

Pakenham East PSP - Amendment C234

Submitter #	21
Agency	xwb consulting (Phil Walton) on behalf of Earldean Pty Ltd and Auscare
Contact name	Phil Walton
Position title	
TRIM reference	COR/18/1643

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
21.1	28	It is submitted that the PSP requires greater clarity in relation to the purpose of the reserve abutting Deep Creek on the subject property	Drainage	<p>It is proposed to retain Deep Creek and its riparian zone in its current form. However, ongoing waterway management will occur in line with current and existing ecological and landscape requirements. The Deep Creek corridor is proposed to incorporate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 100 m reserve east of Deep Creek upstream of Princes Highway, while downstream of Princes Highway it will be 100 m meandering down to 50 m near Canty Lane. • A 50 metre reserve on the west of Deep Creek downstream of Princes Highway. An assumption that any future development west of Deep Creek upstream of Princes Highway would require a 50 m reserve to be consistent with the above. <p>The review of the PSP and associated background reports undertaken by Water Technology in relation to drainage has been reviewed. The key issue appears to be whether a 50m wide or 100m wide reserve should be provided along Deep Creek.</p> <p>Water Technology believe “it may be possible” to modify the floodplain/waterway reserve to 50m width – but this is largely unsubstantiated and would be subject to further investigation/modelling and discussion with Melbourne Water.</p> <p>There is further assessment required to determine how the 100m wide waterway reserve was arrived at, but we would think that this should be about what floodplain is needed to both convey and store the 100 year flood event. A key point that Water Technology seem to be making is that there are no vegetation conservation requirements and therefore the reserve can be narrower, but there is no discussion about the flood conveyance and potential flood storage needs (or storage offsets if floodplain storage was to be reduced) at these locations which would be subject to Melbourne Water requirements.</p> <p>The submission has been referred to Melbourne Water for review.</p>	The submission has been referred to Melbourne Water for review.	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
21.2		The submission requests that greater clarity is provided on maps of differing uncredited open space purpose (e.g. waterway, drainage, conservation)	Graphics and mapping	<p>Each of the plans in the PSP differ in the level of detail provided so will have slightly differing terminology. The VPA will review the wording to ensure there is consistency.</p> <p>The Pakenham East precinct was included within the urban growth boundary after the Melbourne Strategic Assessment was undertaken. Therefore the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy doesn't apply to the PSP so the document is not a background report.</p> <p>At the time of exhibition, it was unknown if any Matters of National Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act were present on the precinct. Therefore the standard requirements and guidelines, in Section 3.4 of the PSP and conservation area concept plans generally implemented through PSPs subject to the BCS were applied.</p> <p>Since the commencement of exhibition a response to the referral made to the Department of Environment and Energy regarding the impact of the PSP on Matters of National Environmental Significance has been received. The referral has decided that the proposed action (i.e. the PSP) is not a controlled action. This means that the proposed action does not require further assessment and approval under the EPBC Act before it can proceed.</p>	Review land use designations relating to the Deep Creek reserve. The VPA position is that the land adjacent to the Deep Creek reserve in the drainage corridor is zoned UGZ, not RCZ. Further discussion with CSC to confirm.	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome

Sub. #	LUB Reference	Submission	Topic Category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
21.3		Objects to the inclusion of land within the drainage reserve adjoining Deep Creek within a Rural Conservation Zone as it provides no flexibility in relation to boundary or adjoining developable land	Planning scheme ordinance	<p>The Pakenham East precinct was included within the urban growth boundary after the Melbourne Strategic Assessment was undertaken. Therefore the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy doesn't apply to the PSP so the document is not a background report.</p> <p>At the time of exhibition, it was unknown if any Matters of National Environmental Significance under the EPBC Act were present on the precinct. Therefore the standard requirements and guidelines, in Section 3.4 of the PSP and conservation area concept plans generally implemented through PSPs subject to the BCS were applied.</p> <p>Since the commencement of exhibition a response to the referral made to the Department of Environment and Energy regarding the impact of the PSP on Matters of National Environmental Significance has been received. The referral has decided that the proposed action (i.e. the PSP) is not a controlled action. This means that the proposed action does not require further assessment and approval under the EPBC Act before it can proceed.</p>	Review land use designations relating to the Deep Creek reserve. The VPA and Melbourne Water position is that the land adjacent to the Deep Creek reserve in the drainage corridor is zoned UGZ, not RCZ. Further discussion with CSC to confirm.	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
21.4		Relocate local park in property 30 to the north-west to encompass native trees to be retained	Graphics and mapping	The VPA will review the potential to relocated Local Park 4 to incorporate native vegetation into the open space.	Review location of LP-04	Additional information / work may be required to inform outcome
21.5		SW6 in the NVPP should be removed and/or assessed with any changes to drainage reserve	Land Use	The NVPP identifies this patch of swampy woodland to be retained. The land outside of the vegetation to be retained (SW6) will be identified in the Land Use Budget as credited open space (Local Network Park) unless it is within the Deep Creek drainage reserve. The Land Use Budget will be reviewed to ensure it is accurate.	LUB to be reviewed to ensure accurate representation of the LUB	Further review/discussion
21.6		SW7 and SW8 should form part of the adjoining local park to the west	Land Use	The land has a conservation value so is treated as land encumbered with conservations values and is therefore not credited as open space.	No action	No action required
21.7		Seek a review of the NVPP to ensure pockets are remnant and not planted	Vegetation	A report detailing the inaccuracies in the native vegetation precinct plan will be required prior to this submission being considered further.	None	Further review/discussion
21.8		Would like to be notified of and provided any submissions that relate to their land	Other	Noted. All submission are publically available	No action	No action required