specification of permit triggers, application requirements, referral and/or notification requirements, and permit conditions so that land use and development within the Precinct is generally in accordance with the PSP.
Schedule 14 to the UGZ is specific to the Minta Farm Precinct as it includes certain permit triggers and requirements that respond to strategic assessment of the land as identified in the background reporting and planning for the Precinct.

The design of the Schedule 14 to the UGZ promotes consistency in the manner that planning authorities deal with land use issues and ensures that the zone implements the SPPF and LPFF. It has been structured in such a way that the ultimate translation to conventional Victorian Planning Provision zones can occur in a timely and efficient manner once the land has been developed.

3.3 Melbourne’s Strategic Assessment and Biodiversity Conservation

In June 2009, the Victorian and Commonwealth governments agreed to undertake a strategic assessment of the Victorian Government's urban development program *Delivering Melbourne’s Newest Sustainable Communities*.

The program involves urban development in four growth corridors and in 28 existing urban precincts, as well as the development of a Regional Rail Link Corridor between Werribee and Deer Park and the Outer Metropolitan Ring/E6 Transport Corridor.

The areas included in the program and covered by the MSA are:

- Areas added to the Urban Growth Boundary by planning scheme amendment VC68 (the 2010 Urban Growth Boundary);
- Areas in the Outer Metropolitan Ring/E6 Transport Corridor and the Regional Rail Link corridor; and
- Areas in the existing 28 urban precincts within the 2005 Urban Growth Boundary.

The Melbourne Strategic Assessment (MSA) evaluates the impacts of the Victorian Government’s urban development program for Melbourne on matters of national environmental significance (MNES) protected under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). It also establishes conservation measures to mitigate these impacts. The MSA required the Victorian Government to make commitments to the Commonwealth Government in relation to conservation outcomes and measures to protect these MNES, which are outlined in *Delivering Melbourne’s Newest Sustainable Communities Program Report 1* (the Program Report).

The MSA delivers a single environmental approval for both Victorian and Commonwealth environmental regulation for the first time. The MSA commitments included the preparation of the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (BCS) which describes the overarching strategy for the protection of biodiversity within Melbourne’s growth corridors.

The BCS sets out the detailed conservation measures required for Victoria to satisfy the commitments made to the Commonwealth Government under the MSA and meet State requirements for biodiversity under the Victoria planning schemes.

3.4 Biodiversity Conservation Strategy

The approved Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (BCS) is the overarching strategy for the protection of biodiversity in the growth corridors and finalises the planning for biodiversity under the MSA.

The BCS sets out all the conservation measures required to satisfy the commitments to the Commonwealth Government and to meet state biodiversity requirements.

The purpose of the BCS is to:

- Inform and guide the preparation of the Growth Corridor Plans;
- Outline how the conservation outcomes for MNES in the Program Report will be achieved spatially within the growth corridors and how impact on the matters of national significance will be mitigated;
- Identify land within the growth corridors that is required to be protected due to the sub-regional species strategies and the prescriptions for matters of national environmental significance;
- Identify how areas set aside for conservation purposes will be managed; and
- Identify how mitigation measures will be implemented.

Essentially, the BCS identifies those MNES that must be protected and conserved and those areas that can be removed to enable the urban expansion of Melbourne. On 11 September 2014 the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment approved all actions associated with urban development in the South Eastern Growth Corridor as described in the BCS. The endorsed Program included a commitment by the Victorian Government to prepare a BCS for the four growth corridors, and accompanying sub-regional strategies, including the Sub-regional Species Strategy for the Growling Grass Frog (Victorian Government Department of Environment and Primary Industries, May 2013).

3.5 State Planning Policy Framework

The State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) ensures that the objectives of Section 4 of the Act are implemented through appropriate land use development by addressing environmental, social and economic factors to achieve sustainable development.

The explanatory report accompanying the exhibited Amendment outlines how the State planning policies, local planning policies and Ministerial Directions relevant to the Amendment have been considered.

3.6 Ministerial Directions

The Amendment complies with the applicable Ministerial Directions as outlined in the explanatory report. More broadly, the Amendment complies with the following Ministerial Directions relating to the preparation of an amendment within the urban growth areas, including Ministerial Direction 11 - Strategic Assessment of Amendments, and Ministerial Direction 12 - Urban Growth Areas, as detailed further below.

3.6.1 Ministerial Direction 11 – Strategic Assessment of Amendments

The Amendment has been strategically assessed in accordance with the assessment criteria set out in Ministerial Direction 11. The Amendment will implement the objectives of planning in Victoria by providing for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use of land identified for urban purposes.

The Amendment has addressed environmental effects, as the pattern of land use and development was guided by studies of the area relating to flora and fauna, flooding and drainage.

The Amendment has addressed the relevant social and economic effects. It is expected to have a positive social and economic effect through the provision of additional housing and community facilities, as well as the creation of local employment opportunities. The Amendment has considered the relevant social, environmental and economic effects, and the amendment will result in a net community benefit.

3.6.2 Ministerial Direction 12 - Urban Growth Areas

This Direction applies to the preparation of any planning scheme amendment that provides for the incorporation of a PSP in the scheme or the introduction of, or changes to, provisions in a schedule to the Urban Growth Zone (UGZ). Therefore, the Direction applies to the Amendment.

The Direction calls for that the Amendment must implement the Growth Area Corridor Plan relevant to the land and must be in accordance with applicable Precinct Structure Plan Guidelines.

3.7 Urban Development Program

The Victorian Government’s Urban Development Program Reports provide an annual updated analysis of supply and demand for residential and industrial land across metropolitan Melbourne.

The program aims to ensure ongoing provision of residential and industrial land and supporting infrastructure. Information and feedback is drawn from across State and Local Government.
Over the past few years, industrial land has been developing at a rate of 290 hectares per year which is similar to the level of development prior to the Global Financial Crisis. With this rapid rate of development, it is important to monitor the supply and take-up of industrial land to ensure that there is sufficient land for future development. To this end the Urban Development Program – Industrial 2017 reports on:

- Changes in zoning of industrial land;
- Supply of vacant industrial land;
- Net consumption of industrial land;
- The economic use of industrial land; and
- Estimated exhaustion rates of vacant land in selected State Significant Industrial Precincts.

