


COR1937120

Tony Marks
Acting Director – Outer Melbourne
Victorian Planning Authority
tony.marks@vpa.vic.gov.au

33 St Andrews Place
East Melbourne Victoria 3002
Telephone (03) 9637 2000
DX210083



Dear Mr Marks

Thank you for your letter providing the Victorian School Building Authority (VSBA) with the opportunity to comment on the Beveridge North West Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) included in Amendment C106mth to the Mitchell Planning Scheme.

I note that some of the feedback the Department of Education and Training (Department) has previously provided to the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) has been incorporated into the PSP document. However, there are some areas in which updates and further clarification is requested. These items are outlined in Attachment 1.

Please note that, in undertaking this assessment, the VSBA has assumed that the impact of potential hazards, such as extra high transmission lines and high-pressure gas pipelines on the proposed school sites, have been addressed appropriately during the development of the PSP and that the ultimate locations of the proposed government school sites were selected to minimise future impacts on the proposed school site.

The VSBA seeks confirmation that the sites' proximity to major hazards has been dealt with during the PSP process and that the sites, as shown, would avoid significant impacts on the VSBA in terms of the cost of building, occupational health and safety considerations, and the impact on emergency management and accessibility.

If you would like further information, please contact Ms Lidia Orsini, Principal Planner, Infrastructure and Planning, Victorian School Building Authority, on (03) 8688 7785 or by email: provision.planning@edumail.vic.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Erin Giles
Acting Director
Infrastructure and Planning
Victorian School Building Authority

7/11/2019

Attachment 1 – VSBA feedback regarding draft Beveridge North West PSP

1. The VSBA has allocated interim names to each of the five proposed government schools within the precinct. Those names are as follows:
 - Hilltops Proposed P–6 (within Northern Local Town Centre);
 - Spring Hill Proposed P–6 (within Eastern Local Town Centre);
 - Beveridge Drystone Proposed P–6 (within Southern Town Centre);
 - Beveridge Drystone Proposed 7–12 (within Southern Town Centre); and
 - Kalkallo Creek Proposed P–6 (within Western Town Centre).

Where possible in the PSP documentation, it would be preferable to refer to the proposed schools by their interim name.

2. We request that references to 'government school' and 'future government school' be changed to 'proposed government school'. Further, updates are requested in relation to any references to the P–12 government school. References to Beveridge Drystone Proposed P–12 should be changed to Beveridge Drystone Proposed P–6 and Beveridge Drystone Proposed 7–12, noting that the proposed P–6 will adjoin the community facility. It is suggested that a performance requirement be added to Table 9 'Southern Town Centre Performance Requirements & Guidelines' (page 19), requiring the Beveridge Drystone Proposed P–6 site to adjoin the community facility.
3. Plan 2, 'Precinct Features' (page 3), indicates a proposed quarry (WA1473) near Hilltops Proposed P–6. It is understood that no planning permit has been issued for the quarry, but should it receive approval, the buffer may impact the school site. Clarification is requested in relation to whether a buffer has been nominated and, if so, if it will impact the school site.
4. Section 2.1, 'Vision' (page 6), includes the statement 'Beveridge North West will be home to resilient communities who will have early access to a range of facilities, including health care, education, recreation and community infrastructure'. The VPA is requested to confirm whether this statement is aspirational or is intended to be a measurable outcome.
5. There are two references to Hilltops Proposed P–6 adjoining the landscape values interface area in Plan 5, 'Image, Character and Housing' (page 9), and in Table 2, 'Sensitive Interface Area Outcomes' (page 13). It would appear that the landscape value (shown by a dashed green line, east of the school site and south of the local indoor recreation facility) has been included in error. Can the VPA confirm whether this is the case?
6. Table 8, 'Anticipated Employment Creation within Precinct' (page 18), has included an employment measure for three proposed government primary schools and one proposed government secondary school. This is to be amended to four government primary schools.
7. Table 9, 'Southern Town Centre – Performance Requirements & Guidelines' (page 19) includes a Future Government School element. This element should be titled Proposed Government School with edits to the following dot points:
 - first dot point edited to read 'Must provide an area of 11.9ha for the provision of a proposed government primary school and a proposed government secondary school'; and
 - third dot point edited to read 'Must have a minimum of two road frontages (three preferred), with one connector road abutting the school with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement while accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement'.

(Note: The VSBA generally requests that a connector road is 25 metres wide, however, a reduced road width may be acceptable if the VPA is able to provide cross sections and traffic analysis to demonstrate a narrower width can still accommodate the outcomes as outlined in the dot point above regarding road widths).

8. Figure 4, 'Eastern Local Town Centre' (page 20), Figure 5, 'Northern Local Town Centre' (page 21), and Figure 6, 'Western Local Town Centre' (page 22), show school sites as part of the local town centre plans. The scaled plans suggest that the council community facility is included within the 3.5 hectare school parcel. While section 4.2, 'Parcel Specific Land Budget' (page 55), is correct, the VSBA requests that the document/plans need to be clear that the 3.5 hectare sites are for education purposes only. Alternatively, a note could be included, indicating that the plans are indicative only and not to scale.
9. Figure 6, 'Western Local Town Centre' (page 22), is missing a pedestrian bridge across Kalkallo Creek, which is shown in Plan 3, 'Future Urban Structure' (page 5).
10. There is an inconsistency in relation to the local access road shown in Figure 7, 'Sports Field Concept Plan (SR-01)' (page 27), and Figure 5 on page 21. The inclusion of the local access road in Figure 7 between the school and the sports reserve is incorrect and should be removed.
11. There are a number of changes requested to Section 3.3.2, 'Community Facilities and Education' (page 32):
 - Requirement R8 – Re-word requirement as follows 'Education facilities must have a minimum of two road frontages (three preferred), with one connector road abutting the school with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement while accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement.';
 - Guideline G40 – This guideline is intended to only apply to non-government schools and should be amended to include the words in bold 'Where the responsible authority is satisfied that land shown as a non-government school site is unlikely to be used for a school at ultimate development of the PSP ...'; and
 - Guideline G41 – In considering any changes to the layout of community facilities and open space, it is important that the responsible authority has regard to adjoining/nearby proposed government school sites. Can you please confirm that Guidelines G35 and G36, which deal with co-location and integration of these facilities with schools, will prevent these uses from being disconnected from school sites?

Given the Department is not a referral authority, it would also be beneficial to include a guideline within the PSP document (and possibly within this section) requesting that the Department be notified of subdivision applications that include or impact proposed government school sites.

12. In relation to Plan 10, 'Street Network' (page 37), can the VPA confirm the width of the connector street – town centre. It would be useful to include a cross section of this road type in the document. The key includes Local Access Street – Level 1 as a road type; however, the cross section at page 65 shows a Local Access Street – Level 2. Can you please confirm the road types adjoining proposed government school sites?
13. In relation to the utilities described in Plan 12, 'Utilities' (page 42), it is noted that Hilltops Proposed P-6 and Spring Hill Proposed P-6 sites are impacted by proposed sewers. Further information is sought around the impact of the sewers on the school sites. It is the VSBA's preference for the proposed government school sites to not be significantly impacted by utility easements.
14. Confirmation is sought in relation to the timeframes in the timings column of Table 4.1, 'Precinct Infrastructure Plan' (page 49). The following changes are also requested:
 - last row on page 51 - The description column states that the school is to be located in proximity to the town centre (LTC-3), while all other school sites are to be collocated with the town centre. The description of this school site should be modified to include the 'collocated with' text; and
 - row 5 on page 52 – The title should be modified from 'Government year P-12 school' to 'Government year P-6 school and Government year 7-12 school'.