

Officer PSP - Amendment C232

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
1 Department of Education and Training							
1-1	DET has reviewed the relevant documents and notes that there are no government school sites in the area that is subject to the amendment. DET considers that the proposed changes will have limited impact on DET or on school demand in the area.	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	VPA notes that DET considers that the proposed changes will have limited impact on DET or school demand in Officer. However, VPA notes that changes proposed to the noise and odour buffer mean this now potentially impacts on the Officer Secondary School site. The buffer that applies to the HyGain site has been increased from 200 m to 250 m following an independent review of this existing buffer in response to changed EPA guidelines, introduced following planning and construction of the school site. DET has been notified of this change and VPA will liaise with DET and EPA to understand the impacts for the school site.	No action required	No further action required
2 Brockman							
2-1	I would like to know if the proposed primary school in the Timbertop Estate in Officer is still going ahead?	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	The Department of Education and Training has not indicated any changes to the number, type or location of schools shown in the Officer PSP. The timing of delivery of these schools is subject to demand and allocation of government funding.	No action required	No further action required
2-2	Also will all the shops etc. in the proposed Officer Town Centre go ahead? If so when is this expected to start and finish?	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	The Victorian Planning Authority is responsible for preparing the revised PSP for Officer, however it does not determine the exact detail or timing of development in the town centre. The PSP establishes a blueprint for development, but the exact type and timing of development is determined by the owners of each land parcel. However, the aim of the current review is to simplify and improve the flexibility of the requirements relating to the Officer town centre in order to remove barriers to development. Therefore, it is anticipated that with increasing residential development in Officer and following approval of the revised PSP, private investment in the town centre should follow.	No action required	No further action required
3 Victorian Local Government Association							
3-1	In 2017 a planning application was lodged for the development of a hotel / motel and 80 EGMs at 1 Station Street Officer. The existing UGZ and PSP in Officer meant that community members were excluded from having a say on the application. A number of Officer community members have been very concerned and distressed by their exclusion and feel that they have been accorded lesser rights than other Victorians.	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. While gaming machine applications are ordinarily subject to third party notice, the Urban Growth Zone switches off this requirement where an application generally accords with an approved precinct structure plan. Therefore, in the absence of a provision in the Officer PSP directly addressing gaming machines as a strategic/structural issue, it is open to a responsible authority to determine a gaming machine application as being generally in accordance with the PSP, particularly in commercial areas. The rationale being that gaming machines are an ordinary incident of commercial areas and therefore generally accord with the PSP.	No action required	No further action required
3-2	Applications for EGMs have significant social and economic impacts on local communities. For this reason, that are assessed under provision 52.28 of the planning scheme which requires that a social and economic impact assessment be undertaken. In order to comprehensively undertake such an assessment, it is necessary to hear from the local community that will be impacted. The effect of excluding an EGM application from advertising in this case has been that Council has not been able to undertake an adequate assessment and community members have been excluded from participation in the process. This may lead to a lessor outcome for the Officer community. Should this application go ahead, I note that the density of poker machines in Officer based on the current population will be in the vicinity of 27 per 1000 adults which is almost 3 times the allowable municipal limit.	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. However, section 52(3) of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> does allow responsible authorities to give notice of applications, even where the scheme exempts some notice requirement, if they determine the applications are 'of community interest or concern'. Therefore, it is still possible for a responsible authority to give notice of an application, even where it is generally in accordance with a PSP.	No action required	No further action required
3-3	I hope that any review of the Officer PSP will rectify this situation and ensure that in future, all EGM applications are subject to advertising and third part appeal rights.	Yes	Submission seeks amendment to Schedule 4 to the UGZ to remove the third party notice exemption for electronic gaming machine applications.	Planning scheme ordinance	Gaming machine application are ordinarily subject to third party notice. However the UGZ and PDZ switch off this requirement. Section 52(3) of the <i>Planning and Environment Act allows</i> responsible authorities to give notice of applications, even where the scheme exempts some notice requirement, if they determine the applications are 'of community interest or concern'. This does not overcome the exemption that prohibits an objector from seeking a review at the tribunal. The VPA does not propose any change to the current practice that allows council to give notice under section 52(3) of the Act, but this does not address appeal rights. Additionally, acknowledge that council has the capacity to refuse permits under existing clauses in the planning scheme relating to social and economic assessments if required. It is considered beyond the scope of this amendment (and the role of hte VPA) to be addressing this matter. It is a state-wide policy issue that should be addressed by DELWP.		Unresolved
3-4	Furthermore, I am concerned that there may be other PSPs in Victoria which would have the same effect and request that the broader implications of poker machines being considered an ancillary use to a hotel in terms of planning applications be considered.	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. It is outside the scope of this Amendment to consider impacts on other PSPs, however if a policy decision is taken to turn off the third party notice and review exemption, consideration should be given to the geographical scope of the change and the potential flow on consequences to other land uses that are prone to cause community concern.	No action required	No further action required
4 BMDA Development Advisory for Coles Group							
4-1	By seeking to facilitate development in the OTC, the Amendment represents a positive change in approach and removes some of the provisions which have previously hindered the development. The Amendment is consistent with Objective 1(a) of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> 'to provide for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use, and development of land.'	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
4-2	Characteristics of the Amendment are supported: - The reduction in the number of permit application requirements and planning controls; - The ability for a Planning Permit to be issued prior to the preparation/approval of an Urban Design Framework (UDF); and - The revised Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) not mandating one Town Centre design/layout and allowing adequate flexibility for alternative designs to be considered.	No	N/A	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
4-3	While the intent of the Amendment is supported, the revised PSP is constrained through the retention of the outdated structure that has not been successful in facilitating development. The revised PSP continues to make use of a superseded structure consisting of 'must be met' and 'should be met' planning and design guidelines. In contrast, the VPA now uses an 'Objectives, Requirements and Guidelines' structure for Precinct Structure Plans. The retention of 'must be met' guidelines results in the mandatory application of 'guidelines', which is a contradiction in terms. Given the move away from mandatory, 'must be met' guidelines in current versions of PSPs, the inclusion of mandatory guidelines must be carefully assessed to ensure that they do not continue to hinder appropriate development in the OTC.	Yes	Submission seeks to amend the format of the PSP to align with the VPA's use of objectives requirements and guidelines.	Other	The VPA was directed by the Minister of Planning to focus its review of the Officer PSP on elements relating to the town centre, and therefore for the sake of consistency, has retained the format of the original document. Direction on how planning and design guidelines that <i>must</i> and <i>should</i> be met should be interpreted is provided in section 4 Elements on page 35 of the PSP.	Out of scope	No further action required
4-4	There is a risk that some of the proposed 'planning and design guidelines that must be met' will not facilitate the development of the Town Centre as intended. Objective 1(f) of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i> , is 'to facilitate development in accordance with the objectives set out in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e).' An Amendment that restricts development which is in accordance with Objective 1 is not consistent with the Act.	No	N/A	Other	The VPA has provided responses to Coles' submission in relation to guidelines that <i>must</i> be met where these may restrict development.	No action required	No further action required

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
4-5	<p>The Officer Town Centre is now forecast to be smaller than originally planned. The revised Officer PSP identifies the Officer Major Activity Centre to serve a 'sub-regional retail role' (previously identified as regional and sub-regional). Similarly, the forecast indicative retail floor space has been changed from a minimum of 30,000sq.m to an approximate 30,000sq.m of 'Shop' floorspace. In part, this recognises that the potential opportunity for a regional centre at OTC has passed. In the last decade, across the outer south-east Melbourne region many shopping centres and large format retail centres have been developed, which have impacted on the opportunities for the OTC. These include the regional centre at Fountain Gate-Narre Warren and the sub-regional centre at Pakenham.</p> <p>Given changes in the retail environment and the development of retail floorspace outside of OTC, the 'aspirational' 30,000sq.m may not be achieved. The lower-scale 'sub-regional' role for the centre will inevitably reduce the size of the OTC and the amount of specialty retail floorspace which can be supported along Siding Avenue (Main Street).</p> <p>Given the reduced role and scale of the Officer Town Centre, it is likely that the main-street element of the town centre will be more compact; and may not extend over the 4-6 blocks along Siding Avenue.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks to reduce the length of the town centre main street.	Concept plan	<p>The status of the Officer major town centre remains unchanged in the revised PSP, with the changes identified in the submission having been made for clarification purposes. Table 9 in the revised PSP now identifies the town centre as playing a sub-regional rather than regional and sub-regional role, which simply brings the role of the town centre into line with the hierarchy set out in the growth corridor plan (i.e. principal town centres playing a regional role and major town centres playing a sub-regional role). The forecast indicative retail floor space identified in Table 9 was changed from 'minimum 30,000 square metres' to '30,000 square metres' to remove any ambiguity for planners assessing permit applications who may have interpreted the PSP to mean any application must include a minimum of 30,000 square metres of retail floor space.</p> <p>While the core of the Officer town centre is planned to extend along Siding Avenue south of the railway line, development in this area is planned to have a more commercial and residential focus. The concept plan identifies retail development to be focused north of the railway line, most of which will be concentrated in the two blocks south of Orchard Street. The VPA believes this is a reasonable expectation given the envisaged scale of the town centre.</p>	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
4-6	<p>A key part of the development of OTC was the construction of a new major arterial road and signalised intersection at Princes Highway East (PHE), with Siding Avenue. The VicRoads approved plan includes a median/lane separator along Siding Avenue, extending from the Princes Highway intersection, to south of Orchard Street. As a result, Orchard Street can no longer be accessed by south bound traffic along Siding Avenue (entering from the Princes Highway). This means that the Coles site is not conveniently accessible to a large section of its market. In a competitive environment, the OTC will not attract end-users and development unless anchor retail sites can be accessed safely and conveniently.</p> <p>Some of the proposed planning and design guidelines do not appear to recognise this material change to the structure of the Officer Town Centre.</p> <p>The effect of this change is that the first opportunity for vehicles in Siding Avenue to access sites to the west is the Gumleaf Lane access; some 280 metres south of Princes Highway. This arrangement is likely to lead to an 'unbalanced', less-developed town centre.</p> <p>Coles considers that the lack of convenient access to the Coles site from the Highway is a major impediment to the creation of convenient customer access. The planning and design guidelines must provide for a direct access-way from Siding Avenue into the site.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks a change to the Officer town centre concept plan to show access from Siding Ave.	Access	<p>The VPA proposes to remove active frontages from Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan, with this detail to be determined in the Urban Design Framework. This figure will also be amended to show a 'vehicle access point' to Coles' site from Siding Avenue.</p> <p>The guideline relating to active frontages will be amended as follows: <i>Other than along Siding Avenue, non-residential built form in the Officer town centre should provide continuous ground floor active frontages to the public realm where practical, for the following uses shown in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan:</i> - specialty retail - commercial - commercial w/residential above.</p> <p><i>Where continuous ground floor active frontages are not possible, applicants should demonstrate a suitable alternative design response, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.</i></p> <p>Additionally, a new guideline that must be met that applies to Siding Avenue only will be added as follows: <i>Non-residential built form along Siding Avenue must provide continuous ground floor active frontages to the public realm, unless providing:</i> - a pedestrian link to the entrance of a use set back from the street boundary - access to upper floor uses - a vehicle access where indicated in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, a new planning and design guidelines will be added to Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre as follows: <i>The vehicle access point on Siding Avenue must be located where indicated in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The vehicle access point on Siding Avenue should be:</i> i. constructed to be at grade with the footpath ii. designed to be utilised by customers vehicles only and to restrict use by large delivery vehicles.</p>	Requested change to amendment documentation not made, but a negotiated outcome proposed	Pending
4-7	<p>Coles supports the intent of the guideline to create a main-street retail centre. However, the requirement for a continuous active frontage may not be achievable across the entire length of Siding Avenue, nor is a continuous active frontage (with no vehicle crossovers) a prerequisite for a successful main-street retail centre.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks increased flexibility in relation to delivery of active frontages along Siding Avenue as well as an amended / new guideline and /or indication on the town centre concept plan allowing ongoing access to their site from Siding Avenue.	Built form	See response to 4-6 - The VPA proposes to amend Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan to show a 'vehicle access point' to Coles' site from Siding Avenue.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
4-8	<p>With the now recognized, reduced role and size of the OTC, it is likely that the main-street element of the town centre design will not achieve the scale and length as originally envisaged. However, this does not appear to be anticipated when Am C232 PSP Figure 6(a) is examined (Exhibit 1). This new diagram indicates a main street undiminished in length from the Officer PSP, September 2011 Figure 6(a).</p> <p>A more achievable and appropriate guideline should seek to encourage a consistent approach aimed at requiring that retail premises have frontages generally along Siding Avenue; but not prevent practical, necessary vehicle accessways to car parking areas located behind the retail frontages. Logically, the more southern areas of frontage, between Gum Leaf Lane and Civic Drive, should have more scope for continuous pedestrian paths. But, as identified, convenient access to the connector road (Orchard Street) is not available from Siding Avenue, north of Gumleaf Lane.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks flexibility within the PSP to allow vehicle access to developments along Siding Avenue, particularly those blocks north of Gum Leaf Lane.	Built form	See response to 4-6 - The VPA proposes to amend Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan to show a 'vehicle access point' to Coles' site from Siding Avenue.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
4-9	<p>Access from/to the Princes Highway is a key attractor for consumers who require safe and convenient vehicle access. The Siding Avenue concrete median which extends south from PHE restricts access from Orchard Street west to Orchard Street east.</p> <p>The median restricts vehicle movements involving Orchard Street west and Siding Avenue to left-in/left-out, with no direct route for consumers accessing the site from the north of the Town Centre (via the Princes Highway). As such, access to the Coles Site is heavily compromised by the established OTC road layout and design.</p> <p>The Coles Site only has functional frontages to Siding Avenue and Orchard Street. The only accessible frontage available to Coles for safe and convenient vehicle access is via Siding Avenue (to the south of the median). However, the requirement for a vehicle crossover on this frontage is effectively prohibited by the 'must be met' guideline requiring the creation of 'continuous active frontages'.</p> <p>In combination with the established road network layout/design, the guideline effectively removes the opportunity to develop the Coles Site for the purpose of a supermarket and shops.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks increased flexibility in relation to delivery of active frontages along Siding Avenue as well as an amended / new guideline and /or indication on the town centre concept plan allowing ongoing access to their site from Siding Avenue.	Access	See response to 4-6 - The VPA proposes to amend Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan to show a 'vehicle access point' to Coles' site from Siding Avenue.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
4-10	<p>The requirement for a 'continuous active frontage' (with no vehicle crossovers) for the operation of successful and active retail main-streets has not been established.</p> <p>The implementation of the 'must be met' guideline would mean that there would be no vehicle access to the west of Siding Avenue for over 250 metres (from PHE to Gumleaf Lane). The provision of a vehicle crossover to the Coles Site would result in a single crossover over the distance of 162 metres (between Orchard Street and Gumleaf Lane). The requirement for a continuous frontage across the lengths of the street blocks would be unusually long when compared with successful main-street centres in established areas. Across metropolitan Melbourne there are many, main-street retail centres which operate successfully while having much shorter distances between vehicle crossovers (Table 1).</p> <p>A survey of established main-street retail centres in metropolitan Melbourne reveals that there is a broad range of distances between vehicle crossovers. The data shows that the existence of vehicle crossovers does not impact detrimentally on the effective operation of these main-street centres and the use of the space by pedestrians/consumers.</p> <p>Many of the surveyed centres command high rental rates, indicative of high retail sales levels. This indicates that the guideline's aim to prohibit necessary and appropriate, practical vehicle crossings is misplaced, and not justified in the particular circumstance, nor from the operation of successful retail main-streets throughout Melbourne.</p>	Yes	Submission seeks flexibility within the PSP to allow vehicle access to developments along Siding Avenue, particularly those blocks north of Gum Leaf Lane.	Built form	See response to 4-6 - The VPA proposes to amend Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan to show a 'vehicle access point' to Coles' site from Siding Avenue.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
4-11	<p>Amendment C232 includes the following, contradictory 'planning and design guidelines that must be met':</p> <p>'Continuous active frontages must be created along key retail streets as shown in Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a), unless providing a pedestrian link or access to upper floor uses.'; and</p> <p>'off-street car parking areas must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be accessible from the roads carrying higher volumes of traffic to the centre - be screened from the public realm/street frontages through the use of built form, landscaping, facade treatments or similar.' <p>Due to the lack of access connecting Orchard Street to Princes Highway, the only road that will carry a higher volume of traffic with access to the Subject Site is Siding Avenue (Main Street). The off-street car parking area cannot connect to Siding Avenue while maintaining a 'continuous active frontage' along Siding Avenue. As such, it is not possible for a development of the subject site to be consistent with both mandatory 'guidelines'.</p> <p>This contradiction highlights the problems that arise through the use of mandatory planning and design guidelines which should instead be discretionary.</p> <p>It appears that the Planning Authority is aware of this issue as the following guideline is included as a 'should be met' planning and design guideline:</p> <p>'Built form along Siding Avenue should present a continuous edge, with vehicle access to car parks avoided where practicable'</p> <p>This 'should be met' guideline wording facilitates design solutions to achieve the objectives of the Officer Town Centre without requiring contradictory mandatory guidelines to be met. Given there is a discretionary planning and design guideline to manage vehicle crossovers to access Siding Avenue, there is a need to resolve how different guidelines are weighted in Planning Permit decisions.</p>	Yes	<p>Delete:</p> <p>'Guidelines that must be met'</p> <p>'Continuous active frontages must be created along key retail streets as shown in Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a), unless providing a pedestrian link or access to upper floor uses.'</p> <p>Replace with:</p> <p>'Guidelines that should be met'</p> <p>'Where practical, continuous active frontages should be created along key retail streets as shown in Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a), unless providing a pedestrian link, vehicle access to off-street car parking north of Gumleaf Lane, or access to upper floor uses.'</p> <p>Figure 6(a) Officer Town Centre Concept Plan 2018 should also be amended to identify a vehicle access towards the west from Siding Avenue, to the north of Gumleaf Lane (Exhibit 3).</p>	Built form	VPA proposes to delete the requirement in Table 10a that 'off-street car parking areas must be accessible from the roads carrying higher volumes of traffic to the centre' in order to eliminate the contradiction. See also response to 4-6 in relation to amended requirements relating to active frontages and car park access.	Requested change to amendment documentation not made, but a negotiated outcome proposed	Resolved
4-12	<p>The 'must be met' planning and design guideline nominates:</p> <p>'The extent and visibility of blank walls and car parking fronting public areas, particularly streets and public spaces, must be minimised.'</p> <p>The guideline does not consider the restricted access to Orchard Street and may prevent the identified development of the site being achieved. The guideline is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent with revised Figure 6(a) which shows 'back of house' areas along Orchard Street; and - Inconsistent with the service role of Orchard Street. <p>Figure 6(a) Officer Town Centre Concept Plan identifies a Town Centre layout/design which is likely to include blank walls and car parking areas along Orchard Street (both east and west of Main Street) (Exhibit 1). However, the Officer PSP still includes a 'must be met' guideline that 'The extent and visibility of blank walls and car parking fronting public areas, particularly streets and public spaces, must be minimised.' It is concerning that a development proposal could be consistent with the Town Centre Concept Plan but prohibited by the 'must be met' guideline.</p> <p>Figure 6(a) Officer Town Centre Concept Plan does not identify active frontages along Orchard Street. The Plan nominates Orchard Street to service large stores to the south and the commercial tenancies fronting onto Princes Highway to the north. The proposed guideline does not differentiate between major retail streets (Siding Avenue) and service roads (Orchard Street). It is not clear from the proposed wording that blank walls and visible car parking areas will be allowed along Orchard Street (as a service road).</p> <p>The mandatory nature of the guideline does not allow adequate flexibility to develop retail and commercial sites as the Amendment intends to facilitate.</p>	Yes	<p>Delete:</p> <p>'Guidelines that must be met'</p> <p>'The extent and visibility of blank walls and car parking fronting public areas, particularly streets and public spaces, must be minimised'</p> <p>Replace with:</p> <p>'Guidelines that should be met'</p> <p>'Where practical, the extent and visibility of blank walls and car parking fronting public areas, particularly retail streets and public spaces, should be minimised.'</p>	Built form	<p>The VPA proposes to amend the guideline relating to blank walls as follows: <i>The extent and visibility of blank walls and car parking fronting public areas, particularly streets and public spaces should be minimised where practical.</i></p> <p>Additionally, active frontages will be removed from Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan. Given the large size of the Officer town centre it is difficult to determine this level of detail at such a broad scale. By changing this guideline relating to active frontages from one that must be met to one that should be met, flexibility is created for the UDF to provide more targeted guidance in relation to active frontages.</p>	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
4-13	<p>The guideline requiring two storey buildings to be developed along Siding Avenue and Gumleaf Lane may result in the development within the OTC not being economically viable.</p> <p>The revised PSP nominates 'Buildings must be a minimum of two storeys in height: - along Main Street - along Gumleaf Lane within the Core sub-precinct (Figure 6) - at intersections with the Princes Highway - where offices, medical centres, leisure and recreation uses are proposed.'</p> <p>Upper storeys must be sufficient to enable appropriate uses, but do not need to extend the full depth of the ground floor.'</p> <p>Given the lack of development in the OTC and the surrounding residential areas, there is unlikely to be demand for the second-storey tenancies in the near future. A requirement to develop unviable tenancies will hinder development of the Town Centre while not achieving an economic land use outcome. It is likely that such tenancies will not be required/viable for some time.</p> <p>To ensure that the requirement does not deter development within OTC, the wording should be further revised to allow the built form to be developed to be two-storey in appearance, with functionality to accommodate stairs and a mezzanine at such a time as first-floor use is economically viable.</p>	Yes	<p>Delete: 'Guidelines that must be met' 'Buildings must be a minimum of two storeys in height: - along Main Street - along Gumleaf Lane within the Core sub-precinct (Figure 6) - at intersections with the Princes Highway - where offices, medical centres, leisure and recreation uses are proposed.'</p> <p>Upper storeys must be sufficient to enable appropriate uses, but do not need to extend the full depth of the ground floor.'</p> <p>To address this issue, Coles requests the following changes to Table 10a:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewording of the Table 10a guidelines to allow for a single storey built form fronting Siding Avenue provided it is two storeys in scale and appearance; and 2. Introducing a new guideline to Table 10a stating that single storey development fronting Main Street be designed to enable its future redevelopment to greater height. 	Built form	<p>In order to facilitate development in the Officer town centre, the VPA proposes to remove the guideline that <i>must</i> be met in relation to minimum built form heights, and reword the guideline that <i>should</i> be met as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewording of the Table 10a guidelines to allow for a single storey built form fronting Siding Avenue provided it is two storeys in scale and appearance; and 2. Introducing a new guideline to Table 10a stating that single storey development fronting Main Street be designed to enable its future redevelopment to greater height. 	VPA agrees with this outcome, waiting on Council's response.	Pending
5	HyGain Feeds Pty Ltd						
5-1	The proposed plan shows Station Street not continuing south of the railway line. It also shows Officer South Road not continuing past the Bride Road/Rix Road roundabout. Currently, all vehicles arriving and departing our Hickson Road premises use one of these two roads. Depending on when these two road closures occur, we may find ourselves without access to our premises, which would destroy our business.	Yes	The submission seeks to maintain the continuation of Station Street over the railway line following the delivery of Officer South Road.	Access	The closure of Station Street is consistent with the existing approved PSP and has not changed as part of the Officer town centre review. Station Street will not continue south of the railway line once Officer South Road has been upgraded, including rail overpass and associated interchange works at the Princes Freeway. This upgrade will provide the north-south connectivity currently provided by Station Street and along with the local road network (which is to be delivered by landowners / developers) will provide access to your site. However, even once Officer South Road is delivered, Station Street would not be closed if the local road network has not been delivered an access to Hygain's site was not possible via an alternative route.	Out of scope	Unresolved
5-2	There is a planned (but as yet unmade) road shown on the proposed plan, which connects the east end of the Officer railway station car park with Bridge Road. This would run past our eastern boundary and could join Hickson Road (east side), but that is not yet built and Mark was advised it would be up to the owner of that land to install that road. So depending on the timing of the two road closures and the building of the proposed road, we may not have access to our property we need guarantees that we will have continual access at all times.	Yes	The submission seeks DCP-funded road access to their site following the delivery of Officer South Road and the closure of Station Street.	Access	Delivery of local roads and associated traffic management measures is the responsibility of landowners / developers. Once again, Station Street will not be closed unless Hygain's site is accessible via the local road network following the delivery of Officer South Road.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
5-3	If the plan is for us to access Hickson Road via the planned road referred to in point 2 above, then this would be directing numerous heavy vehicles to a road that is diagonally opposite the Officer Secondary College and in the vicinity of the Officer Special School. This would then be mixing heavy vehicles with school traffic and school children who utilise the pathways and crossings in the area. This is not a good mix.	Yes	The submission seeks to maintain the continuation of Station Street over the railway line following the delivery of Officer South Road to avoid heavy vehicles accessing the Hygain site via Hickson Road.	Access	The planned road network caters to the long-term vision for the precinct, anticipating that existing industrial uses are unlikely to operate within a major town centre in the long-term. The VPA will however, review the road cross-sections for the local road network to ensure that they are able to accommodate vehicles that require access to Hygain's site.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
5-4	An alternative could be coming from the old highway past the Council building on Siding Avenue and then turning right into the planned (but again as yet unmade) road. However, some of the vehicles entering/departing our site may be too high for this route and again this planned road is at the discretion of the owner.	Yes	The submission seeks DCP-funded road access to their site following the delivery of Officer South Road and the closure of Station Street.	Access	Siding Avenue will be the main retail and pedestrian strip within the town centre and as such will be designed to minimise / slow traffic flows and therefore will likely not provide an appropriate route from the Princes Highway to your site. The more appropriate route would be as described in your earlier points.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
5-5	Prior to our business moving to Officer, we deliberately looked for and then purchased industrial land as we didn't want any houses near our manufacturing business because we can operate up to twenty four hours per day and up to seven days per week. The proposed plan will reclassify the zoning of the area and will allow residential houses to be built close to our site (albeit with Council approval). This means that potentially houses can be erected on land adjoining our site. So potentially people can be living next door to a manufacturing business that operates up to twenty four hours per day and up to seven day per week. My experience is that this only leads to conflict between the two parties, so why create a potential situation in the first place? It's much smarter to be proactive and get the planning correct so there are no conflicts. You may have simplified the plan too much, or put too much flexibility into it.	Yes	The submission seeks to amend Schedule 4 to the UGZ to prohibit dwellings within the noise and odour buffer.	Planning scheme ordinance	As a result of the recommendations made in the buffer assessment review commissioned by the VPA, the VPA proposes to increase the default buffer that applies to the HyGain site from 200 m to 250 m, adjusted for meteorological conditions and make sensitive uses permit required within the buffer distance.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
5-6	The fact that the proposed zoning could potentially allow for residential houses to be built adjoining a manufacturing site, then at some stage someone will try to do this. If the application is rejected, then presumably the applicant would go to VCAT. This could potentially mean Cardinia Council would waste thousands of dollars arguing the point. So again, why would you create such a situation? Don't put yourselves in such a position in the first place. Again, it's much smarter to be proactive and get the planning correct. Again, you may have simplified the plan too much, or put too much flexibility into it.	Yes	The submission seeks to amend Schedule 4 to the UGZ to prohibit dwellings within the noise and odour buffer.	Planning scheme ordinance	See response to 5-5	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved
5-7	As an existing long term business, we have existing user's rights and I believed the proposed plan infringes on those rights. We have an agreed 300 metre buffer zone around our site where no residential houses can be erected. If the proposed rezoning goes ahead, then you are effectively removing our user rights.	Yes	The submission seeks to amend Schedule 4 to the UGZ to prohibit dwellings within the noise and odour buffer.	Planning scheme ordinance	VPA is not convinced there is an agreed 300m buffer around the site. Clause 53.10 does restrict the HyGain site from expanding due to the school being within 300m of the site. Condition 12 of the 2008 permit sets restrictions on use so that the amenity of the area must not be impacted. These need to be considered now and into the future when the surrounding area starts to develop. The existing PSP also has a guideline that must be met in relation to the HyGain site (and the Transition Area as a whole) that states: Strongly discourage further expansion of existing industrial premises and Encourage conversion of existing industrial properties over time. While the business may have existing use rights, expansion and negative amenity impacts to the surrounding area are not appropriate for a town centre location (and prohibited by the planning scheme) and HyGain will need to ensure they remain operating in accordance with permits and the planning scheme.	Not agreed to make change to amendment documentation	Unresolved

