

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
1.00	Ross Payne	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Concern raised about existing and future high levels of traffic on Mickleham Road. Mickleham Road needs to be duplicated (2 lanes in each direction) prior to any proposed developments north of the Aspect Estate.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further investigation	Pending	High
2.00	Joanne Burnett	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Objects to development commencing within Craigieburn West PSP until Craigieburn Road West, Somerton Road, Mickleham Road and Aitken Boulevard have been duplicated. At present, the submitter advises that the road network is saturated at peak hour and that the broader street network is too narrow to accommodate traffic flow and on-street car parking.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>	<p>My objection is unresolved as there is no allocated funding or timing for mickleham rd duplication. It will realistically be years away.</p> <p>The traffic resolution proposed by the developer mainly consists of providing thru roads to channel some of the traffic down to aiken blvd, somerton rd and Craigieburn rd west. Of those, only Craigieburn rd west has funding for an upgrade that is yet to physically commence. Somerton rd and Aitken blvd are single lane and already choked at peak hour.</p> <p>The Craigieburn community should not be subjected to more gridlock by allowing development to pre date the provision of adequate traffic management upgrades. It will be years of gridlock before the roads are upgraded.</p> <p>Progress is inevitable but just as we need to add extra plumbing and power for new housing, roads are the arteries of the community and we should avoid clogging them by shoving in more housing at breakneck speed. Upgrade the roads first. It's a quality of life issue.</p> <p>We don't want to waste more of our precious time in our car trying to get home to our family or trying to get to work ( many Craigieburn people work at the airport so we have to drive).</p> <p>By the way, more traffic lights do NOT make single lane queues any shorter. They do prevent accidents ( important) but they also increase travel times so saying you are going to add traffic lights or speed bumps does nothing to help travel time. Survey anyone who lives or travels along mickleham rd between somerton rd and Craigieburn rd.</p> <p>The proliferation of housing along mickleham rd in the last 5 years has massively blown out travel time and congestion in peak hours.</p>	Further investigation	Unresolved	High
3.00	Michael Velasquez	N/A	N/A	Vision	PSP Vision	Section 2.1 Vision Statement	Concern raised about the Vision's reference to "transition between the residential neighbourhood and the rural land west of Mickleham Road." The submitter utilises the scenic route via Craigieburn Road to Oaklands Road as the drive to work which contributes greatly to mental health.	N/A	<p>The PSP Vision seeks to provide a sensitive built form interface to rural land west of Mickleham Road/Urban Growth Boundary.</p> <p>The Craigieburn West PSP does not facilitate the development of land west of Mickleham Road. Mickleham Road defines the western extent of the Melbourne Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary in this general location. State Government currently has a policy of no change to the Urban Growth Boundary.</p>		No Change Required	Pending	Low
4.00	Rachael Tatf	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Concerns raised about Greenvale not receiving necessary infrastructure commensurate with new estates. The submitter believes that a Greenvale Shopping Centre at Providence and the duplication of Mickleham Road should be a priority before Craigieburn West commences.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP project does not have control over the ability to deliver town centres in other estates. The ability of the PSP to coordinate land use change is defined by the area to which it applies.</p> <p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further investigation	Pending	High
5.00	Andrew Shenouda	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Objects to the development of the Craigieburn West PSP area until Mickleham Road is duplicated. The submitter notes the existing levels of high traffic congestion and that further development in the absence of Mickleham Road being duplicated will make the situation far worse.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further investigation	Pending	High
6.00	Energy Safe Victoria	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Pipelines	N/A	ESV states that it has no direct comments on the draft PSP. ESV note that the APA's Western Outer Ring Main (WORM) project is located to the west of the PSP area. ESV recommends that the VPA notify the APA Group of the draft CWSP so that it can be appropriately considered as part of the WORM project.	N/A	<p>The APA Group was consulted as part of the Agency Validation process for the Craigieburn West PSP and have subsequently advised that Craigieburn West is outside of the project area for the WORM and that they have no interest in the Craigieburn West PSP.</p>	ESV is satisfied with the action taken and considers this action closed.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
7.00	Jessica Meli	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Concern raised about existing levels of traffic on Mickleham Road and that it will not be able to accommodate future growth. Mickleham Road needs to be widened.  Connecting Horizon Blvd with the Craigieburn West PSP will enable cars to by-pass part of Mickleham Road creating more traffic in the Aspect Estate. The submitter requests no road connection with Horizon Blvd.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	High
8.00	Nee Senevi	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	No consideration has been given to upgrading Mickleham Road given the extent of houses and schools being built in the area. Requests that Mickleham Road be duplicated before anymore houses and schools are constructed.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	High
9.00	Shaun McDougall	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Requests that Mickleham Road be duplicated up to Donnybrook Road and that the Craigieburn West PSP will push Mickleham Road beyond its capacity.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	High
10.01	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Land Use Budget Plan / Place Based Plan	Plan 3 - Land Use Budget Plan / Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The submitter states Plan 3 and Plan 4 do not include any information about active or public transport.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	<p>The purpose of Plan 3 and Plan 4 is to show the breakdown of land use ownership within the PSP area and the overall future urban structure. Matters relating to the future transport network are indicated in Plan 5 - Transport Plan.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
10.02	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Street Design	Section 3.1. Housing, subdivision & built form R3	The submitter requests that bike lanes and/or shared path connections surrounding main routes and from schools be included within Requirement 3.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	<p>The Road hierarchy and Standard street cross-sections for the local street network will determine the appropriate level of bike lane/shared path connection required. Level 1 access streets are not designed with bike lanes, due to the low speed environment of local streets. Additionally, the linear park network supplements the opportunity for off-road cycling and other active transport modes.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
10.03	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Subdivision Design	Section 3.1. Housing, subdivision & built form G6	The submitter requests Guideline 6 be changed to increase the width of a 'paper road' from 1.5m to 3m to accommodate the shared path requirements.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	<p>This is a standard guideline. It should be noted that the reference to 1.5m is a minimum width. It is within Council's discretion to require a greater width of paper roads. The detailed design is confirmed at subdivision stage. Paper roads provide local access and are in addition to the active transport network designed to provide general accessibility around the PSP.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
10.04	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Transport Plan	Plan 5- Transport Plan	The submitter requests Plan 5- Transport Plan to include the detailed design of walking routes or on-road bicycle infrastructure	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	<p>The intent of Plan 5 is to show the road hierarchy within the PSP area. Its role is not to show the detailed design of off road routes as this will be a matter for future subdivision design stages.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
10.05	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Open Space	Section 3.1. Housing, subdivision & built form G8	The submitter requests Guideline 8 to include two further points: 1. "Be accessible to safe walking and cycling routes" and 2. "Be within easy walking distance of at least one public green open space"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	<p>Point 1 is generally covered by dot point 2 of G8 and Point 2 is generally addressed by layout of local parks as it meets the test of 95% of households within 400m walk of public open space. The location of local parks is guided by the PSP Guidelines which this benchmark.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
10.06	Fred Fenley	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Bicycle Infrastructure	N/A	Given the PSP does not include Requirements or Guidelines about on-road bicycle infrastructure, the submitter requests that on-road physically protected bicycle lanes should be provided on all major roads and on local streets where direct routes are identified.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	<p>The CWPPSP (Section 4.5) provides a suite of street cross sections that represent the road hierarchy to be delivered within the precinct. A number of street cross sections, including Boulevards, Connector Streets and Local Access Streets, provide dedicated bicycle lanes or shared paths. The provision off-road bicycle lanes provides a greater degree of separation thus creating a safer movement corridor for cyclists.</p>		No Change Required	No further action required	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part 1

\*Assign each unresolved submission a category

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
11.01	Kay Mitchell	Aitken College	1, 2	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	N/A	Concerns about the lack of certainty around funding and delivery of upgrades to Mickleham Road. Until the Department of Transport provides certainty around the upgrade of Mickleham Road, the PSP should be deferred. Opposes the CWSP until such a point in time as these matters are resolved.	N/A	<p>Mickleham Road has an ultimate street cross section that will comprise a six-lane arterial road. The upgrade of Mickleham Road will be commensurate with the ongoing development of the broader growth corridor and as funding is received for its planning, detailed design and construction.</p> <p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamare Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	High
12.01	Tod Mackay	N/A	N/A	Other	State Infrastructure	N/A	A parallel suburban rail line should be developed providing stations at Sunshine North (Mcintyre Road), Kellor East (somewhere between Kellor Park Drive and Fullarton Road) Tullamarine (Sharps Road) branching off to service Attwood, Greenvale, Craigieburn West, Mickleham and Donnybrook West.	N/A	The provision of rail infrastructure is outside of the ambit of the PSP.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
13.01	EPA	N/A	N/A	Land Capability	Potentially Contaminated Land		Supports the requirements and conditions of UG212 about requirements of the Preliminary Site Investigation to provide a determination as to whether the environmental condition of the land is suitable for the proposed use/s or whether an environmental audit is required.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	<p>agree.</p> <p><b>VPA have updated UG212 as outlined below.</b></p> <p>VPA to update the Preliminary Site Investigation application requirement in UG212 to read as follows:</p> <p>For an application to use or subdivide land or construct a building or construct or carry out works for a sensitive use (residential use, child care centre, pre-school centre or primary school) and ranked as 'Moderate' Potential for Contamination and described in Table 2 must be accompanied by a Preliminary Site Investigation of the land prepared by a suitably qualified environmental professional to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, which takes into account the report titled 'Craigieburn West Precinct Structure Plan Preliminary Land Contamination Assessment' (Landserv Environment, December 2018).</p> <p>The Preliminary Site Investigation should be prepared in accordance with Schedule 82 of the:</p> <p>§ National Environment Protection (Assessment of Site Contamination) Measure 1999 (as amended 2013) (NEPM); and</p> <p>§ Provide a determination as to whether the environmental condition of the land is suitable for the proposed use/s or whether an environmental audit of the land is recommended having regard to the Potentially Contaminated Land General Practice Note June 2005, DSE.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>Address Legal Description</p> <p>1880 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 1 TP423679L</p> <p>1800 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 1 TP551293N</p> <p>685 Mt Ridley Road, Mickleham Lot 3 PS301908S</p> <p>1780 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 1 PS736443K</p> <p>1800 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 2 PS736443K</p> <p>1760 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 2 PS301908S</p> <p>1720 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 1 LP97698</p> <p>1690 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 1 PS445746M</p> <p>901 Mickleham Road, Mickleham Lot 2 PS445746M</p>	The Preliminary Land Contamination Assessment prepared by Landserv includes a classification for some properties as having a "Low-Moderate" risk ranking. This is different to PPN30, which refers to the potential for contamination as being "Low" or "Medium", and which typically forms part of EPA's advice and vocabulary.	Change Required	Pending	Low
13.02	EPA	N/A	N/A	Land Capability	Potentially Contaminated Land		Recommendations under section 10 of the Land Contamination Background Report are inconsistent with the proposed planning controls in UG212. The Background Report recommends a further Detailed Site Investigation if the Preliminary Site Investigation identifies contamination. Further investigation set out in the Background Report (i.e. DSI) represents another step in the assessment of potentially contaminated land and is intended to inform whether an audit is required.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	<p>21/1/2021</p> <p>EPA are referring to the VPA Background Summary Report. This report incorrectly identifies the preparation of a DSI, should the PSI not be sufficient. However, this is not the approach proposed under UG212. UG212 requires the preparation of a PSI which will either determine if the land is suitable for the proposed use or whether an environment audit is required. The Background Summary Report should be updated to delete reference to the preparation of the DSI.</p> <p><b>Updated Background summary report to delete reference to the DSI.</b></p>	The potential for contamination at these properties is not considered "Low" in the context of PPN30. For example, please refer to Property 7, which is ranked as having a low-moderate potential for contamination, however we note that the presence of imported fill material carries a "Medium" potential for contamination under PPN30. The risk in limiting the drafted planning control to only "moderate" ranked sites is that you overlook potential contamination on the sites with imported fill and ranked low	Change Required	Pending	Low
13.03	EPA	N/A	N/A	Land Capability	Sodic Soils	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management / UG212	Supports the inclusion of R10 and G28 and G29 in relation to the management of sodic soils and also, application requirements contained in UG212.	N/A	Noted.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.01	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Vision/Mickleham Road Interface	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision and built form/UG212	The Vision Statement and Requirement 4 of the PSP are unclear insofar as the ultimate treatment to the urban/rural interface at Mickleham Road.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	<p>Agree with Mickleham Road Cross-section interface being included in the PSP.</p> <p><b>Update PSP updated to include Mickleham Road Cross Section Interface (as per Lindum Vale PSP) as a Figure within the PSP document.</b></p>	Resolved.	Change Required	Pending	Low
14.02	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Mickleham Road Interface	Section 2.3 Objectives	Add wording to Objective 01: Housing, subdivision and built form: "Sensitive built form to the rural interface west of Mickleham Road"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	This is considered to be addressed by the inclusion of and reference to the Mickleham Road Interface Cross Section as outlined above (Submission Line Item 14.01).		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.03	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade	Section 2.3 Objectives	Add an additional objective, Objective 09 as follows: "Support and work with the Department of Transport to ensure development of the Precinct occurs in line with the upgrade and duplication of Mickleham Road from Donnybrook Road to Somerton Road."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The requested objective is included within Objective 2 and 8.		No Change Required	Resolved	High
14.04	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Transport Plan	Plan 5 - Transport Plan	Plan 5 Transport Plan (legend) needs to be amended to remove the T intersections along Mickleham Road north of Craigieburn Road and replaced with Signalised T intersection as per the supporting background Traffic Assessment Report.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	<p>Agree. Minor change to Plan 5 add the word "signalised" to "T Intersection" (i.e. Signalised T intersection) in the plan 5 legend</p> <p><b>Plan 5 updated to reference "Signalised T Intersection" in Legend.</b></p>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.05	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Public Transport	Section 3.2 Transport & Movement	Given the reliance on Mickleham Road to have high frequency bus service and bus stops within convenient walking distance of households, the PSP needs to be developed in line with the roads future upgrade.	N/A	<p>The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).</p> <p>DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.</p> <p>The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.</p> <p>The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamare Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.</p> <p>Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.</p>		No Change Required	Resolved	High

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
14.06	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Utility discrepancies		A Utilities Plan has not been prepared for inclusion in the PSP. It is noted that there is discrepancy between the Service Report prepared by Taylors and what is shown in the PSP in so far as the reference to lot numbers and the location of assets therein.	N/A	The servicing report is a Stage 1 background study and uses high level assumptions regarding developable area and dwelling yield. The estimated number of lots associated with the development of the PSP is based on a number of assumptions for strategic planning purposes. The number of actual lots developed and the location and extent of service infrastructure required to support development is determined at the subdivision stage. The delivery of service infrastructure is typically required as a condition on the planning permit for subdivision.  The differences between the Stage 1 background studies and dwelling numbers estimated in the Craigieburn West PSP are within an acceptable variable range and will not impact on the supply of utility services.	Resolved. My intention was to just draw attention to the discrepancy in property/parcel identification numbers between the PSP map and the utilities plan in the Taylors report, for example property 28 on the CWSPS is identified as property 27 on Taylors utilities map.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.07	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Utility discrepancies	Section 3.3.2 Utilities G34	Guideline G34 refers to Appendix 4.6 – should be Appendix 4.7.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree.  <b>G34 Updated to reference Appendix 4.7.</b>	Resolved	Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.08	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Local Parks	Local Park (LP-09) Concept Plan	The concept plan is showing too much information. There is also a safety concern in relation to the type of trees and the high level of activity proposed within this local park. Consider removing some of the elements including wild walk path and nature play equipment.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	This is a concept plan only with detail of the park finalised at design stage. Trees shown are existing trees retained for amenity value. The "Wild Walk" and Nature play equipment are appropriate for location and the increased activity will increase surveillance and security.	Unresolved. I am addressing this now as no further community consultation about this will occur. The concept plan is included within the draft planning scheme amendment as an incorporated document, as is. There is a lack of information about how the concept plan design elements can be achieved. I imagine there would have to be, a significant modification to the native vegetation to create safe multiple pathways through the park as proposed. I would think hundreds of trees and understorey would have to be removed to facilitate this design.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
14.09	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Other	Inclusion of Place in PSP	Plan 9 - Heritage and Public Realm Plan	Plan 9 should be updated to include the Place of Worship at Lot 20 (1540 Mickleham Road).	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree.  Additional purple asterisks on Plan 9 to be shown at 1540 Mickleham Road as well as 1550 Mickleham Road (two Places of Worship).  <b>Plan 9 to be Updated as outlined.</b>	Further action required. The asterisk on Plan 9 should remain at property/parcel 19 (1550 Mickleham Road) as this is a current place of worship and a new planning application was lodged on 4-1-21 to substantially increase the intensity of this use and development. An additional asterisk should be placed at property/parcel 20 (1540 Mickleham Road) as this place of worship has an approved planning application but is yet to be built.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
14.10	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Trees	Section 3.5 Biodiversity, vegetation and landscape character	Confirmation is requested in relation to the retention of the trees along Mickleham Road (Ave of Honour).	N/A	The Mickleham Road reserve sits outside the PSP. The ongoing management of the Avenue of Honour and the road reserve is the joint responsibility of the City of Hume and Department of Transport.  Any trees referenced as "to be removed" that are within the Mickleham Road Reserve will be removed from Plan 10.  <b>Plan 10 to be updated to remove trees located outside of the PSP boundary (i.e. those within Mickleham Road reserve).</b>		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.11	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Trees	Plan 10 Biodiversity and Vegetation Plan	The VPA previously advised that Conservation Area 29 would be subject to review to provide a better outcome but this is not reflected in the PSP. What is the status of this proposal?	N/A	Conservation Area 29 has been reviewed by Council & the landowner, and a realignment is considered a good outcome for the conservation values of the BCS. The proposal is with Hume City Council, who will submit the proposal to the Commonwealth Govt via the DELWP-MSA for approval.  The timing of the decision of the Commonwealth is beyond the scope of the PSP.  Information regarding the proposed BCS realignment can be found within Hume City Council's submission (Submitter 17).	Unresolved. The realignment proposes a better outcome but there is no supporting evidence provided to support this. It appears that the only way I can view supporting evidence is when it is referred to the Commonwealth Environment Department EPBC notices.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
14.12	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre	Draft PSP Document	Section 3.7.1 Town centres R36	There is an error in R36. Reference therein to table 5 should be table 6 and table 6 should be table 7.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree.  <b>R36 Updated to reflect correct Table numbers.</b>	Resolved	Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.13	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre	Town Centre Concept Plan	Section 4.3 Craigieburn West Local Town Centre design principles	Section 4.3 Principle 4 refers to a Local Town Centre Concept Plan but the PSP does not include one.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Noted. As part of the PSP 2.0 process for the preparation of PSPs, the VPA has moved away from the preparation of concept plans for local town centres.  <b>Section 4.3 Principle 4 has been amended to remove reference to a Local Town Centre Concept Plan.</b>	Resolved	Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.14	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre	Mixed Uses		The Mixed Use area is very close to the environmental values of Aitken Creek. How will the impacts of uses such as Service Stations on the Creek be managed.	N/A	Development within the Mixed Use areas will be subject to Planning Permits (for Use and/or Building & Works), which will assess the impacts on the surrounding area, including the creek corridor.	Resolved	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
14.15	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Road Capacity		Given the extent of the population and likely vehicle movements in the PSP area, does the main connector road around the Town Centre have capacity for this increase.	N/A	The connector street network has been designed and tested to ensure capacity within the network. The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (November 2020), available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the precinct.  The OneMileGrid report demonstrates that the projected vehicle volumes are within the accepted order of magnitude for the proposed road hierarchy and are considered appropriate.	Further information required. As discussed on 17th March, I was advised that the Traffic Assessment Report was being updated to reflect the increase in vehicle movements. One Mile Grid had analysed the Traffic Impact Assessment on 6153 lots = 55,377 vehicle movements per day but the PSP proposes 8,300 lots = 74,700 vmpd which is an increase of approx. 35%. Hume Council has put forward a solution to distribute the increase in vehicle movements out onto Mickleham Road but this creates other issues, yet I can understand why they have proposed this.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
14.16	Janet Remington	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Precinct Infrastructure Delivery	Section 3.8.1 Subdivision Works	There is an error in R39. The last dot point refers to Table 4, this should be Table 5.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Noted.  <b>R39 updated to reflect Table 5 instead of Table 4.</b>	Resolved	Change Required	Resolved	Low
15.01	Tom Grantham - Satterley	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Greenvale Reservoir		Full development of CWSPS and the protection of the Greenvale Reservoir can only occur if the SPG landholding, as identified on Plan 4 as the 'Greenvale North Investigating Area', is rezoned to enable residential development, thereby providing the mechanism that facilitates the construction of a bund on the southern boundary of the SPG land. The bund would ultimately redirect overland flow away from the reservoir.	N/A	The VPA note that the VPA 2020/21 Business Plan lists Greenvale North Investigation area ("Greenvale North Part 2") as "Pre-Commencement".  The VPA will continue to work with MW & SPG to ensure the timely rezoning and delivery of the necessary assets to facilitate development within the Yuroke Catchment in the future.  The VPA are investigating the inclusion and reference to this matter within the PSP document.  <b>Plan 6 to be updated to include a note regarding the Yuroke DSS to the effect of: "The development of land within the Yuroke DSS cannot commence until the construction of works for the DSS (i.e. the dam and Bund C) are complete"</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
15.02	Tom Grantham - Satterley	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Street Network		There is a conflict between the proposed east-west road from Satterley's True North Estate into property 40 of the PSP. The PSP should be amended to reflect existing conditions.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. It appears that all base Plans with the PSP will need to be amended to reflect the existing road network in the adjoining Satterley True North Estate.  <b>Base plans to be updated to reflect existing road networks.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
16.01	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Drainage & Water	Drainage (Aitken Creek DSS)		A detailed review of the Aitken Creek DSS has been undertaken, which has identified that through minor changes to the northern catchment efficiencies can be achieved whilst maintaining water quality outcomes. Additionally, significant reductions in the cost of acquiring land can be achieved. Key changes proposed include: 1. Consolidation of assets along the eastern boundary, resulting in the removal of ACS801 and consolidating these drainage requirements into a sediment basin ACS802; and 2. Consolidation of the northern reach of the constructed waterway, CW2 (within 1760 Mickleham Road) with wetland ACWL01 into a single asset.  Stockland proposes refinement of the southern catchment which would result in the removal of ACWL04 located on 640 Craigieburn Road. The refinement instead delivers drainage assets at the eastern extent of this drainage catchment, along Aitken Creek, to be controlled by Stockland.  Request endorsement of the revised DSS (Attachment B) by Melbourne Water and subsequent translation in to the PSP.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	The VPA referred Stockland's submission to Melbourne Water for resolution, as it relates to the Aitken Creek DSS. Melbourne Water officers advised they have completed a review of the alternate drainage servicing strategy and are generally supportive of the intent of this proposal, however, there are some minor items that will be required to be addressed, and this has been communicated to the submitter.  The VPA will include the revised layout, with changes incorporated by MW into the PSP.  <b>All Plans to incorporate updated DSS once finalised by MW.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	High
16.02	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Conservation Area 29		Supports the principle of realigning the BCS boundary so that a no net loss outcome is achieved and a net positive outcome is delivered. Endorsement of the realignment of the boundary is predicated on: 1. That the amended Conservation Reserve boundary is generally in accordance with Stockland's Place Based Plan for 1760 & 1780 Mickleham Road (Figure 1). 2. Southern conservation boundary—must be 25m off the southern title boundary of 1760 Mickleham Road, to facilitate the future east-west connector road. 3. Western conservation boundary—must extend to the western title boundary of 1760 Mickleham Road. 4. Northern conservation boundary—must extend to the southern title boundary of 1800 Mickleham Road, where the Conservation Reserve abuts 1800 Mickleham Road. 5. That in order to aid connectivity there must be provision to construct at least one shared path connection through the Conservation Reserve (indicatedly represented within Figure 1). 6. The Active Open Space(SR-01)and the Community Centre(CI-01)must be directly co-located with the Conservation Reserve, as shown on Stockland's Place Based Plan for 1760 & 1780 Mickleham Road (Figure 1). 7. The BCS boundary amendment cannot delay the approval of the PSP or any subsequent Stockland approvals  The changes only affect Stockland land and thus removes any potential for issue by other landowners in the PSP area.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Whilst the VPA is generally supportive of the BCS Boundary realignment, it notes that this is yet to be approved, and any changes outlined below will only be able to occur once the BCS realignment has occurred. 1. VPA is generally supportive of the relocation of the Sports Reserve as shown in figure 1. 2. VPA supports this change subject to discussion with City of Hume. 3. VPA has a preference to see enough room for a shared path between western boundary of the BCS and the property boundary with Mickleham Road. 4. VPA is generally supportive of this change subject to discussion with City of Hume. 5. VPA is generally supportive of this, but note that the MSA documents specify the conditions and requirements for access through conservation areas. Therefore point 5 is broadly considered beyond the scope of the PSP. 6. This should be discussed with Council and the Department of Education & Training. 7. VPA agrees with this position.  The VPA notes that the proposed changes only impact the Stockland controlled parcels.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
16.03	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Open Space	Green Links & Open Space	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	Plan 8 and Table 5: Question the need for GL01 and GL03 as these can be provided within the road network and that the land budget set aside for these Green Links could be redistributed to Local Parks. Requests removal of the Green Links.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	VPA to further investigate this matter in respect to the final BCS alignment, which is still to be confirmed. Subject to discussion with the City of Hume, this would be considered a minor adjustment to the PBP.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
16.04	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Open Space	Local Parks	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	Query whether the area and extent of LP-02, LP-03 and LP-04 are sufficient to accommodate Tree Protection Zones. It is considered that a greater area is required than that identified in the PSP.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Parks have been designed to accommodate tree protection zones, however in the circumstances that TPZ are not within the open space, Guideline 43 allows for flexible park design which envisages alternative configurations. Furthermore, R25 will be updated to provide 10% encroachment into the TPZ, as per the Australian Standard.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
16.05	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Bushfire Management	Setback	LP-09/Table 4	Table 4 of the PSP requires a 33 metre setback to the LP-09.  The proposed local road interface to LP-09 doesn't support a 33 metre separation to development. The preferred interface would be to realign the north-south connector road and have this road directly interface LP-09 (Refer to section 2.2. of submission).	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree.  The VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows:  R22: Development adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.  Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots.  <b>Updated R21 accordingly.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
16.06	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Transport & Movement	Intersections	Plan 5 Transport Plan	Clearly annotate on Plan 5 –Transport Plan the requirement for a minimum of two left-in left-out intersections to Mickleham Road between the southern boundary of 1760 Mickleham Road and the northern boundary of 1780 Mickleham Road and any such intersections are to be included as fully funded ICP items.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	VPA does not support this submission. Left In Left Out (LLO) intersections are unsignalized and for local street access only. They are considered subdivision works and not included as ICP items.  The VPA are working with Department of Transport to confirm acceptability of indicating LLO's along Mickleham, Mt Ridley and Craigieburn Rd.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
16.07	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Open Space	Active OS & Community Provision		The Lindum Vale PSP allocates and will contribute 50% of funds for the delivery of an 8.0ha Active Open Space and a 0.8ha Community Facility in CWSP. This is a discrepancy in what is planned for in the CWSP at a respective land take of 9.5ha and 1.2ha.  Request a review and clear justification (including supporting evidence of sufficient funding from the Lindum Vale PSP) for the additional 1.5 hectares and 0.4 hectares required for the northern Active Open Space (SR-01) and Community Facility (CI-01).	N/A	For further investigation/discussion with City of Hume.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
16.08	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Precinct Infrastructure	ICP	Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure	Given the 'infill' status of the CWSP, the scale of contributions foreshadowed by a standard ICP are beyond what is required to facilitate the necessary infrastructure as outlined in the PSP. Based on 2020-2021 ICPA rates, it is estimated that there will be \$37.7 million collected for Community and Recreation Construction and \$52.5 million collected for Transport Construction.  An excess of \$24.5 million for transport construction and \$11.7 million for community and recreation construction.  Request that confirmation and acknowledgement that the VPA will consider lesser ICP contribution rates if required infrastructure does not require the funds collected under the standard rate. This will have a direct correlation with housing affordability.	N/A	At this stage the Craigieburn West ICP is expected to be a Standard Levy and therefore not subject to consultation. Submitters to the Craigieburn West PSP may comment on the precinct infrastructure plan which will inform the ICP. Should the ICP become a supplementary levy ICP, it will be subject to statutory consultation.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
16.09	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Requirements & Guidelines	IWM	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management R13	Aitken Creek DSS does not meet the objectives of the CSIRO Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines for Urban Stormwater.  Request that R13 be reinstated as a guideline, as Melbourne Water have already substantiated that the requirements of R13 are not being met by the Aitken Creek DSS.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree.  This requirement is standard in nature and relates specifically to a developer's obligation when developing a land parcel anywhere in Melbourne. It would not be appropriate to diminish this obligation by downgrading this requirement to a guideline. Whilst the drainage infrastructure proposed to service this precinct is unable to meet the relevant targets, the full extent of this obligation must still be met, through additional developer funded works or the payment of offsets. Also of note is that there are existing BPDM requirements within the VPP's, and the PSP should not diminish these requirements.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
16.10	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Requirements & Guidelines	IWM	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management R14	Stockland to utilise passive irrigation to support the health of the River Red Gums not stormwater harvesting.  Request that reference to 'stormwater harvesting' be removed from R14.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA does not support this submission. Regardless of Stockland's commitment to use passive irrigation, other development sites throughout the precinct will need to have regard to R14. However, it may be prudent to reflect both the use of passive irrigation and stormwater harvesting as options for IWM.  <b>R14 Updated to reference "stormwater harvesting and/or passive irrigation"</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
16.11	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Requirements & Guidelines	Native Vegetation	Section 3.5 Biodiversity, vegetation and landscape character R33	R33 should be reinstated as a guideline as in its current form it is at odds with the purpose of Clause 52.17 (Native Vegetation), which allows an applicant to apply for a planning permit to remove native vegetation.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
16.12	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Transport & Movement	Street Design	Section 4.5 Street Cross Sections Local Access Street (14.5-20m)	Request the street cross section for Local Access Street (14.5-20m) include fire-resistant trees between the carriageway and the 3 metre shared path, to provide shading to the shared path and a green perimeter to the Conservation Reserve.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Street cross sections within the PSP are considered to be minimum standard guidelines for development. City of Hume has discretion to consider alternatives as appropriate through the subdivision permit application process.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
16.13	James Westh - Stockland	N/A	Properties 4, 6, 27	Other	Precinct Features	Plan 2 Precinct Features	Plan 2 Precinct Features incorrectly identifies the conservation reserve located on 1760 & 1780 Mickleham Road as conservation area (Growing Grass Frog).  Reference to Growing Grass Frog should be deleted.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Noted, this should be amended.  <b>Reference to Growing Grass Frog from Plan 2 Precinct Features to be removed .</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low



Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved  
submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.08	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 4: Resource Removal</b> <b>Water Points:</b> Support is given to the proactive removal of watering points but that the VPA should respond to how this recommendation will be implemented on a precinct wide scale and how this practice will be incentivised. <b>Water Points:</b> removal of water points should not occur when a population is, or becomes, at immediate risk of land locking. <b>Food Resources:</b> reference to 'scraping the topsoil' must be removed from the plan. This precinct includes sodic and dispersive soils. The opening up of the topsoil layer is likely to cause additional risk to aquatic habitats. Recommendations should be confined to mowing and slashing. The VPA should respond to how this recommendation will be implemented given Council has no statutory powers to compel land management in advance of subdivision applications. <b>Protective Habitat:</b> the nature of this recommendation is confusing and potentially has risks causing significant amenity and environmental issues. Please remove the recommendation to remove reference to the removal of gullies or valleys as these areas cannot be removed. Also, no vegetation shown to be retained in the PSP should be subject to this removal of protective habitat recommendation. There is a clear disconnect between the PSP and the KMP.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.09	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 4: In-situ Population Management</b> - The KMP should be updated to reflect the potential change to the BCS area which would assist in retaining a small population of kangaroos in the conservation area rather than stating that no population will be retained across the precinct and the recommendation that all conservation areas have no active kangaroo population. - It also remains unclear why the only way to achieve in-situ population management will be culling across the entire study area. - Multiple options for kangaroo management should be explored rather than culling.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.10	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 5: Population Control</b> - Population control will be required in CWSPSP. - Translocation is not widely used management strategy in Victoria and that the reference to this should be removed or modified to represent the current situation facing salvage and translocation of fauna in Victoria.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.11	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 6: Feasibility Assessment Table</b> - No evidence provided that the use of culverts and bridges to support fauna is cost-prohibitive. Given the scale of the PSP, this is not considered cost-prohibitive. - "Removing Resources"- this section should be revised to discuss the weaknesses of increased risk of sediment on waterways and dust impacts on neighbouring communities - Management Action (In-Situ Population Management)- this should be a moderate feasibility action, particularly if HCC approach allows the land use framework to define and maintain feasible connections with Green Wedge areas.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.12	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 7 Management Actions Table</b> - Speed (Limited Reduction and Virtual Fencing)- DOT should be co-listed as the responsible authority for this action including the receipt of written confirmation by DOT. - Population Monitoring- Council should not be listed as the responsible authority for the monitoring of populations, there is no statutory basis nor funding available for Council to undertake this work. DELWP is the responsible agency for wildlife in Victoria	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.13	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		Attachment 1 of HCC Submission: Kangaroo Management Plan <b>Issue 8: Conclusion</b> - The Kangaroo Management Plan fundamentally fails- it has not led to important and critical changes to the Place Based Plan that can would see kangaroos retained within the large conservation areas and waterway corridors. - The proposed elimination of in-situ kangaroos from the landscape is likely to be necessary given the fragmentation of the landscape. But the KMP fails to recognise that elimination in Craigieburn West will also necessitate the removal of kangaroos for all remaining creek reserves in Craigieburn. - The KMP presents as though the kangaroos have no agency and could not recolonise the retained landscapes by moving back in through the street network via Green Wedge linkages or creeks system. An approach to the land use framework that ensures habitat connectivity from large parcels of conservation and creek reserves should be delivered.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/Investigation with Council & DELWP-MSA required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.14	Hume City Council		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Biodiversity Conservation Area 29	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The revised boundaries better respond to current on site biodiversity values as assessed by Council and DELWP officers in April and June 2020. The reconfiguration of the BCS area also offers opportunities to relocate the sports reserve SR-01 to collocate it with the BCS. Council supports the location of SR-01 adjacent to Mount Ridley Road as shown in the November 2020 PSP. Alternative locations to the north of the BCS can also be explored prior to Advisory Committee hearing subject to: - suitable siting and layout to allow for sports fields, district level playgrounds, pavilions, as well as appropriate access points and carparking. - co-location with community facility CI-01, while providing CI-01 with frontage to the north south connector street. - minimising removal of trees. - liaison with other affected parties.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/graphics to support)	VPA are awaiting approval of revised BCS area/boundary. Council and affected landowner (Stockland - Submitter 16) are submitting to Commonwealth for approval.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.15	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Council's view is that: - The proposed road network will not support the dwelling yield anticipated and land uses proposed within the PSP. - The impacts of land fragmentation and sequencing cannot be appropriately understood through the traffic modelling that was conducted and consequently are not appropriately addressed or managed through the PSP. - The need for potential signalised intersections on connector streets were not appropriately considered, particularly around schools, community centres and the town centre.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. - Revised modelling has been prepared and shared with Council, which demonstrates that the proposed road network adequately supports the dwelling yield. - The traffic modelling represents full development of the PSP and consequently represents the ultimate impact of development on the transport network. Sequencing issues are unknown at this stage but will need to be considered and managed by the RA as development applications are received. - Volumes consistent with Connector Streets do not typically warrant signalisation and are more appropriately managed using roundabout treatments, however the final designation of these intersection will be subject to planning permit and detailed design. However, in response to Council's submission, the VPA have proposed the following changes to the road network: Upgrade E/W connector road 1 (Parcels 6 & 7) to a boulevard connector. Upgrade Vantage Boulevard – north of Fairways Boulevard (Parcel 35) to a boulevard connector. Upgrade Fairways Boulevard – West of Vantage Boulevard (Parcel 35) to a boulevard connector. Upgrade Elevation Boulevard – west of N/S Connector 1 (Parcel 31) to a boulevard connector. Downgrade N/S Connector Road 1 – south of Craigieburn Road (Parcels 29, 30, 31) to a connector street. Downgrade N/S Connector Boulevard 2 – south of Dunhelean Lane (Parcel 38) to a connector street. <b>Plan 4 &amp; 6 updated as outlined above.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.16	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 of Council's submission provides a detailed response to the issues raised on their behalf by GTA. Key issues relate to Traffic modelling, Assumed lot yield and Land use assumptions and trip generation rates. <b>1. Traffic modelling:</b> inappropriate modelling methodology based on a spreadsheet based model being utilised. While this type of traffic modelling might be appropriate for site specific assessments, Council has significant concerns regarding its appropriateness for assessing the road network for a PSP. Requests information and clarification on the type of modelling platform/software used for the works.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The determination of the modelling methodology was informed by the geographic scope of the PSP area and the accuracy of the results required to be delivered. For a sub-area scale project, with arterial road upgrades and signalised intersection locations predetermined by the Department of Transport, intersection-based transport modelling was selected as the most appropriate method. Intersection models are traffic evaluation tools that utilise analytical techniques on aggregate traffic movements. This type of modelling, which was executed using a spreadsheet based process, is considered preferable in this instance to macroscopic or mesoscopic modelling, which in accordance with Department of Transport modelling guidelines, is generally more suited to regional and corridor scale areas.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved  
submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.17	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 of Council's submission provides a detailed response to the issues raised on their behalf by GTA. Key issues relate to Traffic modelling, Assumed lot yield and Land use assumptions and trip generation rates.  <b>2. Assumed Lot Yield</b> - OneMileGrid has assumed an average lot density of 600 sq. m across the PSP with an estimated 6,150 population which contradicts the dwelling yield identified in Table 2 (p.17) of the CWSPSP. Using an average lot density of 20 dwellings per hectare to accommodate the PSP's targets of 18.5 dwellings per hectare and 26.5 dwellings per hectare within the walkable catchment of the town centre, Council anticipates a more realistic dwelling yield to be approximately 8,200 dwelling across the PSP.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The VPA has prepared revised modelling which demonstrates that the proposed road network adequately supports the dwelling yield, as well as proposing minor modifications to the road classifications to ensure roads are operating within the theoretical capacity.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.18	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 of Council's submission provides a detailed response to the issues raised on their behalf by GTA. Key issues relate to Traffic modelling, Assumed lot yield and Land use assumptions and trip generation rates.  <b>3 Land Use Assumptions and trip generation rates</b> - OneMileGrid traffic generation assessments do not take into account the impacts of non-residential land uses in the CWSPSP. GTA's advice to Council states that the nine trips per dwelling rate adopted by OneMileGrid may be acceptable, however they note that this rate is also on the basis of the PSP having lot sizes of 600 square metres and dwellings having good access to the bus network. While most dwellings within the PSP might fall within a 400 metre walkable catchment radius of a potential public transport route, Council questions the extent to which dwellings in several areas of the PSP will have meaningful access to the public transport network. Concerns with the potential future impact on intersections in terms of their safety and accessibility and more broadly, the overall lack of confidence in the proposed road network.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The VPA has prepared revised modelling which demonstrates that the proposed road network adequately supports the dwelling yield, land use assumptions, as well as proposing minor modifications to the road classifications to ensure roads are operating within the theoretical capacity.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.19	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		A revised road network has been prepared underpinned by a number of key principles including: <b>1. Creating movement choices and connecting neighbourhoods</b> <b>2. Managing Sequencing</b> <b>3. Creating a safe and equitable movement network for all</b> <b>4. Responding to features in the urban structure</b> These principles have resulted in the preparation of a revised road network as per the plan shown in Attachment 3 of Council's submission and as outlined below: <b>A</b> - Left in/left out at Mount Ridley Rd <b>B</b> - Access street and left in in/left-out at Mickleham Road <b>C</b> - Preferred boundaries for Biodiversity Conservation Area 29 <b>D</b> - Local road along BCS boundary and left-in in/left-out at Mickleham Road <b>E</b> - Connector road moved north and adjacent to southern boundary of BCS <b>F</b> - Access from east west connector to the south <b>G</b> - Left-in in/left-out at Mickleham Road with link across waterway to north south connector <b>H</b> - North-south local road <b>I</b> - Signalised intersection <b>J</b> - North-south local road to left-in in/left-out at Craigieburn Road <b>K</b> - Realign extension of Elevation Boulevard to align with Cookes Road to the east <b>L</b> - Continuation of connector street - boulevard south of Elevation Blvd <b>M</b> - Relocate non-government school to the east <b>N</b> - Relocate C-02 to the west <b>O</b> - Relocate P-6 school <b>P</b> - Recognise heritage precinct on PPP <b>Q</b> - Signalised intersection <b>R</b> - Tailored local access street <b>S</b> - Access street and left in in/left-out at Mickleham Road <b>T</b> - East-west pedestrian-cycle link or option for local access street <b>U</b> - Continue Vantage Boulevard as key local road <b>V</b> - Include a bus capable road cross section for Whites Lane	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	A. Do not support. The location of the AGS (in conjunction with the BCS realignment) is likely to change the access point along Mt Ridley Rd. VPA position is that the PSP should not prescribe the LLO location along Mt Ridley Rd (as this location does not need to be fixed), and this can be satisfactorily addressed through the permit stage. B. In principle support for LLO, subject to DoT approval. Additional local access street is supported. The rationale for supporting these change is that this LLO & access street are required to indicate the access arrangement for Mickleham Primary School, which is required (under R3) to C. In principle support, subject to final approval. D. LLO locations are not supported, unless there is a strategic justification to be provided in a specific location. E. VPA does not support the proposed change shown by Council. The alignment for Connector E in the draft PSP provides the shortest most direct travel path to Mickleham Road, especially in the context of travel movement heading south towards the airport/ty via Mickleham Rd. F. VPA prefers not to show Local Access Road alignments. G. LLO locations are not supported, unless there is a strategic justification to be provided in a specific location. The VPA prefers not to show Local Access Road alignments. H. VPA prefers not to show Local Access Road alignments. VPA does not support Potential Public Transport Routes on Local Access Roads, as these are not considered Bus Capable under Clause 56. I. VPA prefers to denote 'controlled intersections' for connector connector junctions. J. LLO locations are not supported, unless there is a strategic justification to be provided in a specific location. The VPA prefers not to show Local Access Road alignments. K. Disagree. Current intersection has been located south of Cookes Rd to allow for wetland/retarding basin. In addition, existing dam and topography minimise the ability to deliver intersection at Cookes Rd. L. For further discussion. Query whether volume requires Boulevard Designation. M. Do not support. This area has been reviewed and revised to address issues identified through early versions of the modelling. The proposed changes are not considered to address these issues. N. Do not support. This area has been reviewed and revised to address issues identified through early versions of the modelling. The proposed changes are not considered to address these issues. O. Do not support. This area has been reviewed and revised to address issues identified through early versions of the modelling. The proposed changes are not considered to address these issues. P. Do not support, indicated already on the Precinct Features and Heritage Plan. Q. Do not support. VPA denotes 'controlled intersections' for connector connector junctions. Intersection typology (i.e. roundabout vs signals) is determined at permit stage, and the PSP will not prescribe intersection controls unless KCP items. R. For further discussion. Level 1 Access already shown. S. LLO locations are not supported, unless there is a strategic justification to be provided in a specific location. The VPA prefers not to show Local Access Road alignments. T. Additional access street generally not supported. U. For further discussion. Additional access street generally not supported. V. For further discussion.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.20	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  <b>4. Traffic model / 4.1 Overview</b> - It is not clear on the modelling platform used for the assessment; however it is assumed that it is a spreadsheet model. - It is not clear what the rationale is for the interim year modelling. - Using an ultimate year of 2046 will provide slightly lower volumes on the network compared to 2051.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. OMG has provided clarification on the modelling process and its assumptions in the technical memorandum Traffic Modelling Overview, 1 February 2021.  The interim year modelling seeks to represent traffic conditions at a time when the PSP is fully developed, but wider transport network upgrades have not all been delivered. VPA to seek confirmation regarding interim conditions assumptions from OMG.  The ultimate conditions year is nominal, in that it represents a fully developed PSP, full development of planned land uses across the corridor and all known wider transport network upgrades. The year 2046 as the ultimate design year is considered fit for purpose.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.21	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  <b>4.3.1 Traffic generation of surrounding PSPs / 4.4 Future Base Case Traffic Volumes</b> - It is not clear where the 4,400 vehicles per day using Vantage Boulevard to access Mickleham Road has been derived from. - It is not clear from the corresponding figure of peak periods. This number is then used as an assumption to determine the forecast traffic volume on Craigieburn Road. - It is also not clear how the distribution split of 90% of traffic travelling south along Mickleham Road and 10% travelling north at the intersection with Elevation Boulevard was derived.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. OMG has provided clarification on the modelling process and its assumptions in the technical memorandum Traffic Modelling Overview, 1 February 2021.  VPA are seeking further information from OMG regarding traffic growth assumptions.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.22	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  <b>4.3.2 Through Traffic Growth</b> - It is not clear where the adopted growth rates (1% for several non-arterial roads, 3% for Craigieburn Road) have been derived. Clarification on the source for these rates is recommended.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. VPA are seeking further information from OMG regarding traffic growth assumptions.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.23	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  4.5 Proposed Land Uses - It is not clear where the statement that 10 vehicle trips per day per dwelling is "generally accepted" and how it was determined that the PSP has density and good public transport access to justify a rate of 9 vehicle trips per day on this basis. - The decision to only use a higher residential generation rate and not schools or employment references "other traffic consultants" and that it is a "conservative and appropriate of approach", without reference to previous examples and data points. - Notwithstanding, it is agreed that the resultant generation rate is acceptable when compared to other growth area PSPs in the north growth corridor.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. VPA note that Council accepts the traffic generation rates used by OMG. No further action required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.24	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  4.6 Traffic Generation - It is not clear how the directional distributions of the AM and PM peak have been derived. (AM peak hour: 70% outbound, 30% inbound; and PM peak hour: 40% outbound, 60% inbound). - A review of the reported survey data and SCATS data show that the PM peak hour distribution is closer to a 50%/50% split.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The directional distributions for AM and PM peak period residential traffic flows are consistent with widely referenced empirical data. The directional distribution splits are averages of empirical datasets, and therefore site-by-site variations are to be expected.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.25	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  4.7 Traffic Distribution - VISTA has been used to determine trip purposes for typical households, but it is not stated what areas were considered for the adopted purposes (e.g. inner, middle, outer Melbourne). - The proposed traffic distribution for uses external to the PSP were described, but the 9% for internal trips was not justified.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. VPA are working with Council to resolve traffic matters. VPA are seeking further information from OMG regarding traffic growth assumptions.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.26	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note:  4.10 Traffic Impact - There are no performance plots of the network during the peak period so it is unclear as to how the network performs. These are typically shown in volume to capacity (V/C) plots.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. V/C plots are a typical output of strategic modelling such as VITM, which has not been used for the transport demand forecasts in Craigieburn West. The road segment modelling performed by OMG assesses future performance of intersections using daily traffic volume forecasts, which is generally accordance with the principles set out in the VicRoads Guidance for Planning Road Networks in Growth Areas Handbook (2015). The OMG assessment indicates that arterial/connector road intersections will operate within acceptable capacity limits.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.27	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note: <b>3.3.3 Overall Road Network (Figure 11: PSP Road Network and Intersections)</b> - It is not clear how the intersections have been determined. Typically, these are provided / determined by the VPA and are generally not considered as part of the PSP planning and analysis. - Notwithstanding, their location and treatment are generally suitable for the proposed road network, with the exception of the vicinity of the schools and activity centres where better control for pedestrians and cyclists could be nominated.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. Council accepts the arterial road intersection locations presented by OMG. No further action required. -Volumes consistent with Connector Streets do not typically warrant signalisation and are more appropriately managed using roundabout treatments.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.28	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note: <b>5. Conclusions and Recommendations</b> - The report assesses the future traffic volumes within and connecting the PSP, however it does not include recommendations arising from the modelling to inform the development of the final PSP.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The development of the final PSP road network has been an iterative process, informed by preliminary and draft findings of the OMG transport assessment process. Changes have been made along the way to respond to OMG recommendations, which generally involve the 'upgrade' of streets to manage theoretical capacity issues outlined in the modelling and recommendations.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.29	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note: <b>4.10 Traffic Impact and 5. Conclusions and Recommendations</b> - The report highlights that Vantage Boulevard is over capacity with 11,100 vehicles a day, above the target of 3,000-7,000 vehicles per day. The report also references other consultants work which showed volumes above capacity, which is assumed to be the Cardno Aiton Estate traffic report with a projected 11,000 – 12,500 vehicles per day presented in Figure 18 of the report. - Additional north-south connectors running parallel may help to accommodate these volumes.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The PSP road network includes a connector road, parallel to Vantage Boulevard and east of Mickleham Road, to carry north-south traffic movements.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.30	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Traffic Impact Assessment		Attachment 2 GTA Technical Note: <b>Staging</b> - The staging of development is a consideration for the subdivision stage, however there may be benefit indicating this on the plan to provide more certainty.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Noted. The VPA are of the position that the staging of development is a consideration of subdivision stage, and not a matter for the PSP to address.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.31	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Duplication/Upgrade		Given the unsustainable impacts on traffic movement in the wider corridor, support is not given to the approval of the Craigieburn West PSP until the State Government makes a budgeted commitment for the design and delivery for the duplication of Mickleham Road from Donnybrook Road to Somerton Road.	N/A	The Craigieburn West PSP planning process has included consideration of the future of Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT). DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved. The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP. The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamore Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sumbury Road. Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network. The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.		Further Investigation	Pending	High
17.32	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Whites Lane		Council welcomes the inclusion of a cross section for Whites Lane in the Craigieburn West PSP and the amended Craigieburn R2 PSP. The inclusion of these cross sections will provide consistent guidance to enable the appropriate development of Whites Lane, which will be a key road connection for the Craigieburn West and Craigieburn R2 communities. Given concerns in relation to the transport impact assessment, Whites Lane can help to relieve the network pressure by modifying the cross section and transport plan in both PSPs as per Attachment 4 of Council's submission and as summarised below: - Update the western pedestrian path to be a 2.5 m shared path - Rather than allowing the verge widths to vary where road abuts open space, set nature strip width at 3.2m and allow for variance to instead be the removal of indented parking where road abuts open space. - Update Transport Plan to show Whites Lane as an access street level 2 that is bus capable and include a creek crossing where road reserve crosses Aitken Creek.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. For further discussion and investigation regarding proposed changes to the Whites Lane cross-section.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.33	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Land Capability	Sodic Soils		Ongoing concerns in relation to presence of sodic and dispersive soils. Supports proposed application requirements contained in UGZ12. In relation to the requirement for further groundwater investigations, these additional investigations should not be left to the permit stage but rather be undertaken prior to the finalisation of the PSP to allow for a holistic assessment and recommendations that can be incorporated into the PSP and UGZ. The investigations should be undertaken as a priority for the PSP central area affected by shallow groundwater, including the dam to the north of LP-09 and the impact of its backfilling and development on the shallow groundwater in this area and the potential impact on the river red gums within LP-09.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Disagree. A high level assessment has been undertaken through the PSP, noting sodic soils are flagged as low- to - moderate risk. The study recommended additional work be undertaken at either the precinct level OR subdivision permit stage. The VPA considers that as the risk is 'low-to-moderate', further detailed assessment should be undertaken at permit stage. Additional investigation will have minimal impact on the land use and land requirements for the PSP.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
17.34	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management	Buffers	LP-09	The assumptions that informed the recommendation of a 33 metre setback for LP-09 should be re-examined to assess the following: - The size of LP-09 as per the proposed PSP. - The future state of LP-09 as a local park, rather than in its current state as an unmanaged patch of vegetation. This would include an understanding of Council's future use and management regime for the park and its underlying fuel load, as per the concept plan in the PSP. - The implications of the above on LP-09's classification as a Woodland and/or the potential setback buffers required. Alternatively, the PSP should be updated to allow for the buffer setbacks to be varied subject to approval by Council, using the following wording or similar: <i>Buffers identified on Table 4 may be reduced where it can be demonstrated that the fire threat has been reduced or mitigated and may be amended to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and the CFA.</i>	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Agree. The VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows: R22: <b>Habitable buildings</b> adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority. Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots. <b>ACTION: Update R21 terminology to 'habitable building' in place of the word development.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.35	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management	Buffers	BCS	The ongoing management of the BCS must be secured through the PSP or UGZ schedule to ensure the current vegetation classification, and subsequent setback buffers requirement, are not compromised. The option to retain BCS Area 29 in private ownership should be removed from the PSP, and instead the compensation measures outlined within the Melbourne Strategic Assessment Levy for this land be deployed to ensure that the developers vest this land and are appropriately compensated prior to or at the same time adjoining development occurs. The final PSP amendment must address the matters raised in Attachment 4 - HCC Track changes version to November 2020 exhibited PSP and UGZ Schedule.	N/A	This matter is beyond the scope of the PSP. Matters relating to the ownership and/or transfer of conservation land is the responsibility of DELWP. The VPA encourages further discussions between City of Hume and DELWP-MSA to settle this matter.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.36	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Open Space Network	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	<b>SR-02:</b> Shift SR-02 to the northern boundary of Properties 9 and 10. The current location of SR-02 is considered to create an awkward sliver of development at the north of these properties, shifting SR-02 will allow the 7-12 Government School and the north-south connector road to be adjusted to allow for a more practical sized shape and extent of developable land to be created.  Shifting SR-02 north will allow for an open space connection from the existing Aitken Creek reserve in Craigieburn R2 through the creek corridors and drainage reserves in Craigieburn West to facilitate the movement of kangaroos into and out of the BCS and throughout habitat in the precinct and wider area.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Noted. Further investigation/discussion required. The open space network is not 'designed' for Kangaroo movement. This is a secondary and not a primary function of the open space network.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.37	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Open Space Network	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	In respect of SR-02 and the requested changes, it is understood that due to the land equalisation methodology in the ICP that land that is encumbered with open space without any NDA is costed significantly less than land that is similarly encumbered however still feature a limited amount of NDA. Council questions the equity of this and highlights that the ICP system should be designed to ensure planning and development outcomes for new communities are prioritised instead of arbitrary quirks of the ICP land equalisation methodology necessitating poor development outcomes.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Noted. Further discussion/investigation required. However note that this relates to the ICP.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.38	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Open Space Network	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	<b>LP-14:</b> LP-14 should be shifted to adjoin the green link. Currently LP-14 unnecessarily straddles two properties in separate ownership. It could be more centrally located within the PSP along the green link to maximise its catchment.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Further investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.39	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Open Space Network	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	<b>LP-15:</b> The agency consultation PSP showed the green link running along the eastern boundary of the local access street level 2 running north-south through Properties 33, 34, 35 and 36, with LP-15 integrated into GL-08. As the green link in this section of the PSP has been shifted to the west of the north-south road, LP-15 should be shifted to the west of the road also, to be integrated with the green link.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Refer to Submission from AK Aus. (36.02). Support relocating Open Space to the West / South-West of the Green Link and retain within Property 35 or 36. <b>LP-15 relocated to the west, adjacent to the green link.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
17.40	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space	Open Space Network	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	<b>LP-16:</b> LP-16 was previously co-located with proposed drainage in the agency consultation version of the PSP. With the consolidation of the drainage assets into YCWL01, LP-16 should be shifted south of the east-west connector street to be integrated with this drainage asset.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	LP-16 is located to serve the wider catchment along the south of the precinct. Locating the open space adjacent to the drainage asset would reduce the walkable 'catchment' of the open space and provide a gap in the open space network. Proposed change not supported.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
17.41	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Trees	Plan 10 Biodiversity & Vegetation Plan	Request the inclusion of 14 additional trees that are currently shown as 'vegetation that can be removed' on Plan 10, to be reclassified as native vegetation that must be retained. Justification is provided in Council's submission for the retention of the following Tree Nos.: Tree No: 614 Tree No: 616 Tree No: 617 Tree No: 763 Tree No: 989 Tree No: 1205 Tree No: 1370 Tree No: 1472 Tree No: 1473 Tree No: 1474 Tree No: 1476 Tree No: 1479 Tree No: 1480 Tree No: 1481	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. The VPA's methodology for tree retention has focused on: a) Indicating all Very High and High Value vegetation within Open Spaces (Green Link, Local Parks, Sports Reserves) as 'must be retained' b) Indicating Very High Value vegetation outside of Open Space as 'must be retained'  It is noted that the trees indicated in City of Hume's submission are of High (13) and Medium (1) Value, which does not align with the VPA's methodology for tree retention.  Whilst the VPA understand the need to retain vegetation for character and amenity values, the methodology outlined above provides a good balance between allowing for development to occur within the precinct and the retention of high quality significant vegetation.  It is noted that all trees that are required to be retained are considered 'lost' from a Biodiversity/ecological perspective, as they are within the MSA area, and require offsets to be paid, whether they are removed or retained.  The VPA may be able to consider a third vegetation designation, which is to indicate the high value vegetation outlined by Council as 'should be retained' which would remove these trees from the Schedule to S2.17, and trigger a planning permit for their removal.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.42	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Community Facilities	ICP	The ICP should describe CI-01 or CI-02 as "a functional community centre that responds to community need and expectations" and not include descriptions of the services that they might provide as this is yet to be determined by Council.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Noted. Additional wording to be included in the PSP in the PIP table. <b>Updated wording in PIP Table as requested.</b>		Change Required	No further action required	Medium
17.43	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Community Facilities	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	CI-01 be moved based on the following criteria: - It must be co-located with sports reserve SR-01. - It must have access to a connector road. - It must not be located on an arterial road.	Location or variation to public infrastructure or utilities (within single parcel)	Noted for further discussion and investigation regarding wider context of BCS realignment.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.44	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Drainage		Council will engage with Melbourne Water during their consultation process for the proposed changes to the DSS to determine ownership and management responsibilities of the proposed assets.  Council also acknowledges the area of land that is not within the catchment of a Melbourne Water DSS. The drainage requirements of this land are still to be resolved to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and Council. Any proposed drainage review for this land should be done in consultation with all affected landowners and agencies, particularly where seeking alterations to DSS boundaries.	Location or variation to public infrastructure or utilities (within single parcel)	City of Hume are advised to liaise with Melbourne Water, who are finalising the DSS.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.45	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	ICP		Indicative ICP costings: It is noted that the items proposed to be funded under the Craigieburn West ICP are approaching the upper limit for a standard levy. Council is supportive of using a standard ICP and benchmark costings based on these ICP items however may vary this position if further items are proposed to be included in the ICP. In this case Council would seek full costings to determine the adequacy of a standard levy or whether a supplementary ICP is necessary.	N/A	The VPA will continue to liaise with City of Hume regarding the ICP.  The VPA have previously provided details of ICP costings (based on Benchmark Costings - November 2020 Public Consultation version).  The ICP is currently calculated to have a standard Levy. Any changes to the PSP, or future recommendations from an Advisory Committee, may impact on the ICP costings, and the VPA will continue to liaise with Council.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
17.46	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Introduction	Section 1.4	Section 1.4 should refer to heritage features; existing places of worship; UGB forms western boundary with green wedge land to the west.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Section 1.4 updated as appropriate.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.47	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Draft PSP Document Format	Precinct Features	Plan 2 Precinct Features	Plan 2 should show: - Mickleham Road avenue of honour - Patch of trees north of Craigieburn Road that are within LP-09 - Volcanic cones that should be considered in view lines as per G51	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>Plan 2 updated as appropriate.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.48	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Vision	Section 2.1 Vision Statement	Update Section 2.1 Vision in line with the proposed additional wording and changes as per Attachment 5 of HCC submission and as summarised below: - Ensure consistency of language with reference to Town Centre. - Amend 3rd paragraph, first sentence to read: <i>The central spine incorporating a connector road and a north-south green 'spine' linear reserve will support the primary place-making focus - creating energy and activation.</i> - Amend 4th paragraph to read: <i>The PSP will complete the delivery of the structure plan for the area, completing the delivery of green links within and beyond the PSP boundaries and provision of a sensitive built form interface to rural land west of Mickleham Road/Urban Growth Boundary.</i> - Amend 5th paragraph, last sentence to read: <i>The open space network provides a range of recreation options throughout the community and by maintaining existing trees will continue the character of surrounding developed areas.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. Changes to the vision are not considered to be required, as the change proposed do not change the intent and purpose.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.49	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Purpose	Section 2.2 Purpose	Amend second bullet point as follows: <i>Support the retail and services catchment of the proposed Craigieburn West Local Town Centre, Craigieburn Central and town centres proposed in Aston Village and Highlands Village.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required in context of other submissions.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.50	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Purpose	Section 2.2 Purpose	Amend third bullet point as follows: <i>Facilitate the final drainage outcomes for the development services schemes for the Aitken Creek, Yuroke Creek and Upper Brodies Creek catchments, including the protection of the Greenvale Reservoir.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/Investigation required in context of other submissions (esp. MW, who have submitted on a similar item)		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.51	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Housing, subdivision & built form	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision and built form/R1	Potential typo in R1 regarding reference to "old Mickleham Road".	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree. <b>Remove reference to 'Old' in R1.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.52	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Housing, subdivision & built form	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision and built form/R4	Reward R4 as set out below and to include reference to the provision of an internal loop road and reference to indicative cross section. <i>Development along Mickleham Road and Mt Ridley Road must provide a sensitive rural interface through design treatments, which include a landscaped nature strip between the row of housing and road reservation.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree with inclusion of Mickleham Road Interface Cross-section in the PSP. <b>Action: Update PSP to include Mickleham Road Cross Section interface (as per Lindum Vale PSP) as a Figure within the PSP document.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.53	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Affordable housing	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision and built form/ G4 and UG212	Reward G4 as follows: <i>Applications for residential subdivision or development should provide an equivalent of up to 10% of the total number of dwellings forecast to be provided (and may be provided as constructed dwellings or land or otherwise) as affordable housing. The affordable housing should:</i> • be provided within available catchments where practicable; • provide for a range of housing typologies to meet demonstrated local need; and provide for very low and low households. It is recommended that specific reference to walkable catchments i.e. activity centres, schools and community infrastructure is included in the first bullet point.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. VPA to update provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report. <b>UG212 updated Schedule and PSP documents as required.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Medium
17.54	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Requirements & Guidelines	Housing, subdivision & built form	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision and built form/G6	Amend the last paragraph of G6 as follows: <i>All to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and where adjacent to a waterway, the satisfaction of both the responsible authority and Melbourne Water.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/Investigation required. VPA to determine the final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs. <b>G6 Updated as requested.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
17.55	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Transport Plan	Plan 5 Transport Plan	Plan 5 should be updated to show Whites Lane as bus capable and have a creek crossing.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.56	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Public Transport	Section 3.2.1 Public Transport/G10	Reward G10 as follows: <i>Bus stop facilities should be designed as integral parts of roadways adjoining the town centre and activity generating land uses such as schools, sports fields and employment areas.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Council are seeking clarification in the Guideline that the bus station will be located within the roadways. <b>G10 Updated as requested.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.57	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Walking & Cycling	Section 3.2.2 Walking & Cycling/Requirements	Cross sections in Appendix 4.5 have omitted detail for the linear park. Cross sections have been prepared for VPA's consideration and inclusion in the final PSP. Refer to Attachment 6 of Council's submissions for cross section drawings.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. General support for inclusion of the linear park cross-sections. <b>Include Linear Park Cross-Section in the appendix to the PSP (and reference in R7)</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.58	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Walking & Cycling	Section 3.2.2 Walking & Cycling/G14	Reward G14 as follows: <i>In addition to waterway crossings shown on Plan 5, development proponents should provide waterway crossings at intervals no less than 400m or corresponding with all perpendicular through roads or pedestrian and cycle paths.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	No change required. Hume CC agree to withdraw comment.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.59	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Transport & Movement	Street network	Section 3.2.3 Street network/G19	Reward G19 as follows: <i>All signalised intersections where located on arterial roads should be designed having regard to the Department of Transport (DOT) working document Guidance for Planning Road Networks in Growth Areas November 2015 (as updated), to the satisfaction of The Head, Department of Transport and the responsible authority.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/Investigation with Council required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.60	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R11	Reward first sentence of R11 as follows: <i>Final designs and boundaries of constructed wetlands, retarding basins, stormwater quality treatment infrastructure, and associated paths, boardwalks, bridges, and planting, must include appropriate treatments to provide protection for dispersive soils where these are present and be designed to the satisfaction of both Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated minor grammar error.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.61	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R12	Reward first sentence of R12 as follows: <i>Development staging should provide for the delivery of ultimate waterway and drainage infrastructure, including stormwater quality treatment.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	No change required - R12 to retain 'must' and allow for minor variations.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.61	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R15	Support is also given to similar wording for road delivery in xx ... Reward first sentence of R15 as follows: <i>Applications must demonstrate, through the preparation of Integrated Water Management Plans:</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated minor grammar error.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.62	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/G23	Make the last two bullet points of G23 (as per below) into Requirements. • Protect and manage MNES values, particularly within conservation areas, in relation to water quality and suitable hydrological regimes (both surface and groundwater). • Recognise and respond to Aboriginal cultural heritage significance.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/Investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.63	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/G25	Reward G25 as follows: <i>Where practical, and where primary waterway or conservation functions are not adversely affected, land required for integrated water management initiatives should be integrated with the precinct open space and recreation system and as depicted on Plan 8 and Table 5.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated Table and Plan references.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.64	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Drainage & Water	Integrated water management	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/G29	Reward G29 as follows: <i>Stormwater runoff in areas identified as being affected by sodic and dispersive soils should be designed to manage the potential risk of erosion. Potential management methods may include but are not limited to: ...</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated to include "but are not limited to".</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.65	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Utilities	Section 3.3.2 Utilities/R18	Reward last sentence of R18 as follows: <i>Where that infrastructure is intended to be located in public open space, the land required to accommodate that infrastructure will not be counted as contributing to public open space requirements specified and will be additional to the areas designated in Table 5.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated table references.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.66	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Utilities	Section 3.3.2 Utilities/G33	Clarification is requested in relation to meaning of 'general alignments' in G33.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	"General alignments" refers to information provided by servicing authorities regarding alignments. VPA does not include a Utilities Plan as these alignment can change post PSP. Developers are required to liaise with servicing authorities regarding the alignment of services.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.67	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Utilities	Utilities	Section 3.3.2 Utilities/Table 3	Council will provide details of responsibility of asset ownership through consultation on DSS by Melbourne Water.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/Investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs. VPA notes that this information will be provided by Council/MW once they have confirmed asset ownership. VPA propose to reword R20 to state:	to be discussed with MW through future process - not matter for SAC	Further Investigation	Resolved	Low
17.68	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management	Bushfire management & safety/ R20	Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety/ R20	Please confirm how R20 can be implemented by Council.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	"Vegetation within bushfire hazard areas shown on Plan 7 must be managed in accordance with Table 4 during development." <b>ACTION: VPA to update R20 as outlined above.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.69	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management		Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety/ R22	Query re. how the below outcomes as required by R22 will be implemented: - Within 10 metres of a building, flammable objects must not be located close to the vulnerable parts of the building. - Plants greater than 10 centimetres in height must not be placed within 3m of a window or glass feature of the building. - Trees must not overhang or touch any elements of the building.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.70	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management		Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety	As an alternative to the queries realised in Item XX above, the following new Requirement could be utilised: <i>Buildings must not be constructed within the setback created as a buffer to bushfire hazard areas.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Considered addressed by revised R21.		Change Required	Pending	Medium
17.71	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Bushfire Management		Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety/G40	Query about whether there is a statutory trigger that will allow G40 to be considered and managed.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	G40 is a Guideline, and is not able to be managed through a statutory control. It will provide guidance to the developer/landowner regarding fencing, where adjacent to a Bushfire Hazard .		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
17.72	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space		Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/R24	Reword R24 as follows: <i>The first development proponent to lodge a permit application for land which contains a section of the linear park as outlined on Plan 8 must undertake a master plan for that section of the entire linear park, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority. Consultation with all relevant landowners should be undertaken as part of the master plan preparation. The masterplan may be prepared in separate stages (i.e. north and south of Craigieburn Road) to the satisfaction of the responsible authority using the cross sections in Appendix xx.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree in principle, the intent of the requirement was to require a masterplan for each specific section of the Linear Park outlined by the PSP (i.e. GL-04, GL-09 etc). VPA to review the Requirement wording and update accordingly. <b>Updated to clarify wording and intent of R24.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
17.73	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space		Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/R25	Reword R25 as follows: <i>Development of the linear park as shown on Plan 8 must: - Accommodate the full Tree Protection Zone of all River Red Gums shown as must be retained on Plan 10 within the linear park. - Ensure pedestrian access is provided to all residential lot frontages via a road or paper road.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Change to include 'road' is supported <b>R25 Updated as outlined.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.74	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space		Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/G42	Reword G42 as follows: <i>Local parks should generally be provided where shown on Plan 8 and as outlined in Table 5.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated Table Numbers.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.75	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space		Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/G43	Update G43 to correct Table references from Table 4 to Table 5.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated Table Numbers.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.76	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Open Space		Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/G46	Plan 4 Place Based Plan shows LP-14 spanning multiple parcels. LP-14 should be shifted to be within the single property adjoining the green link. If LP-14 remains in its current location G46 should become a requirement.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.77	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Heritage		Plan 9 Heritage & Public Realm Plan	Plan 9 should identify aboriginal cultural heritage values (waterways) to relate to guidelines.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA consider that areas of Cultural Heritage Sensitivity are provided for within Plan 2 (which references the Areas of Cultural Significance) and G54, which links the Cultural Values Assessment (undertaken by the VPA and landowners through the CHMP process). This allows for a detailed assessment regarding the specific location of Cultural Heritage Values, as the mapping in Plan 2 is general only and may not reflect the outcomes of CVA's and CHMP's.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.78	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Heritage		Section 3.4.2 Heritage & public realm/R26	Update the fifth dot point at R26 as follows: <i>Ensure the parcel containing heritage buildings has access to the internal subdivision street network.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.79	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Heritage		Section 3.4.2 Heritage & public realm/G57	Update G57 to correct formatting to include a dot point for the last guideline point.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree to update drafting error. <b>Added dot point for the last point in G57.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.80	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Education & Community Facilities		Section 3.6.1 Community facilities & education/R34	Reword R34 as follows: <i>New 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.</i> It is noted that the urban structure doesn't locate connector adjacent to Mickleham PS – this requirement can't be met and a unique requirement may be needed.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agreed in principle. Reference to "New" education facilities is supported to differentiate Mickleham Primary (which cannot meet this Requirement). VPA to confirm with DET <b>Confirm with DET then update R34 as outlined if acceptable to DET.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.81	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Education & Community Facilities		Section 3.6.1 Community facilities & education/G65	Reword G65 as follows: <i>Emergency services facilities should have access to the arterial road network to maximise coverage and reduce response times.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree with proposed change. <b>Updated G65 wording.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.82	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centres/Table 6	Table 6 Craigieburn West town centre hierarchy- internal to precinct should be updated as follows: <b>Internal Town Centre- change name to: Craigieburn West Town Centre- LTC1</b> <b>Location and Uses- change wording to:</b> Located centrally in the Craigieburn West PSP, accessible from Mickleham Road and located north of Craigieburn Road <b>with frontage to the connector road network.</b> Provides a full line supermarket and specialty shops, with the ability to support non-retail local services.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree with proposed change. <b>Updated Table 6 wording.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.83	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centres/Table 7	Table 7: Craigieburn West Local Town Centre – performance requirements & guidelines Update third dot point of Key design elements/Performance requirements as follows: <i>Must provide a centralised town square with an open frontage to a connector road that will act as a focal point for surrounding retail, commercial and hospitality uses.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.84	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	Table 7: Craigieburn West Local Town Centre – performance requirements & guidelines Update fourth dot point of Key design elements/Performance requirements as follows: <i>The connector streets to be designed to include dense canopy shade tree provision, outdoor dining and pedestrian activity and on-street parking.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.85	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Plan 4 Place Based Plan	Update PBP to indicate mixed use precinct on the south side of the e-w connector adjacent to Town Centre.	Land Use (incl. applied zone and buffer areas)	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.86	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	At Table 7, create a new Town Centre Element called 'Mixed Use'.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.87	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	Insert a new Performance Requirement for the Mixed Use town centre element as follows: <i>Must provide a minimum mixed-use area of xx net developable hectares.</i> (The above area is to be based on the mixed area shown on Plan4 and area south of the town centre between linear park and n-s connector.)	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.88	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	Insert a new Performance Guideline for the Mixed Use town centre element as follows: <i>Provide a transition between the retail and commercial core and the residential areas</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of Ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
17.89	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	Insert a new Performance Guideline for the Mixed Use town centre element as follows: <i>Development on the south side of the east-west connector should provide capacity for ground floor specialist suites (office, medical services, etc) and independent retail and hospitality tenancies. Floor to ceiling heights should allow for adaptive use with a minimum of 3.6m on ground floor.</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.90	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Local Town Centre		Section 3.7.1 Town Centre/Table 7	Move the fifth dot point within the Retail Core (Local Town Centre) Performance Guidelines into the new Town Centre Element Mixed Use section of Table 7.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.91	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure		Section 3.8.2 Subdivision works/R39	Updated R39 to correctly reference Table 5 and not Table 4.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree with proposed change to correct drafting error. <b>Updated R39.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.92	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure		Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	Update the Description of CI-01 to the following: <i>Purchase of land and construction of a Community Centre.</i>	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree with intent of the proposed change, however this will be dependent on the final outcome of the BCS review and any subsequent changes to the PBP as this may result in a co-located Community Facility (as outlined by the current description)		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
17.93	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure		Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	Update the Description of SR-01 and SR-02 to the following: <i>Purchase of land and construction of sports fields and multipurpose pavilion.</i>	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Agree with proposed change. <b>Updated descriptions for SR-01 &amp; SR-02 in the PIP.</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
17.94	Hume City Council	N/A	N/A	Planning Scheme Ordinance		UGZ12/Clause 2.2 Applied Zone provisions	Query in relation to Table 1 of Clause 2.2 as it relates to Land shown on plan 1 of this schedule Residential on a lot wholly within the local town centre walkable catchment- Applied zone provisions Clause 32.07 Residential Growth Zone.  How does this applied zone work? Only one lot is entirely within the walkable catchment currently and does this apply only to residential lots? Suggest rewording to clarify.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Agree. Table 1 (applied zone provisions) of UGZ12 to be amended to include the following wording: Residential Growth Zone - on a lot wholly within the local town centre walkable catchment (once subdivided)  <b>Update UGZ accordingly.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
18.01	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Housing	Net Developable Area		<b>Property No.24</b> This property is significantly impacted by the designated land uses within the PSP resulting in only 6.36ha of the site available for development, which renders the development of the site as marginal. Surrounding properties have 80-90% of land being NDA.	Land Use (incl. applied zone and buffer areas)	VPA notes the landowner's concerns regarding reduced NDA.	Submission position maintained. Pask maintain that this is a significant issue and that alternative designs for open space and the subdivision design can maintain the aesthetic values of the trees within park (no 09) without the park occupying such a large area. Relocation of the school delivers a better urban design outcome for the property to the north.	No Change Required	No further action required	Low
18.02	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Education & Community Facilities	Education	Plan 4 Place Based Plan & Plan 11 Precinct Infrastructure Plan	<b>Property No. 24</b> The location of the Primary School has significant constraints and issues with transport and pedestrian movement in relation to town centre, mixed use areas and bridge crossing. It is not located closely with active open space and its location leaves little area for development next to the PS and the Creek. Once setback from the Creek and school boundary are considered, the parcel of land would be undevelopable with a depth of only 20 metres.  Requests that the primary school be relocated away from the high conflict, constrained location in the PSP to a location further north within the PSP. If the school is not relocated north of the creek, consideration should be given to shifting it north into the Mixed Use area so the creek interface sets the northern boundary of the school.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA have worked extensively with DET regarding the school location, and DET supports the location of the Primary School.  The VPA does not support relocating the Primary Schools north of the creek as suggested. However, the VPA are working with DET to determine whether it is feasible to move the school north, adjacent to the Aitken Creek.	Submission position maintained, in particular, the catchment gap north of the creek and the difficulty created for the property to the north in delivering a practical development outcome between the school and the creek creates an undesirable outcome.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
18.03	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Open Space	Local Parks	Plan 8 Open Space Plan/LP-08 and LP-09	<b>Property No. 24</b> LP-09 previously identified the removal and offset of the red gum vegetation and Park LP-08 similarly is proposed for the retention of trees, however now the PSP seeks to retain this vegetation and given their proximity to each other, this creates an over provision of open space.  Requests that LP-09 be modified the size of a typical local park size (approx. 1-2ha) co-located with the green link to provide a park network that can still incorporate existing trees.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA does not support a reduction of open space. The land is credited open space and forms part of the overall network. Local park provision is at approximately 5.5% of NDA which is marginally over the typical provision but within an acceptable range.	Submission position maintained. Pask maintain that this is a significant issue and that alternative designs for open space and the subdivision design can maintain the aesthetic values of the trees within the larger park (no 09) without the park occupying such a large area.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
18.04	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Transport & Movement	Street network	Plan 5 Transport Plan	<b>Property No. 24</b> The connector road dissecting the site creates significant constraint on site development, access to the property in the east (Property 25) and creates traffic around the school.  Requests to realign the diagonal road to a north/south orientation to be provided within the boundary of the property to the east.	Land Use (incl. applied zone and buffer areas)	Further investigation required.  The property to the east has existing access via Whites Lane, which is proposed to be maintained (and upgraded) as per the cross section in the Appendix to the PSP.  The connector road alignment has been agreed between Council & VPA. However, potential realignment is being discussed further.	Submission position maintained, alternative designs that are less imposing on subdivision design, that do not impede the road as a bus route, should be considered.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
18.05	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Housing	Density	Table 2 Housing density guide and planned neighbourhood character	<b>Property No. 24</b> Concern that the residential density rates have been determined without justification and will inhibit the developability of the owners three sites.  Requests the density requirements be removed around the activity centre and retain the overall PSP target of 18 lots per Ha average. Density targets should be flexible based on market demand and be site responsive.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP.  Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity.  The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment.  <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Submission position maintained. Pask maintain that higher residential densities should be provided at other high amenity locations such as proximity to open space, linear trails and public transport. The retail centre will not be a significant enough attractor to medium density to the scale proposed. A more equitable, dispersed and higher amenity focus for medium density is sought.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
18.06	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Bushfire Management	Buffers	Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety/Table 4	<b>Property No. 24</b> Queries the bushfire buffers around open space and reserves.  Requests an additional description through a requirement in relation to Table 4 "Bushfire hazard vegetation management and setback requirements" to confirm all setbacks are to be within the reserves and adjoining streets only, no for private residential lots for development.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Considered addressed by Guideline G39.  However, VPA propose to reword G39 to read "Where a setback is required from a bushfire hazard, the setback should, as far as practicable, not be wholly reliant on building setbacks within the boundaries of privately owned residential lots".  <b>ACTION: Update G39 as outlined.</b>	Submission position maintained. Fire management setbacks should be within any reserve and road reservation and not impede on individual lots. A formal response to the recent input of CFA and DELWP is required.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
18.07	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 24	Draft PSP Document Format	Formatting	Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system/R24	<b>Property No. 24</b> The submitter requests to adjust wording in R24 to better describe the specific sections required to be master planned to be more clear.  Additional clarifications should be: - The specific section to be designed needs to be further clarified as the park section identification number. - A preliminary plan only should be required, as details such as cross overs and interfaces may not be known for adjoining sites.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation regarding final wording of R24 is required.  Agree in principle, the intent of the requirement was to require a masterplan for each specific section of the Linear Park outlined by the PSP (i.e. GL-04, GL-09 etc). VPA to review the Requirement wording and update accordingly.  <b>Updated to clarify wording and intent of R24.</b>	Submission position maintained, this is a point of clarification only	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
18.08	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 12 and Property 13	Open Space	Open Space	Plan 8 Open Space Plan/LP-05	<b>Property No's 12 and 13</b> The current location of LP-05 is not located central to the catchment.  Requests that LP-05 be moved to the northern boundary of property 17 (immediately south of property 13 site boundary) co-located with the creek reservation and be more central to the community.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Disagree - Catchment mapping indicates this is located central to the intended catchment.  Locating the open space further south will minimise the availability of open space in the properties to the north (in properties 8, 12 & 13). Locating LP-05 adjacent to the creek corridor will further reduce the available open space west of the creek and linear reserve.	Pask no longer wish to pursue this matter. PSP to remain as exhibited.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
18.09	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 12 and Property 13	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Plan 5 Transport Plan	<b>Property No's 12 and 13</b> The connector road that will provide access to the site is located on the property to the south (Property 17). Access to the site will be reliant on the development of property 17 happening first. Flexibility is required.  Requests that either through a new requirement or guideline that flexibility be incorporated into the location of intersections.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Disagree - The location of intersections needs to be fixed for the preparation of the ICP and subsequent land valuations, and therefore flexibility of the intersection location is not viable.  Initial access to the site will likely be via a temporary left in, left out (LULO), which will require approval from DoT, as well as likely removal once the connector street network has been constructed.	Pask no longer wish to pursue this matter. PSP to remain as exhibited.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
18.10	Pask Group	Pask Group	Property 12 and Property 13	Drainage & Water	MW Drainage Scheme RFI	Drainage	<b>Property No's 12 and 13</b> Requests further information in relation to Melbourne Water Drainage scheme and reserves the right to respond to this matter once in receipt.	Land Use (incl. applied zone and buffer areas)	Noted. Submitter is advised to engage with Melbourne Water (MW), if not already doing so. DSS is currently undergoing review by MW, who will consult affected landowners.  MW have indicated, at the time of this submission, that they have not received any specific queries from the Pask Group or their consultants.  Melbourne Water have provided the Pask Group with a copy of Jacob's Aitken Creek Waterway Values Assessment and contacted their project team to confirm if they have any specific queries regarding the Aitken Creek DSS.	Pask no longer wish to pursue this matter. It is being resolved at detailed design phase with Melbourne Water	No Change Required	Resolved	High
19.01	Capital Group	Aitken Hill	Property 40	Drainage & Water	RFI	Plan 6 Integrated Water management plan	The specific details of the bund to protect Greenvale Reservoir and drainage scheme requirements have not been made available. Without detail surrounding this issue, it is not possible to define a developable area.  Requests that: - The PSP needs to notate through a cross hatch on the plan or the use of a broken line around the gully boundary to indicate that the "ultimate encumbered land boundary is to be resolved through detailed design approved by Melbourne Water."	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The proposed change indicated by the submitter is considered adequately addressed by the note on Page 25, which states: The areas identified in this table are subject to change/confirmation during the functional and detailed design stage to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.  In addition, Melbourne Water advised that it is not expected that there will be any significant changes in land-take due to the later stages of design work for the retarding basin. It should be noted that most of the alignment for the remaining sections of the Greenvale Reservoir protective bunds are located external to this precinct.  The VPA will provide updated details regarding DSS assets within the PSP once this has been finalised by MW.		Further investigation	Pending	High
19.02	Capital Group	Aitken Hill	Property 40	Drainage & Water	RFI	Section 3.3.2 Utilities	The specific details of the bund to protect Greenvale Reservoir and drainage scheme requirements have not been made available. Without detail surrounding this issue, it is not possible to define a developable area.  Add a new Requirement after R19 as follows: "The ultimate net developable area for property 40 should be resolved at development stage with the agreement of Melbourne Water and the Responsible Authority and that the developable area for form the basis of ICP and drainage scheme contribution levies."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. It is noted however, that the developable area of property 40 is unlikely to change, due to the bund and other mechanisms being located in the property to the south of the PSP (outside of the PSP boundary), and the NDA of property 40 is unlikely to change.  The proposed Requirement from the submitter is not considered to be appropriate, as the PSP seeks to resolve the ultimate NDA for the property (subject to minor variations at detailed design stage - i.e. generally in accordance).  In addition, Melbourne Water advised that it is not expected that there will be any significant changes in land-take due to the later stages of design work for the retarding basin. It should be noted that most of the alignment for the remaining sections of the Greenvale Reservoir protective bunds are located external to this precinct.  The VPA will provide updated details regarding DSS assets within the PSP once this has been finalised by MW		Further investigation	Pending	High
19.03	Capital Group	Aitken Hill	Property 40	Drainage & Water	RFI	Drainage	No detail has been provided regarding the costing or the drainage scheme for the Greenvale Reservoir catchment. Requests the right to respond to any change of the PSP as a result of the detailed drainage scheme.	N/A	Noted. For further investigation/discussion.  Costing and details regarding the drainage scheme for the Yuroke DSS should be sought from Melbourne Water.  Whilst details of the bund and drainage outcomes for the Yuroke DSS are subject to finalisation from Melbourne Water, the PSP is responsible for allocating land for the use of drainage reserves. The VPA is aware of the future bund and protection mechanisms and the impact on future developable area, however these sit outside of the PSP area. The PSP indicates the draft Yuroke DSS, which is currently under consultation with landowners.  In addition, Melbourne Water advised that it is not expected that there will be any significant changes in land-take due to the later stages of design work for the retarding basin. It should be noted that most of the alignment for the remaining sections of the Greenvale Reservoir protective bunds are located external to this precinct.  The VPA will provide updated details regarding DSS assets within the PSP once this has been finalised by MW		Further investigation	Pending	High
20.01	Murray Mansfield		Properties 38 and 39	Education & Community Facilities	School Location	Plan 4 Place Based Plan/Primary School Location	The primary school is not located central to its catchment, and requests it be relocated further to the north on the north/south connector road. This will benefit the school by placing it central to its catchment, provide safer intersection treatment and placing the school outside the drainage catchment of the Greenvale Reservoir reducing the drainage levies for the school.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	The location of the Primary School has been confirmed by Department of Education. Relocation is not supported.	VPA position accepted. Do not pursue	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
20.02	Murray Mansfield	N/A	Properties 38 and 39	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Plan 5 Transport Plan/Connector Road Alignment	The co-location of the school, community centre and independent school creates an obstacle to the east west movement within the connector road network. The ultimate road network design would create an unequitable burden on a small amount of landowners to deliver multiple road intersection infrastructure to accommodate the complex road network and would also create a complex movement network around schools.  Requests relocating the school, which will provide a more efficient connector road network, reducing the number of roundabout intersections. Irrespective of the school location, a revised network is required which could include a direct road link from the existing connector at the south of the PSP to the eastern most connector.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	No change required. The road network has been designed to accommodate higher volumes of traffic travelling to and from Vantage Blvd and Mickleham Road. Relocation of the school and a reduction in road network is not supported.	VPA position accepted. Do not pursue	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
20.03	Murray Mansfield	N/A	Properties 38 and 39	Precinct Infrastructure	RFI	Drainage	No detail has been provided regarding the costing or the drainage scheme for the Greenvale Reservoir catchment. Requests the right to respond to any change of the PSP as a result of the detailed drainage scheme.	N/A	Noted. For further investigation/discussion.  Costing and details regarding the drainage scheme for the Yuroke DSS should be sought from Melbourne Water.  Whilst details of the bund and drainage outcomes for the Yuroke DSS are subject to finalisation from Melbourne Water, the PSP is responsible for allocating land for the use of drainage reserves. The VPA is aware of the future bund and protection mechanisms and the impact on future developable area, however these sit outside of the PSP area. The PSP indicates the draft Yuroke DSS, which is currently under consultation with landowners.  In addition, Melbourne Water advised that it is not expected that there will be any significant changes in land-take due to the later stages of design work for the retarding basin. It should be noted that most of the alignment for the remaining sections of the Greenvale Reservoir protective bunds are located external to this precinct.  The VPA will provide updated details regarding DSS assets within the PSP once this has been finalised by MW	Matter is being discussed with Melbourne Water, do not pursue	Further investigation	Unresolved	Medium
21.01	Greenvale Residents Association	N/A		Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road Upgrade	Objection	The submitter is opposed to the PSP due to the uncertainty for funding or delivery of upgrades to Mickleham Road. The submitter wishes to object to the PSP.	N/A	Mickleham Road, which is an arterial road under the care and management of the Department of Transport (DoT).  DoT has undertaken planning work to determine that Mickleham Road will ultimately become a six-lane road in the future, and the land required has been reserved.  The VPA is working with the Department of Transport to ensure coordination between development of the precinct and the necessary road upgrades. The PSP supports the future widening of Mickleham Road through matching intersection designs and additional road connectivity within the PSP.  The recent Victorian State Government budget provides for \$9 million for installation of new traffic lights at the entrance to Aitken College on Mickleham Road and planning for duplication from Somerton Road to Dellamare Boulevard. The Government has announced several road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety in the northern and north-western suburbs. The 2018-19 State Budget invested in upgrades to Craigieburn Road West, Childs Road, Epping Road and Sunbury Road.  Further upgrades to Mickleham Road will be considered under a future funding program in a state wide context. DoT will continue to work with councils, planning authorities and developers to improve safety and relieve congestion across the road network.  The Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by OneMileGrid (Page 30; November 2020) in support of the Craigieburn West PSP, which is available on the VPA's website, outlines a range of major road improvements that will provide additional road connections throughout the vicinity. These improvements are expected to significantly reduce the through traffic volumes along Mickleham Road in the medium to long term.		Further investigation	Pending	High