The Victorian Government’s UDP data has been drawn upon to inform employment land use allocations for the precinct.
4 LOCAL CONTEXT

4.1 Surrounding Precincts and Structure Plans

The Minta Farm Precinct is surrounded by established residential areas to the north and east, and new communities developing in recently completed PSPs to the south. Those PSPs completed and being finalised are estimated to support the delivery of around 42,370 homes and 30,000 jobs, including schools, community facilities and open space.

The Precinct forms part of a broader future employment corridor extending east along the southern boundary of the Princes Freeway toward Pakenham; a strategy which is identified to support localised employment opportunities for the surrounding new communities.

Figure 5 Surrounding Precincts and Structure Plans

4.1.1 Clyde North PSP (South and directly abutting Minta Farm PSP)

The Clyde North PSP was approved in November 2011. This Precinct covers a total area of 612Ha, of which 432ha or 70.5% of the Precinct being developable.

The PSP earmarks 6,605 dwellings with an estimated average density of 15.28 dwellings per Net Residential Developable Area (NDA). The total area of residential NDA is 426Ha and employment NDA is 6 hectares.

The proposed Local Convenience Centre in the Minta Farm Precinct at Grices Road was identified to support convenience shopping, retail and services for surrounding residents.
4.1.2 Thompsons Road PSP (South of Minta Farm PSP)

Thompsons Road PSP was approved in November 2014. Thompsons Road PSP plans for health and business precinct to support 8,900 jobs and a residential community of about 6,440 new homes with an estimated average density of 16 dwellings per Net developable area.

This Precinct covers a total area of 695 hectares, of which 498 hectares, or 71.6% of the Precinct is developable. The total area of residential NDA is 402 hectares and employment NDA is 95 hectares.

4.1.3 Cranbourne West PSP (South west of Minta Farm PSP)

Cranbourne West PSP was approved in February 2010. The PSP covers an area of approximately 790.93ha with a total NDA of 254.12ha and a total NDA Employment of 349.72ha which includes 8.5ha west of Merinda Park Station. The precinct is estimated to support 4,428 dwellings and more than 10,000 jobs.

In addition to Residential NDA the new community includes 23.7ha for schools, community facilities and neighbourhood activity centres.

Cranbourne West PSP was recently subject to a Planning Panel Hearing to consider the proposal for the land use change of 133 ha of applied Commercial 2 zoning to General Residential. The proposal and Planning Panel recommendations are being considered by the City of Casey. The final amendment is yet to be submitted to DELWP and the Minister for Planning for consideration.

4.1.4 McPherson PSP (South of Minta Farm PSP)

McPherson PSP has recently been considered by Planning Panels Victoria in October 2017 and is being finalised for adoption. The precinct covers an area of approximately 952 hectares bounded by Cardinia Creek to the north and east. McPherson PSP completes the UGB to the south of the Minta Farm precinct and is intended to ultimately support around 11,000 homes for approximately 28,300 people and deliver more than 1,600 local jobs.

4.1.5 Clyde Creek PSP (South of Minta Farm PSP)

Clyde Creek was approved in November 2014. This Precinct covers a total area of 1,153 hectares, of which 850 hectares developable land which equates to approximately 73.7% of the Precinct being developable.

Clyde Creek PSP sets out the planned development of a mixed use precinct which will ultimately provide 7,500 jobs and 13,900 dwellings, as well as supporting services and infrastructure.

4.1.6 Officer South Employment (East of Minta Farm PSP and adjacent to Cardinia Creek)

Status - Not yet commenced. Officer South Employment PSP is approximately 1,069 hectares in area and is identified for predominantly for industrial uses with a ‘business and residential’ area along the northern side of the precinct. Future precinct structure planning will determine the desired ultimate land use structure for this area.
5 MINTA FARM PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN

5.1 Role and Function of the Plan

The Minta Farm PSP is a long-term plan for future urban development of the site. It describes how the land is expected to be developed, and how and where services are planned to support development. The Plan provides a high level structure to guide subsequent detailed planning and development and thus will be subject to further refinement through this process.

The PSP provides a guide for the delivery of an urban environment that will be a logical extension of the existing established residential areas and neighbouring PSP’s. The PSP, and Amendment to implement the Plan, enables the transition of ‘urban identified’ land to urban land giving effect to necessary applied zone provisions to allow development to occur in accordance with the Plan.

The PSP outlines the projects required to ensure that future residents, visitors and workers within the Precinct are provided with essential services and timely access to key infrastructure necessary to support proposed land uses and the future community.

The PSP includes a Precinct Infrastructure Plan (PIP), which details what is to be included within the Infrastructure Contribution Plan and ensures Government agencies, Council, developers, the local communities, and investors have certainty about future development requirements of the Precinct.

The VPA will finalise an Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP), based on the ICP items that are detailed in the PIP. An exemption for public exhibition can be sought under Section 20(A) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, as per the ICP guidelines, if the ICP does not trigger a supplementary levy.

5.2 Objectives for the Precinct

The Victorian Precinct Planning Guidelines outline the overarching objectives for precinct structure plans. These include:

- To establish a sense of place and community;
- To create greater housing choice diversity and affordable places to live;
- To create highly accessible and vibrant activity centres;
- To provide for local employment and business activity;
- To provide better transport choices;
- To respond to climate change and increase environmental sustainability; and
- To deliver accessible, integrated and adaptable community infrastructure.

Precinct structure plans must respond to all of these objectives in an integrated way and be flexible enough to respond to the challenges of creating sustainable, long lasting and diverse communities.

The draft PSP more specifically reflects these overarching objectives to inform the future urban structure and development of the precinct in accordance with its Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines.
Figure 6 Exhibited Minta Farm Future Urban Structure
5.3 Vision for Minta Farm Precinct

The Minta Farm precinct will be home to a vibrant and integrated residential and employment community. The precinct’s character will be established through incorporation of the existing and unique natural and built features. Most notable will be the creation of a high amenity and integrated park network designed with the landscape and the remarkable constructed and natural waterway network along Cardinia Creek that is rich in biodiversity. The residential areas and regionally significant employment hub will be integrated by the town centre, will draw upon the natural topography and be connected by convenient transport links and a cohesive network of public spaces.

The precinct is projected to accommodate a residential population of approximately 8,000 people (in approximately 2,850 dwellings) and provide for approximately 11,000 local jobs.

A revised vision is detailed in Section 8.