Officer PSP - Amendment C232

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
13	Tract for Development Victoria						
13-1	There has been identified an instance within the PSP which prescribes use and development "must be generally in accordance with..." specific planning and design guidelines which them selves "must be met" (Page 69 of the PSP). This terminology creates some uncertainty and confusion in interpretation. The planning and design guidelines are either 'guidelines' or 'mandatory requirements', they cannot be both. The use of the terminology "must be generally" is contradictory. It either 'must be in accordance' or 'should be generally in accordance'. We submit that the VPA examine where such wording applies and act to amend the relevant terminology.	Yes	Remove confusing wording "must be generally" to specifically apply "must" only where no variation or flexibility can apply, and use "generally" or 'Should' where an objective which is sought to be met is not rigidly binding.	Other	The VPA does not see a contradiction where something 'must' be 'generally in accordance'; it means that the design response must have regard to a plan, figure, etc. but may show some variation as long as it is consistent with the intent of the plan and relevant objectives and guidelines set out in the PSP. The VPA will review Appendix A of this submission for specific examples of where additional flexibility may be required.	Further review/discussion	Resolved
13-2	The PSP contains a number of "planning and design guidelines which must be met", particularly within Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre. We submit that planning and design <u>guidelines</u> are either 'guidelines' or 'mandatory requirements', they cannot be both. Additionally, if the word 'guidelines' is replaced with 'requirements' (which is most likely how this column will be interpreted), then many of the dot points within column one become quite restrictive. As detailed within Appendix 1, we consider that items within column one of such tables, that is items which "must be met", should only be limited to implementable requirements where no flexibility should be applied.	Yes	Ensure that the direction in applying the objective and requirements is clear and unambiguous.	Planning & Design Requirement/s	The VPA was directed by the Minister of Planning to focus its review of the Officer PSP on elements relating to the town centre, and therefore it is outside the scope of this review to change the format of the document or how planning and design guidelines are to be interpreted. Direction on how planning and design guidelines should be interpreted is provided in section 4 Elements on page 35 of the PSP.	Further review/discussion	Resolved
13-3	The design principles represented within the two plans set out at Figure 6a and 6b of the PSP document are supported in principle, however we have significant concerns regarding their potential use in enforcing particular design outcomes at the permit application stage. Whilst Figure 6a was previously labelled "indicative", it is now labelled a "concept plan". Whilst Figure 6b is labelled "indicative" it is also labelled a "design solution". There is a concern that the verbatim interpretation of this language may lead to its enforcement in a literal sense, i.e. that the outcome shown within each plan is the only interpretation acceptable (and approvable). The emphasis being the use of the word "solution" (as opposed to say "objective") in an incorporated document. Some flexibility needs to be ensured to allow assessment of different land use and development responses on a case-by-case basis and against the Cardinia Planning Scheme in accordance with relevant land use controls such as zones and overlays, and State and Local Planning Policy. The current plans must be reinforced as conceptual in order to allow innovation in design, ongoing evolution of the town centre in response to different growth scenarios, and land use flexibility in a fluctuating economy. It would be deeply concerning if each of the these two plans were to be enforced literally in years to come, and thus potentially restrict investment in the OTC. We acknowledge that it <i>may</i> be the intention of the VPA to ensure these plans read as development plans for direct implementation. If this is the case, there are a number of amendments required to the proposed Figure 6a to ensure the town centre remains responsive and economically viable. <u>We respectfully request that the VPA confirm the intention of the aforementioned Figures so that DV can undertake a full urban design review and provide the appropriate level of detailed feedback, particularly in relation to Figure 6a.</u>	Yes	To assist in guidance on the effective use of the plans, a notation should be added to each plan as follows: The Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a) shows one option that generally accords with the officer Town Centre Precinct Structure Plan The Indicative Design Solution - Gum Leaf Lane SoHo (Figure 6b) shows one option that generally accords with the Officer Town Centre Precinct Structure Plan We note that the above additionally applies to the following: Figures 1- 4, 5b, 6c and 6e.	Concept plan	The intention is that Figures 1 - 4, 5b, 6a, 6b, 6c and 6e are read as indicative design responses to the relevant planning and design guidelines set out in the PSP. They are not to be interpreted literally, however applicants would be expected to show consideration for the outcomes sought in the plans and demonstrate justification that any application responds appropriately. The VPA proposes to add the following note in order to clarify the role of the aforementioned plans: <i>Note: this figure provides an indicative example of how a development application could respond to the requirements of this PSP. Alternative design responses that are consistent relevant objectives and planning and design guidelines may be considered.</i>	Requested change to amendment documentation not made, but a negotiated outcome proposed	Resolved
13-4	The OTC Concept Plan is very specific and we consider it should be reinforced as conceptual as a guide for more detailed design. It is agreed that the UDF must respond to the vision, objectives and planning and design requirements set out in the PSP. However we believe it must only 'have regard to' the OTC Concept Plan and Sub-Precinct Plan, rather than 'be responsive to'. The way dot point 1 in the proposed text at 4.3.3 (Page 84) is currently worded places equal importance on the OTC Concept Plan and Sub-Precinct Plan and the vision/objectives/design requirements and guidelines of the PSP.	Yes	We request dot point 1 is split in two as follows: - "A response to the vision, objectives and planning and design requirements set out in this PSP. - Have regard to the principles demonstrated within the Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan (Figure 6) and the Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a)."	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA supports proposed change.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
13-5	There is some concern that the numbers represented within Table 6 will be read literally. The Table previously provided no average dwelling number / hectare for land within the Officer Town Centre (Major Activity Centre). Conversely, the proposed Table appears (when read verbatim) to limit residential development to 25 dwellings per hectare on land designated 'Commercial (residential permitted)', which appears (when read verbatim) to be equivalent to medium density residential densities / outcomes. This is considered inappropriate within an area which is within close proximity to a train station, a walkable distance to key retail and anchor stores, a walkable distance to open space, and in the centre of a Major Activity Centre. In addition, Table 6 appears inconsistent with other provisions within the PSP. For example, Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre specifies that buildings along Main Street, Gum Leaf Lane, and where offices, medical centres, leisure and recreation uses are proposed, must be a minimum of two storeys in height. In accordance with the applied zone for 'Core' and 'Local Business' areas, the Commercial 1 Zone, there is no specified maximum building height in these precincts. It is unreasonable to show within Table 6 that residential development in the 'Commercial (residential permitted)' areas are to be equivalent to 'medium density housing' in density, whilst also enforcing through Table 10a that: a minimum building height of two storeys is to be achieved; there is no maximum building height; and commercial premises are to be located on ground floor. The controls do not work together to create a positive outcome.	Yes	In order to fully support the location of residential housing above retail and commercial premises, within the Core precinct in particular, the entire row within Table 6 which relates to 'Commercial (residential permitted) areas must be deleted. This will remove any ambiguity in interpretation (i.e. whether it is a guide or a maximum) and remove contradictions within the PSP. Further, the final column within Table 6 which specifies a 'total dwelling' number should also be removed. This is an estimation of the total number of dwellings based on yield and does not belong within a Guideline. Due to the potential for these numbers to be read literally, it favours developers who seek to propose residential development early, and disadvantages those which develop their land later. It is not considered that the VPA intend the Table to be read in this way. We therefore submit that this 'total dwelling' column be deleted from the Table altogether.	Housing density	The VPA proposes to include a new planning and design guideline that should be met will be added to Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre as follows: Subdivision should create lots suitable for the delivery of housing as outlined in Table 6: Housing Delivery Guide and achieve the minimum dwellings / NDA specified. Applications for subdivision that can demonstrate how target densities can be achieved over time, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, shall be considered. Additionally, The VPA now proposes that Table 6 be kept as per the 2011 document but with the commercial updated to reflect the increase in dwelling numbers anticipated in the Transition Area (around the HyGain site, now proposed to be C1Z).	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
13-6	A preliminary review of the background document "Hygain Feeds – Buffer Assessment (GHD), September 2011" shows some variation in views as demonstrated within the report as to the size of the buffer area. Development Victoria intends to undertake a detailed review of the report and provide an additional submission based on this to the VPA.	No	N/A	Noise and odour buffer	As a result of the recommendations made in the buffer assessment review commissioned by the VPA, the VPA proposes to increase the default buffer that applies to the HyGain site from 200 m to 250 m and make sensitive uses permit required within the buffer distance. What is DV stance on this?	No action required	Pending

