

Part C

Schedule of PSP Wording Changes

Submitter Requested Changes

Objectives

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
O3	<p><u>Hume City Council</u></p> <p>Amend Objective 3 by adding the following to the sentence:</p> <p>“and retention of vegetation for its character and amenity benefits.”</p>	<p>Agree with inclusion in objective 3.</p>	<p>VPA propose to revise Objective 3 to state:</p> <p>To provide a framework for a high amenity and integrated urban environment within Craigieburn West that encourages a sense of place and community, as well as responds to the existing natural, cultural, and built form features including the retention of vegetation for its character and amenity benefits.</p>

Requirements

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
R2	<u>PASK Group</u>		
	<p>Amend R2</p> <p>“Subdivision must provide a diverse neighbourhood character by providing a range of lot sizes and dwelling types in appropriate locations throughout the Precinct, <u>including seeking to achieve across the Precinct a dwelling density over time of 20 dwellings per net developable hectare and planned neighbourhood character as specified in Plan 4.</u>”</p>	<p>VPA Disagrees</p> <p>As per Part A submission</p>	No proposed changes
R4	<u>SFA Developments:</u>		
	<p>Delete R4.</p> <p>“The R4 requirement is unclear and appears to be unnecessary based on the existing Mickleham Road reserve and development adjacent to Mickleham Road immediately to the south.”</p>	<p>VPA Disagree. Issues regarding interface are considered addressed by inclusion of the Mickleham Road Interface Cross-Section. Inclusion of this requirement provides for a 'break' between the Ultimate Mickleham Road carriageway and the future housing within the PSP.</p>	No proposed changes.
R5	<u>Stockland:</u>		
	<p>Opposes Council's suggested removal of reference to moderate incomes.</p>	<p>Agree - no change to definition as the definition of affordable housing is set by the P&E Act.</p>	No proposed changes.
	<u>SFA Developments:</u>		
	<p>Delete Requirement 5</p>	<p>Requirement 5 has been deleted as per the Part A</p>	
	APAM		

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
New Requirement under 3.1	<p>Two new requirements in PSP in Section 3.1</p> <p><u>New Requirement R#:</u></p> <p><i>Prior to either an application for a planning or building permit, whichever comes first, for any building within the area identified as the protected airspace area on Plan 2, approval for development within prescribed airspace must be sought from the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development, Transport and Cities after being submitted through Australia Pacific Airports (Melbourne) Pty Ltd.</i></p> <p><u>New Requirement R#:</u></p> <p><i>In any application for a planning or building permit for a dwelling, or to subdivide land for residential purposes within the N Contours, must include requirements for noise attenuation."</i></p>	Disagree. Addressed by Part A & B submissions.	No proposed changes.
R7	<p><u>JAK Group</u></p> <p>Amend R7</p> <p>'Development of the linear park as shown on Plan 5 and Plan 8 must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for a shared path (pedestrian and cycling) which is interconnected with the surrounding footpath and cycle network. • Be designed and located to provide efficient movement of pedestrians and cyclists. • Provide for pedestrian and cyclist priority over vehicular traffic. • 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. • Utilise the cross section designs in Appendix 4.5. • Have a standard minimum width of 15m or 10m where 	Disagree. Additional wording is provided in R26.	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	adjacent to a connector road, unless otherwise agreed to by responsible authority. • <u>Ensure pedestrian access is provided to all residential lot frontages via a road or paper road.</u>		
	SFA Developments:		
	Include an additional dot point in R7 as follows. “One hard standing verge parking space per 2 lots be provided in accordance with the requirement of Clause 56.06-8 of the Planning Scheme.”	Disagree. PSP should not duplicate existing planning scheme requirements.	No proposed changes
	Hawthorn Developments		
	Raises concern that the following bullet point of R7 is inflexible and not location specific: • 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.	Agree.	Proposed amendment of bullet 4 th bullet point of R7: Where a road crosses the linear park, measures to facilitate active transport priority must be investigated and where practicable, implemented to the satisfaction of the relevant authority.
R9	SVR2		
	Amend R9 with the following wording: Vehicle access to lots fronting arterial roads must be provided from a local internal loop road, rear lane, or service road to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. <u>Direct access may be considered on an individual basis considering the relevant land use and to the satisfaction of the Department of Transport (DoT).</u>	Agreed. See proposed change.	Vehicle access to lots fronting arterial roads, <u>and Mt Ridley Road</u> , must be provided, <u>unless otherwise agreed</u> , from the local internal loop road or rear lane, to the satisfaction of the Road Authority