5.4 Descriptions of the Plan

5.4.1 Land use, Housing & Employment

The PSP provides land for residential, employment, local parks and sports reserves, roads and waterways supporting around 210.60 hectares of Net Developable Area (NDA) (See Figure 7 below). The total areas and percentage of net developable area are provided in more detail in the Table 1 of the PSP document.

Figure 7 Exhibited Net Developable Area

| NET DEVELOPABLE AREA - TOTAL (NDA) | 210.60 | 73.95% |
| NET DEVELOPABLE AREA - RESIDENTIAL (NDA-R) | 141.80 | 49.79% |
| NET DEVELOPABLE AREA - EMPLOYMENT (NDA-E) | 68.80 | 24.16% |

Note: Net Developable Area Residential includes applied Mixed Use Zone area.

The PSP is estimated to deliver will deliver 141.80 hectares NDA-Residential across applied Residential Growth Zone, Mixed Use Zone and General Residential Zone supporting an estimated 2,850 dwellings.

The PSP seeks to provide for approximately 65 hectares of dedicated employment lands with 83 hectares in total of employment generating land uses, including the Local Town Centre and Local Convenience Centre and Mixed use areas. These include zones for:

- Commercial 1
- Commercial 2
- Mixed Use (ground floor).

The applied zoning provisions and approximate areas of housing and employment for the exhibited PSP are outlined in Table 1 below.
Table 1 Exhibited Applied Zone Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-PRECINCT</th>
<th>APPLIED ZONING</th>
<th>HECTARES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential within the walkable catchment – High Density</td>
<td>Residential Growth Zone (walkable catchment)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential within the walkable catchment – adjacent to Sports Reserve</td>
<td>Residential Growth Zone (walkable catchment)</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential within the walkable catchment – Standard Density</td>
<td>Residential Growth Zone (walkable catchment)</td>
<td>96.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential outside walkable catchment – Interface Zone</td>
<td>General Residential</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>General Residential</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – excluding ground floor</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>137.17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEDICATED EMPLOYMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Technology</td>
<td>Commercial 2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Office</td>
<td>Commercial 2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYMENT - OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – Ground Floor</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Local Enterprise Area</td>
<td>Commercial 1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Town Centre - Neighbourhood Activity Centre</td>
<td>Commercial 1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Convenience Centre - Convenience Activity Centre</td>
<td>Commercial 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>83.5 Hectares</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 Education

The Plan proposes a site for one primary school facility (K1-6) in accordance with the Department of Education and Training’s (DET) standard provision ratio for primary schools (one per 3,000 dwellings).
The site is located central to the precinct to maximise the broader desired catchment and as part of an integrated land use area consisting of the primary school, sports reserve, and community facility.

DET’s submission to the draft Plan provided support for the provision of the site for use of a Primary School facility and made recommendations to adjust the surrounding road network to accommodate opportunity for improved access and movement. These recommendations have been supported.

5.4.3 Council Community Services

The Plan provides for a Level 1 multi-purpose facility comprising 3 kindergartens, community rooms and additional facilities for childcare and maternal health, on 1.2 hectares of land, in accordance with service category and catchment requirements (8,000 people).

The proposed site is integrated with the Local Town Centre, Primary School site and Sports Reserve to ensure the uses are spatially integrated to maximise opportunities for shared resources.

5.4.4 Transport Network & Assessment

Plan 10 (Figure 8) sets out the indicative street network for the precinct drawing from existing connections in the surrounding network to deliver a grid network pattern of Arterial, Local Connector and Local Access Streets. The transport network reflects:

- The recent announcement by the Premier of Victoria to duplicate O’Shea Road from Clyde Road to Soldiers Road and extend O’Shea Road to the Beaconsfield Interchange and Princes Freeway. It is assumed these works will be delivered by 2022;
- The provision of a North South Arterial Road through the precinct to Grices Road;
- The intention to truncate or close Soldiers Road at the Grices Road intersection with the introduction of the North South Arterial (intended to perform the future Arterial north south function); and
- A future upgrade of Grices Road to a secondary arterial in accordance with the endorsed Clyde North PSP.

The intersections and mid-blocks for the North South Arterial represent the primary transport components of the Infrastructure Contributions Plan for the draft PSP. To manage the impact of vehicle generation by development of the precinct on the surrounding network whilst infrastructure is delivered, the draft Plan proposed a 1,000 lot cap on development prior to the delivery of the interim arrangements for the North South Arterial.

5.4.5 Integrated Water Management & Drainage

The drainage and waterway network detailed by the exhibited plan largely consisted of three stormwater treatment wetlands and a south easterly waterway network crossing the precinct (see Figure 9).

Throughout exhibition, Melbourne Water, in conjunction with DEWLP and VPA, progressed a more detailed evaluation of the hydrological regime for the adjacent waterbodies within the nearby Cardinia Creek Conservation Area and the ability to ensure drainage outflows to Cardinia Creek. Additional ecological evaluations for the conservation area were also undertaken to evaluate the Commonwealth and state listed species and habitats.

Melbourne Water and DEWLP are currently testing two identified drainage strategy scenarios for the precinct, which may result in changes to the exhibited waterway network and outflow arrangements to Cardinia Creek. A revised Future Urban Structure has been prepared detailing a West-East waterway scenario, for consideration, in Section 8. Further refinement is required to confirm a base case Drainage Strategy by Melbourne Water and DEWLP to finalise an accepted Drainage Strategy for the precinct.
Figure 8 Street Network
Figure 9 Integrated Water Management
5.4.6 Open Space

The Plan provides 9.83% of NDA Residential for open space and recreation, which generally meets the PSP Guideline standard provision of 10%. This provision is provided by seven local parks and one local sports reserve (16.64 ha).

The Guidelines also call for 95% of dwellings to be within 400 meters of a local park, which has been achieved as reflected by the Future Urban Structure. Casey Council and Stockland have requested amendment to the scale, location and provision of local parks, which are considered by the revised Future Urban Structure.

5.4.7 Conservation Area

The Cardinia Creek Conservation Area runs adjacent to the precinct on the eastern boundary and consists of approximately 17.29 hectares. The exhibited PSP promotes access to the conservation area for recreation and access to greenspace for future residents and employees.

5.4.8 Vegetation

The site features scattered pockets of native and exotic vegetation species with 58 of the 87 trees attributed to a high arboriculture rating. Many of these specimens were Oak tree (Quercus spp.).

The homestead sites atop the central hill and in the north-west and south-east corners include a variety of species with both ornamental and functional plantings. The homestead hilltop provides the most concentrated area of high value vegetation with the potential to be retained.

