

Submission to the Victorian Planning Authority for the

Lilydale Quarry Comprehensive Development Plan Amendment C193

December 2020

From:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Introduction

This submission focuses mostly on the provision of transport and the building design/orientation for the development. Some of the proposals I support, some I oppose, and others I have comments and/or questions about. These relate to the following sections of the Comprehensive Development Plan:

- 4.4 Integrated Transport
- 4.6 Built Form and Urban Design
- 4.2 Community Facilities
- 3.1 Precinct 1 - Western Neighbourhood
- 3.4 Precinct 4 - Urban Core

The proposed development will affect me personally as I live at [REDACTED], five minutes' walk from Mooroolbark Road which is on the Western edge of the Lilydale quarry site. The proposed transport facilities may result in positive and negative effects for me.

I am also interested in the proposed development in regard to the way in which buildings affect the environment and the availability of community facilities for residents.

The separation of what is required, what is desired, and marketing strategies is essential. It is disingenuous to give the impression to potential buyers that certain provisions will occur in the development when they are not set in concrete.

It is understandable that the Victorian Government is keen to fast track this project (letter to residents dated 13 November 2020 from VPA). This must not be at the expense of quality planning and decision making.

Transport

Potential future railway station:

Throughout the CDP multiple references are made to the *potential future train station*, for example p.4, p.6 and p.23, R20. The proposal of a potential future train station is a mere promise. It would appear that it is being used as a marketing strategy which is not acceptable.

Question: What are the planning considerations required for a potential future train station within such a development and at what stage are they at now?

Ideas such as a potential future train station need to be differentiated from concrete plans and be stated clearly in development applications.

Pedestrian and cycling pathways:

The proposals for pedestrian and cycle ways at 4.4 are positive suggestions. It is essential that provision for these two modes of transport are kept separate. The safety of both pedestrians and cyclists is affected by dual pathways. My own experience and reports from several other people show that there is a reluctance to walk on dual pathways due to the fear of collisions.

There is a suggestion in R17 and R18 of 4.4.1 that pathways may be shared by pedestrians and cyclists which as described above needs to be ruled out.

Building Orientation and Design

The physical orientation of buildings (residential and others) requires careful consideration. Artificial heating and cooling requirements are decreased when buildings are directly orientated to the North to allow maximum use of winter sun and summer cool.

"Good orientation, combined with other energy efficiency features, can reduce or even eliminate the need for auxiliary heating and cooling, resulting in lower energy bills, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and improved comfort. It takes account of summer and winter variations in the sun's path as well as the direction and type of winds, such as cooling breezes.

Good orientation can help reduce or even eliminate the need for auxiliary heating and cooling, resulting in lower energy bills, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and improved comfort" ***yourhome.gov.au Principles of good orientation***

The CDP aims "To deliver liveability through optimum solar performance of lots and built form...."
4.6 O29. This objective needs further detail and needs to be clearly evident in development applications.

Buildings need to work with the terrain. The street view and frontage of buildings should not allow this important environmental aspect to be ignored.

The aim to provide mixed housing densities to meet varying needs requires further explanation.

The description and planning for housing affordability and choice (executive summary 1.2) requires further detail. The distinction between housing for people on low incomes and affordable housing needs to be clear.

There is the suggestion that some buildings be up to 12 storeys as suggested for precinct 4, and up to 6 in precinct 2.

"Encourage higher density residential and/or mixed use development within 400 metres of the potential future train station, where appropriate", 4.6 G34.

Once again planning is heavily dependent on the potential future train station.

Buildings with more than one level without elevators are not accessible to people with limited mobility - even if the ground floor is. Therefore two storey buildings are inaccessible for some potential buyers/residents.

Community facilities

The Urban Core at 3.4 states that it

"...may include an education centre, community meeting spaces...."

In addition to this 4.2 R3 states that

"Unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority, at a minimum, community facilities will consist of one multi-purpose community centre to accommodate the following functions...."

These promises require firmer planning regulation and should not be left up to chance.

Likewise 4.2 R5 proposes a Government Specialist School - more details are required in regard to the planning for this.

Summary

I would support the Lilydale Quarry Comprehensive Development Plan under the altered conditions as described in this submission.

The Development has potential to provide increased amenity, however I am firm in my resolution that attention to transport arrangements, especially in regard to definite plans for the proposed train station and separate cycle/pedestrian paths be addressed.

The orientation of buildings and their design also requires more definition and definite proposals as described in this submission.

Potential buyers and residents need factual information about the future arrangements for the development.