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
13-7	<p>It is commonly understood that Greenfield development must coordinate with existing land uses and landowners in order to achieve an outcome which is of benefit to both existing and future communities. We note that the Hygain site is currently located central to the Officer Town Centre, well-situated close to the Officer Train Station and close to proposed commercial and retail precincts. There is no doubt that the location of the Hygain facility into the future will constrain the development of this activity centre.</p> <p>Development Victoria intends to undertake a detailed review of the proposed planning controls on the Hygain site to determine whether they provide the best outcome in regards to an incentive for Hygain to relocate to a more suitable location zoned for industrial land use. An additional submission based on this will be provided to the VPA.</p>	No	N/A	Noise and odour buffer	<p>The PSP creates a long-term plan for the Officer area. As such, it has to protect the existing use rights of current landowners, while allowing for the transition of land to the new preferred planning outcomes; balancing the needs of current landowners against the long-term vision for the Officer town centre. The PSP cannot compel landowners to move from the PSP area. Further, due to the large amount of land available for development within the Officer town centre, there is unlikely to be a shortage of development opportunities in the short to medium term.</p> <p>As a result of the recommendations made in the buffer assessment review commissioned by the VPA, the VPA proposes to increase the default buffer that applies to the HyGain site from 200 m to 250 m and make sensitive uses prohibited within the buffer distance. There may be some potential for applicants within the buffer distance to seek to reduce the buffer distance as detailed in GHD's review.</p>	No action required	Resolved
13-8	<p>It is understood that the DCP has been updated to remain consistent with the revised Land Budget Summary and the revised Future Urban Structure Plan within the amended PSP. As these changes are consequential and primarily based on the knowledge that more accurate cadastral mapping has been utilised in this PSP review, we have no requested changes in regard to the amended DCP.</p> <p>In principal support for the revised DCP.</p>	No	N/A	DCP	Given that we are now not proposing any changes to the land use budget, we are proposing to revert back to the original DCP.	No action required	No further action required
13-9	In the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 we note that Plan 2, which replaces Map 2, should be altered to extend to property boundaries in order to eliminate ambiguity, particularly where there are gaps between precincts. As this map is used to designate the applied zones within the Urban Growth Zone, a high level of accuracy is required, and it should be unambiguous where one precinct ends and the next begins, lining up with property boundaries where practicable.	Yes	Clearly identify property and precinct boundaries.	Planning scheme ordinance	It is noted that there are some minor discrepancies in the exhibited version of the outline of the Town Centre boundary. The VPA will correct this mapping anomaly, which will ensure that the UGZ4 applies to the correct area and so that there are no gaps between the UGZ3 area.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
13-10	In the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 there is also some concern with regards to proposed clause 2.3 which refers to the HyGain buffer when determining whether a permit is required for Accommodation, Child care centre, Education centre, Hospital, and Place of worship. Whilst we support the inclusion of these land uses within a permit trigger where noise and odour are considered adverse, we request further clarification regarding the proposed useability of this mechanism. Proposed Plan 2 does not appear clear enough in determining whether a property is within the buffer.	Yes	An accompanying solution should be proposed which better allows applicants to determine the impact on their land.	Planning scheme ordinance	Following the completion of the review of the noise and odour buffer imposed by the existing HyGain site, GIS data for the agreed buffer will be supplied to council to inform any future planning permit application decision requirements.	No action required	Resolved
13-11	In the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 under the Application Requirements it is proposed that the requirement for a Sustainability Statement is proposed to apply to the whole Officer Town Centre, rather than only certain precincts. Our view is that this is an inappropriate change, as sustainability requirements are dealt with elsewhere in the Planning Scheme and within building regulations, and there is no appropriate justification to apply additional requirements to the town centre.	Yes	This control should be removed from the PSP altogether.	Planning scheme ordinance	The current UGZ4 requires sustainability statements to be prepared for applications within commercial sub-precincts only. It seems this requirement was inadvertently applied to the whole town centre in the amended scheduled. The VPA will amend UGZ4 to require sustainability statements for applications in the gateway, core and local business sub-precincts only.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
13-12	In the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 in amending the Advertising Signs provision within the Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 the applicable sign controls applying to Mixed Use precincts have become significantly more restrictive. The amendment has seen Category 3 signage controls applied instead of Category 1 signage controls in these areas. It is recommended that the wording within the schedule to ensure Category 1 signage controls remain applicable to Mixed Use precincts. We believe this is sufficiently justified by both the need to encourage economic activity within the emerging town centre, as well as the number of commercial uses permitted within the Mixed Use Zone including office, food and drinks premises, shop (all permit not required uses), and retail premises, warehouse, industry, and leisure and recreation (all permit required uses).	Yes	Apply Category 1 sign provisions within Mixed Use precinct.	Planning scheme ordinance	Category 3 signage controls have been applied to the mixed use sub-precinct so as to be consistent with the applied mixed use zone. The intent of this review process was to simplify the planning controls that apply to the town centre, and alterations to standard zones are should be made in in exceptional circumstances only.	No action required	Resolved
13-13	The extent of the Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) mapping has been revised in accordance with recent map data is supported.	No	N/A	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
13-14	We support the updates which have been made to the Development Contributions Plan Overlay – Schedule 4 (DCPO4).	No	N/A	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
13-15	<p>Whilst application of a Parking Overlay is not necessarily opposed, it is not considered that enough information has been provided regarding the contents of Schedule 1 to the Parking Overlay in order to allow Development Victoria to form a definitive opinion.</p> <p>It is submitted that more information is required from the VPA as to the intended contents of the Parking Overlay – Schedule 1, in particular the mechanisms for collecting, managing and holding funds, the intended infrastructure to be funded, and so on. If a Parking Overlay is to be applied to the OTC, Development Victoria wishes to be certain that funds collected do not 'disappear'.</p>	TBD	TBD	Planning scheme ordinance	The introduction of the PO is to turn on the Column B rate of Clause 52.06 (Car Parking). Amendment C232 does not seek to introduce an alternative specific car parking rate for the Officer Town Centre, nor it is seeking to introduce a cash-in-lieu scheme. The application of a cash-in-lieu scheme would be the subject of a future planning scheme amendment and the submitter would have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal at that point in time.	No action required	Resolved
13-16	Other provisions of the Cardinia Planning Scheme which have been altered as a result of this Amendment (including Clause 63.01, Clause 66.04 and Clause 81.01) are considered supported.	No	N/A	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
13B	Tract on behalf of Development Victoria						
13B-1	In light of new information, and further to the original submission dated 7 May 2018, it is submitted that the applied zone proposed on and around the Hygain facility is appropriate. Further, Development Victoria is supportive of a new buffer assessment report to be commissioned by the VPA to confirm the appropriate extent of a noise buffer and an odour buffer.	No	N/A	Noise and odour buffer	See response to 13-7	No action required	No further action required
13B-2	The Urban Growth Zone – Schedule 4 (UGZ4) should be amended to incorporate a requirement for noise attenuation outcomes related to built form for the sensitive land uses listed above. This has similarly been achieved using the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 10 within the Wyndham Planning Scheme. It is considered that a similar mechanism can be retrofitted within the proposed UGZ4 based on feedback from a review of the noise impact. This requirement would also need to include appropriate application requirements and decision guidelines related to the protection of sensitive land uses from the impacts of noise generated by the Hygain Feeds facility. This solution provides definitive certainty for developers within the affected area and is considered an improved outcome.	Yes	Amend the UGZ4 to incorporate a separate requirement for noise attenuation for sensitive uses, potentially a DDO.	Noise and odour buffer	The buffer is for odour and dust, not noise (incorrectly stated in the exhibited documents). The EPA guidelines from 1990 and updated in 2013 both deal with dust and odour, not noise. Does DV has a position on the updated controls sent out as part of the Panel directed further notification?	Further review/discussion	No further action required

Submission No.	Submission	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
13B-3	<p>The odour impact area as shown within the GHD assessment report has been combined with the noise impact buffer. As each of these sources require very different mitigation measures, it is submitted that the odour buffer continue to be managed as currently proposed by the VPA (permit requirement for sensitive land uses), however with additional application requirements and decision guidelines to assist permit applicants and Council in understanding the expectations of being within the odour impact area.</p> <p>Development Victoria would be pleased to provide some example wording to the VPA and Council for comment prior to the Planning Panel in August and prior to our meeting on 10 July 2018.</p>	Yes	Amend the UGZ4 to include application requirements and decision guidelines relating odour impacts on sensitive uses within buffer distance.	Noise and odour buffer	See response to 13-7	Further review/discussion	Resolved
13B-4	<p>It is submitted that the role of the Officer Town Centre may evolve over time requiring additional opportunities for higher density residential development with good access to the core precinct, community facilities and Officer Train Station. Keeping in mind this long term vision, it is submitted that the Officer Town Centre Precinct Structure Plan 2011 (Amended 2018) should provide flexibility for Leber Reserve to be adapted either wholly or in part for the purpose of developable land into the future, subject to the approval of DELWP (which would include the provision of offsets).</p> <p>Development Victoria would be pleased to provide some example wording to the VPA and Council for comment prior to the Planning Panel in August.</p>	Yes	Amend the PSP to provide flexibility to enable reallocation of parts of Leber Reserve for high density residential development.	Conservation	<p>VPA has sought comment from the DELWP's Melbourne Strategic assessment team who advised that Leber Reserve comprises remnant native vegetation with significant biodiversity values and that as part of developing the Officer Precinct Structure Plan in 2011, a strategic precinct wide process was undertaken to ensure that future development is in accordance with the Native Vegetation Framework (native vegetation regulations for Victoria at the time). A critical part of this was ensuring that across the precinct sufficient steps are taken to avoid the removal of and minimise impacts on native vegetation. This was principally achieved through the requirement to protect native vegetation, including within the Leber Reserve.</p> <p>Consequently, in order to ensure the strategic biodiversity requirements for avoiding impacts to native vegetation in the precinct are achieved, it is important that native vegetation shown in the NVPP as native vegetation to be protected within the Leber Reserve is retained. Locating community and civic facilities in areas comprising native vegetation would not be compatible with protecting the native vegetation. Additionally, DELWP does not support plans identifying a potential for EVC's to be removed nor that DELWP approval may be sought for any change to conservation area boundaries.</p> <p>Given DELWP's advice is very definitive in relation to this issue, VPA is not able to support the inclusion of flexibility in relation to the extent of Leber Reserve in addition to that which is already allowed by the PSP under the 'generally in accordance' provision of the Urban Growth Zone.</p>	Uresolved	Unresolved

Cover pages	-	Includes VPA as a key stakeholder and updates GAA to VPA.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
Contents	No Appendix B or Appendix C	Inserts Appendix B: Officer Town Centre Urban Design Framework Guide; and Appendix C: Property Specific Land Budget	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	UDF in draft form as created by Council.	New UDF Guidelines make clear reference to flexibility, following the Practice Note, using plans/sketches and visual representations over text, and that the VPA can be a party to the UDF or an approval authority.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
Plans and Figures	Key requirements of Schedules 3 and 4 to the UGZ includes 'Urban Design Framework – Officer Town Centre'.	Key requirements of Schedules 3 and 4 to the UGZ include 'Officer Town Centre Urban Design Framework Guide'.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Table 3A: Summary Land Use Budget – New Developable Area Calculation	Rename Table 3a: Summary Land Use Budget				
	Table 3B: Summary Land Use Budget – Employment & Activity Centres Land Areas	Deletion of Table 3b and Table 3c.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Table 3C: Summary Land Use Budget – Residential Yield Estimates	Deletion of Table 4.				
	Table 4: Population Estimates by Dwelling Types	Deletion of Table 5.				
	Table 5: Image and Character Planning and Design Guidelines					
	Figure 6a: Indicative Design Solution – Core Town Centre Precinct	Rename Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Figure 6d: Indicative Design Solution – Leber Conservation Reserve	Deletion: Figure 6d.				
7	-	Updated dates.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
10	Principal Activity Centres (PACs) include:	Updates designation of all PACs to Major Activity Centres (MACs) including:				
	- Pakenham - Officer - Berwick - Casey Central - Hampton Park - Endeavour Hills	- Pakenham - Officer - Berwick - Casey Central - Hampton Park - Endeavour Hills	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
18	No distinction of Victorian Heritage Inventory Sites.	Identifies Victorian Heritage Inventory Sites on Plan 4. Includes one property outside of OTC to far west. Ref. H7921-0028 known as Hedgevale Farm Complex. Reduces extent of heritage overlays to only apply across buildings on some sites: HO104, HO102, HO103, HO105, HO262.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Heritage Overlay designation reliant on old mapping.	Updates mapping of Heritage Overlay with area. Includes: - General reduction in HO102 - HO130 as previous - General reduction in HO103 - General reduction in HO104 - General reduction in HO105 All of the above HO are outside of the OTC boundary. HO143 and HO262 remain as previous (inside OTC)	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Railway station and rail line designated.	Railway station and rail line designated using different type of line.	Support subject to: Legend needs to be updated to match new line.	Graphics and mapping	Line will be updated to be consistent in all plans.	Resolved
19	-	List of sites within the Precinct affected by Cardinia Planning Scheme Heritage Overlay, as well as those <i>proposed</i> to be included within the Heritage Overlay has been updated.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
22	-	2018 says to 'refer to Plan 5' to understand buffer generated from HyGain Feeds.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
24	3.1 Vision currently reads:	Proposed 3.1 Vision reads:				
	"A transit oriented Major Activity Centre will form the heart of the Precinct. The highly urbanised built environment will <u>incorporate leading practice, Environmentally Sustainable Design standards and provide exceptional high quality urban design and amenity.</u> Shared spaces will <u>prioritise pedestrian access over vehicle movement to contribute to safer and more active shopping streets.</u> A Neighbourhood Activity Centre and multiple Neighbourhood Convenience Centres will be located throughout the community to cater for residents' daily needs."	"A transit oriented Major Activity Centre will form the heart of the Precinct. The highly urbanised built environment will <u>create a sense of place, a distinct character with high quality and engaging urban design.</u> Shared spaces will <u>focus activity and pedestrian movement along streets creating a sense of enclosure to the public realm and concentrate access to premises from the street to create a convenient and inviting destination to shop and meet.</u> A Neighbourhood Activity Centre and multiple Neighbourhood Convenience Centres will be located throughout the community to cater for residents' daily needs."	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Designation of Princes Highway as Arterial Road.	Designation of Princes Highway has changed to solid line.	OUTSIDE OTC. Legend needs to be updated to match new line or vice versa.	Graphics and mapping	Plan to be updated to reflect consistency between legend.	Resolved
	Railway station and rail line designated.	Railway station and rail line designated using different type of line.	Support subject to: Legend needs to be updated to match new line.	Graphics and mapping	Line will be updated to be consistent in all plans.	Resolved
	CAD base of property boundaries identified clearly.	CAD base of property boundaries not as clear.	Support subject to: Map needs to more clearly show property boundaries.	Graphics and mapping	Property boundaries look the same to me. Please clarify.	No further action required
	Direction of Princes Freeway designated with arrows.	Direction of Princes Freeway not identified.	OUTSIDE OTC. Map needs to be updated to include arrows.	Graphics and mapping	Plan to be updated to include arrows.	Resolved
	Road abutting proposed arterial between Hickson Road and southern point of the park in Gilbert Land identified as Access Place.	Road abutting proposed arterial between Hickson Road and southern point of the park in Gilbert Land does not match legend.	Support subject to: Map needs to be updated.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, map to be corrected.	Resolved
	No noise and odour buffer to HyGain site.	HyGain site identified with black line and noise and odour buffer of unknown distance identified on plan.	Support subject to: Legend needs to be updated as buffer looks similar to line used for identification of PPTN. Line identifying HyGain site is not in legend.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, line to be differentiated from PPTN.	Resolved
			See Section 2.1.7 of this Submission.	Comment / supports amendment	Remove line identifying HyGain site from legend - buffer is measured from emission sources rather than site boundary	Resolved
				Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Stephens Road shown as proposed.	Stephens Road shown as existing.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Officer South Road shown as Arterial Road.	Officer South Road shown with solid line.	OUTSIDE OTC. Legend needs to be updated to match new line or vice versa.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated.	Resolved
	'Conservation Living Area' within 'other land' section of legend.	'Conservation Living Area' within 'Residential land' section of legend.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
		Clear designation between MAC Core Business (dark purple) and MAC Peripheral Commercial (striped purple).				

No designation between MAC Core Business and MAC Peripheral Commercial.



Core Business area in north-south alignment along Siding Avenue / Main Street and back one block both to east and west.
Peripheral Commercial area in two sections:
- In an east-west direction following Princes Highway between McMullen Road and Bayview Road.
- In between proposed new arterial south-west of OTC (west), the railway line (north), Bridge Road (south) and Core Business area (east).



Support

Comment / supports amendment

Noted.

No further action required

MAC Core Business designated for the majority of the OTC with little Residential Land for inclusion.

Residential Land designated:
- Along entire eastern boundary of Gilbert park including east of Station Street between Leber Reserve and edge of Peripheral Commercial area.
- Additional land designated along Gum Leaf Land (north and south) between Station Street and next Connector Street.

Support

Comment / supports amendment

Noted.

No further action required

3.2.2 states "There is an average net density of 15 dwellings per developable hectare within the Precinct."

3.2.2. states "There is an average net density of 19 dwellings per developable hectare within residential areas."

Support

Dwelling density

Noted. However, VPA notes that this text is the subject of council's submission and is currently under review.

VPA contends that the revised figure does not reflect a change in the proposed density, but reflects the actual average density set out in the PSP. VPA proposes the following rewording: 'There is an average net density of 15 dwellings per developable hectare in standard density residential areas of the precinct'. Alternatively the text could read; 'Average net residential densities are set out in Table 6 (with the exception of dwelling densities for the Officer town centre, which are minimum dwelling densities)'. (blue text is DV preference. To be discussed with Council)

Pending

3.2.2 Major Activity Centre currently states:
"The Officer Town Centre will:
- have a regional retail function with regional and sub-regional core retail anchor stores, peripheral commercial and office uses with a diversity of discretionary and higher-order goods and services;
- be a key focus of the Precinct providing residents with convenient access to office and retail developments, community facilities and jobs; and
- be an attractive, accessible, functional MAC with an urbanised environment through the delivery of higher dwelling densities within and around the Town Centre.
To ensure a high level of pedestrian activity in and around the Officer Railway Station, the station will be supported by a range of community facilities immediately adjacent to it, including the new regional library and potentially health services.
A new grade separated crossing of the railway reservation and the new Main Street will form part of the Officer Town Centre contributing to safe pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle permeability to, from and within the Town Centre. It will also assist in bus circulation to/from the Officer Railway Station and future bus interchange.
The Officer PSP envisages that Station Street will provide opportunities for a range of services, including professional/commercial, medical and personal services, in addition to service business within the Precinct. Importantly, it will complement the uses proposed for the core of the MAC and enable Station Street properties to progressively redevelop over time into more land-intensive uses."