The vegetation along the dams at Cardinia creek include exotic and non-indigenous native species which provide an attractive framework for landscaped public open space.

The pines along Soldiers Road are noted as having a low arboricultural rating – of poor quality or functionally inappropriate to maintain.

The exhibited PSP has sought to provide a greater opportunity to protect trees considered as providing high amenity value through land use planning measures; by allocating local parks to those areas to encourage the opportunity for retention.

A collection of scattered trees have been identified to be retained in the conservation area adjacent to Grices Road in accordance with Plan 8 of the PSP.

5.4.9 Post Contact Heritage

The Plan identifies a Myer House (Myer Cottage) – a type of prefabricated house used during the post-World War II period to build Victoria’s Suburbs, for local historical and architectural significance to be protected by a heritage overlay. The heritage overlay supports protection of the building.

VPA’s GJM Heritage report undertaken for public exhibition determined that the Myer House was of local historical and architectural significance due to its intactness, rarity and as an illustrative example of experimentation in the prefabrication of houses that occurred directly after the end of World War II. As the Myer House was manufactured and constructed off-site without reference to its ultimate destination, the siting of the building is less important than its fabric including, external form, materials and detailing of the building. The GJM report recommended the Myer House be protected by a heritage overlay.

City of Casey’s submission, and accompanying independent peer review, seeks further protection of the Myer Houses’ site by way of a larger Heritage Overlay Area; and proposes support for the inclusion of a Workers Cottage as having state heritage significance.

The Minta Group’s submission contests the heritage significance of both sites. Supporting information is to be provided as evidence at the Panel Hearing.

The VPA has engaged GJM to review the City of Casey and The Minta Group’s submission and supporting materials. The VPA’s Part B Submission will outline the VPA’s position on Heritage matters.
5.4.10 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

A desktop assessment of registered sites and areas of sensitivity was undertaken during the PSP preparation stage to inform precinct planning.

The desktop assessment report found undisturbed vegetated pockets of land within the Minta Farm PSP area, particularly the Cardinia Creek corridor to have a moderate to high level of heritage significance at a local level. These areas consist of archaeological deposits that have the potential to address research questions in relation the cultural land use of the creek corridor and provide evidence to the land’s cultural change over time.

A more detailed analysis by way of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) will be required at the subdivision and/or development stage, in accordance with standard development practices.
6 SECTION 96A PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION

6.1 Proposed Permit Application

A planning permit application is also being considered concurrently to the draft Plan. The application area is approximately 12 hectares adjacent to Soldiers Road and south of Chase Boulevard, and seeks approval for the proposed subdivision of land into 231 residential lots as the first stage of development.

The application is supported by a Town Planning Report and Traffic Report which outline the details of the application and subdivision layout.

The plan proposes a broad range of lot sizes to support housing choice with an average of lot size of 383 sqm with 40% from 400 – 500 sqm (see Figure 10).

6.2 Merits of the Permit Application

A preliminary draft assessment of the application by the planning authority notes the application provides a generally acceptable development outcome for this site by:

- Integrating a functional and clear road network with Soldiers Road and the existing neighbourhood to the west;
- Allowing for further development of land to the south and north to be integrated in a fair and orderly manner; and
- Providing a variety of residential lot sizes and settings suitable for development of the accommodation needs of a wide range of household types.

Further work is being undertaken to address submissions on the draft Planning Permit conditions and evaluate the traffic impact of the proposal on the surrounding network.
Figure 10 Minta Farm Section 96A Permit Application – Proposed Subdivision Layout
7 SUMMARY OF THE ISSUES AND OUTSTANDING MATTERS

7.1 Submissions on the draft Plan

48 submissions were received on the exhibited Plan. Submitters can be generally categorised into the following groups:

- Landowners (with ownership rights over the land) (2 of 2).
- Community members (36) representing 61 submissions (by supporting signatures)
- Local Government (2)
- State agencies or authorities (6)
- Federal Member (1)
- Utility Provider (1).

7.2 Submissions on the Section 96A Permit Application

Five submissions made specific comment or request for changes to the subdivision application or proposed permit conditions to the application. These were made by the following groups:

- Applicant (Stocklands)
- Local Government (City of Casey).
- AUSNET
- APA (gas)
- CFA.

A majority of these were minor in nature or recommended inclusion of standard conditions. Proposed changes are outlined in Appendix 2 - Key Changes Table.

7.3 Key Issues raised by Submissions and Outstanding Matters

The key issues raised by submitters to Casey Amendment C228 can be summarised in the following issue categories:

- Traffic, Congestion and Safety
- 1,000 Lot Development Cap
- Timing and Staging of Road Improvements
- Employment Land Provision and Assumptions
- Drainage
- Heritage
- Distribution of Local Parks
- Refinement of the PSP Requirements and Guidelines
- S96A Permit Conditions.

A summary of outstanding matters raised by key stakeholders and those registered to be heard are noted below. Complete details are available in Appendix 1 - Summary Of Submissions Table. A summary of state agency submissions are detailed in Appendix 4 – Summary Of Submissions (State Agencies And Utility Providers).
7.3.1 Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DEWLP)

DEWLP’s submission requested changes to Figures, Requirements and Guidelines in relation to the management and protection of environmental values concerning State and Commonwealth listed species or their habitats. Outstanding matters relate to the Drainage Strategy and securing outflow arrangements to Cardinia Creek whilst achieving minimal disturbance to the conservation values. The future urban structure will be updated with the final drainage strategy, once completed. All other matters are considered resolved.

7.3.2 Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR)

DEDJTR noted support for the exhibited PSP (employment provision) but opposes any further reduction in land allocation of business and industry purposes. Their submission noted previous planning ratios for ‘Business with Residential’ areas as 50% employment, which is not achieved by the PSP. Other comments note the view of ambitious employment density assumptions applied requiring supportive planning provisions to achieve such long term targets; and the assumption that development will evolve over the medium to long term. All matters are noted or considered resolved.

7.3.3 Transport for Victoria (TfV)

TfV submitted on the adequacy of assumptions applied to the traffic assessment; timing and staging of the north south arterial road, O’Shea Road duplication and extension to the Beaconsfield interchange; and proposed cross sections for the ultimate north south arterial road. Outstanding matters are detailed below.