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
22.01	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Local Town Centre	Scale of LTC	Section 3.7.1 Town Centres/ Table 7	<p><b>1. Table 7/Retail Core (Local Town Centre/Performance Requirements)</b></p> <p>Reword the first dot point to delete 'must' and replace with 'should' and require the LTC to be approximately 2.1-2.5 hectares as recommended by the attachment prepared by Deep End Services Retail Planning Advice.</p> <p>Flexibility is required in this respect to enable other elements of the PSP to guide the development of the centre including guidelines outlined in Appendix 4.3 of the PSP. A review of other new neighbourhood centres in growth areas indicates that a smaller land area would suffice to deliver the proposed elements of the LTC.</p>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	<p>Partly Agree.</p> <p>VPA to reduce the size of the LTC to 2.6ha as outlined by the MacroPlan Report.</p> <p><b>Updated Table 7 to reference 2.6ha for the Town Centre.</b></p>	<p><b>UNRESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 'Macroplan Assessment of retail/commercial land' Background Study (December 2019) does not require 2.8ha of land to host the LTC but rather 2.3-2.6 of land for this purpose (Page 33, Macroplan Assessment).</li> <li>- The 2.1-2.5ha LTC size recommended by the Deep End Services' Retail Planning Advice' (December 2020) includes internal roads, car parking facilities and a public square as envisaged by the PSP.</li> <li>- LTC size flexibility is fundamental to support its evolving needs and viability.</li> <li>- Changes to work/life as a result of COVID-19 could see the reduction in the need for office space, particularly large office space. Designing the LTC to a size in an inflexible and/or traditional sense ignoring this context could result in empty or under-utilised commercial buildings making active frontage design outcomes harder to achieve.</li> <li>- An LTC of a smaller size (i.e. 2.3ha) would encourage a higher density commercial precinct with less areas for roads and parking spaces and more of pedestrian activity in a location close to a future school where less driving and more walking would be preferable and safer.</li> </ul>	Further investigation	Unresolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
22.02	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Local Town Centre	Scale of LTC		<b>1. Table 7/Retail Core (Local Town Centre/Performance Requirements)</b> If the LTC size is reduced, as illustrated in the attached Place Based Plan dated 16/12/2020 prepared by Veris, this will provide additional residential land within a Walkable Catchment along the western side of the property, facilitating a well-designed and high quality interface between the LTC, Medium/High Density Residential Development and Open Space both within the LTC and adjacent linear park land.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Action: VPA to update Whites Lane Cross-section as generally proposed by HCC's submission.</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED</b> - A smaller LTC (see arguments above) would create more space for residential development within the LTC walkable catchment around it. This would extend the opportunities to live in close proximity to the LTC to a broader range of residents and promote a compact and vibrant precinct.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
22.03	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Local Town Centre	Location of LTC	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The northern strip of mixed use has the potential to unnecessarily compromise good design outcomes. Requests that CWSPSP Plans are updated to remove the Mixed Use Land strip within the subject site and to relocate the LTC north, so its northern boundary coincides with the subject site's northern boundary.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree with proposed change. <b>Updated to relocate Town Centre to the north to align with the northern boundary of the subject property.</b>	<b>RESOLVED</b> - Provided the Draft VPA Response ACTION is formalised.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
22.04	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Open Space	Linear Park	Section 3.2.2 Walking & Cycling/Requirements	<b>3. Design Solutions for Linear Park Crossings</b> Amend the Requirements under Section 3.2.2 to remove the fourth bullet point relating to 'Ensure that where a road crosses the linear park, the road is raised with priority given to the linear park.' Alternatives to the above could be either - Removing the word must in respect to this specific requirement or - Relocating the Linear Park so it does not cross the subject site diagonally but rather projects north along the site's eastern side. (Connecting the Local Park (south-east of the site) to the Drainage Reserve(north of the site)and the Linear Park on the LTC west boundary, via the Town Centre and its public square would cancel the need for a Linear Park crossing in the middle of residential land.)	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Submission concern was related to the provisions potentially inferring an 'overpass/underpass'. VPA have proposed updated wording of Requirement to state: "Ensure that where a road crosses the linear park, the road is raised (i.e. raised pavement treatment) with priority given to the linear park." <b>Updated R7 as indicated above.</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED</b> - Provided the re-wording of this policy clarifies roads across linear parks do not need to be physically raised but rather subject to treatment which fosters safety.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
22.05	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Open Space	Linear Park	Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural system	<b>3. Design Solutions for Linear Park Crossings</b> Amend R25 to remove "must" and replace with 'should' on the basis of the inflexibility of the requirement.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	For further investigation via discussion with Council. These are considered two highly important design parameters for the linear park, and are considered non-negotiable. However, it may be prudent to amend R25 to reflect the ability to accommodate minor encroachments into the TPZ's in accordance with Australian Standard AS4970-2009. The VPA are reviewing the application of the AS would be relevant in this context.	<b>UNRESOLVED</b> - Retaining trees by applying Australian Standard AS4970-2009 is considered to be appropriate and to provide flexibility supporting sensible development solutions..	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
22.06	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Native Vegetation Removal	UGZ12 and CWSPSP	<b>4. Removal of Native Vegetation</b> There is no clear permit application pathway to remove vegetation identified for retention in the CWSPSP in special circumstances. Request the inclusion of a planning permit trigger to remove vegetation in the Urban Growth Zone--Schedule 12 (UGZ12) and a statement in the CWSPSP acknowledging vegetation identified for retention in can be removed subject to planning permission.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Permit triggers for removal of native vegetation are contained within Clause 52.17 Native Vegetation. The VPA's position regarding vegetation to be retained, is that it should be retained regardless of planning permissions (subject to applications to the Hume City Council). VPA have included a minor wording change with an update to R33 to state "unless otherwise agreed by the RA". <b>Updated R33 as outlined</b>	<b>UNRESOLVED</b> - Clarify about a statutory pathway to remove native vegetation is important and consistent with several other PSPs which have delivered successful outcomes.	Further Investigation	Pending	Low
22.07	Hawthorn Developments		Property 23	Local Town Centre	LTC Design		<b>Veris Place Based Plan 16/12/2020</b> The Veris PBP considers the matters identified in the previous submission points above and as summarised below: - The LTC to include significant residential component to boost night activity and activate the town square - A central road spine connectivity to the LTC - The retention of significant trees as highlighted in the Arborist Report prepared by Tree tec - Medium to high density residential development of between 20-26.5 dwellings per/NDHA is factored in. Critical design items include: - A 20m road section for the central connector to aid with the fire risk separation of the southern local park fronting Craigieburn Rd and to help divide the west residential development from the linear park fire source. - The road crossing of the linear park is a limited distance of approximately 25m. It is designed to include a pedestrian refuge island for safe pedestrian crossing. The requirement to raise this road above the linear park is considered an impractical and unsightly response to a relatively low key residential built environment. Additionally, the subject road is expected to service the localised community given the proposed higher order boulevard directly to the east, and will likely reveal low traffic numbers. The design is currently proposed at grade. - A 2.3 hectare LTC designed to cover retail, commercial, open space/ town square and medium density residential development providing opportunity for mixed residential typology and an economically feasible residential development to occur ahead of the potentially less economically feasible mixed use typology within the centre. This will bring habitat to the centre early in its development phase to boost activity and passive surveillance of the Town Square as early as stage 1 of the LTC construction phase. - Separation of small open spaces within the centre of the LTC to allow for diverse activity and after hours uses by a diverse range of cultures and ages.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation with Council. However, indicative response to critical design items: - Agreed, however the PSP does not need to show this road. May indicate potential LULO access (TBC). - Noted. The VPA do not see an issue with the raised crossing of the linear park - however there may be potential in investigating this further. The raised crossing only relates to Local access streets. - Noted. 2.3ha may be sufficient - VPA consider a minimum of 2.5ha, noting the MacroPlan report indicated 2.3-2.6ha would be sufficient. - Noted. Provision of Town Square and landscaping buffers are supported. Inclusion of residential is TBC. - Shape and configuration of the LTC is generally supported, noting that this can be further detailed at permit stage (and the PSP may not reflect this change.	<b>UNRESOLVED</b> - Subject to any subsequent responses provided by the VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
23.01	Satterley - Lindum Vale	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Road Intersection Funding		Separation of small open spaces within the centre of the LTC to allow for diverse activity and after hours uses by a diverse range of cultures and ages.	N/A	For further investigation / discussion. However, as these relate to the ICP, these matters are considered beyond the scope of the PSP. The preparation of the Craigieburn West PSP does not change the location or scope of the IN-02 and IN-03		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
23.02	Satterley - Lindum Vale	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	PIP	Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	<b>2. Construction of Mt Ridley Road</b> Amend the Craigieburn West Precinct Infrastructure Plan, on the grounds of equity, to include a 50% apportionment of LV ICP RD-01 to the Craigieburn West PIP (and future ICP).	N/A	For further investigation / discussion. However, as these relate to the ICP, these matters are considered beyond the scope of the PSP. The VPA are reviewing the proposal to include RD-01, however noting that no current apportionment to CWSPSP exists in the Lindum Vale PSP.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
23.03	Satterley - Lindum Vale	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	PIP	Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	<b>3. Descriptions of IN-03</b> Align wording in the Craigieburn West PIP (and future ICP) with the approved wording in the Lindum Vale PIP and ICP for IN-03. The description of the intersection of Mount Ridley Road/Connector Street in the Craigieburn West PIP is incorrect and does not reflect the description within the approved Lindum Vale ICP, which has the effect of removing the 25% apportionment to the signalised T intersection project and transferring it to cover the cost of delivering the 4th leg of the intersection.	N/A	For further investigation and discussion.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
23.04	Satterley - Lindum Vale	N/A	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	PIP Staging	Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	<b>4. Staging of Infrastructure</b> VPA should undertake a review of the staging indicated in the PIP to more closely align with the likely timing and need for delivery of projects including: IN-02- to be shown as S-M rather than M-L on the basis that land acquisition will be required. CI-01 and SR-01- to be shown as S-M	N/A	VPA agree in principle and will review the indicative timeframes.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
24.01	Porter Davis	N/A	Properties 32 and 33	Supports Amendment	Supports		Supports the following PSP outcomes: 1. Designated residential land use as depicted in Plan 4 Place Based Plan 2. Minimum density of 18.5 dwelling per hectare 3. Inclusion of reimbursable park and linear reserve- encouragement is provided to allow for some flexibility in the specific location for local access street (level 2) to enable shallower lot depths to be delivered along this portion of the site.	N/A	Noted support of the PSP. VPA note that minimum density is proposed to increase to 19 dwellings/ha.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/112 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
25.01	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Other		General comment	The draft Future Urban Structure appears to include all alignments and land-takes relevant to the current versions of the Aitken Creek, Upper Brodies Creek and the Yuroke Creek Development Services Schemes.	N/A	Noted. VPA is awaiting MW to confirm final layouts once DSS's are finalised.	Melbourne Water has provided the current proposed DSS layouts relevant to this precinct. Further amendments will be required based on the ongoing conversations with Stockland regarding their proposed amendments, of which Melbourne Water is generally supportive.	Further Investigation	Pending	High
25.02	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Draft PSP Document Format	Formatting	Terminology	Incorrect terminology used. References to "Sodic", "Dispersive" or "Sodic/Dispersive" should be updated to "Sodic and Dispersive" to appropriately reflect the soil types that require potential management/mitigation actions.	Minor drafting error (spelling, grammar, incorrect reference in document)	Noted. VPA to review document and replace as outlined. <b>Updated terminology as required.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.03	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 2.2 Purpose (pg. 10)	Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "Facilitate the final drainage outcomes associated with the Aitken Creek, Yuroke Creek and Upper Brodies Creek Development Services Schemes, including outcomes associated with the protection of the Greenvale Reservoir."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. The proposed wording does not change the purpose/outcome sought by the PSP. <b>Purpose Updated:</b> "Facilitate the final drainage outcomes associated with the Aitken Creek, Yuroke Creek and Upper Brodies Creek Development Services Schemes, including outcomes associated with the protection of the Greenvale Reservoir."	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.04	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 2.3 Objectives 04 Water, Utilities and safety	The current wording does not appropriately reflect the protection requirements for the Greenvale Reservoir, as outlined in ESO-09 in the Hume Planning Scheme, noting that they aren't drainage specific protection requirements. Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "To facilitate safe, resilient and water sensitive urban environments in Craigieburn West that respond to climate change, bushfire management, drainage outcomes and the specific protection requirements relevant to the Greenvale Reservoir Drinking Water Catchment."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Inclusion of additional wording is considered appropriate and does not change the purpose/outcome of the objective sought by the PSP. <b>Objective 4 Updated</b> "To facilitate safe, resilient and water sensitive urban environments in Craigieburn West that respond to climate change, bushfire management, drainage outcomes and the specific protection requirements relevant to the Greenvale Reservoir Drinking Water Catchment."	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action. Melbourne Water also notes that other submitters have raised concerns with the omission of more detailed guidance related to the protection requirements for the Greenvale Reservoir, as outlined in ESO-09 in the Hume Planning Scheme	Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
25.05	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Housing	Formatting	Section 3.1 - Housing, subdivision & built form - Guideline G6 (pg. 16)	G6: Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "Where a street separating development is not feasible, design and layout options should demonstrate:"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. Current wording is consistent with recent PSP's. The opening paragraph, "Subdivision should provide for a street separating development from waterways...", places on the onus on the developer to provide justification for why this should not be the case i.e. why it is not feasible.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
25.06	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management - Requirement R10 (pg. 22)	R10: Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "Stormwater conveyance and treatment (including interim solutions) must be designed in accordance with the relevant Development Services Scheme and Plan 6 to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority, and to avoid or mitigate the risk of erosion from sodic and dispersive soils. Note: this may require a variation to the relevant DSS as shown on Plan 6".	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>R10 Update as outlined.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Further Investigation	Resolved	Low
25.07	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management - Requirement R11 (pg. 22)	R11: Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "The final layout and design of constructed wetlands, retarding basins, stormwater quality treatment infrastructure, and associated paths, boardwalks, bridges, and planting, must be designed to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority, and include appropriate considerations to mitigate the risk of erosion from sodic and dispersive soils"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated R11 as outlined.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Further Investigation	Resolved	Low
25.08	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management - Guideline G22 (pg. 22)	G22: Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "Where practical, development should include integrated water management initiatives to reduce reliance on potable water and increase the utilisation of stormwater and wastewater contributing to a sustainable urban environment."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Inclusion of additional wording considered appropriate as it does not change the purpose/outcome of the objective sought by the PSP. <b>Updated G22 to include 'stormwater'</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.09	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated Water Management - Guideline G29 (pg. 23)	G29: Melbourne Water requests that the below dot point be added to Guideline G29: - Minor instream stabilisation to support pool and riffle structure and reduce risk of disturbance of reconstruction or erosion.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>Updated G29 to include additional dot point.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Further Investigation	Resolved	Low
25.10	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Table 3: Water Infrastructure (pg. 25)	Update "DSS Gap" to "Gap Catchment (Non DSS)"	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. Inclusion of additional wording is considered appropriate as it does not change the purpose/outcome of the objective sought by the PSP. <b>Updated Table 3 &amp; Plan 6 accordingly.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.11	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Drainage & Water	Waterway Setbacks and Buffers	Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety - Guideline G39 (pg. 27)	G39: This buffer/set-back needs to be located external to Melbourne Water's Drainage Reserves and Waterway Corridors, noting that Aitken Creek currently contains native grassland and this guideline will potentially place a significant additional maintenance burden on Melbourne Water. Melbourne Water also requests further guidance as to how this requirement specifically relates to the scattered trees in close proximity to Aitken Creek.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Propose to reword G39 to read "Where a setback is required from a bushfire hazard, the setback should, as far as practicable, not be wholly reliant on building setbacks within the boundaries of privately owned residential lots". <b>ACTION: Update G39 as outlined.</b>	Further consultation between the interested parties needs to be facilitated by the VPA.	Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
25.12	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Bushfire Management	RFI	Section 3.3.3 Bushfire management & safety - Guideline G41 (pg. 27)	G41: The outcome of this guideline is somewhat ambiguous for drainage reserves and waterways, Melbourne Water requests further details regarding the intent of this guideline, noting that many of our constructed waterways feature indigenous species.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required. VPA to determine final wording, as PSP wording is consistent with recent PSP's. VPA is awaiting a response from the CFA/FRV regarding the Bushfire Provisions in the PSP.	Further consultation between the interested parties needs to be facilitated by the VPA.	Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
25.13	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Draft PSP Document Format	Formatting	Section 3.8.1 Development Staging - Requirements Table (pg. 41)	Formatting error within the table	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>PSP to be updated to correct formatting error.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.14	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Draft PSP Document Format	Formatting	Explanatory Report - Page 4	Melbourne Water requests that the below updated wording be considered: "Drainage infrastructure appropriate to cater for the urbanisation of this precinct will be provided for a component of development. This will include stormwater quality treatment assets and retarding basins as required."	Explanatory Documents	Agree. <b>Explanatory Report to be updated.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
25.15	Melbourne Water	Melbourne Water	N/A	Draft PSP Document Format	Formatting	Explanatory Report - Page 5	Update "water treatment facilities, wetlands" to "stormwater quality treatment assets"	Explanatory Documents	Agree. <b>Explanatory Report to be updated.</b>	Melbourne Water agree with the VPA's proposed action.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
26.01	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Housing	Planning	Section 3.1	Support is given for flexible density requirements ensured by flexible planning. The assumptions around the capacity of the private sector to support contributions are pre-COVID based and are now very different and the current situation may lead to outcomes that might not be affordable if the private sector cannot ensure the delivery. Opposes the use of mandatory inclusionary zoning targets, rather the State Gov should look at incentivising the provision of affordable housing through mechanisms including land tax relief for affordable housing, fast track planning approval for affordable housing and flexibility in design standards including height in exchange for affordable housing.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Support for flexibility is noted with thanks. The comments regarding the ability of the industry to support contributions is noted; however, this is a matter beyond the scope of the PSP. The VPA will update the affordable housing provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the Beveridge North West Panel report. <b>Updated documents for affordable housing provisions as required.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Medium
26.02	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Transport & Movement	PSP Objectives	Objective 2	Supports the objectives outlined in Plan Melbourne and the 20-minute neighbourhood strategies in this regard. It is noted that the Department of Transport is yet to confirm that the North-South connector will be a designated bus route, a flexible approach adopted in the Craigieburn West PSP that allows for future adaptation is important. The street must be bus capable.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. All connector streets are to be designed as bus capable.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
26.03	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Open Space	PSP Objectives	Objective 3	It is important the CWSPS remains flexible to enable open space adaptations at the planning permit stage, so that site-specific attributes or constraints can be managed. In relation to heritage sites, any obligations that already exist under the Aboriginal Heritage Act and should not be replicated as it is unnecessary and will add confusion to the planning process.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. PSP does not seek to replicate other legislation and requirements.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
26.04	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Drainage & Water	IWM		Melbourne Water's changes to the its requirements has added significant cost to the Craigieburn West PSP, which will ultimately be passed onto the developer and lot purchaser. Clear expectations on what work must be completed by the relevant authorities in a given timeframe must be stated, so developers understand what is required of them and can cost the measures accordingly.  In relation to the challenges that relate to protecting the Greendale Reservoir and implications for future developability of the southern extent of the CWSP, it is encouraged that the VPA urgently resolves the planning status of the land affected by the Yuroke Drainage Strategy to allow development to occur.	N/A	The VPA are working closely with MW to resolve the status of both the Alken Creek and Yuroke DSS, and seek to include the updated DSS into the PSP once finalised.		Further Investigation	Pending	High
26.05	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Tree retention		There is no justification to the approach or methodology for the significant proportion of existing native scattered trees to be retained.  Trees that are to be retained are to be credited passive open space, which is a positive outcome that the Property Council supports, however, there are still scattered trees marked for retention outside of credited passive open spaces which will affect net development area. Little regard has been given to Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) in the PSP. Trees that are protected will be more than what has been indicated within the PSP and when taken into account they will render land sterilised and undevelopable.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Tree retention has been informed by a vegetation study with high and very high value vegetation identified for retention. This is a standard approach to tree retention. TPZs have been considered throughout the PSP.  While scattered trees outside of credited open space will have a limited impact on net developable area, the amenity derived from these trees is considerable and improves the overall development. Appropriate approaches to the incorporation of these trees can be resolved at subdivision stage to reduce the impact on net developable area.  G43 provides for design flexibility of local parks which will allow the final shape of the park to be adjusted at subdivision stage.  Minor modifications to open spaces and the vegetation requirements may be made post-consultation.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
26.06	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Linear Park	Section 3.5/R33	The linear park incorporates a high number of scattered trees and tree groups. This has caused a problematic separation between the park and the North-South connector road alignment within Property Council members' landholdings. The proximity of the park and the North-South connector road limits the viable design outcomes available for the several residential pockets sandwiched between them.  The viable design outcomes for the pockets of land between these two linear assets are constrained by Requirement R33, which mandates the retention of several scattered trees within the pockets.  R33 conflicts with other important objectives of the CWSP and in its current form lacks flexibility.  Requests that R33 be changed to a Guideline that allows flexibility.  A flexible approach toward the retention of scattered trees should be adopted by the VPA to support urban design outcomes. Amenity value must be primary objective of tree retention, with biodiversity outcomes a secondary benefit. Where trees are retained, developers should be credited toward their passive open space requirements.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA are working with the submitters and HCC to confirm the final alignment of the Linear Park, as well as outlying vegetation for retention under R33.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
26.07	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Land Acquisition		This is a matter for Education Victoria, and it should come with an acquisition timeline rather than warehousing land. Where appropriate, location and design of education and community facilities should be shared use. It would be appropriate for there to be a performance target to measure this provision.	N/A	Noted. School site acquisition is a matter for Department of Education and Training How, if and when the land will be acquired is to be determined by the relevant authorities.  The VPA co-locates education and community facilities where practicable. The management of these facilities is the responsibility of the Department of Education and Council respectively.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
26.08	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia		Outcomes	PSP Objectives	Objective 7	VPA is commended for its work on the CWSP recognising the importance of the availability of local employment as key to delivering a 20 minute neighbourhood principle.	N/A	Noted, with thanks.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
26.09	Property Council of Australia	Property Council of Australia	N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	ICP		The CWSP ICP levy amount is disproportionate to the actual required infrastructure spend. Most of the infrastructure required by the PSP within Craigieburn West already exists.  The VPA needs to identify required infrastructure that does not already exist and require contributions from developers accordingly. It is unhelpful to have the PSP and ICPs run as separate processes, as this creates awkward interim arrangements while developers await the completion of ICPs.	N/A	Noted. The ICP and the PSP are separate scheme amendments. The PSP identifies the infrastructure to be included in the ICP. Currently the ICP is calculated to have a standard levy. Standard levy ICPs do not require consultation. Should the outcome of the SAC require additional items be added to the ICP that result in a supplementary levy, statutory consultation will be undertaken.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
27.01	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Tree Retention		Strongly supports the protection of a significant number of native trees outside of the BCS within Local Parks and the Green Link.  Strongly urges the PSP to go further than this and commit to protection of additional indigenous trees within public open space and the public realm.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. The PSP provides an adequate balance between the retention of remnant high-quality vegetation and the future urban development of the precinct, with the open space contribution of the PSP already exceeding 28% of the NDA (including the waterways and conservation land).	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Low
27.02	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Open Space	Green Links & Open Space		Urges the investigation into potential for additional green links to enhance fauna movement and genetic exchange.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The PSP achieves a balance between the retention of vegetation, provision of open space and the ultimate need for urban development. Additional Green Links are unlikely to be supported as the credited open space contribution of the PSP matches the target of 10% of NDA, with a total of 28% of NDA allocated for open space (including the waterways and conservation land).	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Medium
27.03	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Road Bridges		Roads/bridges crossings over waterways should be explicitly designed to allow fauna to move along waterways/drainage lines.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. Melbourne Water is supportive of this outcome and it is one which should be achieved through a coordinated approach at the functional design stage.	Not resolved - should be specified as a requirement or guideline in PSP	No Change Required	No further action required	Low
27.04	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	BCS Conservation Area 29		The VPA and Council should work with DELWP to optimise the boundaries of BCA 29 to improve the biodiversity function of this area in the context of the wider landscape and potentially establish complementary local parks.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA have collaborated with DELWP and City of Hume to ensure the best outcomes for the BCS. Complementary local parks have been provided, which allow for the retention of the remnant vegetation where possible.  The BCA 29 is subject to boundary review, with a proposal to be submitted to the Commonwealth for a realignment.  The ultimate management of the BCS lies with DELWP-MSA.	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Medium
27.05	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Plan 2 Precinct Features		The legend in Plan 2 lists BCA 29 as being for Growing Grass Frogs. This is a mistake.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. VPA to confirm with DELWP-MSA.	Not resolved	Change Required	Pending	Low
27.06	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Drainage & Water	IWM	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management	G23: Strongly support G23 although its reference to MNES could be expanded to include matters of state and regional conservation significance.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. Reference to "Matter of National Environmental Significance" (MNES) is satisfactory, as this is standard and accepted terminology, and consistent with recent PSP's.	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Low
27.07	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Revegetation & Enhancement		The BNWSP includes the following Guideline:  Where practicable, existing vegetation should be retained, protected and enhanced, and indigenous revegetation undertaken to provide habitat and movement corridors for local fauna.  The CWSP Guidelines should be reviewed with the aim of including appropriate wording about indigenous revegetation.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	This is addressed by current G59: Where practicable, existing vegetation should be retained, protected and enhanced to provide habitat and movement corridors for local fauna.  Due to the extent of existing remnant vegetation in CW in comparison to BNW, additional guidance regarding re-vegetation is not required.	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
27.08	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Drainage & Water	IWM		The IWM targets for the CWPSP should be comparable to the rest of the upper Merri which is in a Stormwater Priority Area that requires higher reductions in stormwater flows. This request particularly relates to the Aitken Creek sub catchment.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The PSP supports the delivery of Integrated Water Management. Targets for IWM are best placed in water authority policy and not the PSP. Melbourne Water also notes that the Healthy Waterways Strategy identifies large areas associated with the Merri Creek Upper Sub-Catchment as Stormwater Priority Areas, however, this does not currently include the Aitken Creek sub-catchment associated with the Craigieburn West PSP.  As a result of the recommendations from the waterway values assessment undertaken by Jacobs, Melbourne Water is making provision for a greater level of waterway protection, acknowledging the local context (i.e. access, amenity, soils, vegetation and waterway form)	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	High
27.09	Merri Creek Management Committee		N/A	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Sodic Soils	UG212	Strongly supports the requirement for Sodic and Dispersive Soils Management Plans in the Schedule to the UG2 and the guidelines and requirements regarding sodic and dispersive soils in the PSP.  Recommends redrafting of the UG212 application requirement as follows and that an appropriate planning control be prepared for any non-UG2 land: "An application to subdivide land or construct or carry out bulk earthworks must be accompanied by, a sodic and dispersive soils management plan, prepared by a suitably qualified professional, that describes... --- --- --- - Soils investigation, undertaken by a certified professional soil scientist."	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Change not supported.  UG212 only applies to land within the UG212 and not non-UG2 land. Non UG2 land within the PSP includes land zoned RC2 where development is not anticipated to occur and hence the application requirement is not relevant.	Not resolved	No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.01	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R2	R2: Clarification required from the VPA about average densities.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas.  Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity.  The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment.  <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
28.02	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R4	R4: VPA to advise of the expectations for the Mickleham Rd interface and provide clearer direction or options for this to avoid confusion at permit stage.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.  R4 is linked with R8, which states: Vehicle access to lots fronting arterial roads must be provided from the local internal loop road or rear lane, to the satisfaction of the Road Authority.  Considered to be addressed by the inclusion of the Mickleham Road interface cross-section.  <b>PSP Updated to include Mickleham Road Cross Section Interface (as per Lindum Vale PSP) as a Figure within the PSP document.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.03	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Affordable Housing	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R5	R5: Adopt the Panel recommendations for BNWPSP in relation to affordable housing.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. VPA to update provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report.  <b>Updated PSP &amp; Ordinance to reflect BNW PSP Panel Report.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Medium
28.04	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Affordable Housing	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/G4	G4: Remove 10% affordable housing target from G4.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. VPA to update provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report.  <b>Updated PSP &amp; Ordinance to reflect BNW PSP Panel Report.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Medium
28.05	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/G6	G6: Retain G6	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
28.06	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/G7	G7: Delete from PSP due to repetition in the UG212.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. This has not been duplicated in the UG212.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
28.07	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/G8	G8: Add 'where practicable' to dot point 2.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. As a guideline G8 has a degree of flexibility built in through the word "should".		No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.08	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Roads	Section 3.2.3 Street network/G18	G18: Delete guideline- Connector streets are low speed traffic environments that are suitable for direct lot access. Given the road is to be designed with a central median the potential for conflict (via right hand turns etc.) is limited. With regard to the two way bike path, the standard connector street cross section allows for a 4.5m clearance between the property boundary and the pathway. This distance was agreed to by growth area councils and the VPA as a sufficient zone for vehicles to stop if necessary, prior to the bike path.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation required.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
28.09	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R10	R10: Add to note to say this could include changes in the DSS in relation to sodic soil requirements.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	R10 already includes a note regarding a variation to the DSS. Furthermore, R10 will be updated as requested by MW (Item 25.06) to state:  "Stormwater conveyance and treatment (including interim solutions) must be designed in accordance with the relevant Development Services Scheme and Plan 6 to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority, and to avoid or mitigate the risk of erosion from sodic and dispersive soils. Note: this may require a variation to the relevant DSS as shown on Plan 6".  <b>R10 updated as per MW submission (Item 25.06).</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.10	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	Formatting	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R11	R11: Add to note to say this could include changes in the DSS in relation to sodic soil requirements.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. This would be a duplication of the note in R10 which already covers a note regarding a variation to the DSS.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.11	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	Waterways	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R15	Waterways should be adjacent to public land such that any stormwater harvesting initiatives can be realised – particularly active open spaces and schools.  Support is given to IWM initiatives but caution the mandating of tanks via a IWM permit condition or mandating tanks via permits. The density targets in this PSP makes it very difficult to incorporate rainwater tanks coupled with the lack of demand/competition with the Class A Recycled Water (mandated) reticulated system.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. The PSP does not mandate specific IWM initiatives or specific conditions in the UG2 regarding water tanks.		No Change Required	No further action required	Medium
28.12	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Bushfire Management	Bushfire Hazard	R21	R21: What was the rationale for the Waterway for Aitken Creek being classified as a Bushfire Hazard 2 (Grassland).  The northern end of the Aitken Creek will be a highly modified waterway corridor as it is less defined in this location and will be designed and landscaped in accordance with Melbourne Water standards.  Change classification of northern section of waterway to Bushfire Hazard 3.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. However, the VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows:  <b>R22: Habitable buildings</b> adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.  Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots.  <b>ACTION: Update R21 terminology to 'habitable building' in place of the word development.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
28.13	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Bushfire Management	Bushfire Hazard	R22	R22: What was the rationale for the Waterway for Aitken Creek being classified as a Bushfire Hazard 2 (Grassland).  The northern end of the Aitken Creek will be a highly modified waterway corridor as it is less defined in this location and will be designed and landscaped in accordance with Melbourne Water standards.  Change classification of northern section of waterway to Bushfire Hazard 3.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. However, the VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows:  <b>R22: Habitable buildings</b> adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.  Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots.  <b>ACTION: Update R21 terminology to 'habitable building' in place of the word development.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
28.14	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	Funding	G29	G29: As per comments for R10 and R11, any widening of the waterway over and above the hydraulic widths to convey flows must be funded by the scheme.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	A response from MW is required. The VPA have referred submission to Melbourne Water. DSS matters, i.e. DSS funding, are considered outside of the scope of the PSP.		No Change Required	Pending	High

