

**Pakenham East PSP - Amendment C234**

Submitter #	45
Agency	Niche on behalf of Bauenort
Contact name	Celia Konstas
Position title	Principal Planner
TRIM reference	COR/18/1692

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
45.01	1	Support overall PSP vision, objectives and Future Urban structure	Supports Amendment	Noted.	No action required	No action required
45.02	1	A mix of sideages (and backing where appropriate) should be incorporated to balance the cost of construction of roads with the overall development potential and yield, and to soften the existing urban/rural transition interface	Lot interface	Figure 1 of the PSP Transmission Easement Interface Housing Concept Plan is an indicative example of how this land could be developed. Requirement 15 of the PSP establishes the design criteria for subdivision of land within the Housing Interface Area 3.	No action required	No action required
45.03	1	Submit that a 20m edge road cross-section is excessive and a 16m road reservation is sufficient for the low traffic volumes and appropriate interface with green wedge land	Roads & Transport	The cross section is designed to be able to incorporate a wider nature strip to soften the transition between the urban development of the PSP and the green wedge. It will allow for the planting of substantial canopy trees to provide a suitable landscaping design response. The carriageway is identical to the 16.0m local access level 1 cross section and is designed to facilitate the low levels of local traffic expected.	Not agreed to update cross section	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation
45.04		That the average minimum lot size of 2,000 m2 expressed in R15 be deleted to provide flexibility for future subdivision outcomes that can be assessed through site analysis and design response, rather than a fixed area	Requirements & Guidelines	R15 expresses a requirement for an 'average minimum lot size'. This is based on the NDA of the land encumbered by the transmission line easement divided by the expected number of lots (based on the concept plan) taking into consideration land requirements for local roads. This requirement does not require each lot to be a minimum of 2000sqm, but requires the average minimum lot size across each stage of development to have an average minimum lot size of a minimum of 2000sqm. This requirement will ensure an appropriate transition from the standard density residential development of the PSP to the green wedge land to the north. It is also a realistic yield for this land if it meets the requirement of the PSP relating to housing. The VPA are willing to consider adjusting the minimum lot size if a subdivision layout for the Interface Housing Area 3 can be demonstrated that meets the requirements of the PSP.	Discuss with submitter potential subd	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
45.05		Support controls such as those required by R15, including fencing treatments, retaining wall treatments, landscaping and building envelopes	Requirements & Guidelines	Noted	No action required	No action required

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
45.06		Amend the UGZ schedule to include an application requirement that requires a visual assessment and design response within the housing transition area to inform and encourage high quality development, landscaping and built form outcomes	Planning scheme ordinance	This additional application requirement can be considered	Change to amendment documentation	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
45.07		Delete/amend 2.95 dwellings/hectare from <i>Table 3</i> and ensure densities are reflective of urban areas and are informed by site-specific design responses and ability to viably develop the landholding	PSP text change	Table 3 (Housing Delivery Guide) guides potential densities of the various residential types. It is based on achieving a minimum average lot size of 2000sqm. See response above regarding the application of a minimum lot size of 2000sqm (Response 45.04).	No action required	No action required
45.08		Amend R7 to reflect flexibility and discussions with Council at the permit level in response to slope (via the Slope Management Plan) and development, particularly as this property will exceed 10% slope and require a holistic approach to the subdivision design with retaining walls needing to be flexible and exceed 1m in height	PSP text change	The planning controls that relate to subdivision of land with a slope of greater than 10% are implemented through a subdivision application requirement that requires an application to subdivide land or to construct a building or carry out works for land shown on Plan 2 of the Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan as having a slope greater than 10%, must include a Slope Management Plan that responds to the document 'Guidelines for Slope Management in Subdivisions- Pakenham East Precinct Structure Plan. Subdivision applications must also meet the requirements set out in R7. These controls are intended to work together to allow the developer to respond to slope greater than 10% by submitting a Slope Management Plan that allows the application to provide a performance based site specific response to the land, while meeting key, design criteria (that set out in R7). Regardless of the materials used, or design of retaining walls, the VPA consider the meeting of the design criteria set out in R7 as fundamental to achieving an appropriate urban design response on sloping land. There is also the flexibility of the requirement to be considered by the responsible authority if agreed through the slope management plan. The VPA consider this to be an appropriate compromise between a performance based approach and the meeting of key design criteria set out in R7.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation
45.09		The identified dead stag (NVPP <i>Native Vegetation to be removed and retained</i> 141) located along Dore Rd to the east of the site has been fallen for some time; seeking to have it deleted from the PSP and NVPP	NVPP	A report detailing the inaccuracies in the native vegetation precinct	Submitter to provide report detailing	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
45.1		Deletion of the dead stag (142) from the NVPP	NVPP		Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
45.11		Deletion of the nominated conservation reserves from the PSP and NVPP, as it is argued that without this vegetation being retained as part of a large conservation reserve or with linkages to other open spaces or reserves the viability is not considered appropriate	NVPP	<p>The Victorian planning system has a variety of policies and provisions for the management and protection of native vegetation. The State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) outlines Victoria's policy objectives and strategies relating to the protection and management of native vegetation. Specifically, the following clauses give policy context and inform decision making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12.01 Biodiversity</li> <li>• 12.04 Significant environment and landscapes</li> <li>• 13.03 Soil degradation</li> <li>• 13.05 Bushfire</li> <li>• 14.02 Water</li> <li>• 15.03 Heritage (includes Aboriginal cultural heritage)</li> </ul> <p>Clause 12.01 Biodiversity provides specific direction regarding the protection and management of biodiversity and native vegetation in Victoria. A key strategy identified in Clause 12.01 is to ensure that there is no net loss to biodiversity as a result of the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation. This is achieved through the following three-step approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoid the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation.</li> <li>2. Minimise impacts from the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation that cannot be avoided.</li> <li>3. Provide an offset to compensate for the biodiversity impact from the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation.</li> </ol> <p>The strategic planning process is the most effective planning mechanism to protect and manage native vegetation and to achieve the objectives of the SPPF. Considering how native vegetation will be protected and managed through strategic</p>	Not agreed to make change to amend	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation
45.12		If a supplementary levy is identified for the PSP area, the client wishes to be notified	ICP	If a supplementary ICP is required for the PSP, it will be formally exhibited and all materially affected parties will be notified	No action required	No action required