This text has now been deleted.

Support

Comment / supports amendment

Noted.

No further action required

3.3.1 Net Developable Area states:

Proposed 3.3.1 Net Developable Area states:

Support

"The total Net Developable Area is approximately 645 hectares."

"The total Net Developable Area is approximately 650 hectares."

Extra NDA comes from more accurate mapping.

Land use budget

Noted. However, council has submitted that the original CAD data should be used for the property specific land use budget and associated tables in the PSP and DCP, to which the VPA has agreed. Further, upon reconsideration of our direction from the Minister for Planning to focus our review of the PSP on elements relating to the Officer town centre, property specific data will not be included in this amendment and Council has advised they will review the DCP in 2020.

No further action required

- 3.3.2 updates reference to Tables.

Support

Comment / supports amendment

Noted.

No further action required

Based on previous Future Urban Structure Plan. Updated to reflect proposed Future Urban Structure Plan.

Support

Comment / supports amendment

Noted.

No further action required

Land Use Budget designates areas of:
- High Density Residential A (avg. 50 dwellings/ha)
- High Density Residential B (avg. 35 dwellings/ha)

Noted. However, VPA intends to reinstate residential density types in Plan 6: Land Use Budget, Table 3a: Summary Land

	- Medium Density Residential (avg. 25 dwellings/ha) - Standard Density Residential A (avg. 15 dwellings/ha) - Environmental Residential A - Environmental Residential B - Environmental Residential C - Large Lot Residential	Land Use Budget designates Residential and deletes eight previous designations for different types of residential land density.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Dwelling density	Use Budget and include property specific residential densities in Appendix C at council's request, in recognition of the fact that residential densities are applied to specific areas within the Officer PSP, rather than to 'walkable catchments' or similar as is current VPA practice.	No further action required
	Designates between 'Conservation Reserve', 'Creek Network' and 'Drainage Easement / WSUD / Wetland / Retarding Basin'.	Renames 'Drainage Easement / WSUD / Wetland / Retarding Basin' to 'Waterway Drainage Reserve'. Removes designation for 'Creek Network' and replaces with 'Waterway Drainage Reserve'.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Designates between 'encumbered' and 'unencumbered' open space.	Changes 'encumbered open space' to 'credited open space'. Changes 'unencumbered open space' to 'uncredited open space'.	Support	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Designates between 'Active open space – District Reserve', 'Passive Open Space – District Park' and 'Passive Open Space – Local Open Space'.	Designates only between 'Local Sports Reserve' and 'Local Park'.	Support subject to: Suggest change to legend to allow improved readability, the two green colours are extremely similar and difficult to tell apart.	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP. Need to make sure colours are distinct.	Pending
	Designates between 'Railway Corridor & VicTrack Land' 'Arterial Road – 6 lanes' 'Arterial Road – 4 lanes' and 'local roads'.	Designates only between 'Public Transport Facility/Reserve' 'Widening – Arterial Road' and 'Widening – Non-arterial Road'.	Support	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Land shown for proposed arterial road stretches between Officer South Road and Princes Highway.	Land shown for proposed arterial road stretches from Officer South Road and terminates at the south-western corner of Property 188.	OUTSIDE OTC Map needs to be revised. Whilst outside of the OTC, this could potentially impact the Gilbert parkland into the future.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed. Need to clarify where the road should be indicated.	Resolved
30 – Plan 6: Land Use Budget	Stephens Road widening shown to east of current road.	Stephens Road widening shown to west of current road.	OUTSIDE OTC	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Nominates land 'Conservation Living Area'.	Changes 'Conservation Living Area' to 'Existing developed land'. No change in extent shown on map.	OUTSIDE OTC	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Shows Heritage Overlay as per 2011 mapping.	Updates HO mapping.	OUTSIDE OTC	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Identifies 'Major Easements (gas and water)'.	Changes 'Major Easements (gas and water)' to 'Utilities easements'. No change in extent shown on map.	OUTSIDE OTC	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Identifies 'Non-Government education'.	Changes 'Non-Government education' to 'Potential non-Government school'.	OUTSIDE OTC	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	-	Includes note at the bottom of plan stating "This plan should be read in conjunction with Land Budget Calculation on Page 189 of the PSP document".	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Leber Reserve shown on plan.	Leber Reserve shown slightly larger on plan.	Support subject to:	Land use budget	Noted. VPA has agreed to revert to 2011 information.	Resolved
	Land shown as Regional Open Space in south-east of PSP.	The boundary of land shown as Regional Open Space in south-east of PSP has been altered slightly.	OUTSIDE OTC	Land use budget	See above.	No further action required
	Road widening shown on north-eastern corner of intersection between Starling Road / Princes Highway.	Removes the road widening related to north-eastern corner of intersection between Starling Road / Princes Highway.	Clarification Required: Require confirmation that the road is not to extend past this point, otherwise plan required updating.	Graphics and mapping	This is a mapping error to be corrected post-exhibition.	Resolved
	Blue dashed line through linear parkland shown on plan.	No blue dashed line through linear parkland shown on plan.	Support subject to: Need to cross reference with open space plan.	Graphics and mapping	Blue line is drainage line. Not necessary to be shown on this plan.	Resolved
31 – Table 3a: Summary Land Use Budget	See existing table.	Changes across the board, significant changes include: - Total land area of Cell 1 reduced from 894.39 hectares to 871.71 hectares. - Total land area of Cell 2 (OTC) increased from 129.19 hectares to 149.08 hectares. - Reduced NDA for Cell 2 (OTC) from 88.41 hectares to 79.25 hectares. - Increase in Transport land within OTC from 1.92 hectares to 33.54 hectares. - Removal of Railway Corridor / VicTrack land (11.64 hectares) from calculations but introduction of Public Transport Facilities /Reserve (5.7 hectares) - 31 additional hectares for Community Facilities, including schools. - Removal of 'unencumbered' and 'encumbered' title over open space. - Overall the changes are a simplification of the table.	Support subject to: Clarification that this is as a result of more accurate mapping.	Land use budget	This table has been updated to reflect more accurate GIS data. In response to Council's submissions, this table will be reverted back to the original and will include the original CAD data.	Resolved
32 – Table 3b and Table 3c		Both Table 3b and 3c deleted.	Support	Land use budget	Noted. However, VPA notes that these deletions are the subject of discussion between VPA and council in response to Council's submission.	No further action required
33	3.4 Demographic Projections currently reads: "The Precinct is estimated to provide approximately 10,900 dwellings and an ultimate community of approximately 28,300 residents."	Proposed 3.4 Demographic Projections reads: "The Precinct is estimated to provide approximately 11,400 dwellings and an ultimate community of approximately 34,700 residents."	Support	Dwelling density	Noted. However, VPA notes that there was an error in these calculations, which should be 11,400 and 31,900 respectively.	Resolved
34 – Table 4: Population Estimates by Dwelling Types	Existing table specifies the expected number of dwellings, average household size and estimated population for each of the eight residential area types.	Table deleted.	Support	Dwelling density	Noted. The VPA proposes to amend Table 6: Distribution of housing densities, which incorporates the detail previously included in Table 4, as per 'PSP Table 6' tab to separate dwelling estimates for the Officer town centre from the remainder of the PSP so that is clear that the amendment makes changes to the town centre only.	Resolved
	Based on previous Future Urban Structure Plan.	Updated to reflect proposed Future Urban Structure Plan.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
36 – Plan 7:	Identifies CA08 – Character Area 8 – Officer Town Centre on plan.	Deletes reference to CA08 on plan. Introduces new CA08 reference 'Character Area 8 – Cardinia Creek' located within the south-western area of the PSP.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required

Image and Character	Identifies 'major easements'.	Changes 'major easements' to 'utilities easements'.	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Some elements of plan unclear, such as 'major drainage lines', 'Precinct Structure Plan Area' boundary.	Still unclear.	Support subject to: Recommend to VPA to improve clarity of map. Blue 'Major drainage lines' should be the top layer, not underneath the Precinct Structure Plan Area layer.	Graphics and mapping	It is not considered necessary for this plan given it relates to Image and Character, not drainage/infrastructure.	Resolved
37	Under heading Officer Town Centre, existing text reads: "The objectives for image and character for the Officer Town Centre are to: - create a high profile image, in particular to be seen as a leading example of: o Environmentally Sustainable Development (refer Element 7: Utilities, Energy & Sustainability); and, o a centre of innovative mixed use urban development in Melbourne's South East. - provide for a distinctive character through: o the provision of a highly urbanised, intensively developed, built form; o creating a contrast between the character of Officer Town Centre and surrounding neighbourhoods; and, o establishing streets with a strong urban feel."	Text removed.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
41	Describes the guidelines which must be met in relation to CA9 – Officer Town Centre.	Removes all guidelines. No requirements to be met.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
42	4.2.1 Housing Objectives currently includes 10 dot points.	Proposed 4.2.1 Housing Objectives inserts two new dot points that read as follows: - "Maximise housing diversity and density within the Officer Town Centre to take advantage of proximity to the Officer train station. - Provide a high amenity urban environment within the Officer Town Centre, including active frontages to streets, as well as public access and permeability between buildings where appropriate."	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	4.2.1 Housing Objectives sub-heading Officer Town Centre previously included a large number of objectives for the OTC.	Deletes this section.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Based on previous Future Urban Structure Plan.	Updated to reflect proposed Future Urban Structure Plan.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
43 – Plan 8: Housing	Plan 8 designates areas of: - High Density Residential A - High Density Residential B - Medium Density Residential - Standard Density Residential - Large Lot Residential - Environmental Residential A - Environmental Residential B - Environmental Residential C - Future Development Area (subject to EPBC approval)	The plan continues to reflect this and keeps all areas the same with the exception of: - Increasing the High Density Residential A land to include all residentially designated land within the OTC.	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, in response to submissions the VPA proposes to show residential land with the applied mixed use zone as 'mixed use' in Plan 8 in the interests of clarity.	No further action required
	Designation of Princes Highway and Officer South Road as Arterial Road.	Designation of Princes Highway and Officer South Road has changed to solid line.	OUTSIDE OTC. Legend needs to be updated to match new line or vice versa.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated.	Resolved
	Legend specifies land for 'existing major easements'.	Proposed legend changes 'existing major easements' to 'utilities easements'.	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	Existing plan and legend do not specify buffers.	Proposed plan and legend introduce new 'noise and odour buffer' to the HyGain site, however the HyGain site has not actually been identified on the plan.	Support subject to: VPA updating this plan to show HyGain site for clarity.	Graphics and mapping	It is not considered necessary to show the site to which the buffer applies, as it is the buffer that imposes development restrictions.	Resolved
	Existing plan and legend shows areas of 'Commercial where residential use may be permitted'.	Proposed plan and legend introduce 'Commercial (residential permitted)' and 'Commercial (residential not permitted)'. The area shown 'Commercial (residential not permitted)' is located within the Peripheral Commercial precinct in the north of the OTC.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Plan currently shows Conservation Living Area on block opposite existing Cardinia Shire Council Offices to the east of Siding Avenue.	Proposed plan shows this block as within the 'Commercial (residential permitted)' area.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
		Amended table just shows the NDA in ha, the number of dwellings per NDA, and the total number of dwellings expected for each residential area type.	Support subject to:			
44 – Table 6: Distribution of Housing Densities	Table currently shows Net Residential Hectares in ha and percentage, the number of dwellings, the average lot size, and % of dwellings across the total area for each residential area type.	It also determined an anticipated total population @ 2.8 persons per dwelling.	We seek removal of the row "Commercial (residential permitted)" from inclusion within the table. This land was not previously provided a figure for Dwellings / NDA and it is considered an unnecessary restriction which can be incorrectly interpreted as a limit of 25 dwellings per hectare (equivalent to medium density housing) within the heart of the Officer Town Centre.	Dwelling density	Refer to response to 13-5 in DVs main submission.	Resolved

		<p>The number of dwellings has increased within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High Density Residential A and B areas. - Standard Density Areas. - Large Lot Residential areas. <p>The number of dwellings has slightly decreased within:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medium Density Residential areas. - Environmental Residential Area A, B, and C areas. <p>Conservation Living Areas have stayed the same.</p> <p>Commercial (Residential Permitted Areas) have increased from 901 dwellings, to 992 dwellings. <u>A limit of 25 dwellings per hectare has been applied.</u></p>	<p>As we understand it, restricting higher density residential development within close proximity to public transport, services, and community facilities is against the intention of State Planning Policy including Plan Melbourne. In order to eliminate any possible misinterpretation we submit that this line item be removed entirely from the table and that any proposed multi-residential development application be assessed on its merits against the relevant planning controls, and not a high level number stated within a strategic planning document.</p> <p>See Section 2.1.6 of this Submission for further comments.</p>				
44 – Table 6a: Housing Type by Lot Size	No Table 6a exists.	Supported housing types are listed and their appropriateness on differing lot sizes is shown indicatively.	Support	Dwelling density	Noted. However, this is the subject of discussion between council and VPA as council have questioned the need for this table.	No further action required	
	Previously applied only to High Density Residential A & B areas.	Proposed to be applied to Commercial (Residential Permitted) areas as well as High Density Residential A & B areas.	Support subject to:	Other	VPA proposes to update Table 7 as per 'PSP Table 7' tab to ensure amended guidelines apply only to the Officer town centre and do not impact on controls on housing delivery outside the town centre. The table will no longer refer to 'Commercial (Residential Permitted), which is a distinct land use type from high density residential. VPA notes that Table 7 in the approved PSP does not include commercial areas where residential development is permitted.	Resolved	
	Guidelines that must be met covered building design, urban environment, subdivision and requirements for the small lot housing code application.	Revised Guidelines that must be met include:			It is not considered that dot point two of the 'Planning and Design Guidelines that must be met' is relevant to Commercial (residential permitted) areas.		
	Overall requirements are extensive and specific.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Safe and convenient access must be provided between car parking and bicycle areas and the pedestrian entry to residential buildings. 			It is recommended that Commercial (residential permitted) areas have a different set of guidelines than the High Density Residential A & B areas. These are two very distinct housing types with distinct purposes and different zone controls in most cases. It would be a more appropriate solution to provide separate guidelines for the two types.		
45 -Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Guidelines that should be met included a restriction on lot sizes to be no more than 230sqm, and the need to incorporate retail space and so on in the ground floor street edges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated parking solutions must be provided for residential buildings to minimise private garage access points and ensure private garage access is only be via rear or side lane. 		Built form	It is also submitted that dot point two under 'must be met' should be deleted or reworded. At present this requirement reads: "Integrated parking solutions must be provided for residential buildings to minimise private garage access points and ensure private garage access is only be via rear or side lane." The words 'must' and 'ensure' reiterate that this is a mandatory provision. As seen in Figures 2 and 3 of this report, there are numerous ways in which to achieve appropriate design outcomes which promote activation at ground level and discourage continuous garage doors along streetscapes. We consider that this requirement should be removed or reworded to allow for variation in design response. Good design outcomes can be achieved by having a combination of front and rear loaded dwellings.	VPA proposes to change the guideline to one that <i>should</i> be met as follows: <i>Vehicle access from street frontages should be minimised, for example via rear-loaded lots or consolidated vehicle crossovers.</i>	Resolved
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The subdivision of land for housing that creates a lot less than 300 square metres must contain a building envelope that is in accordance with Appendix A Small Lot Housing Code. - Shop-top residential developments must provide entrances accessed from the street." <p>Revised Guidelines that should be met include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The Officer Town Centre should deliver a higher density urban environment, including shop-top dwellings and multi storey apartments, especially within the retail core and mixed-use sub-precincts and within 400 metres of the Officer Train Station, as per the Officer Town Centre Sub-precinct Plan (Figure 6). - Residential buildings should incorporate retail spaces, cafes, restaurants or home offices in the ground floor to increase visual and physical connections between the interiors of new buildings and adjacent streets. - Subdivision design should provide for flexible floor plates and built form (including floor to ceiling heights) that can be adapted to accommodate additional storeys and a variety of uses over time." 		Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required	
	Existing text: "In addition to the objectives for activity centres, objectives specific to the Officer Town Centre (MAC) are to:	Proposed text: "The Officer Town Centre will:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a clear structure and layout, including: o a grid that is well integrated with surrounding development; o a block size that is capable of accommodating additional development; o a central north-south Main Street from Princes Highway to Rix Road, that provides the primary activity spine; o supporting east-west streets, that provide secondary spines; o a 'multiple-loop' circulation system, with several roads providing access to the retail core and its edges; o a road hierarchy and reservation widths that cater for all modes of transport; and o a structure that allows for flexibility and change over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - perform a sub-regional retail function with retail anchor stores, supporting commercial and office uses with a diversity of discretionary and higher-order goods and services; - be a key focus of the Precinct, providing residents with local access to jobs, community facilities and services; - create a sense of place with a distinct character, high quality and engaging urban design; - be an attractive, pedestrian-focused, urbanised town centre that incorporates higher dwelling densities; - support an active and lively street environment from the early morning to late evening, seven days a week; - encourage sustainable transport options by maximising housing density within a walkable catchment of the Officer train station and integrating the station into the broader town centre; and - promote adaptable land use and built form outcomes so that it can evolve with changing community needs." 	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required	

- o a defined retail core area north of the railway line as the primary location for major retail anchor stores;
 - o civic and entertainment precincts, located in proximity to the Officer Railway Station;
 - o a mixed use urban village south of the railway line; and,
 - o dedicated high density residential areas in proximity to high amenity open space, creek corridors and public transport.
- Respond to existing uses and manage change in use over time."