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/112 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
28.15	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Utilities	Formatting	G35	G35: Amend G35 to define what 'practical alternative' means.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further investigation	Pending	Medium
28.16	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Bushfire Management	Bushfire Hazard	G37	G37: Assume that this would only apply to Bushfire Hazard Areas 1 and 2 and not Areas 3 and 4 which are low threat. Clarification required and to be reflected in G37.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Proposed to reword G37 to read "Subdivision adjoining bushfire hazard areas 1 & 2 should include a publicly accessible perimeter road." <b>ACTION: Update G37 as outlined</b>		Further investigation	Pending	Medium
28.17	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Bushfire Management	Formatting	G39	G39: Delete guideline or reword so that the setbacks defer to the Site Management report.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Propose to word G39 to read "Where a setback is required from a bushfire hazard, the setback should, as far as practicable, not be wholly reliant on building setbacks within the boundaries of privately owned residential lots". <b>ACTION: Update G39 as outlined.</b>		Further investigation	Pending	Medium
28.18	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Open Space	Support	R23	Support this initiative but must be co-ordinated with service depths and offsets. The use of site won soils and the requirement to review and enhance soils is supported.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. R23 address utilities offsets.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.19	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Open Space	Formatting	R24	R24: This requirement is unclear. If an application is lodged on parcel 7, would R24 require that a masterplan is prepared for the entire GLO3 (parcels 7 and 8) or all the green link down to Craigeburn Road. Clarification required. Amend R24 so it is clear what is required by each landowner.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation regarding final wording of R24 is required. Agree in principle, the intent of the requirement was to require a masterplan for each specific section of the Linear Park outlined by the PSP (i.e. GL-04, GL-09 etc). VPA to review the Requirement wording and update accordingly. <b>Updated R24 to clarify wording and intent.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.20	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Open Space		G48	G48: The PSP does not really provide for this.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>G48 Deleted.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.21	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Heritage	Formatting	R27	R27: Delete first dot point of R27, and change 'must' to 'should'. (Unless a building has heritage significance or is contributing in another sense, it is not the role of the PSP to require that each existing building becomes a feature of the precinct. It is also a very vague requirement to be applied to adjoining land.)	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. R27 relates to places of worship, where these are proposed to be retained. It is important that these are included as features of the precinct. The intent of the requirement is to require design to take into account the Place of Assembly/Worship when the site is subdivided. This is not intended for adjoining landowners to address where there is no obvious adjacent place.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.22	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Education & Community Facilities	Formatting	G63	G63: Reword to acknowledge that the subdivision may not facilitate the integration but it should not compromise the design of the facilities in an integrated fashion.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.23	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Precinct Infrastructure	Formatting	G71	G71: Amend as follows: 'should provide for the early acquisition or delivery of ...	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.24	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Street Cross Sections	Section 4.5	Street cross sections – Connector Street (28.0 to 31.0m), Boulevard The inclusion of footway/two way bike path detail and the need for driveways will create a poor urban forest outcome. Review.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. Cross sections contained within the PSP are standard across PSPs and provide a baseline. Alternatives may be considered a subdivision stage.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.25	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Street Cross Sections	Section 4.5	Street cross sections – Local Access Street Level 1 (16.0m) Issue with the notes at this plan on the trees, should include 'canopy spread' as well (our estimation is minimum 8m in diameter). Update cross section to refer to 'canopy spread'.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Further discussion/investigation is required. However, cross sections are standard, and VPA are unlikely to support specific revisions to cross-sections.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.26	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Other	Planning Scheme Amendment Process		The formal consultation and submissions process must be given priority over rushing the process to ensure that a thorough consideration of the issues is undertaken. The principles of natural justice and orderly planning must be followed for the Craigeburn West PSP amendment in allowing us to make submissions and test assumptions of the PSP by calling evidence at the SAC. We urge the VPA to request the SAC hear submissions and evidence via a public Committee Hearing and process.	N/A	Noted. The VPA Projects Standing Advisory Committee Terms of Reference dated July 2020 outlines the purpose of the Standing Advisory Committee. No.8 and no.15 of the Terms of Reference outlines the methods and conduct of proceedings. The Standing Advisory Committee is to make the decision on the type of Forum for proceedings to take place, and the VPA is not in the position to make a request.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
28.27	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Precinct Infrastructure	School	Section 4.1	<b>School timeframes</b> - The PIP identifies the school as medium-long (M-L) term delivery. They must be regarded as short-medium (S-M) given the straddling of the school site across four titles and existing capacity issues in Craigeburn.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. VPA to seek further advice from DET regarding timing and delivery of school infrastructure.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.28	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Precinct Infrastructure	Sports Reserves	Section 4.1	<b>SRO2 timeframes</b> - The PIP identifies this project as M-L. It should be shown for S-M delivery to align with the secondary school.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.29	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Precinct Infrastructure	Connector Road		<b>Funding of Connector Road to provide access</b> - The PSP locates the Secondary School across 4 titles, one of which being the existing road reserve for Olivers Road. This currently provides access to the Deague land and other parcels. Typically, PSPs would seek to retain a road reserve and show its continued use as a local road to provide ongoing access to properties. However, given this is not the case, and the PSP area is highly fragmented, the Precinct PIP and ICP must fund the delivery of the connector road to facilitate development for several properties, and enable connection from east to west through the Precinct. A further option to explore the provision of a road is the ability for a local road to be funded under the Standard Levy.	N/A	For further discussion/investigation. From a preliminary review the VPA consider that the Connector Street does not meet the definition for inclusion in the PSP, however this is being reviewed in line with the new ICP Ministerial Direction.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.30	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Precinct Infrastructure	ICP levies		<b>Funding of Connector Road to provide access</b> - There is likely a surplus in levies to be collected for transport items. On that basis, the VPA ought to consider funding this key connector street as part of the standard levy to ensure that access can be gained through the fragmented land	N/A	For further discussion/investigation. From a preliminary review the VPA consider that the Connector Street does not meet the definition for inclusion in the PSP, however this is being reviewed in line with the new ICP Ministerial Direction.		Further investigation	Pending	Low
28.31	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Education & Community Facilities	Catchments and location of school/AOS		VPA to consider the catchments for the AOS and Secondary School and whether the Place Based Plan ought to be reviewed to reduce overlapping catchments.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	The location of the Primary School has been discussed and confirmed by DET. Relocation is not supported. The location of the Active Open Space has been discussed and confirmed by Hume Council. Relocation is not supported.		No Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
28.32	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Education & Community Facilities	Catchments and location of school/AOS		VPA and DET to provide confirmation that the location of the secondary school across 4 property titles will not pose an impediment to its early acquisition.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	DET are supportive of the location of the school over 4 property titles. The VPA cannot provide guarantees around the timing or acquisition of school sites.		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.33	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	IWM		The waterway and wetland layout shown in Plan 4 lacks technical basis. Melbourne Water has not been able to complete its modelling and assessments to the same extent it ordinarily would to inform the preparation of a PSP.  Given this, the waterway design and wetland locations and the overall approach to the drainage is unresolved and results in the draft Place Based plan creating inefficient spaces, poor interfaces and in some instances some irregular drainage outcomes.  This is a fundamental deficiency in the process to date and must be resolved - the completion of the approval of the PSP amendment in a scheduled program should not override the detailed consideration of drainage options for the Precinct and our site.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation/discussion is required. The VPA have referred submission to Melbourne Water for DSS Resolution		Further Investigation	Pending	High
28.34	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	IWM		Adopt the recommendations of the Afflux work in the PSP Urban Structure, and require MW to undertake detailed further modelling. (Refer to Afflux memo attached to submission)	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation/discussion is required. The VPA have referred submission to Melbourne Water for DSS Resolution, and are awaiting the technical review and response to the work prepare by Afflux from MW.		Further Investigation	Pending	High
28.35	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Road access, servicing and delivery		Include the East West connector road as an infrastructure project in the Precinct Infrastructure Plan and funded via the Infrastructure Contributions Plan. This will create efficiencies for multiple landowners.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. From a preliminary review the VPA consider that the connector street does not meet the definition of an ICP allowable item, however, this is being reviewed in line with the new ICP Ministerial Direction.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
28.36	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Road access, servicing and delivery		Whites Lane is also another important road that will assist in opening up the area. There is not timeframe for the upgrade of the road noting that the land to the east is currently at a permit stage. This timeline needs to be discussed between the VPA, Council and obligated landowners.	N/A	Whites Lane is proposed to be upgraded in accordance with the cross section in Appendix 4.5.  The upgrade of this road will occur in line with the development along Whites Lane. As a local road the timing is dependent on the development of the surrounding area.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
28.37	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Transport & Movement	Road access, servicing and delivery		Realign the connector road coming off INQ1 so that it is wholly contained within Deague property.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. E/W Connector has been aligned to the south of the BCS to provide the edge road interface to the BCS.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
28.38	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Efficient lot layout		<b>Adequate lot depths</b> –  Shift the AOS 15 metres to the south to enable the development of lots along the boundary of parcel 9. The positioning of the AOS in the PSP does not provide adequate space to provide for a local road along the boundary of the AOS and a row of lots. Shifting the AOS 15 metres to the south will resolve this issue as shown in Figure 3 of the submission.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Agree.  <b>Plan 2 to be updated to relocate AOS 15m to the south to provide edge road and row of lots adjacent in the north.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
28.39	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Housing	Efficient lot layout		<b>Curved and Diagonal Roads</b> – local and connector roads must be reviewed to create a more efficient lot layout and maximise views to natural assets as follows:  - Diagonal alignment south of the school and town centre straightened to seek improved subdivision outcomes. - Potential for the connector intersection at Craigieburn Road to shift west and align with the park reserve road whilst still maintaining a 400m spacing. This would also mean the realignment to the north doesn't need to be so severe. - Square the north south connector through property 14 to create a direct view line to the waterway and Town Centre, reduce extent of undevelopable land and improve lot layout.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required.  Need to confirm school size/AOS areas are not impacted.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
28.39	Deague Group		Properties 7, 9, 11, 15	Drainage & Water	Efficient lot layout		<b>Review waterway width and alignments</b> – review the location of the waterways so that they are not creating compromised land or cutting diagonally across properties. To improve land use and efficiency the following is recommended:  Locate the waterway along Mickleham Road as it passes through properties 7 and 6. This approach is beneficial in a number of ways by:  - Providing for a soft green frontage and will deliver the rural interface character sought by R4; - Removing a difficult piece of residential land which would be wedged between a 6 lane arterial; - Reduces frontage roads required along the waterway as well as loop roads to Mickleham Road frontage; and - Allows for the culvert/bridge requirements to be determined and developed as part of the delivery in intersection IN-01.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation/discussion is required. The VPA have referred submission to Melbourne Water for DSS resolution, and understand waterway widths and waterways are currently under review by MW through the Aitken Creek DSS review.		Further Investigation	Pending	High
29.01	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 34	Precinct Infrastructure	ICP	Section 1 (Page 5)/Section 1.2 Page 7	Insert anticipated timeframes for the ICP	N/A	Disagree. The anticipated timeframes for the preparation of the ICP should not be included in the PSP, and are not required to be inserted into the PSP.  The ICP has been calculated to be a standard levy (at this point in time) and accordingly does not require consultation. It is anticipated that the ICP will be approved concurrently with or shortly after the approval of the PSP. Should changes to the PSP result in the ICP changing to a supplementary levy, the ICP will undergo notice as per the requirements of the P&E Act.	Unresolved. Whilst it is understood that a Satandard Levy is being pursued and is supported, the major intersections connecting to Mickleham Rd / Elevation Blvd and Craigieburn Rd / North South Rd require 'non-standard' intersection designs.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.02	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 35	Draft PSP Document Format	Precinct Features	Plan 2 Precinct Features	Amend Plan 2 (Precinct Features) to show only 'high' and 'very high' River Red Gum trees.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation/discussion. Whilst retention value generally relates to River Red Gums, there are some High and Very High Value species other than River Red Gums which are also considered for retention due to amenity and character value.	Unresolved. It is requested that the VPA and/or council nominate exactly where these additional trees are located.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.03	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 36	Draft PSP Document Format	PSP Purpose	Section 2.2 (Page 10)	Amend current drafting of dot point #3 to include the highlighted words:  "Facilitate the final drainage outcomes for the Council "DSS Gap" catchment and the Melbourne Water development services schemes for the Aitken Creek, Yuroke Creek and Upper Brookes Creek catchments, including the protection of the Greenwale Reservoir."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree.  <b>Purpose updated to include reference to the Gap Catchment.</b>	Pending. This matter can be resolved if the proposed VPA change is made.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.04	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 37	Draft PSP Document Format	Precinct Land Use Budget	Plan 3 Land Use Budget	Amend Plan 3 Land Use Budget Plan to reflect land uses as per the attached Peet Master plan layout.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. The alignment of the Blvd Connector is subject to submissions from the north side of Craigieburn Road and the adoption of the masterplan as requested, requires further consideration.	Noted. We note that any movement of the intersection will impact the tree retention strategy and open space layout on the Peet land.	Further Investigation	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
29.05	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Draft PSP Document Format	Precinct Land Use Budget	Section 2.4 Precinct land use budget	Amend the land areas associated with 'Waterway and drainage reserve', 'Local network park (ICP Land)' and 'Arterial road - new/ widening / intersection flaring (ICP land)' and adjust the Net Developable Area for the Peet Landholding accordingly.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required.	Unresolved, unless Melbourne Water and Council change their current positions.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
29.06	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Draft PSP Document Format	Open Space	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	Amend Plan 4 to incorporate the changes identified in the "Key Issues" section of the submission, including: 1. Alter the local open space distribution to be consistent with the attached Master plan 2. Amend the shape and size of the wetlands in Properties 30 and 31 to be consistent with the attached Master plan 3. Add a 0.6ha drainage asset on Property 32 4. Shift the alignment of the north-south street further west in accordance with the attached Master plan 5. Replace the Connector Street - Boulevard between Craigieburn Road and Gallantry Avenue with a Local Access Street - Level 2 (bus capable) 6. Replace the Connector Street - Boulevard south of Gallantry Avenue with a Local Access Street - Level 2 (linear park)  Amend labelling errors: 1. Amend the street classification of Gallantry Avenue and Riverglen Drive to Access Street -Level 2	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. VPA to discuss further with HCC and submitter, however a preliminary response is provided below: 1. VPA supports in principle. Agree subject to detailed discussions with HCC and PEET. 2. Agree subject to discussions with HCC and MW. 3. Agree as above. 4. Further discussion. 5. Disagree. Traffic modelling indicates that additional capacity is needed to support the broader network. 6. Disagree as above.  Amend errors 1. VPA to review and confirm position. Noting this is subject to further discussions with HCC.	Unresolved, unless Melbourne Water and Council change their current positions.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
29.07	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 (Page 15)/R1	Amend R1 as follows: 1. Remove dot point 3 regarding the rural landscape interface west of Mickleham Road. 2. In any event, Remove the word "old" from dot point 3.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	1. Do not support. Rural landscape interface is an important aspect of the transition between the rural land and urban development in Craigieburn West. R1 is there to encourage suitable separation distances, as indicated and provided in the Peet Masterplan included as part of the submission. 2. Agree.  R1 updated to remove 'old'.	Pending. It is requested that the VPA confirm whether the proposed subdivision layout included in the Peet submission is deemed to comply with this Requirement.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.08	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Precinct Infrastructure	Landscaping	Section 3.1 (Page 15)/R4	Amend R4 as follows: 1. Amend Requirement R4 to make it clear that the landscaped nature strip is being implemented within the existing arterial road reserve and is not seeking to create an additional tree reserve, nor widen the road reserve of the internal 'loop' road within the subdivision.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Intention is for landscape strip to be included in the arterial road reserve. VPA to include Mickleham Road interface cross-section in the PSP to provide additional guidance.  PSP updated to include Mickleham Road Cross Section interface (as per Lindum Vale PSP) as a Figure within the PSP document.	Resolved if the cross section is provided and the PSP is updated.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.09	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Mickleham Road	Section 4.5 Street Cross Sections	Include a Cross Section for Mickleham Road (ultimate) in Section 4.5 of the PSP.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion. VPA will amend to provide an interface cross section for Mickleham Road as per Lindum Vale PSP, however question whether the provision of an ultimate Mickleham Road cross section is required.	Resolved if the cross section is provided and the PSP is updated.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.10	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 (Page 15)/R5	Delete R5 similar to the approach adopted at the BNWPSP Panel.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The PSP and UG212 to be updated to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report.  Updated documents as required.	Resolved if the cross section is provided and the PSP is updated.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.11	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 (Page 15)/G4	Amend G4 to state: "An application for subdivision of land into residential lots or development of land for residential or mixed use purposes should provide affordable housing as defined by the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The affordable housing should be located within walkable catchments and provide for a range of housing typologies to meet the demonstrated local need"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The PSP and UG212 to be updated to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report.  Updated documents as required.	Pending, subject to approval of the Beveridge North West PSP as per the Panel Recommendations.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.12	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 (Page 15)/G5	G5: Further clarity is required regarding the extent of higher density development around retained vegetation.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	G5 indicates that density should be provided in locations that have higher amenity. Areas of retained natural vegetation are high amenity areas. This is a guideline and not a requirement.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Medium
29.13	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 (Page 16)/G6	G6: Clarify dot point 1 to make it clear whether: a) The title boundary of the lot is to be set back at least 4.0m from the waterway/open space; or b) The dwelling is to be set back 4.0m from the title boundary.  If it is to be option (a), then the Guideline should be simplified as follows:  Subdivision should provide for a street separating development from waterways, sporting reserves and local parks and the linear reserve. Where subdivision does not propose a local street separating development, design and layout options should demonstrate:  - A 4.0m wide "paper road" should be provided as the primary point of access from a footpath or shared path with a minimum width of 1.5 metres along the lot frontage.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Seeks to clarify the intended widths of a paper road as 4m.  Updated dot point 3 to include "A 4.0m wide 'paper road...".	Resolved provided the Guideline is updated as proposed by the VPA.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.14	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Plan 5 Transport Plan	Amend Plan 5 to incorporate the changes identified in the "Key Issues" section of this submission, including: 1. Shift the alignment of the north-south street further west in accordance with the attached Master plan 2. Replace the Connector Street - Boulevard between Craigieburn Road and Gallantry Avenue with a Local Access Street - Level 2 (bus capable) 3. Replace the Connector Street - Boulevard south of Gallantry Avenue with a Local Access Street - Level 2 (linear park) 4. Replace the "controlled intersection" legend description with "roundabout" for the intersections within Properties 30, 31 and 34. 5. Add specific notation to state the Craigieburn/NS Road intersection requires a non-standard design response. 6. Add specific notation to state the Mickleham/Elevation Road intersection requires a non-standard design response.  Amend labelling errors: 7. Amend the street classification of Gallantry Avenue and Riverglen Drive to Access Street -Level 2	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation/discussion is required. Preliminary responses below: 1. This is subject to further discussions with HCC and other landowners north. 2. Not supported by traffic modelling. 3. Not supported by traffic modelling. 4. This change is unnecessary as a controlled intersection is typically a roundabout but may include other methods of control. 5. For further discussion to clarify. 6. For further discussion to clarify. 7. VPA to review and confirm position. Noting that this is all still subject to further discussions with HCC.	Unresolved	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.15	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Walking and Cycling	Section 3.2.2 (Requirements (Page 19))	1. Add a Requirement number for future reference 2. Show the alignment of the linear park on Plan 5 3. Include a cross section in Appendix 4.5 that specifically includes the linear reserve in varying circumstances (include a new Local Access Street - Level 2 (adjacent linear park) cross section)	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation/discussion is required. Preliminary responses below: 1. Agree - Update requirement numbers 2. Plan 5 currently shows the alignment of the linear reserve. However, this can be made more prominent on Plan 5 3. Cross Section on page 65 provides information.  Updated Requirement numbers.	Pending. Further discussion required with the VPA.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.16	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Section 3.2.3 (Page 20)/G18	Amend G18 to remove dot point 4.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. This is guidance and is one of a number of options available to development.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.17	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Section 3.2.3 (Page 20)/G20	Amend G20 to include the highlighted wording to confirm that the streets abutting the linear park do not need to provide a row of trees on the side adjacent to the park. The Guideline is drafted as follows:  Unless abutting the linear park, street trees should be provided on both sides of all roads and streets (excluding laneways and streets abutting the linear reserve) at regular intervals appropriate to tree size at maturity, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority....	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. There are positive outcomes to having additional planting on both sides where adjacent to the linear reserve. This will provide additional canopy cover and provides additional character and amenity. Furthermore, there is no guarantee planting would occur within the linear reserve adjacent to the road reserve.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part 1

Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
29.18	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Section 3.2.3 (Page 20)	Include a Guideline in Section 3.2.3 (Street Network) that states: <i>"Interim site access may be gained from the arterial road network in the early stages of development"</i> .	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	For further discussion with DoT. VPA to determine final wording to ensure consistency with current PSPs.	Unresolved. Further discussion with VPA required as interim access to Gallantry Blvd is required to effectively develop the land.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.19	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	IWM	Plan 6 Integrated Water Management Plan	Amend Plan 6 to incorporate the changes identified in the "Part 1: Key Issues" section of this submission, including: 1. Amend the Melbourne Water DSS and Gap drainage catchment boundaries to reflect the recommendations from Stormy Water Solutions as shown on the attached Master plan; 2. Increase the area of drainage asset ACS808 from 1.43ha to 2.1ha; 3. The Gap catchment 'potential asset (no DSS)' should be shown as two assets: one on Property 31 and one on Property 32 as per the attached Master plan. 4. Replace the reference to 'potential asset (no DSS)' with 'drainage asset (no DSS)'	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation and discussion. The VPA has referred the submission to Melbourne Water for DSS Resolution.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
29.20	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	IWM	Section 3.3.1 (Page 22)/R9	R9: Amend Requirement R9 to state: <i>"Development must give effect to relevant policies and strategies being implemented by the responsible authority, Melbourne Water and Yarra Valley Water, including the Healthy Waterways Strategy and the approved integrated water management plan for each permit/project."</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. Water Authorities are also responsible for preparing IWM plans, and development proposal will need to respond to these as relevant.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	High
29.21	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	IWM	Section 3.3.1 (Page 22)/R13	R13: Update Requirement 13 to provide clear date reference to the Best Practice performance targets that must be met.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. No date is specified as the standards are updated periodically.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.22	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	IWM	Section 3.3.1 (Page 15)/R15	R15: Update Requirement 15 to include performance targets so compliance can be appropriately assessed	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.23	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	IWM	Section 3.3.1 (Page 22)/G23	G23: We request further clarity as to the expectations that are sought to be achieved by this Guideline.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	G23 seeks to provide guidance on the preparation and design of IWM initiatives and treatments prepared as part of the IWM plans. The wording of G23 is consistent with recent PSPs.	Unresolved.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.24	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Utilities	Services	Section 3.3.2 (Page 22)/R16	R16: Amend Requirement R16 to include the following highlighted words: <i>"All existing above ground electricity cables (excluding substations and cables with voltage 66kv or greater) must be placed underground as part of the upgrade of existing roads or subdivision works, unless the cables share power poles with higher voltage lines"</i> .	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Disagree. R16 is a standard requirement. Change not supported.	Unresolved. Current wording fails to consider the precinct specific situation. There is no point in undergrounding the lower voltage cables if it doesn't serve the purpose of removing the above-ground infrastructure. Further, native vegetation along Mickleham Road is impacted if we are required to underground the cables.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.25	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Utilities	Services	Section 3.3.2 (Page 25)/Table 3	Amend Table 3 as follows: 1. Increase the size of ACSB-08 size from 1.43 hectares to 2.1 hectares 2. Increase the 'gap' asset size from 0.52 hectares to include two assets, one of 0.76 hectares on Property 31 and the other 0.60 hectares on Property 3 3. Responsibility should be listed as Council in the 4th column for the additional DSS Gap asset. 4. Ensure note "x" also applies to the DSS 'Gap' asset.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation and discussion. The VPA has referred the submission to Melbourne Water and HCC for comment.	Unresolved, unless Melbourne Water and Council change their current position.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
29.26	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Bushfire Management	Formatting	Plan 7 Bushfire Plan	Amend Plan 7 to remove "Mickleham Road reserve (60m low threat setback)" from the legend.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation/discussion. The VPA are awaiting confirmation from the CFA regarding the Bushfire Management provisions in the PSP.	Noted. Wait further advice from VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
29.27	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Bushfire Management	Formatting	Section 3.3.3. (Page 27)/G37	Amend G37 so that it only relates to Bushfire Hazard Area 1 and Bushfire Hazard Area 2.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Proposed to reword G37 to read "Subdivision adjoining bushfire hazard areas 1 & 2 should include a publicly accessible perimeter road." <b>ACTION: Update G37 as outlined</b>	Noted. Wait further advice from VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
29.27	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Open Space	Parkland	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	Amend Plan 8 to incorporate the changes identified in the "Part 1: Key Issues" section of this submission, including: 1. Alter the local open space distribution to be consistent with the attached Master Plan 2. Move LP-14 to the west to be located at the entry to Elevation Boulevard and contained entirely within Property 31 as per the attached Master plan 3. Adjust the alignment of the Linear Park to be adjacent to the north-south street as per the attached Master plan 4. Equalize the total public open space area across the Peet Landholding	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to discuss with HCC and submitter, however the VPA provide a preliminary response: 1. VPA agree in principle subject to HCC position 2. As above 3. As above 4. This is dependent on the outcomes of points 1-3 above. Notwithstanding we need to discuss this further with PEET in order to understand the details.	Unresolved. The location of LP-14 is yet to be resolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.28	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Open Space	Parkland	Section 3.4.1 (Page 29)/R24	R24: Amend Requirement R24 to read as follows: <i>"The first development proponent to lodge a permit application for land which contains a section of the linear park as outlined on Plan 8 must undertake a master plan for that section of the entire linear park, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority. The masterplan should be prepared in separate stages and for practical lengths (i.e. Mt. Ridley Road to east-west connector, east-west connector to Craigieburn Road, Craigieburn Road to Riverglen Drive and south of Riverglen Drive) to the satisfaction of the responsible authority."</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation regarding final wording of R24 is required. Agree in principle, the intent of the requirement was to require a masterplan for each specific section of the Linear Park outlined by the PSP (i.e. GL-04, GL-09 etc). VPA to review the Requirement wording and update accordingly. <b>Updated to clarify wording and intent of R24.</b>	Noted. Wait further advice from the VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.29	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Open Space	Trees	Section 3.4.1 (Page 29)/R25	Amend R25 as follows: <i>"Development of the linear park as shown on Plan 8 must: - Accommodate the full Tree Protection Zone of all River Red Gums shown as must be retained on Plan 10 within the linear park. - Include the Tree Protection Zone area in the credited open space. - Ensure pedestrian access is provided to all residential lot frontages via a 1.5 metre paper road."</i>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to discuss further with HCC and submitter.	This matter may be able to be resolved, subject to further feedback from council following the recent site meeting.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.30	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Vegetation retention	Section 3.4.1 (Page 31)/Table 5	Amend Table 5 (LP-14) as follows: - amend "Locational Attributes" to remove reference to retention of existing vegetation - reduce area from 0.6 hectares to 0.3 hectares as per attached Master plan	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	VPA does not have a position on the change, however consider it appropriate for further discussion and investigation subject to the outcome of discussions between HCC and PEET in relation to Open Space and other reserves.	Unresolved. This matter may be able to be resolved, subject to further feedback from council following the recent site meeting.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
29.31	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	vegetation retention	Plan 10 Biodiversity & Vegetation Plan	Amend Plan 10 to incorporate the changes identified in the "Part 1: Key Issues" section of this submission, including: 1. Re-arrange local open space configuration to match the attached Peet Master plan 2. Re-categorize trees 953, 959, 968, 969, 982, 1048, 1232, 1265 & 1266 (TreeTec, 2019) from 'native vegetation that must be retained' to 'vegetation that should be removed.' 3. Remove 'native vegetation that must be retained' from areas outside of the open space areas 4. Only show River Red Gums to be retained.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation. Subject to the outcome of discussions between HCC and PEET.	Unresolved. This matter may be able to be resolved, subject to further feedback from council following the recent site meeting.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.32	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Vegetation retention	Section 3.5 (Page 36)/R33	R33: Remove as a Requirement and change to a Guideline that states: 'Vegetation shown on Plan 10 as Vegetation for Retention should be retained and incorporated into either the open space network or the public realm'.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA to discuss further with HCC and submitter.	Unresolved. This matter may be able to be resolved, subject to further feedback from council following the recent site meeting.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.33	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Precinct Infrastructure	Formatting	Section 3.8.2 (Page 42)/R38	R38: Remove dot point 14 as it is a duplication of dot point 6 of R38.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>R38 reworded as appropriate.</b>	Resolved.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.34	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Precinct Infrastructure	Formatting	Section 3.8.2 (Page 42)/R39	R39: Amend the Final dot point of R39, it incorrectly references Table 4 (bushfire setbacks) instead of Table 5 (open space).	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>R39 reworded as appropriate.</b>	Resolved.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.35	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Precinct Infrastructure	Intersections	Section 4.1 Precinct Infrastructure Table	N-05: Amend the description of Intersection N-05 in Table 4.1 (Precinct Infrastructure table) to include the following: 'Construction of a signalized T-intersection (non-standard)'	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree. Precinct Infrastructure Plan is not required to designate standard vs non-standard infrastructure.	Unresolved. Whilst it is understood that a Standard Levy is being pursued and is supported, the major intersections connecting to Mickleham Rd / Elevation Blvd and Craigieburn Rd / North South Rd require 'non-standard' intersection designs.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
29.36	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Drainage & Water	Open Space	Section 4.2 Parcel Specific Land use Budget Table	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 34: Amend the Property Specific Land Budget table to: 1. Change the land areas of the local parks to match the areas shown on the Master plan attached to this submission, and to achieve a Public Land equalisation outcome across the Peet landholding. 2. Increase the size of waterway and drainage reserve on Property 30 from 1.43 hectares to 2.1 hectares. 3. Increase the size of waterway and drainage reserve on Property 31 from 0.52 hectares to 0.76 hectares	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation and discussion. The VPA has referred submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved, unless Melbourne Water and Council change their current position.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
29.37	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Open Space		Section 4.2 Parcel Specific Land use Budget Table	Property 32: 1. Add a 0.60 hectare waterway and drainage reserve to Property 32. 2. Remove the 0.24 hectare allocation of 'Local Network Park (LCP Land)' for LP-14 (now contained wholly within Property 31 as per the attached Master plan).	Location or variation to public infrastructure or utilities (within single parcel)	For further investigation/discussion. The VPA has referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Noted. Wait further advice from the VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
29.38	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement		Section 4.5 Street Cross Sections	Connector Street (28.0-31.0m) Boulevard (Pg. 59): Cross section should make it clear the median is 3m if there is no WSUD proposed and 6m if WSUD is proposed.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation. It is noted that VPA cross sections are standard.	Noted. Wait further advice from the VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.39	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Transport & Movement		Section 4.5 Street Cross Sections	New cross sections: 1. Include a new Local Access Street – Level 2 (linear park) cross section 2. Include cross sections for Mickleham and Craigieburn Roads (with and without a frontage road) 3. Include cross section for a standard laneway	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Additional Cross Sections are to be provided for: - Linear Park - Mickleham Road interface. No cross section is proposed for Craigieburn Road. Laneway cross section to be discussed with Council. <b>Include cross sections for Mickleham Rd Interface and linear parks.</b>	Noted. Wait further advice from the VPA.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
29.40	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Other		Section 4.8 Centres External to the Precinct/Table 8	Delete Table 8 from the PSP.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree. Table 8 provides context regarding the Town Centre Hierarchy external to the PSP.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
29.41	PEET limited	N/A	Properties 28, 29, 30, 31 and 39	Other		Section 4.8 Centres External to the Precinct/Table 9	Delete Table 9 from the PSP.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree. Table 9 provides context to the employment generation within the PSP.	Resolved. The response provided is satisfactory.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
30.01	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	The proposed housing density target of 26.5 dwellings per net developable hectare (NDha) is too high should the minimum density need to be complied with for all individual parcels within the walkable catchment.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP. Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity. The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment. <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.02	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	The application of a housing density of minimum 26.5 dwellings per hectare within a typical greenfield residential subdivision development raises significant concerns on the potential for such density to undermine its objectives of delivering a residential estate supporting a high level of amenity and character.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP. Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity. The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment. <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.03	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	To deliver this level of density, there is an absence in the current market of volume housebuilders and this situation is unlikely to change by the time of gazettal of the PSP.	N/A	Noted - for further investigation.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
30.04	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	A residential subdivision-lead form of development supporting a minimum housing density of 26.5 dwellings/NDha has a higher potential to undermine preferred urban design objectives, including a higher proportion of narrower lots requiring single space garages and resultant increased on-street parking and congestion.	N/A	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP. Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity. The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment. <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.05	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	Provision of higher density low-rise apartment housing is highly unlikely in the short-term representing an unproven dwelling product in the LTC location bringing significant concern with the cost of development and market pricing compared to more typical house and land offerings. Request that the PSP clarify that the minimum housing density target within the walkable catchment of the local town centre is to be realised over its life cycle allowing Council discretion to issue planning approval for a parcel which may not achieve the adopted minimum housing density albeit are satisfied that the housing density target will ultimately be achieved.	N/A	For further investigation.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.06	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	Minimum densities within walkable catchments should match that of other recent PSPs including BNPWSP and Shenstone PSP, which have a minimum density of 25d/NDha.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agreed. Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP. Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around Local town centres and other areas of amenity. The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment. <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.07	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Density		There are opportunities to meet the desired housing density target of a minimum 20 dwellings/NDha (as per Clause 11.03-25) over the PSP area external to the LTC walkable catchment but proximate to activity centre areas external to the PSP area, proximate to public open space network and educational and community facilities. These areas are shown in the submission including land around the Mickleham PS and land adjoining Debonaire Parade. This would enable the allowance for a reduced density requirement within the LTC walkable catchment	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation is required.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.08	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Requirement & Guideline		There is an apparent conflict between R1 and R4 insofar as the inference through the need to create a sensitive interface to the west that larger lots would be provided whilst this area is also located within the walkable catchment of the LTC. A more appropriate housing density target for this site is a minimum of between 20-23 dwellings/NDha.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agreed. VPA propose to refine walkable catchment approximately 90-100m 'in' from the PSP boundary along Mickleham Road. <b>ACTION: Revise Walkable catchment as outlined.</b>	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.09	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Housing	Requirement & Guideline	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	Requests that R2 and Table 2 include the wording below similar to that included in the BNPWSP: "The minimum average density provides guidance regarding the expected quantum of housing to be delivered within a development area. Applications for subdivision that do not meet the minimum average density but can demonstrate how the requirement may be achieved over time may be considered."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation is required. VPA to review BNW and confirm wording as appropriate.	Unresolved.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
30.10	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Requirements & Guidelines	Road Design	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R4	R4-The PSP provides no direction on what is expected for this road design. R4 should be redrafted as it suggests provision of a nature strip separate to a typical local street reserve cross section. It is unclear what landscaping requirements are contemplated by the requirement.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. Intention is for landscape strip to be included in the Arterial Road reservation. VPA to include Mickleham Road interface cross-section in the PSP to provide additional guidance. <b>PSP updated to include Mickleham Road Cross Section interface (as per Lindum Vale PSP) as a figure within the PSP document.</b>	Unresolved. Provision and review of updated documents may resolve.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
30.11	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Requirements & Guidelines	Affordable Housing	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/G4	G4 appears to be contrary to R5 as it states the provision of affordable housing up to 10% and prioritised to within a walkable catchment whereas there is no such detail in R5. G4 suggests the provision of affordable housing is at the discretion of the developer up to 10% whereas R5 specifies a rate to the satisfaction of council. A rate of up to 10% represents an arbitrary figure whilst a provision of 1% or less would technically satisfy the rate of up to 10%. Requests G4 be deleted and replaced with consistent affordable outcomes to G17 and G18 of the Beveridge North West PSP tracked changes Appendix 2 version.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA will update provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report. <b>Updated documents as required.</b>	Unresolved. Provision and review of updated documents may resolve.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
30.12	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Requirements & Guidelines	Housing, subdivision & built form	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/Table 2	Redraft Table 2 (Residential Within Walkable Catchment) as follows: "Housing will comprise a variety of typologies, which may include low-rise apartments buildings, terraced homes and townhouses (including rear-loaded product), and detached dwellings."	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation. VPA to review BNW and confirm wording as appropriate.	Unresolved. Provision and review of updated documents may resolve.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
30.13	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Local Town Centre	Town Centre Plan	Section 3.7.1 Town Centres/Table 7	In the absence of a town centre concept plan, an additional Performance Guideline be included in Table 7 as follows: "The design of the local town centre is to ensure that the back-of-house design and operation will not result in a detrimental impact to the amenity of surrounding residential land."	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further investigation. VPA to review LTC Guidelines (Appendix 4.3) to confirm no duplication.	Unresolved. Provision and review of updated documents may resolve.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
30.14	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Local Town Centre	Local Town Centre location	Section 3.7.1 Town Centres	As the local town centre is positioned centrally within the PSP area access is required via the connector street network through residential areas rather than via an arterial road. Request the VPA to further review the proposed location of the town centre and its potential relocation along an arterial road.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree. The Town Centre has been located central to the PSP to provide for a local and accessible activity centre location. Location along an Arterial Road is not supported.	Unresolved.	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
30.15	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Vegetation		VPA to confirm there is no expectation of the PSP for retention of existing Cypress trees located in adjoining land adjoining the site's east boundary and in GL-04.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The PSP is silent on the removal of the specific vegetation outlined by the submitter. The retention of existing vegetation is always encouraged, however, there is no requirement for the retention of these trees.	Resolved	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
30.16	SFA Land Development Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 17	Planning Scheme Ordinance	UG212		The affordable housing assessment should have formed part of the PSP background information rather than a site specific requirement upon submission of permit applications. The requirements and guidelines in the PSP address provision of affordable housing. Propose deletion of the requirement to prepare an affordable housing assessment.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	The VPA to update provisions within the PSP and UG212 to be consistent with the recommendations of the BNW panel report. <b>Updated documents as required.</b>	Unresolved. Provision and review of updated documents may resolve.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
31.01	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		Request that any assets proposed within the property (waterway and drainage reserve and bridge/culvert) to be minimised, particularly along the eastern portion of the site, given the significant land take currently proposed as part of the PSP, and on the basis of the following key considerations:  1. The blunt application of the minimum corridor widths in the absence of a robust site specific assessment does not represent a sophisticated solution for this section of the north-eastern tributary as it relates to our client's site;	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation/discussion is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciated the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
31.02	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		2. This section of the north-eastern tributary has been assessed to have limited ecological values;	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation/discussion is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciated the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
31.03	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		3. No presence of significant vegetation (such as River Red Gums) is located along this section of the north-eastern tributary;	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciate the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
31.04	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		4. No rare or threatened flora and fauna was found (or likely to be found) along this section of the north-eastern tributary;	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciate the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
31.05	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		5. There is merit in considering an 'online' stormwater treatment in lieu of the proposed 'offline' treatment for the north-eastern tributary given the steep topography, and therefore opportunity to reduce the minimum corridor widths associated with the proposed asset e.g. the existing online treatment successfully utilised at Flax Lily Creek to the south of Craigieburn Road;	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciate the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
31.06	Frances Baker		Property 16	Drainage & Water	Drainage and Roads		6. The infrastructure assets (connector road and bridge) are proposed to cut across the waterway along this section of the north-eastern tributary which does not represent an economically sound solution based on the excessively wide corridor widths proposed and potential impacts upon Net Developable Area of the precinct.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further investigation is required. The VPA acknowledge the concerns relating to the Development Services Schemes. Whilst we appreciate the matters raised and the potential impacts on the subject property, the VPA are not in a position to resolve matters regarding the DSS. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment and are awaiting response.	UNRESOLVED	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
32.01	SVR2 Pty Ltd ATF - SRV Discretionary Trust		Properties 21 and 22	Other	Alternative Land Use	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The potential for the site for residential development is constrained by its location, which ultimately affects its amenity. Future duplication of Mickleham Road will also add to this issue. It is considered to offer greater benefit for convenience uses and complementary services to serve passing traffic and residents.  Whilst these uses are permissible in the residential zone, the PSP should more explicitly identify the opportunity to achieve this outcome.  Requests that: The PSP should be amended to expressly identify the site for potential appropriately scaled local convenience uses. Changes to Plan 4 should be as per those highlighted in the submission which relate to the inclusion of an asterisk on the site and wording in the legend to say "potential service station, local convenience uses and complementary uses."	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation. However, provision of an LCC on arterial roads is not a desired outcome of the PSP.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
32.02	SVR2 Pty Ltd ATF - SRV Discretionary Trust		Properties 21 and 22	Requirements & Guidelines		Section 3.2.3 Street Network/R8	Access to a service centre in this location is not appropriate via loop roads and real lanes as required through R8.  Request that R8 allow for direct access or access via a service lane for non-residential uses that have direct frontage to arterial roads, subject to the consent of the Roads Authority.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. However, provision of an LCC on arterial roads is not a desired outcome of the PSP.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
33.01	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Drainage & Water	Water Supply		Since issue of the Taylors report (Services Investigation Report March 2019), Yarra Valley Water has installed DN300 DW & NDW mains and two (2) Pressure Reducing Stations along Mickleham Rd, between Craigieburn and the southern boundary of the PSP area, as shown in the attachment DW/NDW supply concept plans for the Craigieburn West PSP area.  The PSP area will be serviced by three DW/NDW distribution zones- Mickleham Pressure Boosted Zone at TWL; Mt Ridley Reservoir Zone at TWL; Mt Ridley Reservoir Pressure Reduced Zone at TWL.	N/A	Noted.	No further response required	No Change Required	No further action required	Low
33.02	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Drainage & Water	Water Supply		Protection required for M658 DW transfer main (DN825 through the southern section of the PSP) with adequate pipe corridor and minimal road crossings. Provision of all works in the vicinity of this critical water supply pipeline will need to be negotiated with Yarra Valley Water	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further investigation is required. This pipe is located outside of the PSP, adjacent to the boundary with Aitken Hill Reserve (east of the conference centre).  <b>ACTION: VPA to review if a Requirement can be included (or existing Requirement modified) to address the need for paper road/access along the pipe-track.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
33.03	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Precinct Infrastructure	Water Supply		Provision of land will be required for up to 4 (no.) pressure reducing stations.  Further details of indicative layouts and extent of land required for each site will need to be negotiated with Yarra Valley Water	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>R38 updated to include land and works for water services.</b>	No further response required	Change Required	No further action required	Low
33.04	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Precinct Infrastructure	Water Supply		No capacity allowance is available for any large scale urban development of land outside of present UGB, west of Mickleham Road.  Some allowance made for connectivity of existing and future non-urban development may be possible but subject to further discussion with Yarra Valley Water.	N/A	Noted.	No further response required	No Change Required	No further action required	Low
33.05	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Drainage & Water	Sewer		The updated DW/NDW supply concept plans for the CWPSA area show the Craigieburn West Sewer Asset Sequencing.  Development occurring within the catchment of Greenvale Reservoir will incur additional servicing conditions from Yarra Valley Water to satisfy the Greenvale Reservoir Risk Management Plan established to protect the reservoir catchment.  The ES09 overlay plan defines the area that will attract these special conditions.	N/A	Noted. Additional Conditions and Requirements are provided through the referral triggered by ES09. The PSP does not require additional mechanisms as this is already captured by the planning scheme.	No further response required	No Change Required	No further action required	Low
33.06	Yarra Valley Water	Yarra Valley Water		Heritage	Integrated Water Management / Cultural Heritage		DELWP's Vic map Hydro database identifies two Streams within the Craigieburn West PSP that are not yet recognised as an 'Area of Cultural Sensitivity' because they have not yet been formally named. These waterways have a cultural significance identified by the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation.  It is recommended that these streams be named in Woi Wurrung language and afforded the same cultural heritage status, under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006, as named waterways.  The identified waterways are the stream running eastward approximately 100m north of Craigieburn Road and the stream running southward crossing Oliviers Road.	N/A	Noted. The VPA are undertaking a Cultural Values Assessment for the PSP, which will assist in addressing these comments. Note that the stream/waterway to the north is currently non-existent (due to dams built in the area) and is not proposed by the MW DSS as a waterway (water proposed to be piped along Craigieburn Road).	Acknowledging the request of the Planning Minister through Plan Melbourne, and that of the Water Minister within the Letter of Expectation, for authorities to work more closely with Traditional Custodians in protecting cultural heritage places across Melbourne, we look forward to hearing about and being updated on the progress of the Cultural Values Assessment being undertaken by the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part 2

Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
34.01	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Supports Amendment	PSP		Supports the following aspects of the PSP and Plan 4 Place Based Plan: - Recognition of existing church, - Future zoning of the land (residential) - The proximity of the Town Centre which is within walkable distance. - The future connections from the west for vehicle access.	N/A	Noted.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
34.02	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Transport & Movement	Connector Road	Plan 5 Transport Plan	The proposed connector road alignment is not supported as it provides little access to the site. The lack of road access to the west as well as other areas of the precinct is seen to negatively affect the site.  A revised realignment of the connector road to the western edge of the site is proposed, which caters for the site owner and also provides benefits to surrounding landowners consistent with the purposes of the Draft PSP (Refer to traffic assessment attachment)	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. Access to the site is already available from Whites Lane, which is proposed to be maintained in its current alignment/reservation. Not all parcels will be provided access via a connector street.  The VPA are reviewing alignment of the north south connector in light of other submissions.	Unresolved - please advise when further investigation is carried out	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
34.03	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Transport & Movement	Street Network	Plan 5 Transport Plan	The connector road south-west of the subject site bisects parklands which contains the largest cluster of high retention value trees in the immediate area - this is a sub-optimal outcome based on environmental and urban design grounds, as it appears that a large number of these existing valued trees will need to be removed to develop the proposed road position.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. Vegetation is proposed to be retained in Local Open Spaces where practical, as indicated by the PBP.	Resolved - our client does not seek to dispute the VPA's preliminary position at this time.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
34.04	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Transport & Movement	Street Network		The current road network plan does not facilitate the growth of the property and its proposed expansion and the location of the adjoining school and Town Centre activity area. It is recommended the realignment of the north-south Boulevard Connector Street (and associated public transport) in the vicinity of the subject site such that it extends along the southern boundary of the primary school site before turning south along the western boundary of the subject site.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. Access to the site is already available from Whites Lane, which is proposed to be maintained in its current alignment/reservation. Not all parcels will be provided access via a connector street.  The VPA are considering alignment of the north south connector in light of other submissions.	Unresolved - please advise when further investigation is carried out	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
34.05	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Transport & Movement	Street Network		The realignment will see the inclusion of a controlled intersection, approximately 200m to the east of the controlled intersection at the 90-degree bend in north-south Boulevard Connector Street where it first meets the western boundary of the subject site. The realignment will be an increase accessibility to the site.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion/investigation. The provision of a sharp bend (90 degree) in a connector street may cause issues with the function of the road network.  The VPA are reviewing alignment of the north south connector in light of other submissions	Unresolved - please advise when further investigation is carried out	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
34.06	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Local Town Centre		Section 4.3 Craigieburn West Local Town Centre - design principles	The guidelines in Section 4.3 Craigieburn West Local Town Centre as they relate to directing childcare centres and medical centres to be located within or at the edge of the local town centre are too restrictive in the context of the future expansion of the church complex and land use opportunities of the site.  An additional guideline to offer more flexibility for extended uses in the precinct is required in Section 4.3.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required.	Unresolved - please advise when further investigation is carried out	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
34.07	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Requirements & Guidelines	Lot density	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R2	The proposed lot density of 26.5 per ha is too high for the site irrespective of its location within the walkable catchment. It is noted that the lot density requirements are per NID/ha.  Greater flexibility is required to achieve lot densities and enable the landowner to deliver on their own intentions for the church complex.  Request that R2 be reworded as follows:  "Subdivision should achieve minimum average densities and planned neighbourhood character as specified in Plan 4 and Table 2."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Plan Melbourne requires a minimum average density of 20dw/ha for greenfield areas. A reduction of the density in the walkable catchments will require an increase in density outside the walkable catchments to maintain the average density across the PSP.  Walkable catchments are a standard VPA planning tool to provide increased densities around local town centres and other areas of amenity.  The VPA does not support the removal of the walkable catchment, however the VPA have considered a slightly reduced density of 25 dwelling/ha within the walkable catchment.  <b>ACTION: Revise density targets in Table 2 to 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP</b>	Unresolved - please advise when further investigation is carried out	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
34.08	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Local Parks/Tree Retention	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	LP-07, as identified on the site, proposes to retain a number trees. LP-07 also contains a telco tower, which may be removed in the future by the landowner as part of the Church complex development or otherwise.  Due to the possibility of the relocation of the Telco tower, it is recommended to include a guideline or requirement to provide flexibility in the retention of trees (specifically trees 622, 623 and 624).  Opposes the location of the LP-07 on the site until further updated tree investigations are undertaken.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree.  LP-07 is located to retain existing high value vegetation and considered acceptable.	Resolved - our client does not seek to dispute the VPA's preliminary position at this time.	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
34.09	Universal Syrian Orthodox Church	N/A	Property 25	Drainage & Water	ACWL-03 Drainage Asset	Plan 6 Integrated Water Management Plan	Queries the drainage asset ACWL-03's size, location and whether it is required on the site.  The wetlands could be moved to the northern adjoining property (Property 15 and 116) to allow for staging of infrastructure and the asset.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water, who advised:  The Aitken Creek Development Services Scheme (DSS) overlaps with the northern section of the Craigieburn West PSP, and has been designed to cater for the flood protection, stormwater quality and waterway health outcomes associated with the urbanisation of this catchment.  It should be noted that the Aitken Creek DSS (4480) was implemented in the early 2000's and is currently a final rate DSS, which would have included a robust consultation process at the time with the relevant stakeholders (including land-owners) as defined by Principle 23 of Melbourne Water's Principles for the Provision of Waterway and Drainage Services for Urban Growth.  Melbourne Water's proposed revision to the Aitken Creek DSS has aimed to achieve best practice stormwater quality treatment where practical, however, there have been a number of conceptual constraints identified, including steep topography and road alignments. The Aitken Creek DSS concept proposed for inclusion in the Future Urban Structure/Place-Based Plan for this precinct, has aimed to balance the conceptual constraints and the requirements of Clause 56-07A. Melbourne Water notes that there are existing concerns related to the conveyance of sediment, nutrient loading and algae bloom in downstream assets, and we will not consider further reductions in the expected pollutant load reductions for new urban catchments.  Melbourne Water is currently undertaking an engineering review of the Aitken Creek DSS to inform it's appropriateness to address and optimise the stormwater quality treatment opportunities across the relevant sub-catchments, to better meet the relevant obligations of development. Once the future urban structure for this precinct is finalised, Melbourne Water will be able to finalise our engineering review of the Aitken Creek DSS, which will include further consultation regarding the specific changes in land-take and the revised drainage contribution rate.  The wetland identified in the Craigieburn West PSP as asset ACWL03, has been proposed on the southern side of the existing alignment of Aitken Creek to provide primary and tertiary stormwater quality treatment for the corresponding local catchment (approx. 30 hectares). The siting of this asset has been based on a conceptual assessment of the surrounding terrain to determine the optimal location. As this asset is proposed to provide stormwater quality treatment to support the urbanisation of a local catchment to the south of Aitken Creek, which is retained as a natural waterway in its existing alignment, it would not be practical to relocate this asset further to the north as suggested and is not an outcome that Melbourne Water would consider.	Resolved - our client does not seek to dispute the VPA's preliminary position at this time.	No Change Required	Resolved	High
35.01	Ricky Duggal		Property 10	Education & Community Facilities	Primary School	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	Location of school is better suited to the northern extent of the PSP area to service the external catchment.  There are already two primary schools within the R2 PSP area within close proximity to the proposed school. The northern catchment of the CWVSP area and the Lindum Vale PSP area will not be within convenient proximity to a primary school.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree.  The VPA have worked extensively with DET regarding the school location, and DET supports the location of the Secondary School central to the PSP.  The VPA does not support relocating the Secondary School to the north as suggested.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
35.02	Ricky Duggal		Property 10	Open Space	Sports Reserves	Plan 8 Open Space Plan/SR-02	Oppose the location of SR-02 on the property as it is not logical or equitable for the future community.  The R2 PSP area has local sports reserve designated immediately east of the PSP area therefore the need for one in this location is questioned.  Relocate SR-02 to the southern extent of the CWVSP to provide for a greater level of POS.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Disagree.  The location of the Active Open Space (AOS) has been discussed and confirmed with Hume Council. The open space to the east is not intended to provide the same form and function as the AOS which has also been co-located with the secondary school.  Relocation not supported.		No Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
35.03	Ricky Duggal		Property 10	Other	Land Equity & Fairness		The FUS results in over 91% of the property being designated for undevelopable land uses. This is not an equitable outcome in comparison to other properties. 32 of the 40 properties in the CWSPSP achieve a minimum of 60% developable land or significantly higher.  Should the land uses not change, the landowner will contest at Panel.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Noted. Whilst every intention is made to ensure an equitable outcome, the PSP has primarily been prepared to provide a high quality urban outcome.  It is noted that whilst the land is not developable, the Active Open Space is credited and the Secondary School site will be acquired in the future by DET/VSBA.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
35.04	Ricky Duggal		Property 10	Housing	Efficient lot layout	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The strip of residential land to the northern extent of the property cannot be developed without an access road unless one is provided by the adjoining property owner. If a one-sided 16m road is constructed, the balance of the land is too shallow to enable a standard 30m lot depth.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Agree. The adjoining landowner has also submitted on this item (Submission 28.38)  <b>Plan 2 to be updated to relocate AOS 15m to the south to provide edge road and row of lots adjacent in the north.</b>		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
36.01	AK (AUST) Pty Ltd		Properties 35 and 36	Supports Amendment	Primary school location		Support the PSP and its intentions, specifically in relation to the inclusion of the non-government school proposed on property 36 and the amount of developable land available to property 35 and 36	N/A	Noted.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
36.02	AK (AUST) Pty Ltd		Properties 35 and 36	Open Space	Local Park location	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	There is an opportunity to better locate LP-15 within 1320 Mickleham Road to a more prominent location within the property thereby making it more accessible and visible within the landscape as show in the submission letter i.e. locating LP-15 to the west of its current location on the western side of the n-s road.	Location or variation to public infrastructure or utilities (within single parcel)	Agree.  <b>Updated to Relocate LP-15 to the west, adjacent with the linear park.</b>		Change Required	Pending	Low
37.01	Melbourne Airport	Melbourne Airport		Land Capability		Noise	DELWP is soon to review the Melbourne Airport Environs Overlay (MAEO). Given the proximity of the Craigieburn West PSP to Melbourne Airport, APAM recommends contact be made with DELWP on the potential changes to the Overlay to ensure any potential implications are considered.	N/A	Noted. The VPA have contacted DELWP regarding the MAEO Review.		No Change Required	Pending	Medium
37.02	Melbourne Airport	Melbourne Airport		Melbourne Airport		Section 3.1	APAM acknowledges that the proposed PSP includes notification of planning applications for building and works and / or subdivision where land is affected by N-Above contours, in Clause 66.06 of the Hume Planning Scheme.  APAM strongly recommends that Section 3.1 of the PSP includes an explanation of the N-Above contours and provides an associated N-Above contours plan (APAM can provide this wording and plan if desired).  This will clearly indicate the land affected by the N-contours for readers, in particular Council, to enable accurate notification to APAM regarding developments on affected land, pursuant to Clause 66.06.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA will update the PSP to show the N-Contours, as well as a note explaining the N-Contours as requested by MA.  <b>PSP updated to include N-Contour lines on Plan 2 (Precinct Features) and include a note on Plan 2 to state:</b>  <b>"The land within the PSP area is partly affected by the Melbourne Airport N-Contours.</b>  <b>The effect of aircraft noise and the boundaries of the Melbourne Airport N-Contours can vary over time with changes to Melbourne Airport's operations, traffic volumes and types of aircraft using Melbourne Airport.</b>  <b>The most up-to-date information should be sought concerning aircraft noise and can be obtained from Melbourne Airport and its website, which can be accessed at: <a href="http://www.melbourneairport.com.au/">http://www.melbourneairport.com.au/</a>.</b>  <b>This approach is consistent with the Lindum Vale and Sunbury South PSP's.</b>		Change Required	Pending	High
37.03	Melbourne Airport	Melbourne Airport		Melbourne Airport		Noise	Clause 18.04-15 of the PPF does not support new proposals that have the potential to prejudice the ongoing operation and curfew-free status of Melbourne Airport (for example, a residential rezoning that would lead to new noise-sensitive development).  Given the location of Craigieburn West relative to Melbourne Airport's flight paths and noise contours we do not support the proposed rezoning for future residential use without proper mechanisms in the Planning Scheme and PSP to ensure matters of noise and intrusions into the Prescribed Airspace are adequately considered.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA have considered the submission and included additional notations and reference to both prescribed airspace and n-contours within the Plan 2 - Precinct Features, as outlined in response to 37.02 & 37.04.		Change Required	Pending	High
37.04	Melbourne Airport	Melbourne Airport		Melbourne Airport		Prescribed Airspace	Controlled Activity cannot be carried out without approval.  Melbourne Airport has not received any request to carry out a controlled activity in relation to prescribed airspace at the area of the Craigieburn West PSP.  Prior to the VPA proceeding with the endorsement of this PSP and the Planning Scheme being amended with the current layout resulting in an intrusion into the Prescribed Airspace, it is requested approval is sought from Air Space Protection, Melbourne Airport is sought.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	The VPA cannot apply for approval as the preparation of a PSP is not considered a controlled activity.  However, the construction of buildings within the precinct (post PSP approval) will be considered a "controlled activity" under the Airports Act 1996 (Ch) and that controlled activities, including the need for notice, are regulated under the Airports (Protection of Airspace) Regulations 1966 (Ch). In short, this requires that Melbourne Airport be given notice of relevant proposals (controlled activities) by the building surveyor.  This has been outlined and recommended within the Planning Panel Reports for the Lindum Vale and Sunbury South PSP's.  However the PSP will include a note regarding Prescribed Airspace.  <b>PSP updated to include note on Plan 2:</b>  <b>"The land within the PSP area partly intrudes into Prescribed Airspace, and may require additional approvals for works and construction.</b>  <b>The most up-to-date information should be sought concerning prescribed airspace can be obtained from Melbourne Airport and its website, which can be accessed at: <a href="http://www.melbourneairport.com.au/">http://www.melbourneairport.com.au/</a>.</b>		Change Required	Pending	High
38.01 (a)	North Victorian Buddhist Association	N/A	Property 8	Supports Amendment			The NVBA are supportive of the JAK Investment Group Submission.		Noted.				
38.01 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Drainage Corridor Dimension		The drainage reserve traversing the site is not a natural waterway and should adopt a constructed waterway solution with a reduced width of 45 metres (35 metre hydraulic width and water depths of no greater than 450mm) appropriate to manage hydraulic functions. The constructed waterway could easily tie-in with other waterway outcomes upstream and downstream, and to minimise potential impacts on the sodic soils in the sub-layer.  Reducing the waterway corridor to 45 metres will assist with site feasibility on a small and currently significantly encumbered site.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
38.02 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Plains Grassy Wetland & Existing Dam		The "Aitken Creek Waterway Values Assessment" dated December 2020 prepared by Jacobs recommends retention of the Plains Grassy Wetlands that surrounds the existing dam adjacent the Daham Niketanaya Buddhist Temple.  The dam appears to be a choke point for the hydraulic conveyance of the existing rural flows as evidenced by the localised expansion of the 100 year ARI flood extent at the dam.  Decommissioning of the dam is expected to release this choke point to reduce the extent of the 100 year ARI flood. Jacobs recommendation was to expand the drainage corridor to encompass the 100 year ARI flood. This appears to be an unnecessary encumbrance on potential developable land.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
38.03 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Natural Waterway designation		Melbourne Water's requirements to create a consistent corridor width will inappropriately inhibit developable land on the site. Given the separation between various parcels of Plains Grassy wetland on the site, there is no need to maintain a consistent corridor width of 60m (as preferred by MW for natural waterways) as opposed to a 45m constructed corridor which is widened where required.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
38.04 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Natural Waterway designation		The designating of the waterway as a natural waterway, adjacent the Daham Niketanaya Buddhist Temple, may result in the existing temple being located within the nominated bushfire setback.  If a bushfire were to occur, the temple could be damaged, as a result of the waterway being a natural waterway, rather than a constructed waterway.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required. The VPA have referred the submission to Melbourne Water for comment.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	High
38.05 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Lot density and diversity		Due to the proposed natural waterway traversing the site, this will result in a Bushfire Hazard Area 2 designation with a 19m setback from the grasses within the waterway corridor. The application of the setback on both sides of the 60m corridor will create an undevelopable zone, other than local streets, of more than 100m wide through the site, from dwelling front wall to dwelling front wall. As the site is only 200m and noting the diagonal alignment of the drainage corridor this is an impediment to development.  - Lot diversity will be significantly impacted, given the mandated bushfire setback removes the incentive to direct front medium density product to the waterway, and it makes the achievement of the minimum PSP dwelling density of 18.5 dwellings per hectare very difficult. - Adopting a 45m constructed corridor would shift the Bushfire Hazard from Area 2 to Area 3 thus enabling a more compact urban form through medium density housing and assisting with meeting the PSP objectives.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows:  R22: Habitable buildings adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.  Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots.  <b>ACTION: Update R21 terminology to 'habitable building' in place of the word development.</b>	Unresolved. Awaiting CFA response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
38.06 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Lot density and diversity		If Melbourne Water and the VPA will not accept the argument and the waterway is to remain natural, then the additional land takes associated with the Bushfire Hazard Area 2 classification of the waterway should be reimbursable as they are a direct consequence of the Melbourne Water DSS.	N/A	This matter has been referred to Melbourne Water for comment, however the VPA note that this relates to DSS reimbursements, and is outside of the scope of the PSP.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	No Change Required	Unresolved	High
38.07 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Drainage & Water	Lot density and diversity	Section 3.3.1 Integrated water management/R10 and 11	R10 and R11 relate to locations where sodic/ dispersive soils may require more expansive waterway dimensions. Any extra over land required to meet these conditions, or any attributable costs, must be funded by the DSS (i.e. land takes and/or costs over and above what would be considered 'standard' conveyance widths where sodic/ dispersive spoils do not exist).	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	This matter has been referred to MW for comment, however the VPA note that this relates to DSS reimbursements, and is outside of the scope of the PSP.	Unresolved. Awaiting Melbourne Water response	No Change Required	Unresolved	High
38.08 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Bushfire Management	Buffers		Any bushfire buffer associated with grasslands should and can be dealt with at the built form stage within future development, as has been the standard PSP approach to bushfire management in recent years. This flexibility to respond to bushfire threats through built form responses meeting require BAL ratings is preferred over the now mandated setback requirements contained within the draft CWSPSP.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree.  The VPA have proposed to reword R21 to state as follows:  R22: Habitable buildings adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be approved subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.  Note: Setbacks should be provided within reserves/streets/public spaces and not within private lots.  <b>ACTION: Update R21 terminology to 'habitable building' in place of the word development.</b>	Unresolved. Awaiting CFA response	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
38.09 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Open Space	Linear Park	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	The prescription of linear parks in addition to the standard open space contributions as well as the requirement for shared paths to be delivered within waterways is considered excessive.  GL-Q3 is not warranted within the site as it only picks up one tree to be retained and is considered unnecessary in the context of all the other site constraints.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required.  The provision of open space within Craigieburn West is not excessive and is within a normal range - 10.28% of NDA comprises open space. The PSP guidelines indicate approximately 10% of NDA should be open space.  The retention of very high and high value vegetation is a key component of the linear park, especially in areas where there is minimal remnant vegetation.	Unresolved. Alternative design response to meet the linear connectivity principle on this site has been proposed and to be discussed further with Council	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
38.10 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd	N/A	Property 8	Open Space	Linear Park	Plan 8 Open Space Plan	The Linear Park should be relocated so that it extends from the northern end of GL-Q4, up along the rear boundary of Lot 13 and 12, then cutting across Lot 9 and continuing along the rear boundary of Lot 7, before meeting up with the south east corner of the Biodiversity Conservation Area.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Disagree. Change is considered unnecessary as flexibility is provided within G42.	Matter unresolved. Alternative design response to meet the linear connectivity principle on this site has been proposed and to be discussed further with Council	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
38.11 (b)	JAK Investment Group Pty Ltd		Property 8	Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Linear park and Trees	Plan 8 Open Space	The existing tree on the subject site should be removed, given that it is a singular tree, not located within a cluster, and is located centrally within the site, which makes it difficult to develop around it.  If this is not supported, it is suggested that a reasonable compromise would be to relocate the Linear Park as detailed, and retain the tree within a small pocket park which could be linked in a north south orientation with the trees to the north with a standard 16 metre local road that has a more straightened alignment than that which is depicted in the draft CWSPSP.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	Further discussion/investigation is required.  The retention of very high and high value vegetation is a key component of the linear park, especially in areas where there is minimal remnant vegetation.	Partially unresolved. JAK willing to retain tree in pocket park as part of an alternative design response to meet the linear connectivity principle on the site, which is to be discussed with Council	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
39.01	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Schools		The number of proposed schools is appropriate based on the anticipated population.	N/A	Noted. Confirmed number of schools is appropriate.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
39.02	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Land Capability		Requests that VPA confirms that there is no impact of potential hazards, such as slope, extra high transmission lines and high-pressure gas pipelines, on the proposed school sites, and that the ultimate location of these sites was selected to avoid significant impacts on DET in terms of the cost of building, occupational health and safety considerations, and the impact on emergency management and accessibility.	N/A	Noted. VPA can confirm there are no known potential hazards located within the proposed schools sites.  The site is within the Yuroke Creek DSS, and requires payment of the Development Services Scheme Levy. MW advised this is required to be paid prior to subdivision/title creation.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low
39.03	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	School reference names		All references to 'government primary school', 'government year P-6 school' or similar should be amended to 'proposed government primary school'.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted.  <b>PSP updated to reference 'government primary school', 'government year P-6 school' or similar to 'proposed government primary school' (or equivalent).</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
39.04	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	School reference names		All references to 'government secondary school', 'proposed government High School', 'government year 7-12 school' or similar should be amended to 'proposed government secondary school'.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Noted. <b>PSP updated to reference to 'government secondary school', 'proposed government Secondary School', 'government year 7-12 school' or similar to 'proposed government secondary school' (or equivalent).</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.05	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	No. & width of roads adjoining government schools	Section 3.6.1 Community facilities & education/R34	Reward R34 to provide greater clarity on road functions and safety and efficiency of traffic and pedestrian movement, as follows: "Education facilities must have a minimum of two road frontages (three preferred). These roads must have sufficient width to provide student drop-off zones and on-street indented parking, in addition to other street functions. At least one of these must be a connector road with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement/parking, while simultaneously accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA have sought to be consistent with recent PSPs. It is noted that this proposed requirement was not included in the Beveridge North West or Shensstone Park PSPs. The VPA; have sought clarification from DET, and now propose the following wording or R34: "Education facilities must have a minimum of two road frontages (three preferred). These roads must have sufficient width to provide on street indented parking (for use as additional student drop-off zones), in addition to other street function. At least one of these must be a connector road with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement/parking, while simultaneously accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement." <b>ACTION: VPA to update as indicated above.</b>		No Change Required	Pending	Low
39.06	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Subdivision Design	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form	New Requirement to Section 3.1 to ensure no separation of schools from sporting reserves et al as follows: "Subdivision must provide for a street separating government schools from all surrounding land uses other than sporting reserves, local parks, linear reserves and community facilities."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. A guideline is considered appropriate. <b>ACTION: Include new Guideline as requested.</b> VPA to provide amended wording of requirement		Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.07	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Reorientation of Mickleham Primary School	Section 3.1 Housing, subdivision & built form/R3	Reward R3 to provide clarity on the intent, particularly as the word 'internal' may be read to imply internal to the school site, as follows: "In order to reorient school buildings and access away from adjoining arterial roads(Mickleham Road and Mt Ridley Road), subdivision adjacent to the existing Mickleham Primary School (and the proposed expansion) as indicated on Place Based Plan (Plan 4) must provide a subdivision layout which facilitates access to the School from the local road network. Local streets adjacent to Mickleham Primary School (and the proposed expansion) must have sufficient width to provide student drop-off zones and on-street indented parking, in addition to other street functions. At least one of these must be a connector road with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement/parking, while simultaneously accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement in accordance with the Department of Transport's guidance for public transport and land use development."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA considers that R3 clearly relates to development of land surrounding the existing school site and not land within the existing school site, however agree with removing internal to clarify this position. Furthermore, R3 has been updated in accordance with the updated wording proposed as per 39.05.  Proposed Requirement wording: "In order to reorient school buildings and access away from adjoining arterial roads(Mickleham Road and Mt Ridley Road), subdivision adjacent to the existing Mickleham Primary School (and the proposed expansion) as indicated on Place Based Plan (Plan 4) must provide a subdivision layout which facilitates access to the School from the local road network. Local streets adjacent to Mickleham Primary School (and the proposed expansion) must have sufficient width to provide on-street indented parking (for use as additional student drop-off zones), in addition to other street functions. At least one of these must be a connector road with a road easement wide enough to allow for school bus movement/parking, while simultaneously accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement in accordance with the Department of Transport's guidance for public transport and land use development." <b>ACTION: VPA to update R3 as outlined above.</b>		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.08	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Inclusion of kindergartens in local community facilities	Plan 4 Place Based Plan	The local community facilities shown adjacent to Government Primary Schools on Plan 4 Place Based Plan should include a kindergarten to comply with the State Government's commitment to locate kindergartens adjacent to all new government primary schools. The legend on the Plan for Community Facilities could be amended to read 'Local community facilities (including kindergartens)'	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	VPA does not agree with the DET position and does not support the proposed change on the basis that Council have yet to determine the configuration of the ICP funded community facilities. If DET wish to reference Kindergartens, this should be included in the education facilities. VPA have advised DET of this position.		No Change Required	Unresolved	Medium
39.09	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Inclusion of kindergartens in local community facilities		DET notes that there is no proposed community facility adjoining the proposed government mid school site. It is understood that this area will be serviced by another community facility in the adjoining Craigieburn R2 PSP. DET would like to continue discussions regarding the need for a local community facility (including a kindergarten) adjoining the proposed mid government primary school.	Location or change to public infrastructure or utilities (multiple parcels impacted)	DET are advised that the PSP currently delivers all required community facilities, and there is no scope to provide additional facilities.		No Change Required	Resolved	Medium
39.10	Department of Education		N/A	Education & Community Facilities	Inclusion of kindergartens in local community facilities		Request new Guideline to facilitate easy, safe and efficient drop-offs to both a government primary school and kindergarten facility, as follows: "The frontage for both a proposed government primary school and a kindergarten should be close to each other to encourage a single drop off for parents who have children attending both facilities."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	As per 39.08, the PSP will not indicate Kindergartens, therefore this Guideline is not able to be included in the PSP.		No Change Required	Resolved	Medium
39.11	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Consistency between land use budget tables and plan	Table 1 and Appendix 4.2	The land use listed as 'Government school' in Table 1: Precinct land use budget' (page 13) and 'Appendix 4.2 Parcel specific land use budget table' (page 48) should be amended to read: Proposed government school (including expansion to existing school)	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update to: Proposed Government School (including expansion to existing school).</b>		Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.12	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Consistency between land use budget tables and plan	Table 1 and Appendix 4.2	In Appendix 4.2, Parcel 4 is stated to allocate 0.10 ha of '[Proposed] government school' land. However, 'Plan 3: Land Use Budget' (page 12) does not show any proposed government school land within Parcel 4.	N/A	The VPA have confirmed that there is a small sliver of 0.1ha located within parcel 4. This land area is currently a small public road reserve (Olivers Lane) which will be truncated by the development of the future school site. Plan 3 is at a scale in which this is not evident, however the VPA can confirm 0.1ha of school expansion is within Parcel 4, and this is reflected in the LUBT.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.13	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Proposed government secondary school site size	Appendix 4.2	Table 4.2 shows parts of the Proposed Secondary School site are contained within three land parcels: Parcel 9 (1.55 ha), Parcel 10 (1.81 ha) and Parcel 14 (4.70 ha), which total 8.06 ha. The proposed site size is 0.34 ha smaller than the standard 8.4 ha site area the DET requires for secondary schools in greenfield areas. DET requires an additional 0.34 ha be allocated to the proposed government secondary school site. This could be achieved by moving the adjoining recreational facility (SR-02) slightly further north.	N/A	Remaining school area is located within the Olivers Road Reserve as indicated on the PBP and outlined in Appendix 4.2.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.14	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Timing for delivery	Appendix 4.1	It is suggested that either the heading 'timing' be relabelled 'indicative timing' or that a footnote is added, stating that "The Department of Education and Training will determine when each school will be needed".	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Timing has been a standard heading in the PIP for all previous PSP's. G73 provides a note stating: Project delivery timing outlined in Appendix 4.1 is indicative and subject to periodic review by the relevant responsible authority. The VPA consider this note in G73 addresses this item.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.15	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Timing for delivery	Appendix 4.1	It is recommended that the timeframes for delivery are defined within the PSP.'	N/A	As per above - see G73.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of Ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
39.16	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Timing for delivery	Appendix 4.1	Appendix 4.1 states the timing for the purchase of land and construction of a Community Centre collocated with Mickleham Primary School expansion (CI-01) is M-L term, whereas the timing for expansion of Mickleham Primary School is S-M term. It is suggested that the timing for CI-01 should change to S-M term to ensure coordinated delivery of both the school expansion and early childhood/kindergarten services.	N/A	VPA to confirm timing of Community Facility with Hume City Council.		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
39.17	Department of Education		N/A	Employment	Employment generation	Appendix 4.9	A note should be included in Appendix 4.9 stating the source of these estimations. Also, the number of jobs generated by Mickleham Primary School should be excluded, as they are existing and will not be created by development of the precinct.	N/A	Noted. The source of these estimates are a longstanding job creation formula, which has been confirmed through various PSPs. RE: Mickleham Primary, the VPA consider that the jobs will still be within the precinct, and therefore should remain within the calculation. This does not impact the planning or development of the CWPS, but provides detail as to the number of likely jobs that the PSP will provide upon the ultimate development of the precinct.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.19	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Precinct Infrastructure Delivery	Section 3.8.1 Development Staging	Add new Requirement as follows: "In staged subdivisions, land containing a proposed government school site, adjoining community centre and streets adjoining the school site should all be included in the same stage"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA have sought to be consistent with recent PSP's. It is noted that this proposed requirement was not included in the BNW or Shenstone Park PSPs. The proposed Requirement is drafted as a "Should" and therefore would be considered Guideline. This is considered addressed by G74. However VPA note the concerns from DET relate to G74 stating 'committed' infrastructure, where the PSP only indicates schools as 'proposed' infrastructure. VPA propose to update dot point 3 in G74 to state: "Proximity to existing, committed or proposed community infrastructure, such as schools" <b>ACTION: VPA to update G74 as outlined above.</b>		No Change Required	Pending	Low
39.20	Department of Education		N/A	Precinct Infrastructure	Precinct Infrastructure Delivery	Section 3.8.2 Subdivision works	Add new Requirement as follows: "Land allocated for a proposed government school should be fully serviced (including installation of all utility infrastructure and connection, and construction of all roads surrounding the school site) before the Department of Education and Training acquires the school site."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	The VPA have sought to be consistent with recent PSP's. It is noted that this proposed requirement was not included in the BNW or Shenstone Park PSPs. The proposed Requirement is drafted as a "Should" and therefore would be considered Guideline. This is considered addressed by R38.		No Change Required	Resolved	Low
39.21	Department of Education		N/A	Planning Scheme Ordinance	UG12	Permit exemptions	Schedule 12 to Clause 37.07 Urban Growth Zone, 2.3 Specific provisions – Use of land states that a permit is not required for a primary school or a secondary school, with the condition: "On land identified as 'potential non-government school' in the incorporated Craigieburn West Precinct Structure Plan." It is likely that the intention is to exempt government schools from requiring a permit, specifying non-government schools may be interpreted as implying that government schools do require a permit. To avoid confusion, DET request that the condition be amended as follows: "For non-government schools, on land identified as 'potential non-government school' in the incorporated Craigieburn West Precinct Structure Plan."	Planning Scheme Ordinance	The UG212 has been prepared in accordance with DELWP guidelines and is consistent with previous PSPs. The P&E Act provides for exemptions for the Minister for Education under S16, and is not considered relevant to re-state exemptions that are already contained within the Act.		No Change Required	Pending	Low
40.01	DELWP-MSA	N/A	N/A	Vision	Vision	Section 2.1 Vision Statement	Please include a general reference to biodiversity conservation which recognises the value and contribution of Conservation Area 29 as identified in the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (BCS).	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation. VPA seek additional information from DELWP-MSA.	Noted. DELWP awaits contact from VPA to confirm additional information required.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
40.02	DELWP-MSA	N/A	N/A	Other	Objectives	Section 2.3 Objectives	Update Objective 5 as follows: "To facilitate the long-term conservation of significant flora and fauna species through the retention and protection of Conservation Area 29 and landscape features within Craigieburn West including scattered trees and waterways as key community assets that are integrated with the urban landscape."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agreed. Proposed wording of Objective 5 accepted. <b>ACTION: Update Objective 5 as outlined.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.03	DELWP-MSA			Precinct Infrastructure	Land Use Budget/Plan	Plan 3 Land Use Budget/Land Use Budget	Update to specifically identify conservation area as BCS conservation area to distinguish from local conservation areas (present in PSPs other than Craigieburn West). As follows: - Update Plan 3 legend to specify 'BCS conservation area.' - Update Table 1, open space to specify 'BCS conservation reserve.' - Update accordingly on plans throughout the PSP for consistency: • Plan 2 (note, lists as GGF conservation – please remove) • Plan 4 • Plan 8 • Plan 10	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update Plan legends, Table 1 to specify 'BCS Conservation Area'. Remove reference to GGF conservation on Plan 2.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.04	DELWP-MSA			Utilities		Section 3.3.2 Utilities/R19	Update wording of R19 to DELWP's preferred wording as follows: "Utilities must be placed outside of Conservation Area 29"	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update R19 as outlined.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.05	DELWP-MSA			Bushfire Management		Section 3.3.3	Conservation Area 29 is currently classified as bushfire hazard area 2 with a grassland management class. Please confirm that this classification will remain accurate given the context of the conservation area being reserved for the protection of Grassy Eucalypt Woodland with some canopy restoration to occur (up to approximately 20% cover). Any fire buffer requirements must be met outside the conservation area. It is important that if additional setback may be required in the future, that there is no pressure for this to be within the conservation area.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA are still awaiting a response from the CFA/FRV regarding the Bushfire Management report and Requirements and Guidelines in the PSP.	Noted. DELWP awaits confirmation following response from the CFA/FRV. Noted. Further discussion required to ensure: - That planning permit triggers from removal of native vegetation within the conservation area remain (under current plan the planning scheme would not recognise any native vegetation within the conservation area) - That there is clarity around what is required to be retained for purposes beyond the MSA (i.e. any vegetation outside the conservation area to be retained) and - That there is long term clarity on when a planning permit for native vegetation is exempt and when it is not.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium
40.06	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems		Plan 10 Biodiversity & Vegetation Plan	Plan 10 needs to be updated to address the following: - reflect DELWP's timestamping data layer (for native vegetation patch) and scattered tree dataset; - ensure native vegetation within Conservation Area 29 is displayed - ensure the following information is shown: scattered trees to be retained, scattered trees to be removed, native vegetation patch to be removed and native vegetation patch to be retained.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	For further discussion and investigation. Previous discussions with DELWP-MSA through Agency Validation indicated that this would create confusion within the PSP, as the vegetation for removal under the MSA does not necessarily reflect the trees to be retained for amenity and character values by the PSP.		Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