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<u>Department of Transport</u>		
	Amend R9: Vehicle access to lots fronting arterial roads, <u>and Mt Ridley Road</u> , must be provided from the local internal loop road or rear lane, to the satisfaction of the Road Authority.	VPA agrees with recommended change. Mt Ridley Road will become a declared arterial, where direct vehicular access is to be limited.	Amend R9 as proposed above.
R11	<u>Deaque Group</u>		
	Stormwater conveyance and treatment (including interim solutions) must be designed generally 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 result in variation to the Melbourne Water DSS as shown on Plan 6. <u>Despite any conflicting requirements, the north east tributary on property 11 may be removed subject to an alternative design approved by Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.</u>	Disagree. The VPA does not support the proposed changes to R11. Sufficient flexibility is provided in the current drafting.	No proposed changes.
New Requirement (Transport at 3.2.3)	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	New Requirement "Provide a road network generally in accordance with Plan 5."	VPA Disagrees. Clauses 37.07-10 Subdivision of Land and 37.07-11 Buildings and works, contained within the head provision of Clause 37.07 already	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
		require that a permit to subdivide land and for buildings and works must be generally in accordance with the precinct structure plan applying to the land. Including this requirement within the Craigieburn West PSP would lead to a duplication of provisions already contained within the Hume Planning Scheme.	
New Requirement (Drainage at 3.3.1)	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	Within the area not covered or able to be serviced by a Melbourne Water Drainage Services Scheme, only one stormwater retention asset is to be provided generally in accordance with Plan 6 and Table 4.2.	VPA Disagrees. Considered addressed by Requirement 12.	No proposed changes.
New Requirement (Drainage at 3.3.1)	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	The stormwater retention asset in the area not covered by a Melbourne Water Drainage Services Scheme must be provided at the same time as the subdivision of properties 31, 32, 33 or 34.	Disagree. This is considered addressed by R13, which requires development staging to provide for the delivery of ultimate waterway and drainage infrastructure including stormwater quality treatment.	No proposed changes.
	<u>Deague Group</u>		

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
R12	<p>Amend R12</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Despite any conflicting requirements, the location, layout and design of these assets may be varied, including to other properties, subject to an alternative design approved by Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.</u></p>	<p>Disagree. The VPA believes that sufficient flexibility is provided within the R12 and is further confirmed by the note on Table 3: "Note: 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." and the proposed note on Plan 6: "Stormwater quality treatment assets are subject to refinement through detailed design, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority".</p>	No proposed changes.
	<p>Porter Davis</p> <p>Amend Requirement 12:</p> <p>'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 <u>(as appropriate within the gap (no DSS) catchment)</u> and the responsible authority and include appropriate considerations to mitigate the risk of erosion from sodic and dispersive soils.'</p>	<p>VPA disagree - reference to the Responsible Authority considered appropriate to address the Gap catchment.</p>	No proposed changes.
R13	<p><u>PEET:</u></p>		
	<p>Requirement R13 to provide clear date references to the Best Practice performance targets that must be met;</p>	<p>VPA Disagree.</p> <p>No date is specified as the standards are updated periodically.</p>	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
		It is also noted that this matter was considered resolved by PEET prior to the SAC hearing (email dated 22/02/2020)	
R14	<u>Merri Creek Management Committee</u>		
	<p>Amend R14</p> <p>Stormwater runoff from the development must meet the performance objectives of the CSIRO Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines for Urban Stormwater prior to discharge to receiving waterways and as outlined on Plan 6, unless otherwise approved by Melbourne Water and the responsible authority.</p> <p>Proposals that exceed the performance objectives <u>and in particular that meet the targets of the Upper Merri Stormwater Priority Area</u> are highly encouraged and can be considered, to the satisfaction of the relevant authorities.</p>	Disagree	No proposed changes.
R15	<u>PEET</u>		
	Requirement R15 be updated to include performance targets so compliance can be appropriately assessed.	VPA Disagree. Inclusion of performance targets is not considered appropriate.	No proposed changes.
R22	<u>JAK</u>		
	<p>Amend Requirement R22 as follows:</p> <p>'Development adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 should be set back in accordance with Table 4.</p> <p>However, a lesser setback may be considered subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk, vegetation classifications and setbacks to the</p>	VPA Disagree. The inclusion of the additional text in R23 can be considered addressed by the allowance for a site-specific investigation, which would determine the hazard classification depending on the waterway corridor type.	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<p>satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.</p> <p><u>The revision of a drainage corridor type (natural or constructed) or dimension in the applicable Drainage Services Scheme may also result in a change in the Bushfire Hazard classification of a particular corridor as identified in Plan 7 and Table 4.'</u></p>		
R23	<p><u>Hume City Council:</u></p> <p><u>Amend R23</u></p> <p>If the provisions like those within G36 are required, then they should with minor changes to suit, be specified as a condition in the UGZ schedule not as a requirement in the PSP.</p>	VPA Part B Proposed to delete R23 and G36	R23 and G36 to be deleted.
R25	<p><u>Hawthorn Developments</u></p> <p>Add text to dot point 1, Section 3.4.1 Open space and natural systems - Requirement R26 (in Part A Track Changes)</p> <p>“unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority”</p>	VPA proposes to amend R25..	<p>Proposed change to R26:</p> <p>Development of the linear park as shown on Plan 8 must, unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
R26	<p><u>JAK Group</u></p> <p>Delete Requirement R26.</p>	VPA Disagree – R26 is required to facilitate the development of the linear parks.	No proposed changes.
R34	<u>Hume City Council</u>		