	Implementation list as existing.	Implementation list should include two new dot points being: - Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan - Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Proposed change: Figure 6 and Figure 6a are considered essential in guiding implementation of the Officer Town Centre principles and objectives.	PSP / DCP text change	Agreed, reference to figures 6 & 6a to be included.	Resolved
	Implementation list includes Table 8: Employment in the Precinct.	This should be removed from the implementation list.	Proposed change:	PSP / DCP text change	Disagree. This could be the case with all plans, tables, and figures included in the PSP. Table 8 provides guidance and can be used as a tool for implementing the objectives for employment in the OTC therefore VPA considers appropriate to include in the list.	Resolved
			It is considered this Table is more aspirational than directly implementable.			
	Activity Centre Boundary shown.	Deletion of Activity Centre Boundary.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
60 – Plan 9: Employment and Activity Centres	Includes reference to 'Core Business' and 'Peripheral Commercial' only.	Introduces new elements to the Core Business and Peripheral Business areas including: - Gateway Business (the Peripheral Business adjacent the Princes Highway). - Local Business (the Peripheral Business within the south-western portion of the OTC). - Mixed Use (High Density Residential A land)	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	-	Various mapping anomalies regarding legend and plan inconsistencies.	Support subject to: Resolved map inconsistencies.	Graphics and mapping	VPA will review all plans prior to finalisation of the PSP.	Resolved
61 – Table 8: Employment in the Precinct	Estimated number of jobs within all activity centres within the PSP area at 4,600 (includes Retail, other retail, and non-retail commercial). Total jobs across all sectors in PSP area: 6,555.	Estimated number of jobs within OTC only at 3,134 (including Core, Gateway and Local business). Total jobs across all sectors in PSP area: 5,805.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Existing role and function of OTC (a Major Activity Centre) is: - <u>Regional</u> and sub-regional retail role comprising Department Store and multiple Discount Department Stores.	Proposed existing role and function of OTC (a Major Activity Centre) is: - <u>Sub-regional</u> retail role comprising Department Store and multiple Discount Department Stores.	Support Assume this is based off Plan Melbourne Refresh.	PSP / DCP text change	Table 9 now identifies the town centre as playing a sub-regional rather than regional and sub-regional role, which simply brings the role of the town centre into line with the hierarchy set out in the growth corridor plan (i.e. principal town centres playing a regional role and major town centres playing a sub-regional role).	No further action required
62 – Table 9: Hierarchy of Activity Centres in the Precinct	Fourth column labelled "Role and Function".	Rename fourth column to "Objectives".	Proposed change: It's considered that the items listed within the fourth column are objectives to be met regarding the hierarchy of activity centres, rather than prescriptive requirements. The label "Role and Function" is very definitive (or at the very least can be interpreted as such) and does not allow adequate flexibility. Further, the items listed here are aspirational, not implementable. This should be repeated for each similar table within the PSP.	PSP / DCP text change	The descriptions under this column are meant to be descriptive and relatively definitive, hence the title of the column being "Role & Function" that the VPA considers appropriate.	Resolved
63 – Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres Planning and Design Guidelines	Existing Table 10 specifies guidelines which must and should be met for: - Layout and structure - Built form and massing - Public domain - Interfaces and edges to the road network - Traffic and site access - Parking - Public Transport - Signage - Site Servicing	Proposed new Table 10 removes all 'subtitles' from table. States one consolidated list of guidelines which must be met, and should be met. (see table for text)	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
66 – Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan	Plan contains seven (7) town centre precincts and seven (7) sub-precincts.	Plan contains five (5) sub-precincts (previously shown as precincts) being: - Gateway - Core - Mixed Use - Local Business - Residential Explanation of how to use the plan has been deleted. Four broad objectives for the town centre have been listed on the plan. The location of sub-precincts is almost the same as those precincts shown previously. Some precincts have been 'snapped' to roads rather than consisting of half blocks. Plan includes new Noise and Odour buffer.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required

<p>67 – Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre</p>	<p>Eight pages worth of table outlining objectives, guidelines that must be met, and guideline that should be met for the Officer Town Centre.</p> <p>One and a half pages worth of the same table – significantly reduced in size. <u>All objectives have been deleted.</u></p> <p>Changes to guidelines which must be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintains two storey minimum height limit along Main St, Gum Leaf Lane, intersections at the Princes Highway, and where offices, medical centres, leisure and recreation uses are proposed. - Zero setbacks proposed in the Core precinct if abutting public realm. - Deletes prohibitions which previously existed (e.g. 'Creation of at-grade car parks in common property is not permitted' has been deleted). - Gum Leaf Lane maximum setback of two metres. - Subdivision must provide paper roads separating development from Gilbert, Lever, and Gum Scrub creek reserves. - New guidelines for Main Street construction and tree planting. - Requirements for large format supermarkets have been deleted. <p>Changes to guidelines which should be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Now only ten (10) guidelines. - Block length should not exceed 200m - Buildings should be minimum two storeys in height. - SOHO should be provided along Gum Leaf Lane and other areas. - Small scale tenancies encouraged to create diversity. - Car parking areas should not hinder long term development opportunities. - Number of vehicle crossovers to Highway should be minimised. - Built form along Siding Ave should be continuous and should not include access to vehicle parking. - Local parks should have one road frontage and connectivity for pedestrians / cyclists. 	<p>Support subject to:</p> <p>Clarification is needed as to why the VPA has elected to change the arrangement of pedestrian pavement and tree planting arrangements along Main Street. Planning approvals have been granted for the interim and ultimate construction of Main Street by Development Victoria.</p> <p>For example, the direction that "Main Street <i>must</i> be designed for a low speed environment of 40km/h or less such that vehicles and cyclists share the carriageway and pedestrians can safely cross the road" is desirable but also somewhat problematic when considering that traffic arrangements and speeds should be dictated by the Responsible Authority for the road, and that speeds must be flexible and dependent on different road situations.</p> <p>The proposal for "Footpath widths along the Main Street, within and around the town square must be generally in accordance with relevant street cross sections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - allow universal access; - accommodate outdoor dining; and - facilitate small gathering spaces at key nodes. "is additionally confusing. This is another example of 'must be generally in accordance with' a common occurrence in this document. 	<p>Comment / supports amendment</p> <p>Built form</p> <p>Comment / supports amendment</p> <p>Comment / supports amendment</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The cross sections that apply to Siding Avenue have not changed. Additionally, changes to guidelines relating to the design and construction of Siding Avenue will not affect any existing agreements with Council.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No further action required</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>No further action required</p> <p>No further action required</p>
<p>As per existing page 67 Table.</p>	<p>There are a number of mandatory requirements within the first column which can be more appropriately be addressed through detailed design and should not form a mandatory requirement but rather a guideline. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dot point 1 - Dot point 7 - Dot point 9, sub-point 2. - Dot point 11 - Dot point 12 <p>It is requested that the above dot points are placed within column two "Planning and Design Guidelines that should be met".</p>	<p>Proposed change:</p> <p>Dot point 1 - Without knowledge on tenancies, real demands of a resident community in Officer for services and retail and recognising that town centre land uses are dynamic, mandating specific land uses in specific areas is too prescriptive.</p> <p>Dot point 7 - This is not a prescriptive requirement under the sub-points and is open to interpretation and by default functions as a guideline. It should therefore be a guideline.</p> <p>Dot point 9, sub-point 2 - The objective is fully supported however in providing active frontages and fencing, there are numerous responses that can achieve the desired effect (surveillance). This is overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Dot point 11 - It is not the role of a structure plan to determine traffic management outcomes. This forms part of a planning application in consultation with Council traffic requirements to establish ongoing traffic management mechanisms which inevitably change over time and in response to the specific built form outcome and traffic needs. While a laudable objective, which is supported, it should not be mandatory.</p> <p>Dot point 12 - This is either a guideline or a mandatory requirement, it cannot be both. The use of the terminology 'must be generally' is contradictory. It either 'must be in accordance' or 'should be generally in accordance'. Overall however, the way that this provision is drafted is that it is a guideline. The cross sections are mandatory anyway – any other requirement in this table regarding these matters is superfluous.</p>	<p>PSP / DCP text change</p> <p>Built form</p> <p>urban design</p> <p>Other</p> <p>PSP / DCP text change</p>	<p>1 - VPA proposes to amend this guideline to one that <i>should</i> be met as follows: 'Subdivision, land use and development should have regard to the proposed land uses shown in Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan.'</p> <p>Additionally, the following note will be added to Figures 6 and 6a in order to clarify the role of these plans: <i>Note: this figure provides an indicative example of how a development application could respond to the requirements of this PSP. Alternative design responses that are consistent relevant objectives and planning and design guidelines may be considered.</i></p> <p>7 - VPA proposes to revise the guideline as follows, to clarify that the sub-points are not intended to be prescriptive, providing flexibility for how applicants may address the required "strong built form edge": 'Development fronting Rix / Bridge Road must provide a strong built form edge, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - minimising building setbacks - providing active frontages - constructing buildings with a minimum or equivalent frontage height of two storeys. <p>9 - The intent is for this to be prescriptive to ensure the height does not exceed 1.5m, as this is a DELWP policy to encourage activity along reserve interfaces and discourage behaviour such as littering. It is therefore appropriate to maintain this as a "must". However, there is flexibility in how "semi-permeable" can be achieved.</p> <p>11 - Disagree. It is common for structure plans to designate the types of roads to be delivered, the designs of such can dictate what maximum speeds these roads should be. It is considered entirely appropriate that the PSP mandate the type of road, including the speed limit of such roads, as this will achieve amenity and type of environment envisaged for the area in which the road is to be delivered.</p> <p>12 - Agreed. The wording should be corrected to remove ambiguity, therefore deletion of "generally in accordance".</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p>

		Dot point 14 – we note that whilst this is as an objective supported, there is concern that rigid interpretation of this provision may compromise the ability to design high surveillance car parking and a response to public safety, particularly at night. Careful consideration of this wording needs to be applied.	Dot point 14 – We request that the requirement be reworded to ensure the correct balance of public safety, and avoided large areas of unappealing car parking.	Built form	14 - VPA proposes to amend this guideline as follows: Existing Wording "The design of off-street car parking areas must: - Be accessible from the roads carrying higher volumes of traffic to the centre. - Be screened from the public realm / street frontages through the use of built form, landscaping, façade treatments, or similar. - Have a minimum number of access crossovers and dedicated pedestrian routes." Proposed Wording "The design of off-street car parking areas must: - Be accessible from the roads carrying higher volumes of traffic to the centre. - Be screened Treat interfaces to from the public realm / street frontages to protect the visual amenity of the area whilst facilitating public safety and surveillance. This may be through the use of built form, landscaping, façade treatments, or similar. - Have a minimum number of access crossovers and dedicated pedestrian routes."	Pending
75 – Figure 6a: Indicative Design Solution – Core Town Centre Precinct	Plan consists of the Core Commercial Precinct only and specifies built form outcomes, location of public spaces, location of supermarkets, department stores and mini majors. Residential areas nominally indicated.	Plan renamed to "Officer Town Centre Concept Plan" and scope of plan widened to include the entire OTC. Plan contains a similar arrangement to the previous iteration but only nominates between Core Retail, Specialty Retail, Commercial, Entertainment, and Commercial w/Residential Above. No mention of store types and plan is drawn in a 'concept' style or 'blob' plan style. Additional areas include High Density Residential which mixes with Mixed Use – SOHO and Commercial uses to transition to the core precinct.	Support subject to: There is a concern that verbatim interpretation of this 'concept' plan may lead to its enforcement in a literal sense. I.e. that the outcome shown within the plan is the only interpretation which is an acceptable response. For example, if a transition from commercial to specialty retail uses were to occur, would this be acceptable in light of what this plan is showing? Would Council refuse an application for a permitted specialty retail land use if it happened to be located within the 'commercial' or 'entertainment' precincts? Some flexibility needs to be ensured to allow assessment of different land use and development responses on a case-by-case basis and against the Cardinia Planning Scheme in accordance with relevant land use controls. The current concept plan provides good structure, but should nevertheless be reinforced as conceptual. We consider it would be best to include a note on the plan stating the following: "The Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a) shows one option that generally accords with the Officer Town Centre Precinct Structure Plan." We note that our preference would be to delete such a plan from the PSP; however the above response is acceptable. Inclusion of this plan is otherwise not supported. See Section 2.1.4 of this Submission.	Concept plan	A concept plan is intended to provide guidance as to how the layout of the town centre and the location of various uses can be delivered. It is not prescriptive. The VPA will include a note to this effect - see response to 13-3 in DV's main submission	Resolved
76 – Figure 6b: Indicative Design Solution – Gum Leaf Lane SoHo	Existing plan nominates two rows of battle-axe style allotment layouts between Gum Leaf Lane and rear laneway access.	Plan nominates four rows of attached rear-loaded townhouses between Gum Leaf Lane and rear laneway access as well as a new Access Street.	Support subject to: Urban design responses should be informed by appropriate guidance as contained within the PSP, the PSP should not be nominating urban design outcomes to be achieved. Whilst we agree with the principles stated upon this plan (in text boxes), we consider their visual representation to will lead to comparison with any proposed permit application for subdivision and development. It must be clear that this is not how the plan is to be used. There is a concern that verbatim interpretation of this indicative design solution may lead to its enforcement in a literal sense. I.e. that the outcome shown within the design solution is the only interpretation which is an acceptable response. This is reinforced within its description as a design "solution". Whilst we appreciate that this plan is 'indicative' we consider it would be best to include a note on the plan stating the following: "The Indicative Design Solution – Gum Leaf Lane SoHo (Figure 6b) shows one option that generally accords with the Officer Town Centre Precinct Structure Plan." We note that our preference would be to delete such a design solution from the PSP; however the above response is acceptable. Inclusion of this design solution is otherwise not supported. See Section 2.1.4 of this Submission.	Concept plan	See above response	Resolved
78 – Figure 6d: Indicative Design Solution – Leber Conservation Reserve	Existing plan shows the built form arrangement which should be achieved to the south-east of the Leber Conservation Reserve.	Plan has been deleted.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
84	4.3.3a existing text: "Urban Design Frameworks An Urban Design Framework (UDF) is required for the following areas: - Officer Town Centre (MAC) in relation to all land zoned Urban Growth Zone Schedule 4; and	Proposed 4.3.3a text: "Urban Design Frameworks – <u>Officer Town Centre</u> An Urban Design Framework (UDF) must be prepared in consultation with the Responsible Authority, and approved by the Responsible Authority. The UDF applies to land within the boundary <u>show</u> in Figure 6b (Officer Town Centre Concept Plan). The UDF must address the following:	Support subject to: Typo 'show' should be 'shown'. We are hesitant to accept a UDF which responds to the Officer Town Centre Concept Plan and Sub-Precinct Plan directly. As discussed above, the OTC Concept Plan is very specific and we consider it should be reinforced as conceptual. We agree that the UDF must respond to the vision, objectives and planning and design requirements set out in the PSP.	PSP / DCP text change	Support - refer to response to 13-4 in DV main submission	Resolved

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whiteside Road Neighbourhood Activity Centre (NAC) (as per the requirements of Urban Growth Zone Schedule 3). <p>The Responsible Authority has the discretion to waive the requirement for the UDF to be prepared prior to issuing permits for development."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A response to the Officer Town Centre concept plan (Figure 6b), Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan (Figure 6) and the vision, objectives and planning and design requirements set out in this PSP Officer Town Centre Urban Design Framework Guide contained in Appendix B Any relevant design guidelines prepared by the Victorian Government and Cardinia Shire Council. <p>All to the satisfaction of the Victorian Planning Authority and Responsible Authority."</p>	<p>However we believe it must only 'have regard to' the OTC Concept Plan and Sub-Precinct Plan, rather than 'be responsive to'. The way dot point 1 is currently worded places equal importance on the OTC Concept Plan and Sub-Precinct Plan and the vision/objectives/design requirements and guidelines of the PSP.</p> <p>We therefore request dot point 1 be split in two as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A response to the vision, objectives and planning and design requirements set out in this PSP. Have regard to the principles demonstrated within the Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan (Figure 6) and the Officer Town Centre Concept Plan (Figure 6a). <p>Or similar wording giving effect to our submission.</p>			
	'Urban Design Framework – Officer Town Centre' Other text regarding the OTC UDF and specific requirements which must be met within the UDF.	This text has now been deleted as it has been summarised in the previous column.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
89 – Plan 10: Community Facilities	Under 'Open Space and Environment': 'Regional Open Space'	Designates 'Regional Open Space <u>(Parks Victoria)</u> '	Support subject to: Legend inconsistent with Land Use Budget plan.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated. VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Designates between 'public open space (unencumbered)', 'public open space (encumbered)' and District Sports Reserve (Active)'	Changes 'public open space (unencumbered)' to 'local park'. Changes 'public open space (encumbered)' to 'conservation reserve'. Changes 'district sports reserve (active)' to 'sports reserve'.	Support subject to: Legend inconsistent with Land Use Budget plan.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated. VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Designates land as 'District Parkland (Passive)	Deletes 'district parkland' from legend.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
90	Table 11: Community facilities and services	Table 11 should be prefaced with the word 'indicative' community facilities and services.	Proposed change: Community facilities Table 11 should be renamed "Indicative community facilities and services". In new communities, facilities and services require flexibility to adapt and change as required by the population and demographic. It is considered that for consistency this table should be labelled indicative.	PSP / DCP text change	This requested change is outside the scope of the review. VPA does not support the requested change	Resolved
97 – Plan 11: Open Space Network	Under 'Open Space and Environment': 'Regional Open Space – Cardinia Creek Parklands'	Designates 'Regional Open Space'	OUTSIDE OTC. Legend inconsistent with Land Use Budget plan.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated. VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Designates between 'district park (passive)', 'district sports reserve (active)', 'conservation reserve (encumbered)', 'Other encumbered open space'	Changes 'district park (passive)' to 'local park – Cardinia Creek parkland'. Changes 'public open space (encumbered)' to 'conservation reserve'. Changes 'district sports reserve (active)' to 'sports reserve'. Changes 'other encumbered open space' to 'waterway & drainage reserve'.	OUTSIDE OTC. Legend inconsistent with Land Use Budget plan.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated. VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Designates 'Gum Scrub Creek corridor' and includes note stating 'Gum Scrub Creek Corridor minimum 50m from Creek centrelines'.	Deletes 'Gum Scrub Creek corridor' and replaces with note on plan stating 'Gum Scrub Creek Corridor minimum 50m from Creek centrelines'.	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
98 – Plan 12: Integrates Water Management	Designates between 'public open space (unencumbered)', 'public open space (encumbered)', 'Regional open space (Parks Victoria)', and 'District Open Space'.	Changes 'public open space (unencumbered)' to 'local park'. Changes 'public open space (encumbered)' to 'conservation reserve'. Changes 'District Open Space' to 'sports reserve'.	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
99-100 – Table 13: Open Space Categories	Names the role, location and responsibility of open space categories which include: - Regional Open Space – Cardinia Creek Parklands. - District Parkland (passive) - District Sports Reserve (active) - Conservation Reserve (encumbered land) - Other Encumbered Land (incl. drainage & Cultural Heritage Reserves, Electricity & Gas Easements) - Local Park - Linear Open Space (encumbered and unencumbered)	Similar table with the following categories: - Regional open space (Cardinia Creek Parklands) - Local Park (Cardinia Creek Parklands) - Sports Reserve - Conservation Reserve - Waterway & Drainage - Local Park	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	'Other encumbered land' listed as the responsibility of either CSC, Melbourne Water or Private. Lists location as 'throughout the PSP area'. Lists the role as: - "To provide for overland flows and stormwater retention. - To maintain access to services, particularly those underground. - To protect and conserve sites of cultural heritage significance (where known)."	'Waterway and Drainage' listed as the responsibility of CSC, Melbourne Water, Private part Melbourne Water (encumbered), part CSC (unencumbered). Lists location as 'throughout the PSP area; Gum Scrub Creek; along drainage network'. Lists the role as: - "To provide for overland flows and stormwater retention. - To maintain access to services, particularly those underground. - To protect and conserve sites of cultural heritage significance (where known). - To serve a variety of purposes including: o drainage and/or water management; o wildlife corridors; o visual buffers; and, o movement corridors (for pedestrians, cyclists, and potentially horses where appropriate). - Includes both encumbered and unencumbered land. - At least 95% of all dwellings are to be within 1 kilometre of linear parks and trails (either along waterways, vegetation corridors and/or road reserves)."	Support	Graphics and mapping	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
102 – Table 14: Open Space Planning and Design Guidelines	See above for existing categories of open space. Lists the planning and design guidelines that must be met for each category of open space.	Uses new categories of open space. Creates a new guideline that must be met for Gum Scrub Creek Open Space Corridor which reads: "All artificial lighting must be baffled away from the Gum Scrub Creek open space corridor to prevent light spill and glare impacting fauna."	Support	Graphics and mapping Comment / supports amendment	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP. Noted.	Resolved No further action required
108 – Plan 13: Biodiversity Management	As existing.	Not sure on exact change.	Need confirmation on what has altered.	Graphics and mapping	There have been no changes to this plan.	No further action required
	Includes a number of guideline which must be met for Biodiversity including: - "Ensure building envelopes and development proposals provide setbacks from patches of native vegetation identified to be protected in the Officer NVPP to allow management access and fire buffers. - Ensure indigenous species are used exclusively in open spaces adjoining conservation areas."	Existing two dot points deleted.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required