0/21/152 Checklist Fast Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
40.07	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems		Plan 10 Biodiversity & Vegetation Plan	Title of Plan 10 should be changed to 'Biodiversity & Native Vegetation Plan'	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update Plan 10 as outlined.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.08	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems		Section 3.5 Biodiversity, vegetation & landscape character/R29	Update requirement R29 to specify public road edge. Examples of private roads along the boundary of other conservation areas (e.g. for gated communities/retirement communities) has prevented the intent of a publicly managed buffer around the conservation area. R29 to read as follows: "All proposed development adjacent to BCS Conservation Area 29 must provide a minimum 20m public edge road along all boundaries to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update R29 accordingly.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.09	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems		Section 3.5 Biodiversity, vegetation & landscape character/R31	Note, R31 states that paths must be located in accordance with the BCS Conservation Area Concept Plan. The PSP does not contain a Conservation Area Concept Plan and so this reference should be removed. Reword as follows: "Paths located within the BCS Conservation Area 29 must be located and designed to avoid and minimise disturbance to native vegetation and habitat for matters of national environmental significance to the satisfaction of the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning."	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update R31 accordingly.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.10	DELWP-MSA			Transport & Movement	Street Cross Sections	Section 4.5/Conservation Area Interface (Page 64)	Amend the street cross section for Conservation Area Interface as follows: - Locate the vehicle exclusion fence on the boundary of the conservation area, not within the nature strip. - First two dot points in the notes are contradictory. Remove first dot point. - In the boundary fence note, specify it is to allow pedestrian access at specified access points. - Plan caption currently reads as BCA Area 28. Update to BCS Conservation Area 29. - Specify light pole to be designed and baffled to cast light away from the conservation area.	Formatting of map, table or appendix in PSP document (SEF/GIS/Graphics to support)	Agree. <b>ACTION: Update Conservation Interface cross-section accordingly.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.11	DELWP-MSA			Planning Scheme Ordinance		Schedule to Clause 52.17	Update the wording for the permit exemption in the table for schedule to Clause 52.17-1 to reflect proposed wording for an upcoming planning scheme amendment to update MSA planning conditions: "All native vegetation in the levy area within the meaning of the Melbourne Strategic Assessment (Environmental Mitigation Levy) Act 2020. This does not apply to native vegetation identified as to be retained in a precinct structure plan incorporated in this scheme."	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Agree. <b>ACTION: VPA to make the change to the schedule to Clause 52.17.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Unresolved	Low
40.12	DELWP-MSA			Planning Scheme Ordinance		Schedule 6 to Clause 43.03	DELWP MSA is currently in the process of updating standard biodiversity conditions for the program in consultation with the VPA. Once complete (expected end January 2020) DELWP MSA will provide these to the VPA for inclusion in the UGZ and IPO schedules for Shenstone Park. - Remove the Condition – Salvage and Translocation from 43.03-3. No parcels are subject to salvage and translocation requirements within the Craigieburn West PSP area. - Remove Conditions Kangaroo Management Plan from 43.03-3. Kangaroo management requirements suitably addressed through the Urban Growth Zone schedule.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Agree. The VPA is aware of the changes to the standard biodiversity conditions for the program and will await confirmation from DELWP MSA to include the updated provisions. <b>ACTION: The VPA to remove the salvage and translocation condition from the IPO and the KMP condition from the IPO.</b>	Noted.	Change Required	Resolved	Low
40.13	DELWP-MSA			Planning Scheme Ordinance		Schedule 12 to Clause 37.07	DELWP MSA is currently in the process of updating standard biodiversity conditions for the program in consultation with the VPA. Once complete (expected end January 2020) DELWP MSA will provide these to the VPA for inclusion in the UGZ and IPO schedules for Shenstone Park. - Remove the Condition – Salvage and Translocation from 43.03-3. No parcels are subject to salvage and translocation requirements within the Craigieburn West PSP area. - Remove Conditions Kangaroo Management Plan from 43.03-3. Kangaroo management requirements suitably addressed through the Urban Growth Zone schedule.	Planning Scheme Ordinance	For further discussion/investigation. DELWP noted mistake in the submission and sent revised text on 9/2/21.		Further Investigation	Pending	Low
40.14	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		The following from the original RFQ and proposal have not been adequately addressed: <b>1. Management recommendations</b> Detail on the management actions that will be implemented to manage risks to animal welfare and human safety during development of the Craigieburn West Precinct including: - how it contributes to achieving the precinct wide strategy; - how the action relates to other actions and whether its effectiveness is dependent on other actions being implemented; - Timing of the action relative to the precinct's development and other management actions - Analysis on any constraints and what is needed to address them - Estimate on the cost of the action	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	For further discussion/investigation. The purpose of the KMS is to provide guidance to landowners/developers in preparing site specific KMPs, which are required by the UGZ12 to be approved (by DELWP) and submitted to HCC as part of subdivision permit application in Craigieburn West. The detail requested in this submission is not considered appropriate at the PSP stage and will be provided as part of the site specific KMPs, which will be required to respond to the Management Actions identified in the PSP KMP.	ACTION: Remove Salvage and Translocation from 37.07 as per revised text sent 09.02.2021 Incorrect - the KMS is not to provide guidance on the preparation of site specific KMPs. The purpose of the KMS is to provide a precinct wide strategy for managing risks to human health and animal welfare that will result from the development of the land within the Craigieburn West PSP. Individual KMPs will need to respond to the broader management actions of the KMS. These comments must be addressed in the final KMS to give confidence that kangaroos can be adequately managed during the development of the precinct. Note regarding DELWP's original comments it was requested previously that these items be included in the KMS scope of works for E&HP. DELWP recommends an additional with the VPA to address general positions on and understandings of the KMS.	Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
40.15	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		<b>2. Responsibility &amp; funding</b> - Who will coordinate implementation of the strategy? - How will management actions be paid for and what measures will be implemented to ensure there is an equitable management burden across landowners.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	For further discussion/investigation. The VPA is of the opinion that the implementation of the strategy will be the responsibility of DELWP-MSA, as the approving authority for the site-specific KMPs. Each site-specific KMP, required as part of a permit application will require the approval of DELWP-MSA. Accordingly, implementation of the KMS will be ensured by DELWP when approving the site-specific KMPs. Please note that this does not mean that DELWP are responsible for implementing the site-specific KMPs, this will still be the responsibility of the landowner/developer, as per standard practice. The cost of the specific management actions will be the responsibility of the landowner/developer.	Further discussion required. DELWP believes further work needs to be undertaken on the KMS to clearly identify who will be responsible for the implementation of key management actions and how their implementation will be coordinated. Without this further detail accurate judgement cannot be made on the responsibility of the KMS implementation. Significant precinct wide management actions would clearly require coordination beyond individual KMPs and potentially multiple authorities. E.g. the requirement for a wildlife overpass which cannot be implemented through an individual site specific KMP. Updates to the KMS must address these comments. DELWP recognises it will have a role in assessing KMPs as a condition of the UGZ schedule. DELWP is however not responsible for managing kangaroos on private land and therefore will not be responsible for implementing the strategy.	Further Investigation	Pending	Medium
40.16	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		<b>3. Monitoring and review</b> - How will monitoring of the strategy's effectiveness with respect to achieving risk management objectives will be achieved (including when and who)	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	Further discussion/investigation. The VPA is of the opinion that monitoring of the KMS will be undertaken by DELWP, through the monitoring and enforcement of site specific KMPs. Site-specific KMPs are standard practise in other PSP areas.	Further discussion required pending updates to the KMS as per comments. Updates to the KMS must address these comments. DELWP will not be undertaking monitoring of KMS. As above DELWP is not responsible for kangaroo management on private land.	Further Investigation	Pending	Medium