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate layout and design of intersections for the north south arterial</td>
<td>VPA in conjunction with TfV are undertaking a ‘first principles’ evaluation of the ultimate intersection cross sections. These will be revised in line with findings and updated in the ICP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection performance of Soldiers and Grices Road</td>
<td>Performance assessment for the Grices Road roundabout will be reviewed with the updated traffic assessment. Ultimately, this roundabout will be truncated at 1,000 lots and replaced with signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for further consideration of interim measures for the north south arterial to support required traffic volumes.</td>
<td>The principle of land and first carriageway is applied to PSPs in greenfield areas whereby the PSP funds the purchase of ultimate land and construction of the first carriageway. The initial traffic volumes (up to the proposed 1,000 lot cap) indicate that Minta Farm is not expected to generate sufficient traffic on its own to warrant the construction of a second carriageway to be funded by the ICP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.4 Melbourne Water

Melbourne Water noted that the current drainage layout in the exhibited PSP is conceptual and requires further refinement. Melbourne Water noted the intention to complete a concept level functional design for the drainage and environmental assets. This work has progressed in conjunction with DEWLP and VPA to finalise a suitable drainage outcome for the precinct. A final base case drainage strategy for the site is outstanding. Outstanding matters are noted below.

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes that the current drainage layout in the exhibited PSP is conceptual and requires further development to achieve a feasible implementation</td>
<td>The VPA will review and revise the exhibited drainage surface water management plan in line with options presented by Melbourne Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
outcome based on discussions with DELWP and functional design. following the proposed additional technical review once completed.

The structural integrity of embankments adjacent to Cardinia Creek is one of the key issues that needs to be addressed as the creek is the only outfall for drainage. Noted. These matters are outside the scope of the PSP to address. They will be managed as part of detailed design.

### 7.3.5 Department of Education and Training (DET)

DET’s submission confirmed the direction to illustrate a future government primary school site at this location; requested refinement to existing Requirements and Guidelines; and requested road level changes. All matters are considered resolved.

### 7.3.6 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA noted support for the proposed amendment noting the future requirement of r development to ensure the mediation of any contaminated sites or items to be undertaken in accordance with various EPA publications. All matters are considered noted and resolved.

### 7.3.7 Country Fire Authority (CFA)

CFA noted the existing road network gaps for the area pending the delivery of the access at the Beaconsfield interchange and O’Shea Road extension; and the future amendment to the Bushfire Prone Area map. All matters are considered noted and resolved.

### 7.3.8 City of Casey

City of Casey submitted on a broad range of areas with a focus on traffic concerns and the timely delivery of the North South Arterial; Heritage and the protection of the Myers House and a Workers Cottage; Local Parks; Drainage; and various Requirements and Guidelines. Many items have been resolved. A number of items continue to be listed as ‘Decision Pending’ where these matters are considered to be able to be reasonably addressed. Outstanding items are listed below. A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 5 – Summary Of Submission (City Of Casey).

**Outstanding issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers Road classification and capacity.</td>
<td>Noted. This road cross section has been built to support volumes above the current council classification. The road in its current function is performing above its classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic assessment assumptions and inclusion of surrounding future road improvements.</td>
<td>Noted. The revised traffic assessment has considered a 2022 delivery of the O’Shea Road duplication and extension to Beaconsfield interchange, in accordance with assumptions defined by Transport for Victoria. Surrounding improvements with a funding mechanism available through ICP’s have also been included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling should consider implications during construction period during the 1-1500 lot period</td>
<td>Disagree. The traffic impacts of construction traffic are typically off-set by the occupation of dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP and capacity to deliver the identified road improvements.</td>
<td>The ICP framework is a streamlined process to remove the need for detailed costings to be undertaken for each PSP. The VPA will review the draft ICP in accordance with the final PSP. Should</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposes that some projects (IN-06 and IN-04) could potentially be removed from the ICP, and delivered through a permit condition.

- **Condition 4:**
  - VPA agrees in part to recommendations to Condition 4 – please see proposed S96A Ordinance Changes.

- **Condition 5:**
  - 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.
  - The trigger mechanisms for delivery of the road have been integrated into the ICP and PSP.

### Notes on Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan). The exhibited PSP have removed these notes.

- **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”.

### A note should be added to Figure 7 (Conservation Area Concept Plan) of the PSP considering the management of vegetation within the conservation area.

- **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.

### 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.

- **Not supported.** The use of 2.8 persons per dwelling is a standard that is applied to all PSPs within growth areas. VPA are reviewing dwelling assumptions inline with the recent release of the 2016 ABS data for future precincts.

### Amend Guideline G62 to require a diversified water supply as per submission.

- **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.

### Inclusion of section 173 trigger in the UGZ Schedule for:
- 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.
- The ongoing management and works to the heritage place(s) as identified in the Conservation Management Plan.

- **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.
  - The UGZ14 heritage assessment requirements should be deleted as the Conservation Management Plan is unnecessary with the inclusion of the HO.

### Requirement R44 which requires the sharing of complementary infrastructure including car parking should be changed to a Guideline.

- **Not supported.** This is a standard requirement supported by DET. The sharing of integrated facilities and assets is supported. VPA notes that this result in a Supplementary Levy, the ICP items will be costed in detail and will be publicly exhibited.
permits are not required for schools. DET has requested a requirement to ensure the school and community facility is delivered in an integrated way.

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.

VPA notes Casey's concern regarding a suitable permit trigger for earthworks. As this matter relates to including an earthworks control not required under standard Victorian Planning Provisions, this matter is more appropriately raised with DELWP.

Requests for amendment to Clause 21.10, Casey Planning Scheme.

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.

### 7.3.9 Cardinia Council

Cardinia Council noted the importance of the proposed business and residential area in supporting the liveability of the broader Casey-Cardinia growth area highlighting they would not support the reduction of any commercial land in the precinct. Cardinia asserts that any job loss resulting from Amendment C219 (Cranbourne West) should be reallocated within Casey PSPs. Their submission requests that the corridor plans should be updated to reflect changes since their adoption noting the view which seems to be building on Cardinia to provide for a large majority of jobs on top of what they are currently expected to deliver has not been tested. Cardinia also recommended the inclusion of a Conservation Area buffer to Cardinia Creek conservation area. All matters are considered noted and resolved. A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 6 – Summary Of Submission (Cardinia Council).