Other guidelines also listed but not amended.						
109 – Table 15: Biodiversity Planning and Design Guidelines	-	Creates three new dot points under the heading 'Biodiversity' for guidelines that must be met: - "Subdivision designs must allow for adequate setback from Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves to separate development from areas of bushfire risk, to the satisfaction of the Country Fire Authority and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. - Development adjoining Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves must have as their primary address an interface road (which may include a 'paper' road) that allows adequate emergency service vehicle access, to the satisfaction of the Country Fire Authority and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. - Trees planted in open spaces adjoining Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves must be of local provenance."	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
111 – Plan 14: Heritage	Designates 'existing major easements'.	Changes 'existing major easements' to 'utilities easements'.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required
	-	Designates 'Victorian Heritage Inventory Site'.	OUTSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
	Existing HO extent based on old mapping.	Updates HO mapping to 2018 records.	OTUSIDE OTC.	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
116 – Plan 15: Road Network	Designates 'existing major easements'.	Changes 'existing major easements' to 'utilities easements'.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	Resolved
	Does not designate the OTC area.	Shows the OTC area with dotted line.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted.	No further action required
117 – Plan 16: Public Transport	Railway station and rail line designated.	Railway station and rail line designated using different type of line.	Support subject to: Legend needs to be updated to match new line.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, legend to be updated.	Resolved
	-	Creates a 'Potential Interim PPTN (Bus Route)' and a 'Potential Interim Local Bus Route'.	Clarification Required Has this altered so that interim bus routes can operate along interim roads?	Other	It has been amended to allow interim bus routes along Siding Ave, until such time that the ultimate bus capable routes are constructed.	Resolved
118 – Plan 17: Walking and Trails	Key Local Footpath designated between corner of Siding Ave / Railway line (north side) and the designated new community centre.	Shared path designated between corner of Siding Ave / Railway line (north side) and the designated new community centre.	Road widths for this street not in PSP cross sections. It is unclear what impact this requirement will have on road cross sections, or DV landholding. Is there now a requirement for a wider road reserve to accommodate the shared path? Note: this requires cross reference with the DCP as it appears Figure 9 of the DCP has not been updated.	Walking and cycling	This section of shared path was changed from 'key local footpath' prior to exhibition following the submission made by Transport for Victoria during agency consultation. It would be expected that a 2.5m shared path would be delivered in this section, in accordance with the shared path shown in cross section M4a.	Resolved
	Legend based on old map suite.	Legend based on proposed map suite.	Support subject to: Need to update notes in legend to refer to VPA.	Graphics and mapping	Noted, DCP Figure 9 to be updated. (not sure what this refers to?)	Pending
	Legend based on old map suite.	Legend based on proposed map suite.	Support subject to: Need to update notes in legend to refer to VPA.	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, note to be updated.	Resolved
102 – Table 14: Open Space Planning and Design Guidelines	Open Space categories based on existing categories	Open Space categories based on new categories.	Support	Comment / supports amendment	Noted. However, VPA notes that in response to council's submission, it has been agreed to reinstate land use categories as per the 2011 PSP.	No further action required

Ordinance	Clause Number	2011 Report	2018 Report	Comment	Issue category	VPA Response	Status
Schedule 4 to the Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	37.07s04	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All references to PSP updated to read "Amended March 2018" 'Maps' relabelled as 'Plans' 	<p>Support</p> <p>It appears (when accepting tracked changes) that the Future Urban Structure Plan Amended March 2018 has not been incorporated into the UGZ4, the current plan remains.</p>	<p>Comment / supports amendment</p> <p>Planning scheme ordinance</p>	<p>Will correct.</p> <p>Will correct.</p>	<p>Resolved</p>
2.1	Map 2		Plan 2	<p>Support subject to:</p> <p>Gaps between precinct boundaries as shown on Plan 2 should be eliminated to ensure ambiguity for future development applications is avoided.</p> <p>Identification of the HyGain site should be shown to provide context to the buffer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway Business precincts redesignated as Gateway Conservation Land redesignated as Open Space Urban Village redesignated as Core Transition redesignated as Local Business Noise & Odour Buffer included 'Urban Growth Zone 4 boundary' relabelled as 'Officer Town Centre Boundary' 	 <p>Planning scheme ordinance</p> <p>Planning scheme ordinance</p>	<p>Will correct.</p> <p>Will correct.</p> <p>This will be updated.</p>	<p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>Resolved</p>
2.2	Applied Zone provisions only for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation land (PCRZ) 	Applied zones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation land: Public Conservation and Resource Zone Core: Commercial 1 Zone Gateway: Commercial 2 Zone Mixed Use: Mixed Use Zone Residential: Residential Growth Zone Local Business: Commercial 1 Zone 	<p>Support subject to:</p> <p>There is inconsistent terminology between Plan 2 and the Applied Zones with respect to 'Conservation land' vs 'Open space' which needs to be rectified.</p> <p>The use of applied zones is highly supported to ensure ongoing development of the land in accordance with the existing Cardinia Planning Scheme. Use of applied zones also creates certainty and legibility by integrating future development controls better with the existing scheme controls.</p>	<p>Planning scheme ordinance</p> <p>Planning scheme ordinance</p>	<p>Will be corrected.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	
2.3	Comprehensive Table of Uses in lieu of applied zones	Old table of uses deleted and replaced as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1 Uses (permit not required) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any use listed in Clause 62.01 (must meet requirements of Clause 62.01) Section 2 Uses (permit required) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodation, Child care centre, Education centre, Hospital and Place of worship (On land where the applied zone is Commercial 1 Zone within the noise and odour buffer area surrounding the Hygain site) Section 3 uses (prohibited) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industry (except Service industry and Research and development) - in the Mixed Use precinct 	<p>Support subject to:</p> <p>It is considered that the text "Any use listed in Clause 62.01 (must meet requirements of Clause 62.01)" is superfluous given Clause 62.01 applies no matter what a zone table specifies. We request its removal.</p> <p>How will an applicant know that they are within the HyGain buffer area? Clarification on how the VPA seeks to implement and manage the identification of sites within the buffer is required.</p>	<p>Planning scheme ordinance</p> <p>Planning scheme ordinance</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>This must be included as it is in line with the Form & Content.</p> <p>There is only one buffer on the plan, it is quite clear whether a site is within this buffer that is titled "noise & odour buffer".</p>	<p>Resolved</p>	
2.4	Use of land A use must not detrimentally affect the amenity of the neighbourhood including through:	Clause deleted	Support			Noted.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ - Transport of materials or goods to or from the land. □ - Traffic generated by the use. □ - Appearance of any buildings, works or materials. □ - Emissions from the use. 		Planning scheme ordinance		No further action required
2.8 2.5	<p>Specific provisions – Modification or removal of Existing Turkeys Nest Dams A permit is required to modify or remove any existing waterbody on Lot 1 TP134961.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Incorporated into 'Specific provisions – buildings and works' clause <p>Modification or removal of Existing Turkeys Nest Dams A permit is required for buildings and works to modify or remove any existing waterbody on Lot 1 TP134961.</p>	<p>Support subject to: For clarification's sake, and to avoid misinterpretation of this change, we request the wording to be: "A permit is required for buildings and works associated with the modification or removal of any existing waterbody on Lot 1 TP134961." This ensures the permit trigger is for buildings and works only associated with modifying or removing a water body, and not buildings and works alone on Lot 1 TP134961.</p>	<p>Planning scheme ordinance</p> <p>Agreed. Will be updated to reflect this wording.</p>	Resolved
2.1	Two separate clauses regarding Urban Design Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The two clauses are amalgamated and moved under the 'Application Requirements' clause. 	<p>Support subject to:</p>		Disagree
4	2.10 Specific provisions - Requirements before a permit is granted	Urban Design Framework	<p>Alteration of wording from "an application for use and/or development on land identified <u>must be consistent with</u> any urban design framework approved under this schedule" to "an application for use and/or development on land identified <u>should be generally in accordance</u> with the urban design framework approved under this schedule".</p>	<p>Planning scheme ordinance</p>	<p>The wording in the exhibited schedule is consistent with that applied by the VPA in other PSPs requiring a UDF. The VPA notes that in wording this clause in this way, it is intended that the UDF would be drafted to include a higher degree of flexibility than if applications were to be 'generally in accordance with' the UDF. Noted.</p>
3	Urban Design Framework and 4.0 Conditions and requirements for permits – general Urban Design Framework	<p><i>Except with the consent of the responsible authority and the Victorian Planning Authority, a permit must not be granted to use or subdivide land, or construct a building and carry out works until an urban design framework for the area has been prepared to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and the Victorian Planning Authority.</i> <i>An urban design framework approved under this schedule must be generally in accordance with the precinct structure plan applying to the land.</i> <i>An application for use and/or development on land identified must be consistent with any urban design framework approved under this schedule.</i> <i>A permit may be granted to subdivide land or to construct a building or construct and carry out works prior to the approval of an urban design framework if, in the opinion of the responsible authority, the permit is consistent with the requirements for the urban design framework and the permit implements the objectives in the Officer Precinct Structure Plan.</i></p>	<p>We are highly supportive of greater involvement from the VPA in considering permits prior to the approval of a UDF.</p> <p>Comment / supports amendment</p>	Resolved	
	Responsible authority may grant permit prior to approval of an Urban Design Framework, where it is viewed to be consistent with the UDF and objectives of the	<p><i>The responsible authority may allow an urban design framework to be prepared in stages.</i> <i>The urban design framework may be amended to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and the Victorian Planning Authority.</i></p>			
2.11	Public transport referral requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Clause moved into Application Requirements clause and 'referral' deleted from title of clause 	Support	<p>Comment / supports amendment</p>	Noted.
3		Public transport referral requirements			No further action required
3.2	Residential subdivision	References to the applied zones incorporated into clause	Support	<p>Comment / supports amendment</p>	Noted.
3					No further action required
3.4	Two or more dwellings on a lot or residential buildings <i>An application to construct a building or construct or carry out works for two or more dwellings on a lot or residential buildings must provide all information required under Clause 55, unless otherwise exempt in this Schedule.</i>	Clause deleted	Support	<p>Comment / supports amendment</p>	No further action required
3.5	Sustainability statement requirements <i>An application for subdivision of 60 or more lots, or to construct a building in the areas shown as Peripheral Commercial or Core Business must be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement as set out in the Officer Precinct Structure Plan (September 2011).</i>	Sustainability statement requirements <i>An application for subdivision of 60 or more lots, or to construct a building must be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement as set out in the Officer Precinct Structure Plan (September 2011, Amended March 2018).</i>	Disagree: This change specifies that a Sustainability Statement is now required to accompany a permit to construct any building within the Officer Town Centre, rather than only buildings within the Peripheral Commercial or Core Business areas.	<p>Planning scheme ordinance</p> <p>Agreed. This will be updated so it does not apply to the whole Officer Town Centre area.</p>	Resolved
3	<i>If the responsible authority is satisfied that this requirement is not relevant to the evaluation of an application, it may waive or reduce the requirement.</i>	<i>If the responsible authority is satisfied that this requirement is not relevant to the evaluation of an application, it may waive or reduce the requirement.</i>	<p>We do not accept application of this permit required for an subdivision or development within the town centre.</p> <p>We recommend removing the trigger for a Sustainability Statement altogether. It is considered superfluous to other requirements within the planning scheme and within the building regulations.</p> <p>Note: this requirement seems like an afterthought in any case as there is a comment left on the exhibited document by VPA. We do not consider that there is sufficient evidence available to mandate this requirement to all buildings across the town centre area.</p>		
	<p>Sustainability statement requirements <i>An application for subdivision of 60 or more lots, or to construct a building in the areas shown as Peripheral Commercial Gateway or Core on Plan 2 of this Schedule Business must be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement as set out in the Officer Precinct Structure Plan (September 2011, Amended March 2018).</i> <i>If the responsible authority is satisfied that this requirement is not relevant to the evaluation of an application, it may waive or reduce the requirement.</i></p>				
4.6	Small lot housing code	Inserts references to applied zones.	Support		Noted.

	4					Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
	5	-	New clause inserted 5.0 Exemption from notice and review None specified.	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
	6	-	New clause inserted 6.0 Decision Guidelines None Specified.	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
	5 7		Advertising signs categories set out in table based on precincts. For Land shown as residential, a permit may be granted to display an advertising sign that promotes the sale of land or dwellings. The permit must specify an expiry date of 5 years from the date the permit is issued. Table deleted and replaced with: <i>Land is in the category specified in the applied zone.</i>	Support subject to: We consider that for a truly mixed use precinct, advertising signs should be assessed under Category 1 for signage, not Category 3 as per the applied zone. We therefore request wording as follows: "All land designated within the applied zone Mixed Use Zone is in Category 1. All other land is in the category specified in the applied zone."		Planning scheme ordinance	Disagree Category 3 signage controls have been applied to the mixed use sub-precinct so as to be consistent with the applied mixed use zone. The intent of this review process was to simplify the planning controls that apply to the town centre, and alterations to standard zones are should be made in in exceptional circumstances only. The intent is not to allow extensive commercial signage within the mixed use areas, therefore the VPA is of the opinion the category applicable to the applied zones are appropriate.
Schedule 4 to the Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO4)	45.09s04		All references to PSP updated to read "Amended March 2018"	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
Parking Overlay (PO)	45.09	N/A	PO introduced into scheme	Clarification required			
						Planning scheme ordinance	The introduction of the PO is to turn on the Column B rate of Clause 52.06 (Car Parking). Amendment C232 does not seek to introduce an alternative specific car parking rate for the Officer Town Centre, nor it is seeking to introduce a cash-in-lieu scheme. The application of a cash-in-lieu scheme would be the subject of a future planning scheme amendment and the submitter would have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal at that point in time.
Schedule 1 to the Parking Overlay (PO1)	45.09s01		Applies the rate in column B of Table 1 in Clause 52.06-5 Notes the PSP as a reference document	Clarification required		Planning scheme ordinance	Given the overlay applies only to the Officer Town Centre, it is appropriate to guide applicants to the PSP as this guides development within the Town Centre.
Schedule to clause 61.03 What does this scheme consist of?	61.03s	Lists the maps comprising part of the scheme	Adds map 13PO for the Parking Overlay	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
Referral Of Permit Applications Under Local Provisions	66.04s		Lists the VPA as a determining referral authority for: <i>An application to subdivide land, or construct a building or carry out works (if the application includes 1,000 square metres or more of leasable floor space) on land identified on Figure 6 in the incorporated Officer Precinct Structure Plan as 'Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan' where there <u>is</u> <u>no</u> approved Urban Design Framework in place.</i> Lists the VPA as a recommending referral authority for: <i>An application to subdivide land, or construct a building or carry out works (if the application includes 1,000 square metres or more of leasable floor space) on land identified on Figure 6 in the incorporated Officer Precinct Structure Plan as 'Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan' where there <u>is</u> an approved Urban Design Framework.</i>	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required
Table of Documents Incorporated In This Scheme	81.01s	Lists Incorporated Documents	All references to PSP updated to read "Amended March 2018"	Support		Comment / supports amendment	No further action required