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<p>Amend R34</p> <p>"Vegetation shown on Plan 10 as Vegetation for Retention must be retained unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Responsible Authority.</p> <p>Retained vegetation must be incorporated into either the open space network or the public realm.</p> <p><u>Vegetation identified as to be retained on Plan 10 must not be removed unless it presents an unreasonable risk or is not reasonably capable of being incorporated into the public realm with reasonable adjustments to a subdivisional layout."</u></p>	<p>General Comment</p> <p>R34 was reworded in the Part A to allow for discretionary decision making.</p> <p>A position was provided to the committee recommending the addition of the following sentence: "Retained vegetation must be incorporated into either the open space network or the public realm."</p> <p>The VPA does not support the addition of decision criteria in the requirement as this is a duplication of 52.17.</p>	<p>Update text to read</p> <p>Vegetation shown on Plan 10 as Vegetation for Retention must be retained unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority.</p> <p>Retained vegetation must be incorporated into either the open space network or the public realm."</p>
	<u>Stockland</u>		
	<p>Amend R34</p> <p>Introduction of a planning permit trigger. We support the VPA Part A submission proposal to include additional wording to R33 (R34) "... unless otherwise agreed by the Responsible Authority"</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Addressed in the Part A Tracked Changes PSP Document – April 2021</p>
R35	<u>Department of Education and Training</u>		
	<p>Amend R35</p> <p>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</p>	<p>As addressed in Part B Part 2 submission.</p>	<p>R35 amended to state:</p> <p>"Education facilities must have a minimum of two road frontages (three preferred). These roads must have sufficient width to provide on street indented parking (that can incorporate a student drop-off zone), 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</p>

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
			accommodating on-street parking and two way traffic movement."