### 7.3.10 The Minta Group (Landowner)

The Minta Group submitted on a proposed reduction in the scale of employment land provided, including an alternative Future Urban Structure and the Minta City presentation respectively provided on the 14th and 19th March 2018. The VPA will consider the merits of the proposal and seek to incorporate recommendations where appropriate. However, as the proposal is untested from a Whole of Government review, items of merit will largely be considered during and following the Panel Hearing.

Other comments included those on proposed development controls and Requirements and Guidelines; noting outstanding Drainage Strategy; the ICP and objection to the 1,000 lot cap. Outstanding matters from The Minta Group’s submission are noted below. A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 7 – Summary Of Submission (The Minta Group).

**Outstanding issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Noted. VPA will seek additional information regarding the proposal to consider elements of merit. VPA considers this proposal as 'untested' from a 'Whole of Government' evaluation requiring further testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>VPA Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Noted. The VPA considers there is merit in the proponent’s objective to deliver a high amenity mixed use environment at this location. However, the alternative statutory arrangements proposed are not supported as an applied zone must be implemented to trigger subdivision and building works requirements for a mixed Commercial type use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks removal of permit requirement for restricted retail uses in the Commercial 2 Zone.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage strategy is outstanding and seeks options for flexibility in delivering differing drainage arrangements.</td>
<td>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. R83 allows for flexibility in considering adjustments to the drainage strategy, subject to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority. Proposed amendments to R83 will also allow for consideration of the underlying zone when efficiencies occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Not supported. The lot cap will ensure that initial development does not result in adversely impacting the service performance of the immediate surrounding road network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not support Heritage Overlay to the Myer House.</td>
<td>Not supported. VPA supports application of a Heritage Overlay in the form proposed in the exhibited Amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3.11 Stockland (Landowner)

Stockland submitted on a number of elements, including removal of the Local Convenience Centre; scale and provision of Local Parks; the proposed 1,000 lot cap and its implementation; and various comments on requirements and Guidelines. Outstanding matters are noted below. A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 8 – Summary Of Submission (Stockland).

**Outstanding issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage - Awaiting final drainage strategy from Melbourne Water. Pursuing co-location of Wetland WL3 within the Cardinia Creek Corridor.</td>
<td>Melbourne Water and DELWP are currently preparing a revised Drainage Strategy for the precinct, to address outflow requirements and meet biodiversity objectives for Commonwealth and State listed species in the Conservation Area. Melbourne Water and DEWLP will be the responsible authorities for endorsement of the final Drainage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy. In addition, R83 is intended to allow for flexibility in considering adjustments to the drainage strategy, subject to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

Requests the deletion of the Local Convenience Centre (Advice in Appendices 3), which asserts that a smaller format supermarket in this location is not viable. Including removal of associated Requirements and Guidelines for the LCC.

Noted. Planning for the LCC assumed the provision would support convenience shopping access for nearby residents. This will be informed by expert advice and awaiting proponent’s evidence.

Transport Network - Seeking reserving land and constructing a single carriageway (on the Stockland landholding only) prior to Statement of Compliance on the 1,200th lot on the Stockland project. Including amendments to associated Requirements and Schedule.

Not supported. The lot cap will ensure that initial development does not result in adversely impacting the service performance of the immediate surrounding road network. Further traffic assessment will be undertaken to inform the need to revise the lot cap. Linking the cap to the statement of compliance is not supported.

Requested Changes to Requirements: R4 – Removal of requirements for indicative building envelopes.

Not supported. This is a standard requirement that seeks to ensure that urban design outcomes for building layouts, retaining walls, fencing, and crossovers are considered in more detail at the subdivision stage. The current wording is considered to provide an adequate level of flexibility regarding the level of information to be provided - "as appropriate".

Requested Changes to Requirements: R8: Development within the Transitional Housing area fronting the conservation area.

Not supported. It is proposed to amend R8 to reflect the changes made in the McPherson PSP, as per the McPherson PSP Panel Report recommendations.

7.3.12 Community Members

Overall, 34 submissions were made from community members (representing a total of 66 submissions by signature). Many of the outstanding matters raised relate to concerns over increased road congestion in the area, the timing and staging of road improvements (including the surrounding existing road network), visual impact concerns from the future proposed employment areas, adequate provision of public transport services and schools.

Comments by nearby community members noted a frustration over the cumulative effects of growth in the area, particularly in relation to vehicle traffic and congestion along Soldiers Road. In this regard, the purpose of the PSP assessment is to consider the precinct generated traffic and propose suitable improvements to mitigate impacts. Consideration of impacts in the broader network are generally considered outside the scope of the assessment as the relevant infrastructure delivery agencies are responsible for management of performance of the broader network.

The proposed amendment, which includes 1,000 residential lot cap will manage the timing and delivery of new homes and business within the precinct prior to the delivery of the interim arrangements for the North South Arterial, is applied as a basis for addressing the potential for further congestion in the immediate area.

Key outstanding issues submitted by surrounding residents and the community are noted below. A summary of all community submissions is detailed in APPENDIX 2 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS.
Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, congestion and safety of the surrounding road network, particularly O’Shea Road and Soldiers Road.</td>
<td>Noted. Additional traffic assessment is being carried out to provide options for addressing congestion concerns, including the staging and timing of infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of road improvements proposed and staging and timing of infrastructure to support growth.</td>
<td>Essential infrastructure required of the precinct is funded by development contributions paid by development within the precinct. Therefore these improvements cannot be provided prior to approval in the absence of a supplementary levy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.13  Submitter 15 - Adrian Dabraio

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 9 – Summary Of Submission (15 Adrian Dabraio).

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objects the amendment as the proposed O’Shea Road extension is not built as a part of the development because it is a proposed road project and subject to government funding.</td>
<td>Noted. The PSP also includes improvements required of precinct generated traffic only. The O’Shea Road extension and duplication to Clyde Road is to be State government funded and is listed as part of the Monash Freeway/ Princes Highway upgrade project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes concern of the timing and staging of infrastructure to support development, particularly non-precinct funded roads (O’Shea Road extension) and the potential impact to the Chase Estate, in particular Bridgewater Boulevard, as people try to avoid congestion along O’Shea and Soldiers Road.</td>
<td>Noted. Additional traffic assessment is being carried out to provide options for further addressment of congestion issues, including the staging and timing of infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.14  Submitter 32 – Carole and Guenther Haberle

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 10 – Summary Of Submission (32 Carole And Guenther Haberle).