14	Section	Change to the amendment requested?	Summary of requested change	Issue category	VPA response / proposed outcome	Action	Status
Officer Precinct Structure Plan							
14-1	Plans and Figures contents page	Yes	Retain the plans, tables and figures as requested in Council's submission	Other	Supported	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-2	Plan 3a: PSP areas	Yes	Update plan to include Pakenham East PSP area	Graphics and mapping	Supported	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-3	Plan 4: Precinct Features	Yes	Revise location of HO143 to be consistent with Cardinia Planning Scheme	Graphics and mapping	Supported	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-4	Buffers (page 22)	Yes	Further discussion required in relation to wording of this section. Need to clearly document and understand the statutory implications of replacing the Transition Precinct (T1, T2 & T3) with the 'Local Business' allocation which has an applied zone of Commercial 1 Zone. Should discuss what the 'buffer' actually is - in terms of measurement from what location.	PSP text change	Understand that VPA and CSC agree in principle to showing buffers on plan and the intent of the Commercial 1 zone to accommodate medium to long term transition to uses more compatible with the function of a major town centre. Sensitive uses will be permit required to protect existing use rights of current operation As a result of the recommendations made in the buffer assessment review commissioned by the VPA, the VPA proposes to increase the default buffer that applies to the HyGain site from 200 m to 250 m and make sensitive uses permit required within the buffer distance. However it is also noted that once development intensifies around the HyGain site, Condition 12 of their 2006 permit might start to be an issue. This condition requires them to not detrimentally affect the amenity of the area.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-5	2.3.10 Bushfire Risk Management Zone	Yes	Need to clearly document CFA requirements in relation to BAL (Bushfire Attack Level) rating.	PSP text change	Noted - VPA proposes to work with council and CFA to implement the outcomes of the bushfire assessment and development report so as to be consistent with the approach taken in Cardinia Creek South and Minta Farm PSPs. Might need to update Schedule 4 of UGZ to include requirements for bushfire risk management measures, as per Schedule 14 of Casey's UGZ.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-6a	Plan 5 - Future Urban Structure	Yes	New access streets interfacing open space / conservation reserves not shown on map	Graphics and mapping	Noted - VPA proposes to work with council and CFA to implement the outcomes of the bushfire assessment and development report so as to be consistent with the approach taken in Cardinia Creek South and Minta Farm PSPs.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-6b	Plan 5 - Future Urban Structure	Yes	Allocate 'mixed use' as per Plan 2 in UGZ4	Graphics and mapping	VPA supports this change.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-6c	Plan 5 - Future Urban Structure	Yes	Amend 'Bridge Road' to be consistent with movement network in legend	Graphics and mapping	Noted - Bridge Road will be updated to be shown as a 'Local Arterial / Connector Street (Boulevard)	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-6d	Plan 5 - Future Urban Structure	Yes	Not all changes listed have been included on the plan	Graphics and mapping	Subject Further information required re outstanding changes being provided VPA will amend accordingly	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-7	3.2.2 To create greater housing choice diversity and affordable houses to live	Yes	Retain original average net density of 15 dwellings per developable hectare - change is outside scope of review	Dwelling density	While the average density identified for standard residential areas is 15 dwellings / hectare, the overall average density of the precinct is higher when high and medium density areas are factored in. The proposed revised figure does not reflect a change in the proposed density, but reflects the actual average density set out in the PSP. Could reword to read: <i>There is an average net density of 15 dwellings per developable hectare in standard residential areas of the precinct, alternatively something to the effect that average net residential densities are set out in Table 6 (with the exception of dwelling densities for the Officer town centre, which are minimum dwellings / NDS).</i> Note answer to 14-10 below - table 6 to be updated.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-8	3.3.1 Net Developable Area	Yes	Further review of the property specific land use budget required to determine correct net developable area.	PSP text change	Supported - this text will be amended as required following the finalisation of the review of the property specific plan use budget. VPA agrees to revert to and incorporate the original CSC property specific land budget within the PSP	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-9	3.3.2	Yes	Retain original text referencing Tables 3b: Summary Land Use Budget - Employment and Activity Centres Land Areas and Table 3c: Summary Land Use Budget - Residential Yield Estimates - removal is outside the scope of review	PSP text change	Changes were made to improve overall clarity of the document (i.e. presenting information in single / consolidated locations) which is consistent with intent to simplify where possible. To discuss with Council regarding best approach.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-10	Plan 6: Land Use Budget	Yes	Retain original allocation of Residential densities and depict in detailed land use budget. Information on residential densities is currently obtained from the 'in-house' detailed land use budget. This information should now form part of detailed land use budget in the revised OPSP. This information is used as part of the assessment of subdivision applications.	Dwelling density	VPA agrees to revert to and incorporate the original CSC property specific land budget for the Officer town centre area only. Densities inside the township boundaries will be updated to concur with direction of current amendment. Table 6 will be revised accordingly to provide greater clarity and separate out the Major Town Centre from the balance of the precinct. The residential land is shown as a single 'residential' land use in the Land Use Budget plan to improve overall clarity of the document (i.e. presenting information in single / consolidated locations), which is consistent with intent to simplify where possible. The breakdown of different residential densities is shown in Plan 8: Housing. This approach is consistent with VPA's standard approach, including in the Pakenham East PSP.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-11	Table 3a: Summary Land Use Budget	Yes	Further review of the detailed land use budget will determine correct allocation of land uses as listed in this table	Table	Refer to response to 14-10	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-12	Table 3b: Summary Land Use Budget - Employment and Activity Centres Land Areas	Yes	Retain table - removal outside scope of review - and update following review of property specific land use budget.	Table	Refer to response to 14-9	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-13	Table 3c: Summary Land Use Budget - Residential Yield Estimates	Yes	Retain table - removal outside scope of review - and update following review of property specific land use budget.	Dwelling density	Refer to response to 14-9	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-14	3.4 Population Projections	Yes	Need to identify as being 'Amended by C232' and dwelling and population estimates updated following review of property specific land use budget.	Dwelling density	Noted.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-15	Table 4: population Estimates by Dwelling Types	Yes	Retain table - removal outside scope of review - and update following review of property specific land use budget.	Dwelling density	Revised Table 6 as discussed with CSC should address this	Further review/discussion	Resolved

14-16	Plan 7: Image and Character	Yes	Review of 'colouring' of areas within the Officer town centre and what these represent.	Graphics and mapping	These have not been changed from the original PSP.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-17	Officer Town Centre (page 37)	Yes	Delete sub-heading	PSP text change	This sub-heading has been retained to demonstrate that this section has been deleted as part of the amendment.	Further review/discussion	Unresolved - refer to panel
14-18	Officer Town Centre (page 42)	Yes	Delete sub-heading	PSP text change	This sub-heading has been retained to demonstrate that this section has been deleted as part of the amendment.	Further review/discussion	Unresolved - refer to panel
14-19a	Plan 8: Housing	Yes	Show 'mixed use' in OTC as 'mixed use' (residential permitted) - too much emphasis given to residential for this area	Graphics and mapping	VPA supports this change.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-19b	Plan 8: Housing	Yes	Need separate legend item for land within the buffer (when is residential permitted) (interim vs ultimate when Hygain goes)	Graphics and mapping	Any buffer and associated controls would remain until these were changed by a future amendment.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-20a	Table 6: distribution of Housing Densities	Yes	Retain original columns in Table 6: Distribution of Housing Densities	Dwelling density	See PSP Table 6 tab for proposed change to table format	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-20b	Table 6: distribution of Housing Densities	Yes	Update Table 6: Distribution of housing densities to: - reflect revised detailed land use budget - include a separate category for 'mixed use' (residential permitted) - include 'land within buffer'	Dwelling density	See PSP Table 6 tab for proposed change to table format	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-20c	Table 6: distribution of Housing Densities	Yes	If 'anticipated population' is to remain in this table, in order to be consistent PEPS include anticipated population of both 2.8 and 3.1 persons per dwelling.	Dwelling density	This is potentially an in / out of scope issue to be discussed	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-21	Table 6a: Housing Type by Lot Size	Yes	Need further clarification from the VPA with regard to the need/purpose of this new table.	Dwelling density	This table is typically included in VPA PSPs to provide landowners information about the type of housing product expected on different lot sizes, but is happy to remove it if council does not find it useful.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-22a	Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	High Density Residential A & B also applicable to land Whiteside AC, not just OTC.	Dwelling density	See PSP Table 7 tab for proposed change to table format which seeks to ensure that the revised guidelines apply to the Officer town centre only.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-22b	Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Residential in OTC includes Mixed Use area	Table	VPA agrees to show the mixed use area a separate residential land category in Plan 8 and restructure Table 7 as described above. The renamed 'Officer town centre' section will the apply to all residential land use types within the Officer town centre, including Mixed Use.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-22c	Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Include text re residential within the buffer	Table	Include a new guideline that <i>must</i> be met to the renamed 'Officer town centre' section of Table 7 as follows: <i>Any application for residential development within the noise and odour buffer (refer Plan 8: Housing) must respond appropriately to any potential negative amenity impacts and demonstrate adequate mitigation measures where required. (Text in the UGZ4 may be sufficient)</i>	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-23a	Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Retain the original 'must be met' regarding passive surveillance / CPTED: <i>Building design is to: - maximise ground level windows, pedestrian entrances and verandas to promote active frontages to ensure informal or passive surveillance of streets and other public open spaces; - ensure passive surveillance is provided from buildings overlooking laneways to provide a safe environment..</i>	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA proposes to reinstate this guideline, with minor amendments so as to read as a requirement that <i>must</i> be met, as follows: Building design must: - maximise ground level windows, pedestrian entrances and verandas to promote active frontages to ensure informal or passive surveillance of streets and other public open spaces; - ensure passive surveillance is provided from buildings overlooking laneways to provide a safe environment.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-23b	Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Include a new dot point for subdivision of lots less than 300 sq. m - must contain a building envelopment in accordance with the Small Lot Housing Code.	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA proposes to reinstate the following guideline that <i>must</i> be met, with minor amendments: The subdivision of land for housing that creates a lot less than 300 square metres must contain a building envelope that is in accordance with the Small Lot Housing Code in Appendix A.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-24	Figure 2: Indicative Medium Density Residential Typologies	Yes	Replace with mixed use precinct development scenarios prepared by Council	Graphics and mapping	VPA agrees to include mixed use development scenarios (or edited versions thereof) provided by council to VPA on 24 July 2017.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-25	Plan 9: Employment and Activity Centres	Yes	Review the boundary of the four sub-precincts in the OTC seems different to Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan.	Graphics and mapping	VPA agrees to review sub-precinct boundaries to ensure consistency between Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan and Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-26a	Table 8: Employment in the Precinct	Yes	No explanation given as to why this table has been revised.	Employment	Refer to response and proposed change in Table 8 tab.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-26b	Table 8: Employment in the Precinct	Yes	Review Table 8: Employment in the Precinct in line with information obtained in the revised land use budget	Graphics and mapping	It is not clear how the land use budget would affect Table 8, however the VPA is happy to work with council to review as required.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-26c	Table 8: Employment in the Precinct	Yes	Mixed Use not allocated as an 'employment' land use category in OTC	Graphics and mapping	Refer to response and proposed change in Table 8 tab.	Further review/discussion	Pending

14-27	Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres and Design Guidelines	TBC	Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres and Design Guidelines (was pg. 63 - 65) addressing (35 'musts' and 13 'shoulds'): layout and structure built form and massing public domain interfaces and edges to the road network traffic and site access parking public transport signage site servicing ** This has been replaced with a one page table (12 'musts' and 4 'shoulds'). Ensure changes have not gone beyond scope.	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA understands changes are within scope however will review and awaits council's detailed review of amended guidelines included in Table 10.	Further review/discussion	Pending
47-27a-q	Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres and Design Guidelines	TBC	This has been replaced with a one page table (12 'musts' and 4 'shoulds'). Ensure changes have not gone beyond scope.	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA understands changes are within scope however will review and awaits council's detailed review of amended guidelines included in Table 10.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-28	Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres and Design Guidelines (pp. 64-65)	Yes	Amend page numbers. Pages deleted due Table 10: Employment and Activity Centres Planning and Design Guidelines - pending discussion re Council's comment for page 63	Other	Page numbers 64 and 65 have been deleted so that content in revised PSP aligns with page numbers in original PSP. Could be addressed with a clarification note in PSP - 'Pages 64 - 65 are not used in this document to ensure consistent page numbering with Officer Precinct Structure Plan (September 2012)'	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-29a	Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan	TBC	Still require opportunity to comprehensively review to changes to permitted uses with the new allocation of sub-precincts	Planning scheme ordinance	VPA awaits council's detailed review of amended guidelines included in Table 10.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-29b	Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan	Yes	Sub-precincts need to be amended to ensure that all lots are covered	Graphics and mapping	VPA agrees to amend Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub-Precinct Plan to ensure sub-precincts align with lot boundaries and there are no gaps between sub-precincts. Council to advise which sub-precincts roads should be located in.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-29c	Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan	No	Highway Business 1 & 2 and Gateway is now defined as Gateway Mixed Use 1, 2 & 3 is now defined as Mixed Use Commercial 1 & 2 and Urban Village is now defined as Core Transition 1, 2 & 3 is now defined as Local Business Residential 1, 2 & 3 is defined as Residential	Graphics and mapping	These changes were made in consultation with council staff at workshop held at VPA offices on 4 July 2017 and subsequent communications.	No action required	No further action required
14-29d	Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan	Yes	A noise and odour buffer is now shown on this plan - further information needs to be provided in the OPSP with regard to the buffer. A new report should be commissioned to check that the 'buffer' is correct and ensure the correct statutory tools form part of this amendment.	Noise and odour buffer	Agreed - the VPA is in the process of commissioning a desktop review of the buffer assessment commissioned by VicUrban and completed in 2011, which will take into consideration planning permits granted to Hygain since this time and proposed changes to permitted land uses within the buffer area shown in the amended PSP.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-30a	Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre	TBC	8 page table with 83 'musts' and 31 'shoulds' replaced a 2 page table with 16 'musts' and 10 'shoulds'	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA awaits council's detailed review of amended guidelines included in Table 10a.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-30b	Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre	Yes	A new report should be commissioned to check that the 'buffer' is correct and ensure the correct statutory tools form part of this amendment.	Noise and odour buffer	See response to 14-4	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-30c	Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre	TBC	Table in original PSP makes reference to distance requirements that 'must be met' with regards to Lot 1 TP602076.	Planning & Design Requirement/s	This distance requirement relates to zoning within the (formerly) transition sub-precinct in order to ensure appropriate controls were applied in relation to the HyGain site. This arrangement has been replaced by the proposed applied zone and land use restrictions within the buffer area.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-31	Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre (pp. 69-75)	Yes	Amend page numbers. Pages deleted due extensive revision of Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre - pending discussion re Council's comment for page 66 & 67	Other	See response to 14-28.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-32	Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre (pp. 69-75)	TBC	Further discussion about revised planning and design guidelines required	Planning & Design Requirement/s	VPA awaits council's detailed review of amended guidelines included in Table 10a.	Further review/discussion	Pending

14-33a	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Active Frontages – inconsistent application [i.e. commercial north of Princes Hwy don't require Active Frontages but those south do but only if west of Station St, there are many other examples]	Graphics and mapping	<p>As discussed with Council the VPA proposes to remove active frontages from figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan, with this detail to be determined in the Urban Design Framework. Due to the large scale of the Officer town centre and the requirement for a UDF to be prepared, this level of detail is not appropriate in the PSP document.</p> <p>Additionally, the guideline relating to active frontages will be amended as follows: <i>Other than along Siding Avenue, non-residential built form in the Officer town centre should provide continuous ground floor active frontages to the public realm where practical, for the following uses shown in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan:</i> - specialty retail - commercial - commercial w/residential above.</p> <p><i>Where continuous ground floor active frontages are not possible, applicants should demonstrate a suitable alternative design response, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.</i></p> <p>Additionally, a new guideline that must be met that applies to Siding Avenue only will be added as follows: <i>Non-residential built form along Siding Avenue must provide continuous ground floor active frontages to the public realm, unless providing:</i> - a pedestrian link to the entrance of a use set back from the street boundary - access to upper floor uses - a vehicle access where indicated in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, a new planning and design guidelines will be added to Table 10a: Officer Major Activity Centre as follows: <i>The vehicle access point on Siding Avenue must be located where indicated in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan.</i></p> <p><i>The vehicle access point on Siding Avenue should be:</i></p>	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-33b	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Mixed Use sub precinct – suggest one colour be used for all building footprints in this precinct [use the current Mixed Use – SoHo teal colour]	Graphics and mapping	This concept was developed by council and provides guidance for the finer grain land uses that are consistent with the vision for the town centre requirements and guidelines as well as the applied zone. This is considered to be the role of the concept plan - by showing all built form within a given sub-precinct as a single colour the plan essentially becomes a zoning map.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-33c	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Commercial in Core sub precinct – suggest change to Commercial w/Residential above [Purple]	Graphics and mapping	As above.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-33d	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	All buildings footprints addressing Siding Ave [north and south of train line] except Community building footprints – suggest should be shown as Speciality Retail [cyan]	Graphics and mapping	As above.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-33e	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Transition in legend – suggest annotation be changed to Local Business	Graphics and mapping	VPA agrees to this change.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-33f	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	No road interfacing with western Local Park [Urban Park] – this does not meet requirement of Table 10a [p67] last dot point on 'should' column but note the must in the guideline 'All local parks must have at least one road frontage'	Graphics and mapping	The difficulty of providing a road frontage to this local park was discussed with council prior to exhibition. The document requires active frontages facing the open space, additionally the plan could be amended to show connection/s to surrounding road network.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-33g	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Road Network – the road layout south of Leber Reserve is inconsistent between several maps Plan 5 / Plan 8 / Figure 6 [not shown] Plan 9 / Plan 15 [shown as east west access street] Figure 6a [shown as north south access street] - this needs to be clarified.	Graphics and mapping	The VPA will review the concept plan to ensure consistency with other plans in the PSP.	Change to amendment documentation	Pending
14-33h	Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Yes	Access Streets that interface with Gilbert and Leber Reserves – while issues around the interface to the reserves is yet to be resolved please note that these specialised [and constrained] streets will require their own classification [Access Street - Level 3 ?] in mapping and a cross section developed.	Graphics and mapping	See response to 14-5	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-34a	4.3.3a Urban Design Frameworks - Officer Town Centre	Yes	The UDF applies to land within the boundary shown in Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan not Figure 6b.	PSP text change	Noted. The VPA will correct the reference accordingly.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-34b	4.3.3a Urban Design Frameworks - Officer Town Centre	Yes	Delete sub-heading 'Urban Design Framework - Officer Town Centre'	PSP text change	This sub-heading has been retained to demonstrate that this section has been deleted as part of the amendment.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-35	Plan 10: Community Facilities	Yes	Mixed use are within the OTC shown as residential, further discussion required as to how consistently depict the mixed use area	Graphics and mapping	Given the mixed-use zone falls under the residential category, this area is probably most appropriately shown as residential in Plan 10, which does not differentiate between different residential land use types. However, the VPA is happy to discuss this in more detail with council.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-36	Table 11: Community facilities and services	Yes	Need to ensure area (hectares) is consistent with the detailed land use budget and Officer DCP.	Table	Noted, the VPA will review this table to ensure land take for public uses is consistent with the property specific land use budget. Note, the VPA agrees to revert to and incorporate the original CSC property specific land budget within the PSP, which should be consistent with the areas set out in Table 11.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-37	4.3.3a Community Facilities Delivery Statement	Yes	Update reference to the Officer Development Contributions Plan.	PSP text change	Noted, the text will be updated to read ' <i>Officer Development Contributions Plan (Month 2018)</i> '.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-38	Plan 11: Open Space Networks	TBC	Update plan depending on outcome of detailed land use budget	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, Plan 11 will be updated to ensure consistency with the public land takes and land use categories in the original CSC property specific land use budget.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-39	Plan 12: Integrated Water Management	TBC	Update plan depending on outcome of detailed land use budget	Graphics and mapping	Agreed, Plan 12 will be updated to ensure consistency with the public land takes and land use categories in the original CSC property specific land use budget.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved

14-40a	Table 13: Open Space Categories	Yes	Update terminology/role in table is not clearly shown as tracked changes.	Table	Open space categories will be amended to be consistent with original CSC open space categories, to be shown in Plan 11.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-40b	Table 13: Open Space Categories	Yes	Could this section be updated to identify the CFA and DELWP referral requirement.	Table	Further clarification required as to what referral requirements are expected to be included here; this could have broader consequences beyond the town centre.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-41	Table 14: Open Space Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Update terminology/role in table is not clearly shown as tracked changes.	Table	Open space categories will be amended to be consistent with original CSC open space categories, to be shown in Plan 11.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-42	Table 14: Open Space Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Unclear of why this guideline (relating to artificial lighting along Gum Scrub Creek corridor) has been included and not specifically tracked. Have others been included?	Planning & Design Requirement/s	This was the only change to this table - the note re amendment C232 can be shown adjacent to this guideline specifically for the purposes of clarity. This change was made in response to the submission made by DELWP during agency consultation. VPA is willing to discuss in order to ensure that additional requirements have not been imposed on landowners outside the town centre.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-43	Table 15: Biodiversity Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Amended guideline requiring planting of local tree species in Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves should be clearly specified on Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Graphics and mapping	This detail is not appropriately shown in the concept plan, which deals primarily with land uses and built form. There are many guidelines that apply to the town centre that are not shown in the concept plan. This would create unnecessary duplication.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-44	Table 15: Biodiversity Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Amended guideline requiring setbacks from Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves should be clearly specified on Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Graphics and mapping	The required road interfaces will be shown in the concept plan, which reflects the appraise design response required to satisfy this guideline. These roads could potentially be identified in the legend as 'Access road / bushfire prone area setback' or similar which correlates to new/revised cross section. Setbacks should not be shown as there is an opportunity to vary these with consultation with the CFA. This level of detail should not be included in the PSP.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-45	Table 15: Biodiversity Planning and Design Guidelines	Yes	Amended guideline requiring development adjoining Gilbert, Leber and Gum Scrub Creek open space / conservation reserves to have as their primary address an interface road should be clearly specified on Figure 6a: Officer Town Centre Concept Plan	Graphics and mapping	This requirement is reflected in Figure 1: Indicative High Density Residential Typologies as well as Figure 6b: Indicative Design Solution - Gum Leaf Lane SoHo. Agree it should also be in Figure 6a. CFA has issues with Figure 6b and VPA is waiting on advice from them as to whether or not to include it.	Further review/discussion	Resolved
14-46	Plan 14: Heritage	Yes	HO143 to be consistent with Cardinia Planning Scheme Map no 13HO	Graphics and mapping	Noted, Plan 14 will be amended to accurately reflect the area covered by HO143.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-47a	Plan 15: Road Network	Yes	Further discussion required with regard to the status of Orchard Street (its entire length). Given the expected uses interfacing with Orchard Street, officers would like to review whether an access street with a 17m road reserve could be considered in place of the current 22m reservation proposed.	Graphics and mapping	VPA is willing to consider adding a note to the relevant cross section to the effect that it could be reduced to 17 m subject to council review, noting that council can reduce the cross section required of developers at the permit stage under the 'generally in accordance' provision of the UGZ schedule.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-47b	Plan 15: Road Network	Yes	Access street shown outside of the OTC may be considered to be beyond the scope of the review.	Graphics and mapping	The access street shown along the Gum Scrub Creek corridor outside the town centre was added as a response to submission made by the CFA and DELWP during agency consultation. Further, Table 15 in the current PSP requires that 'building envelopes and development proposals provide setbacks from patches of native vegetation identified to be protected in the Officer NVPP to allow management access and fire buffers ' so this change really just reflects what is currently required by the PSP. VPA is willing to consider removing the road outside the town centre in consultation with DELWP/CFA. The VPA also notes that a bushfire assessment and development report to identify the setbacks required to meet clause 13.05, which may alter the interface requirements along the Gum Scrub Creek corridor.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-47c	Plan 15: Road Network	Yes	Should also identify 'interface' road adjoining Gilbert and Leber reserves.	Graphics and mapping	Noted, however response to bushfire development assessment report to be determined.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-48	Plan 16: Public Transport	Yes	Base road layout needs to be consistent with Plan 15: Road Network 'Residential' Land colour includes open space / conservation areas - this colour is not identified as 'residential in Plan 15: Road Network.	Graphics and mapping	Plan 16 will be reviewed to ensure consistency with Plan 15.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-49	7.1 Acronyms	Yes	Include VPA, DELWP, and other updates	Table	Noted, acronym list will be updated accordingly.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
	7.1 Acronyms	Yes	Remove Planning Scheme zone acronyms that are no longer applicable and insert those now referenced	Table	Noted, acronym list will be updated accordingly.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
	7.1 Acronyms	Yes	Should the reference to GAA be updated to VPA?	Table	Reference to GAA will be updated to VPA.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-50	7.2 Glossary of Terms	Yes	Update as required	Table	Glossary will be reviewed to identify any additional terms for inclusion.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-51	7.3 References	Yes	Update as required	Table	Glossary will be reviewed to identify any additional references for inclusion.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved

14-52	Appendix C: Property Specific Land Use Budget	Yes	Amend detail land use budget as per council's email dated 30 April 2018	Table	<p>VPA agrees to reinstate the CAD property specific land use data and original land use terminology, to the property specific land use budget and all other relevant plans and tables in the PSP.</p> <p>Additionally, in response to submission 15 and 17 The VPA proposes that the Panel recommend the property specific land use budget should be removed from the amendment and replaced with a property specific land use budget for properties within the Officer town centre only.</p> <p>Our intention when including the property specific land use budget in the amended PSP was to make transparent information that was already in use by council when assessing planning permit applications. However, upon further consideration of the direction provided to the VPA by the Minister for Planning to focus our review particularly on elements relating to the Officer town centre, the VPA believes that our revised position is more in keeping with this scope.</p> <p>Should the Panel recommend complete removal of the property specific land use budget, the VPA would support council releasing the property specific land use budget as a local policy as an interim measure ahead of a review of the balance of the Officer PSP.</p> <p>Alternatively, should the Panel recommend the property specific land use budget be retained in the PSP, the VPA would not support any changes to the allocation of land uses, as any such amendments can be negotiated with Council and other relevant authorities as part of the planning permit application process under the 'generally in accordance' provision of the Urban Growth Zone</p>	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
Officer Development Contributions Plan							
14-1	Table 8: Officer Precinct DCP Land Budget Summary	Yes	Replace with original Table 8: Officer Precinct DCP Land Budget Summary (ODCP 2011)	Table	VPA agrees to reinstate original Table 8.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-2	3.1.2	Yes	Replace with: "The Standard rate applies to all land in the PSP area, except where the Differential rate applies. The Differential rate applies to the land shown as Gateway on Figure 6: Officer Town Centre Sub Precinct Plan for the following PSP Property Numbers: 11, 156 to 176, 189 to 216, 323 to 326 and 340 as identified Plan 6: Land Use Budget of the Officer Precinct Structure Plan (September 2011) (Amended March 2018)."	PSP / DCP text change	VPA agrees to make requested change in the interest of clarity.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-3	Table 9: Breakdown of NDA by DCP type	Yes	Replace with original Table 9: Breakdown of NDA by DCP rate type (ODCP 2011)	Table	VPA agrees to reinstate original Table 9.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-4	Table 10: Projected residential dwelling yield and population share	Yes	Replace with original Table 10: Projected residential dwelling yield and population share (ODCP 2011)	Table	The number of dwellings and estimated population shown in Table 10 will vary from those in the 2011 DCP due to changes to residential land use types within the town centre, made in consultation with council. See Table 6	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-5	Table 11: Demand units by land use type	Yes	Replace with original Table 11: Demand Units by Development Type (ODCP 2011)	Table	The number of dwellings will vary from those in the 2011 DCP due to changes to residential land use types within the town centre, made in consultation with council. However, the standard and differential rate areas will revert to those shown in the 2011 DCP.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-6	Table 13: Cost apportionment summary	No	No change/update required, remain as per ODCP 2011	Table	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-7	Table 16: Levies by DCP rate type	No	No change/update required, remain as per ODCP 2011	Table	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-8	4.5 Payment of levies	Yes	Update text to reflect amended OPSP	PSP / DCP text change	Noted, text will be updated to read ' <i>In relation to MAC Core Business or MAC Peripheral Commercial...</i> ' for consistency with revised PSP.	Change to amendment documentation	Pending
14-9	Appendix C: DCP Project Sheets	No	No change/update required, remain as per ODCP 2011	Table	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-10	DCP document	No	No independent review of the Officer DCP required: - there is no change proposed to the land affected by the differential rate in the OTC review - Council has requested that the VPA maintain the original OPSP land budget figures, categories, etc. - therefore the consistency between the OPSP and ODCP is maintained	Other	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
Planning scheme ordinance							
14-1	Clause 32.07 Residential Grown Zone (RGZ)	No	Insertion of RGZ into the Cardinia Planning Scheme supported	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-2a	Schedule 3 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ3)	No	Amendment to UGZ3 to reflect updated date reference of the Officer PSP and DCP supported	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-2b	Schedule 3 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ3)	Yes	Map 1 needs to be consistent with amended OPSP (has not been updated to identify new categories). Major Activity Centre colour in legend is not clear as the colour is faded to represent land within UGZ4.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agreed. Map 1 in UGZ3 will be updated to be consistent with the updated PSP.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-2c	Schedule 3 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ3)	Yes	Map 2 needs to be consistent with amended OPSP (has not been updated to identify new categories).	Planning scheme ordinance	Agreed. Map 2 in UGZ3 will be updated to be consistent with the updated PSP.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-3a	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	No	Amendment to UGZ4 to reflect changes to the Officer PSP in response to Officer Town Centre Review is generally supported.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-3b	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	Yes	Plan 1 needs to be consistent with amended PSP (has not been updated to identify new categories). Colour in legend is not clear as the colour is faded to represent land within UGZ3.	Planning scheme ordinance	Agreed. Map 2 in UGZ3 will be updated to be consistent with the updated PSP.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-3c	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	Yes	Inconsistency with Plan 2 wording and Table 1: Applied zone provisions. Conservation or open space?	Planning scheme ordinance	Agreed. These will be updated to ensure consistency.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved

14-3d	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	Yes	Plan 2 should extend to all lot boundaries to avoid confusion	Planning scheme ordinance	Agreed. The shape files of the different category of areas reflect essentially the same shape files from the current <i>Map 2</i> in UGZ4. However, it is agreed that these should extend to all lot boundaries/leave no gaps in order to avoid confusion.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-3e	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	Yes	Council seeks further discussion with regard to the list of uses where a permit can be considered for land within the noise and odour buffer. Need to be clear if any changes have been inadvertently made.	Planning scheme ordinance	The VPA will undertake a detailed review to compare the change in permit triggers between the existing controls and amended controls, with specific regard to the land within the odour and noise buffer to ensure no inadvertent uses are now as-of-right.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-3f	Schedule 4 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone (UGZ4)	Yes	Council seeks further discussion and documentation with regard to the list of 'permitted uses' in the all the applied zones in comparison to the 'permitted uses' in the original Officer PSP.	Planning scheme ordinance	As above. The VPA will undertake a detailed review to compare between the current Schedule 4 and amended Schedule 4.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-4a	Schedule 4 to Clause 45.06 Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO4)	No	Amendment to DCPO4 to reflect the date of the amended incorporated DCP is supported.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted.	No action required	No further action required
14-4b	Schedule 4 to Clause 45.06 Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO4)	Yes	Need to seek advice from Urban Enterprise (author of the Officer DCP) to ensure that the 'standard' and 'differential' rate has not been affected by the Officer Town Centre Review.	Planning scheme ordinance	VPA to undertake that request.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-5a	Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay	No	Council supports the insertion of the Parking Overlay into the Cardinia Planning Scheme.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-5b	Schedule 1 to Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay	No	The Amendments turns on Column B car parking rates in Clause 52.06 by applying a Parking overlay.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-5c	Schedule 1 to Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay	No	It is envisaged that council will prepare a Parking Precinct Plan for the town centre, which will ultimately lead to a planning scheme amendment that will facilitate a financial contribution.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-5d	Schedule 1 to Clause 45.09 Parking Overlay	Yes	Parking Overlay boundary is not consistent with the Officer town centre boundary (UGZ4 boundary).	Planning scheme ordinance	The VPA will review the PO boundary to ensure consistency with the UGZ4 boundary.	Change to amendment documentation	Resolved
14-6	Schedule to Clause 61.03	No	Amendment to the Schedule to Clause 61.03 to update the list of maps included by Amendment C232 is supported.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-7	Schedule to Clause 66.04	Yes	Council objects to the VPA being a determining authority as it is contrary to the purpose of the review, which is to simplify and streamline the approval process for applications within the Officer town centre. This provision is an additional layer in the approval process which adds more 'red tape' and delays investment.	Planning scheme ordinance	The VPA is currently reviewing its position in relation to this issue.	Further review/discussion	Pending
14-8	Schedule to Clause 81.01	No	Council supports the amendment to Schedule to Clause 81.01, which inserts the following documents: Officer PSP (Sept. 2011, Amended March 2018), Officer DCP Officer PSP (Sept. 2011, Amended March 2018)	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-9a	Planning Scheme Map No. 13	No	Council supports the amendment of Planning Scheme Map 13 to realign the boundary between the UGZ3 and UGZ4 to better reflect the town centre area.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-9b	Planning Scheme Map No. 13	Yes	Inconsistency with boundary between UGZ3 and UGZ4. At the eastern end Starling Road reserve is included in UGZ4, the proposed amendment excludes Bayview Road reserve.	Planning scheme ordinance	The VPA will review the town centre boundary to ensure consistency. Additionally, the VPA proposes to amend the boundary to align with the southern boundary 20A Tivendale Road, as requested by submission number 14.	Change to amendment documentation	Pending
14-10a	Planning Scheme Map Nos. 11LSIO and 13LSIO	No	Council supports the amendments to Planning Scheme Maps 11LSIO and 13LSIO to delete a portion of land within the amendment area from Clause 44.04 Land Subject to Inundation Overlay.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required
14-10b	Planning Scheme Map Nos. 11LSIO and 13LSIO	No	The amendment removes the LSIO from land within the Officer PSP, not just the Officer town centre, following investigation into developed areas that have been filled and no longer subject to flooding.	Planning scheme ordinance	Noted	No action required	No further action required

Table 7: Housing Planning and Design Guidelines

Issue	Planning and Design Guidelines that <i>must</i> be met
Housing density Types	
Officer Town Centre - High density residential A&B	As per Planning and Design Guidelines that <i>must</i> be met in exhibited Officer PSP March 2018, plus agreed changes
Whiteside Road Neighbourhood Activity Centre - High density residential A&B	As per Planning and Design Guidelines that must be met in current Officer PSP September 2011 for High Density Residential A & B
Balance of table as per current Officer PSP September 2011	

Planning and Design Guidelines that *should* be met

As per Planning and Design Guidelines that *must* be should in exhibited Officer PSP March 2018, plus agreed changes

As per Planning and Design Guidelines that should be met in current Officer PSP September 2011 for High Density Residential A & B

Officer Town Centre – Employment estimates

Floorspace estimates for the Officer town centre varied within the 2012 PSP and also betw completed by Urbis in 2011. The estimates provided in Table 8 (Employment in the Precin both Table 9 (Hierarchy of Activity Centres in the Precinct) and the Officer Retail Study for

Land use	2012 PSP Table 8
Retail	43,250 ¹
Other retail (inc. bulky goods)	25,000
Non-retail commercial	45,500

1. Table 8 in 2012 PSP includes 57,000 square metres of retail floor space for the Officer PSP, includi
2. Development of Stage 4 is dependent on a number factors including the performance of the town

It appears that the floorspace estimates in Table 9 if the 2012 PSP were much higher than based on the floorspace estimates in Table 9, these may have been overestimated in the f

Consequently, the floorspace estimates for the Officer town centre in the exhibited PSP w However, the VPA agrees that the previous land use types of retail, other retail and non-re that the 'local business' category should be retained as the intent for this sub-precinct has Commercial 1 Zone, which will likely result in increased development of employment uses as an employment land use category, as per council's submission and the share of home-b will be included in the sub-total.

The remainder of Table 8 will remain unchanged (with the exception of the home based b include dwellings in the Officer town centre).

The employment densities (i.e. jobs per m² or ha) are revised based on current VPA figure

Land use	Employment measure
Officer town centre (MAC)	
Retail 'shop' floorspace	Jobs per 30 m ² floor space
Other retail (including bulky goods)	Jobs per 40 m ² floor space
Non-retail commercial	Jobs per 60 m ² floor space
Mixed-use	Jobs per ha
Local business	Jobs per ha
Home based business	Jobs per dwelling
Sub-total	

ween the PSP and the Retail Assessment
ct) of the PSP were higher than those in
Stage 3 as outlined below.

Estimated floorspace		
2012 PSP Table 9	Officer Retail Study – Stage 3	Officer Retail Study – Stage 4 ²
30,000	29,000	41,000
25,000	N/A	N/A
25,000	3,000	50,000

ng 43,250 in the Officer town centre, 10,000 in the Whiteside Road neighbourhood activity centres and 3,750 across the five
centre and population levels within the trade area (see p. 30 Officer Retail Study, Urbis 2011)

other estimates. As the job estimates are
PSP, or at least their basis is unclear.

were revised to match those in Table 9.
etail commercial should be reinstated, but
s changed with the application of the
s. Additionally, 'mixed-use' will be included
based businesses located in the town centre

usiness line item, which will no longer

s on the advice of VPA's Urban Economist.

Jobs per employment measure	Anticipated land use quantity	Estimated Jobs
1/30	30,000	1,000
1/40	25,000	625
1/60	25,000	417
60	8	480
150	10	1,500
0.1	2248 (TBC)	225
		4,246

neighbourhood convenience centres