Guidelines

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
G4	<u>Stockland</u>		
	Opposes Council's suggested removal of reference to moderate incomes.	VPA agree - Affordable Housing definition is set by Section 3AA of P&E Act.	No proposed change to affordable housing definition.
	<u>SFA Developments</u>		
	Delete Guideline 4.	Reworded VPA G4 as per Part A track changes is appropriate for retention within PSP.	G4 to be retained as outlined in the Part A Tracked Changes PSP.
G5	<u>Pask</u>		
	<p>Amend Guideline G5 as follows:</p> <p>"Subdivision should deliver a broad mix of lots that are an appropriate size and shape to support the planned neighbourhood character of the precinct, as specified in Table 2, by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Providing a range of lot sizes, widths, depths and densities o Providing higher residential densities and more intensive building typologies in locations where they will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support the viability and vibrancy of activity centres, access to community infrastructure and amenities. ▪ Have good access to public transport and support walking and cycling and proximate to open space areas. ▪ Make a positive impact to planned neighbourhood character and identity through the incorporation of remnant vegetation (where indicated in Plan 10). 	Agreed. Change has been reflected in the Part A Tracked Changes PSP Document.	No further change proposed.
New Guideline under Section 3.1	<u>APAM</u>		
	<p>In Section 3.1 under 'Guidelines', the following should be added:</p> <p>G# In any application to subdivide or develop land for residential, educational or commercial purposes within the PSP area,</p>	<p>VPA disagrees.</p> <p>This PSP should not pre-empt the findings of the MAESSAC,</p>	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	consideration should be given to including noise attenuation treatments within any building to minimise the impacts of aircraft noise. Details of the N-Contours as they apply to the PSP area can be located at: https://www.melbourneairport.com.au/Corporate/Community/Noise-at-Melbourne-Airport/Noise-too	nor should this be dealt in an ad hoc fashion.	
G7	<p><u>Pask:</u></p> <p>Amend G7:</p> <p>“Subdivision applications for super-lots identified for medium density, high density or integrated housing should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Consider how dwelling density in Table 2 can be achieved over time subject to market conditions and achieving good urban design outcome 	<p>VPA Disagrees.</p> <p>G7 is considered adequate in its current form.</p>	No proposed changes.
G21	<p><u>Hume City Council</u></p> <p>Amend G21</p> <p>For the local subdivisional streets, a variety of road cross-sections should be used in a subdivision layout . . . etc.”</p>	<p>VPA disagrees.</p> <p>The current drafting of G21 clearly identifies that minimum dimensions and, performance and widths are to be retain.</p>	No proposed changes.
G23	<p><u>Merri Creek Management Committee</u></p> <p>Where practical, integrated water management systems should be designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Maximise habitat values for local flora and fauna species. – Enable future harvesting and/or treatment and re use of stormwater. – Protect and manage MNES values, <u>and matters of state and regional significance</u>, particularly within conservation 	<p>VPA disagrees.</p> <p>“matters of state and regional significance” are not defined; therefore, inclusion in the guideline is not considered suitable.</p>	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	areas, in relation to water quality and suitable hydrological regimes (both surface and groundwater).		
New Guideline (at 3.2.3 Transport)	<u>Hume City Council:</u>		
	Add new guideline to 3.2.3: "Further road linkages with Mickleham, Craigieburn and Mount Ridley Roads should be provided on a left in left out basis only and having regard to the overall needs of the precinct	VPA Disagree. Considered addressed by R8.	No proposed changes.
	<u>PASK:</u>		
	Section 3.2.3 (Street Network) be amended to include a guideline that states: "Interim site access may be gained from the arterial road network in the early stages of development";	VPA Disagree. Considered addressed by referral to DOT under Clause 52.29	No proposed changes
G36	<u>Hume City Council:</u>		
	If the provisions like those within R23 are required, then they should with minor changes to suit, be specified as a condition in the UGZ schedule not as a requirement in the PSP. The same applies to G36.	VPA Part B Proposed to delete R23 and G36. Matters raised by R23 and G36 will be addressed through site specific bushfire management plans.	R23 and G36 to be deleted.
G42	<u>JAK Group:</u>		
	Amend G42 to refer explicitly to linear parks, i.e.: 'Local parks and linear parks should generally be provided where shown on Plan 8 and as outlined in Table 5.'	VPA agrees.	Amend G42: Local parks and linear parks should generally be provided where shown on Plan 8 and as outlined in Table 5.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
New Guideline 3.6	<u>APAM</u>		
	<p>New Guideline under section 3.6:</p> <p>G# In any application outside the N-Contours to develop land for education or community facilities, or upgrade existing educational or community facilities, consideration should be given to noise attenuation treatments within any buildings to minimise the impacts of aircraft noise. Details of the N-Contours as they apply to the PSP area can be located at: https://www.melbourneairport.com.au/Corporate/Community/Noise-at-Melbourne-Airport/Noise-tool</p>	Addressed in Part A and Part B	No proposed changes.
G58	<u>Merri Creek Management Committee</u>		
	<p>Where practicable, existing vegetation should be retained, protected, and enhanced <u>and indigenous revegetation undertaken</u> to provide habitat and movement corridors for local fauna.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>R24 required planting to be undertaken as per Council policies & guidelines. G58 relates to existing vegetation.</p>	No change proposed
G63	<u>Universal Syrian Orthodox Church</u>		
	<p>Amend G63</p> <p>'Educational, community or civic infrastructure not shown on Plan 11 should be located within or proximate to a town centre, local convenience centre, community hub, <u>or council community building or existing community facility such as a Place of Worship, as appropriate.</u></p>	VPA agrees to an amendment of G63	Educational, community or civic infrastructure not shown on Plan 11 should be located within or proximate to a town centre, local convenience centre, community hub, or council community building or within an existing Place of Worship as appropriate.
New Guideline under 3.7.1	<u>SVR2</u>		
	New Guideline:	VPA Disagrees.	No proposed changes.