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact to Viewgrand Drive and request to truncate the PSP Boulevard connector street at this location.</td>
<td>Not supported. The Draft Plan proposes a grid road network to ensure variable movements to the local town centre and throughout the precinct. The future development of the area may include requirements which can include traffic calming interventions to manage specific traffic flows in this direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S96A application consideration of existing congestion on Soldiers Road during peak periods.</td>
<td>The S96A application has estimated volumes for the 231 lot proposal in accordance with standard (trips per day) assumptions, including the exhibited PSP traffic assessment. An additional precinct level traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The employment area should be shifted to the east side of arterial road and the innovation and technology business sub-precinct should be transferred to the west side of the proposed arterial road.

Not supported. The innovation precinct is more appropriately located adjacent to the highway as it may contain some noise sensitive uses; and the office and commercial area will support the proposed local town centre.

7.3.15 Submitter 30 – Dellium Advisory (Paul Terro)

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 11 – Summary Of Submission (30 Dellium Advisory).

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amend the Casey Planning Scheme to change Clause 21.05-2, Strategy to reflect proposed changes to the employment vision.</td>
<td>Noted but not supported. Clause 21.05-2 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.16 Submitter 41 – Kellie and Brad Hurren

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 12 – Summary Of Submission (41 Brad And Kellie Hurten).

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern over congestion on Soldiers Road.</td>
<td>Noted. A traffic assessment is underway which includes additional traffic counts on Soldiers Road to determine the required timing of the north south arterial.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.17 Submitter 18 – Raymond Micallef

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 13 – Summary Of Submission (18 Raymond Micallef).

Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposes the mixed-use precinct as the proposed building height of up to 3 storeys is inconsistent with the surrounding established neighbourhood</td>
<td>Noted. This change is not supported. Strategic policy documents have earmarked this site for business and residential uses since 2002. The PSP also includes a requirement for the upper level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character (of up to two storeys). Considers two storeys appropriate.</td>
<td>Setback of at least 3 meters above a first storey to manage visual bulk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes to have the (2-3 storey) Mixed-Use sub precinct in place of the (1-2 storey) Innovation and Technology Business sub precinct where there is a greater setback from existing residential areas.</td>
<td>Noted. This change is not supported. The employment sub-precincts have been planned appropriately given noise sources and sensitive uses. The commercial and office precinct will support the local town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposes the Commercial and Office sub-precinct as the proposed building height of up to 6 storeys is excessive and inconsistent with the surrounding established neighbourhood character.</td>
<td>Noted. As shown in Plan 3 - Future Urban Structure, the location of the employment hub and the Commercial and Office sub-precinct is deemed to be appropriate as it is located away from existing residential areas in the north-eastern area of the precinct adjacent to the freeway and Cardinia Creek corridor. New general employment requirement: Buildings adjacent to O’Shea Road, as illustrated in Plan 6, must have upper level setbacks of at least 3 metres above a first storey (to manage visual bulk and provide an appropriate interface to residential areas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposes to swap building heights for the Commercial and Office-Sub Precinct with the Innovation and Technology Business sub-precinct.</td>
<td>Noted. This change is not supported. The Innovation and Technology Business sub-precinct is proposed to sit in the north-eastern area of the PSP due to its interface with the freeway and distance from existing and proposed residential uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summarised concerns raised:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Minta Farm PSP provides for 68 hectares of dedicated employment capable land plus 4.6 hectares for the Local Town Centre and Convenience Centre and 10 hectares of mixed use (83.4 total) and 141 hectares of residential uses. Work is being undertaken to further test the capacity of the employment land to achieve the desired job targets and provide guidance on the timing and staging of employment uses. The proposed employment land is expected to fully develop over the long term.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects to the proposed employment area noting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insufficient demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nearby competition with Officer South employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oversupply of office and commercial in central Dandenong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planned employment in Narre Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses concern that the existing road network is unable to cope with growing population, in particular traffic along Soldiers Road.</td>
<td>Noted. Additional traffic assessment is being carried out to provide options for further addressment of congestion issues, including the staging and timing of infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.3.18 Submitter 33 – Sasikumar Mani (representing 25 signatures)**

A summary of the entire submission is detailed in Appendix 14 – Summary Of Submission (33 Sasikumar Mani).
### Outstanding issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>VPA Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes traffic, safety and nuisance concerns of vehicle movements along Soldiers Road.</td>
<td>Noted. Additional traffic assessment is being carried out to provide options for further addressment of congestion issues, including the staging and timing of infrastructure improvements for the precinct. The findings will determine the suitability of improvements proposed and the timing and staging of road improvements required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 PROPOSED CHANGES TO AMENDMENT DOCUMENTATION

8.1 Changes to the Amendment documentation in response to submissions

Following evaluation of submissions, a Key Changes Table has been prepared detailing the proposed amendments to the exhibited documentation and ordinance in response to submissions and further technical assessment. These changes are detailed in Appendix and a summary of key changes made to date and outcomes are noted below.

This work will continue following the further evaluation of expert evidence and panel outcomes on the Amendment until a final plan is prepared for consideration by the Minister for Planning.

A revised Future Urban Structure (FUS) and land balance is detailed below (see Figure 11 and Table 2). The key changes prepared to the FUS to date include:

- Changes to the waterway alignment and drainage network to test an West-East waterway scenario and removal of the North South waterway;
- Changes to local parks – scale and distribution, including a linear park through the Innovation Sub-precinct;
- Inclusion of a Boulevard Connector through the Innovation Sub-precinct, in accordance with councils desire for a circuitous green path network; and
- Reflection of a more clearly defined road hierarchy for Local Road Access Level 1 and 2, including removal of Local Access Roads where the PSP is not required to illustrate these (though they may be required by PSP Requirements and Guidelines).

The FUS will continue to be refined in response to submissions on the exhibited plan following Planning Panel.

Table 2 Land Balance Summary – Revised Future Urban Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NET DEVELOPABLE AREA</th>
<th>211.86</th>
<th>74.39%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NET DEVELOPABLE AREA – RESIDENTIAL (NDA-R)</td>
<td>143.47</td>
<td>50.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET DEVELOPABLE AREA – EMPLOYMENT (NDA-E)</td>
<td>68.39</td>
<td>24.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1.1 Vision for Minta Farm

Minta Farm will be home to a vibrant and integrated business and residential community for the Casey-Cardinia area. The precinct will be a destination of choice where residents can live, work and play with a variety of housing options, local parks and a conservation area, and a critical employment hub for the Casey-Cardinia region surrounded by a Local Town Centre supporting daily needs and services. The precinct is projected to accommodate a residential population of approximately 8,000 people (in approximately 2,850 dwellings) and ultimately provide for approximately 11,000 local jobs.