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/152 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance	
40.17	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		<p>KMS General Structure/Content- Section 5 is difficult to read. Structure it into the following sections:</p> <p>Potential management options (5.1 and 5.2): Suggested that this section provide an overview of the potential management options that could be implemented. This could be in the form of a brief description of the management options and what the intended outcome of the management options would be. E.g. 'a culvert is a passage under a road etc. etc. A culvert allows kangaroos to safely crossroads etc. etc.' The current 5.1 and 5.2 largely achieve this, however, there appears to be an opportunity to condense this information, making it more concise, and shifting relevant parts about recommendations of management options to section 5.4 (see further below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feasibility assessment (5.3): As per the current section 5.3 feasibility of each management option should be assessed. For management options that are deemed not to be feasible/have a low feasibility it should be identified in the assessment the key reasons why with reference to the context of the Craigieburn West PSP where relevant.</li> <li>Management actions to be implemented (5.4): This section should go into the detail of implementing the recommended management options. For example, detail on where, when and by who. Currently the appropriate level of detail in Section 5.4 is missing or is in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 where it is recommended to instead include the relevant information in 5.4. Ultimately Section 5.4 would be the crucial part of the strategy as it should spell out which management options are recommended based on the feasibility assessment and how they will be implemented. Individual development level KMPs should be responding to the management recommendations in this section.</li> </ul>	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	<p>For further discussion/investigation.</p> <p>VPA have provided comments to the consultant for review and updates of the KMS.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium	
										Noted. DELWP awaits contact regarding the review and update of the KMS.				
40.18	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		<p><b>Addressing key risks.</b> The strategy does not adequately address two key future risks associated with development of the precinct including:</p> <p><b>Increased incidents of vehicle collisions:</b> the strategy seems to place heavy emphasis on virtual fencing to manage this risk. From DELWP's perspective there is currently a lack of scientific evidence that virtual fencing is effective and therefore DELWP does not believe it can be relied upon to address what is identified as a major risk. Construction of 'culvert/bridge underpasses' and 'overpasses' are identified as potential actions to reduce the numbers of individuals attempting to cross roads. DELWP believes the Strategy does not adequately investigating the feasibility of these actions and how they would be implemented. Key questions in this regard include: Where would they need to be located? How much land outside of road reserves would they likely encumber? Does the topography allow for them to be effectively constructed? Would there be issues with obtaining consent from landowners outside the precinct (i.e. west of Mickleham Road)? What would they cost and who would pay for them?</p>	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	<p>For further discussion/investigation.</p> <p>VPA have provided comments to the consultant for review and updates of the KMS.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium	
										Noted. DELWP awaits contact regarding the review and update of the KMS.				
40.19	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		<p><b>Addressing key risks.</b> The strategy does not adequately address two key future risks associated with development of the precinct including:</p> <p><b>Risk of landlocking (southern population):</b> there appears to be a particularly high risk of landlocking of kangaroos as a result of development in the southern section of the precinct. This includes landlocking within and outside the precinct. The strategy needs to outline specifically how the risk of landlocking in this area will be addressed.</p>	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	<p>For further discussion/investigation.</p> <p>VPA have provided comments to the consultant for review and updates of the KMS.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	Medium	
										Noted. DELWP awaits contact regarding the review and update of the KMS.				
40.20	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	BCS Conservation Area 29		<p><b>BCS boundary realignment:</b> No objections to the proposed boundary adjustment and is supportive of endorsing the adjustment application.</p> <p>This is on the grounds that the adjustment results in a net increase in the biodiversity values of the conservation area and will not impact on the future management of the conservation area.</p> <p>The final boundary adjustment requires approval from the Commonwealth Minister for Environment. With support from relevant stakeholders DELWP will submit a notice of boundary change and letter of endorsement to the Commonwealth Minister for Environment for approval.</p>	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	<p>For further discussion/investigation.</p> <p>The VPA notes DELWP's support of the proposed realignment of the BCS, which is undergoing the federal approval process.</p>		Further Investigation	Pending	Low	
										Noted. DELWP is awaiting confirmation from landowner/Hume City Council that the proposed boundary change adjustment is to their satisfaction. DELWP will keep the VPA informed of further progress with the proposed conservation area boundary adjustment.				
40.21	DELWP-MSA			Biodiversity & Ecosystems	Kangaroo Management Plan		DELWP has provided extensive comments on EHP's Kangaroo Management Report. Please refer to the attachment to DELWP's submission.	Additional report or study (subject to VPA procurement requirements)	<p>For further discussion/investigation.</p> <p>VPA have provided comments to the consultant for review and updates of the KMS.</p>		Further Investigation	Unresolved	Medium	
										Noted. DELWP awaits contact from VPA to confirm additional information required.				
41.01	DoT	N/A	N/A	Outcomes	Objectives	Objective 2	Support the inclusion of objective 2 and the requirements and guidelines outlined within Section 3.2 (Transport and Movement). This helps to facilitate 20-minute neighbourhoods by providing an integrated transport network that incorporates active and public transport options.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted.		Item is satisfactorily addressed (resolved) for the submitter - No further action required	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
41.02	DoT			Transport & Movement	Street network		Adequate number of intersections and proposed transport network provides opportunities for high quality bus and active transport connections between local centres and the surround residential neighbourhoods et al.	N/A	Noted.		Item is satisfactorily addressed (resolved) for the submitter - No further action required	No Change Required	Resolved	Low
41.03	DoT			Transport & Movement	PAO		<p>Supportive of the inclusion of a Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO) through the PSP process to Craigieburn Road.</p> <p>The PAO is required to ensure that land can be acquired by the Department to deliver the ultimate intersection layout for Craigieburn Road (6 lanes) and Mickleham Road (6 lanes). The ultimate signalisation of the intersection will ensure the arterial road system provides a safe network for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists that travel through the area. Craigieburn Road is currently a declared arterial road.</p>	Planning Scheme Ordinance	Noted.		Request this matter is kept open - DoT will make further submissions on this matter to the Panel	No Change Required	Unresolved	Medium
41.04	DoT			Transport & Movement	PAO/Intersection Design		It is appropriate for an ultimate intersection concept design to be prepared and considered for the purpose of refining this proposed additional PAO. This design must use the most current MRPV Craigieburn Road project design as a base.	N/A	Noted. This considered beyond the scope of the PSP. VPA advise they are not responsible for the preparation of this intersection design. This is something that would ordinarily be planned at the delivery stage.		Unresolved & Outstanding - this relates to supporting the exact PAO boundary.	Further Investigation	Unresolved	Low
41.05	DoT			Transport & Movement	Subdivision layout	Section 3.1	<p>The site which Mickleham Primary School is situated abouts Mount Ridley Road and Mickleham Road, which at present are the only roads that can afford the School vehicular access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department has been working closely with Mickleham Primary School and Hume City Council to address safety and operational issues at this location. If the VPA considers information relating to these present day issues contextually relevant to the further refinement of this PSP (as it relates to the School), DoT would be pleased to elaborate.</li> <li>future vehicular access to the School from these roads, which are ultimately 6 lane roads, will result in significant traffic issues.</li> <li>strongly support the inclusion of requirement R3 that facilitates the reorientation and proposed expansion of Mickleham Primary and requires that an internal subdivision layout must appropriately facilitate access to the School from the internal road network.</li> </ul>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted.		Unresolved & Outstanding - DoT / VPA / DET / VSA working to resolve matter including ensuring that requirement R3 can be achieved. Likely to have implications for the PSP if a new signalised intersection is required	No Change Required	Unresolved	Low
41.06	DoT			Transport & Movement	Mickleham PS access		<p>Additional requirements in relation to Mickleham Primary School access are required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To show, on plans that are relied on for an understanding of the road network, an annotation to the effect of "School Access Road" or "School Access Location" be included.</li> </ol>	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	VPA are working with DoT & DET to ensure access provision for Mickleham Primary is clearly understood. Consideration has been given to showing a local access road south of Mickleham Primary, with a left in left out (LILC) onto Mickleham Road.		Request this matter is kept open - DoT / VPA / DET / VSA working to resolve matter including ensuring that requirement R3 can be achieved.	Change Required	Pending	Low

Victorian Planning Authority: consideration of submissions

D/21/112 Checklist Part  
Track Process

\*Assign each unresolved submission a reference

Submission Item No.	DoT	Organisation / Group / Agency	PSP Property ID	Topic Category	Sub Category	Clause/Section of ordinance or PSP	Submission	Proposed Change	VPA Response - Updated 23 April 2021	Submitter Response (Post 20/04/21)	Action on submission	Status	Level of Significance
41.07	DoT			Transport & Movement	Mickleham PS access		2. To expand requirement R3 to include that the school access provided by the network internal to the PSP must be to a standard and capacity that will enable the closure of any interim School access to Mickleham Road and Mt Ridley Road.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	VPA are working with DoT & DET to ensure access provision for Mickleham Primary is clearly understood. Consideration has been given to showing a local access road south of Mickleham Primary, with a LLO onto Mickleham Road. Updated wording for R3 is also under consideration.	Request this matter is kept open - DoT / VPA / DET / VSBA working to resolve matter including ensuring that requirement R3 can be achieved.	Further Investigation	Pending	Low
41.08	DoT			Transport & Movement	Mickleham PS access		3. That the PSP document be updated to reflect, without ambiguity, that ultimately the School will not have vehicle access from Mickleham Road or Mt Ridley Road. An adjustment to wording in R3 outlining this is sufficient.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	VPA are working with DoT & DET to ensure access provision for Mickleham Primary is clearly understood. Consideration has been given to showing a local access road south of Mickleham Primary, with a LLO onto Mickleham Road. Updated wording for R3 is also under consideration.	Request this matter is kept open - DoT / VPA / DET / VSBA working to resolve matter including ensuring that requirement R3 can be achieved.	Further Investigation	Pending	Low
41.09	DoT			Transport & Movement	Mickleham PS access		DoT requests to be notified as soon as practical if any other submission to the PSP seeks an outcome contrary to point 7 of this letter.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Further discussion/investigation is required. VPA have indicated that DoT should consider the Stockland, DET & Council Submissions.	Request this matter is kept open - DoT / VPA / DET / VSBA working to resolve matter including ensuring that requirement R3 can be achieved.	Further Investigation	Pending	Low
41.10	DoT			Transport & Movement	Street network	Section 3.2.3/R8	Requirement R8 requires access to lots to be undertaken to the satisfaction of the Road Authority. This requirement needs to be amended so that it is clear that 'arterial roads' is defined as roads this PSP designates as arterial. This relates primarily to remove any potential ambiguity if this requirement applies to Mt Ridley Road - to which we submit it does apply.	Requirement or guideline in PSP document	Noted. Further clarification required. Seek additional advice from DOT on wording.	Matter to kept open until wording is agreed	Further Investigation	Pending	Low
42.01	Stephen Cooper			Other	Renaming of Precinct		Objects to the renaming of his address -- renaming devalues the honour places on the memorials to fallen Mickleham soldiers on Mickleham Rd The name Craigieburn West is not a permitted name under the land rules issued by the Victorian Land Office	N/A	The PSP does not propose to change the name of the suburb area. This is a matter for the Hume city Council and the Land Office. The name Craigieburn West reflects the Precinct Structure Plan and does not intend to rename the suburb area.		No Change Required	No further action required	Low