Provision	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<p>Commercial and non-residential uses that serve local and broader community needs (such as service stations, childcare, convenience restaurants and medical centres) may establish at intersections of arterial roads subject to suitable access being available.</p> <p>Alternatively, define Local Community Centre within the PSP. Suggested wording:</p> <p>Local Convenience Centres are neighbourhood-based retail centres that offer convenient access to goods and services for their local communities. They differ from clustered commercial uses that are designed to cater for car-dependent uses such as convenience restaurants, convenience shops and service stations."</p>	<p>The uses specified are Section 1 or 2 land uses under the planning scheme, where an application can be considered on merit.</p>	
G73	<p><u>Hume City Council</u></p> <p>Amend G73 as follows:</p> <p>Delete the sentence and amend the third sentence and delete the reference to "Note" and redraft balance to read -</p> <p>"Project delivery timing outlined in Appendix 4.1 is indicative and subject to periodic review by the relevant responsible authority the availability of funds in the infrastructure contribution plan account.</p>	<p>VPA agree. See proposed amendment.</p>	<p>Proposed amended note for G73:</p> <p>Project delivery timing outlined in Appendix 4.1 is indicative and subject to periodic review and the availability of funds in the infrastructure contribution plan account.</p>
G74	<p><u>Department of Education and Training</u></p> <p>Amend point 3 of G74 as follows:</p> <p>"Proximity to existing, committed or proposed community infrastructure, such as schools"</p>	<p>As addressed in Part B Part 2 submission.</p>	<p>Proposed amended G73:</p> <p>Proximity to existing, committed, or proposed community infrastructure, such as schools</p>
New Guideline under 3.8.1	<p><u>Hume City Council:</u></p> <p>New Guideline under 3.8.1 Development Staging:</p> <p>"Ensure that development staging is co-ordinated with the delivery of key local and state infrastructure."</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>New Guideline:</p> <p>Development staging should have regard to the delivery of key local and state infrastructure.</p>

Table Changes

Table Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
Table 1	<u>Department of Education and Training</u>		
	Update text to read: "Proposed Government School (including expansion to existing school)."	As addressed in Part B Part 2 submission.	Update text to read: "Proposed Government School (including expansion to existing school)."
Table 2	<u>PASK</u>		
	Amend Table 2 to: (a) Identify average dwelling density within the Town Centre and Mixed-Use Area of 25; (b) Identify average dwelling density within the Walkable Catchment outside of the Town Centre and Mixed-Use Area of 22 and around key open space areas. (c) Amend the planned neighbourhood character for the walkable catchment outside the Town Centre and Mixed-Use Area as follows: "Development will have an urban neighbourhood character, characterised by buildings up to 4 storeys in height. Housing will comprise a variety of typologies which may include low rise apartment buildings, terraced homes and townhouses (including rear loaded product) and detached dwellings. (d) Add a note at the end of Table 2 as follows (as recommended by Mr Fetterplace): "Note: The minimum average density provides guidance regarding the expected quantum of housing to be delivered within a development area. Applications for subdivisions that do not meet the minimum average	Disagree. Proposed changes are not considered an appropriate response for inclusion within Table 2, except for the note which is proposed to be added.	VPA propose to include a note in table 2 that states: "Note: The minimum average density provides guidance regarding the expected quantum of housing to be delivered within a development area. Applications for subdivisions that do not meet the minimum average density can demonstrate how the requirement will be achieved overtime may be considered."