A variety of housing choices will be provided with space for lower density urban living along the Cardinia Creek Conservation Area to higher density apartments and town houses within and surrounding the local town centre and mixed use areas. Residents of the precinct will be able to access a variety of services via the centralised Local Town Centre and integrated Community hub, including those within the nearby established town centres of Berwick and Casey Central.

The precinct will be a highly connected and walkable environment featuring shared paths, bike lanes, and bus capable roads throughout its compact urban residential and business environment. The precinct’s character will be established through the provision of a diverse range of open spaces, tree-lined boulevards and the incorporation of existing and unique natural landscapes. Most notable will be the creation of a high amenity and integrated park network designed with the landscape and the remarkable constructed and natural waterway network along Cardinia Creek that is rich in biodiversity.

The precinct will also evolve over a 25 year period to provide a wide range of information, research, technology and knowledge-based employment and services to support Casey’s growing population and economy featuring four employment sub-precincts, including:

- A high amenity Commercial and Office sub-precinct as an expansion of the Local Town Centre to support knowledge based businesses
- An Innovation and Technology sub-precinct to support research and development businesses and bespoke advanced and light manufacturing uses
- Mixed Use areas where residents and business are co-located featuring commercial offices, shops, restaurants and cafes; and
- Local Enterprise and population serving businesses, like Gym’s, health care services, private childcare and education facilities alongside the Local Town Centre and retail shopping precinct.

Businesses will take advantage of its strong links to key road and public transport corridors, access to surrounding centres and employment clusters within the Casey-Cardinia corridor, and established and growing communities to stimulate opportunities for investment and local employment. Through high quality amenity and modern built form, the employment precinct will foster creative and innovative businesses, feature medium-high density development, a mix of active uses and opportunities for integrated housing adjacent to the Local Town Centre to encourage day and night activity.

The precinct is strategically positioned adjacent to the Princes Freeway with a direct connection proposed through a future upgrade to the Beaconsfield Interchange and O’Shea Road. In addition, the precinct’s workforce and residents will be supported by close connectivity to the Beaconsfield Train Station and Melbourne’s Metropolitan railway line. These combined qualities and infrastructure investment proposed by the PSP will ensure Minta Farm evolves to become a resilient business and residential community for the City of Casey.

8.1.2 Drainage

Melbourne Water, in conjunction with DEWLP and the VPA have progressed conceptual Drainage Strategy scenarios for the site incorporating consideration of outflow arrangements to Cardinia Creek and minimal disturbance to Commonwealth and State listed habitats and values.

Two scenarios were presented to stakeholders and landowners for consideration prior to conclave and the Panel Hearing with a majority of stakeholders noting support for the West-East waterway alignment scenario. The Future Urban Structure has been updated to reflect consideration of this preliminary line work. However,
refinement of the complete drainage land take and final endorsement by Melbourne Water and DEWLP is outstanding and subject to further testing.

8.1.3 Local Parks

The scale and location of local parks have been updated to reflect desired outcomes presented primarily by Stockland and Casey Council. Key changes are detailed below.

The VPA seeks to apply 10% provision target of credited open space with a 90% walkable catchment target within 400m to ensure future residents have good access to an adequate provision (scale and location) of local parks and open space. These targets were met by the exhibited plan and are also achieved by the revised FUS.

City of Casey has adopted an *Open Space Strategy Core Service Level Standards, April 2017*, which outlines the scale and dimension requirements for local park provision within the local government area setting a 1 hectare minimum and 70m minimum dimension requirements. Whilst these requirements have not been achieved for every park, the provision target has been met by the changes. In addition, Casey is seeking to facilitate a continual boulevard link throughout the Innovation Sub-precinct, with a requested linear park to support employee’s access to open space. VPA has tested this option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARK NUMBER</th>
<th>EXHIBITED SCALE (ha)</th>
<th>REVISED SCALE (HA)</th>
<th>REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP-01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Council requirements for minimum scale and dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-02</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-03</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-04</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-05</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Council desire for linear park within the Innovation Sub-precinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-06</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Council requirements for minimum scale and dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP-07</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Stockland request for movement and dimension change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-01</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.52 % NDA-R 3.23% NDA-E</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.4 Road network hierarchy changes

The exhibited plan did not adequately differentiate between proposed Local Access Level 1 and Local Access Level 2 Roads. This has been updated in the revised FUS whereby a majority of illustrated Local Access Roads are delineated as Level 2.

To support additional access to the Primary School Site, the Local Access Level 2 Road on the eastern boundary has now been identified as a Local Collector Road. This will ensure a suitable access option is provided for away from the Town Centre. This change has been requested by DET.
8.1.5 Requirements and Guidelines, and various Plan changes

A number of changes were made to the exhibited PSP document and ‘Requirements and Guidelines’ to improve clarity, flexibility and address errors with the documentation. Key changes (as detailed in Appendix ) include:

- Removing various built form ‘Requirements’ for employment sub-precincts and applying these as ‘Guidelines’ to enable flexibility;
- Removing the ‘Requirement’ for employment uses to be generally consistent with Plan 6 – Employment and Town Centre (uses) with the Schedule taking precedence;
- Removing maximum building height ‘Requirements’ in employment areas;
- Updating Figure 7 Conservation Area Concept Plan to address DEWLP requirements;
- Updating the Transitional Housing Area Requirements and Concept Plan to meet consistency with provisions supported in the McPherson PSP.

8.1.6 Ordinance Changes

Proposed changes to Schedule 2, 6 and 14 are proposed to address submissions, including:

- Updating the condition and requirements for permits for the protection of conservation areas and native vegetation during construction with revised standards;
- Amending conditions and permit requirement for land management and co-operative agreement for land within a conservation area;
- Updating DEWLP as the responsible authority for the implementation of the Salvage and Translocation Protocol; and
- Protecting conservation areas and native vegetation during construction.

8.1.7 Section 96A Permit Application

Proposed changes to the exhibited Section 96A Planning Permit have been made to allow for parties to enter into a Section 173 agreement to delivery land or works for key infrastructure, including reflection of standard conditions by submitting utility providers. These proposed changes are outlined in Appendix .
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