Table Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	density can demonstrate how the requirement will be achieved overtime may be considered."		
	SFA Developments		
	<p>Amend Table 2:</p> <p>Delete the wording "Development will have an urban neighbourhood character, characterised by buildings up to four storeys in height" and only include the following wording: "Housing will comprise a variety of typologies, including low-rise apartments buildings, terraced homes and townhouses (including rearloaded product), and detached dwellings."</p> <p>Include the following note:</p> <p>"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 will be achieved overtime may be considered."</p>	<p>Disagree with removal of heights within Table 2, as this merely reflects the maximum allowable height limit as the applied zone (Residential Growth Zone).</p> <p>Agree with including a note in Table 2 as outlined by SFA Developments.</p>	See above
Table 3	<u>PEET</u>		
	<p>Table 3 be amended to increase the size of ACSB-08 size from 1.43 hectares to 2.0 hectares;</p> <p>Table 3 and land use budget tables be amended to increase the size of the 'gap' asset to a singular shared asset of 1.0 hectare on Property 31;</p>	VPA to update Table 3 in response to the DSS outcomes as advised by Melbourne Water, including the 2ha ACBS-08 and 1ha "Gap" Catchment asset.	
	<u>Porter Davis</u>		
	<p>Amend Table 3, Gap Cathcment (Non-DSS) row:</p> <p>Identify a retarding and sediment basin of 1 ha;</p>	Agreed	Table to be amended

Table Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	Amend Table 3, Gap Catchment (Non-DSS) row: identify Hume City Council as the responsible entity for the asset.	Agreed	Table to be amended
	Amend Table 3: Include a note at the bottom of the table which states: The location and size of the stormwater quality treatment asset within the gap (no DSS) catchment is subject to refinement through detailed design, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.' *NB: this note is proposed in addition to the note proposed by the VPA in its memo dated 29 April 2021 (Document 100), which we interpret as relating to DSS assets only (given the reference to Melbourne Water).	Disagree. Not supported. Intent of note is clear.	No proposed change.
	Amend Table 3: "Include a note at the bottom of the table which states: 'Culvert upgrades beneath Mickleham Road, to appropriately service the gap (no DSS) catchment, to be included in Craigieburn West Infrastructure Contribution Plan. This project may be removed from the ICP as part of the regular reviews of the ICP in the event that Department of Transport undertake culvert upgrades as part of the future upgrade of Mickleham Road before the gap catchment landowners undertake development.' *NB: subject to VPA consideration of Ministerial Direction on the Preparation and Content of Infrastructure Contribution Plans.	Disagree. Culverts are not an ICP item.	No proposed change.

Table Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
Table 4	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	Amend Table 4 under Part 3.3.3 (Bushfire) of the PSP to make reference to AS 3959 – 2018 which is where the relevant classifications are found and described.	Agree. To include (as amended) in the wording.	VPA propose to update table 4 to include reference to AS 3959 – 2018 (as amended) in Table 4.
Table 5	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	In Table 5 in the Locational Attributes wherever there is a reference to “retention of existing vegetation” amend each entry to read: “Located for public open space purposes and to retain existing vegetation . . . etc “	VPA disagree - "located for public open space purposes' is not a location attribute -but more so a 'purpose' of the open space.	No proposed change.
	<u>Stockland</u>		
	SR-01 No change required to Table 5: Credited open space delivery guide. The locational attributes and area of the active open space remain unchanged.	VPA Agree.	
	<u>Porter Davis</u>		
Table 5 currently provides for a local park (LP-14) of 0.6 ha. Primary position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the row referring to LP-14 in Table 5. Update Plan 8 (Open Space) accordingly. Alternative position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the row referring to LP-14 in Table 5 to change the area to 0.3ha. Update Plan 8 (Open Space) accordingly.	Disagree. The VPA proposed alignment of Elevation Boulevard to meet Cookes Road obviates the need for changes to this park. Open space to remain in current location for the retention of high value vegetation.	No proposed changes.	
	<u>SFA Developments:</u>		

Table Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
Table 7	<p>Include an additional dot point to Table 7 and Appendix 3 as set out below:</p> <p>“The design and layout of the local town centre should have regard for the potential to cause adverse amenity impacts on the surrounding residential area and public realm (including linear open spaces) as a result of the location of back-of-house areas, deliveries and refuse storage and collection. Subdivision and development should minimise adverse amenity conflicts.”</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>This is addressed in Appendix 4.3: Design Principles - Principle 9.</p>	No proposed changes.
	<u>Hawthorn Developments</u>		
	Reduction in the minimum land area identified in Table 7 for the Retail Core (Local Town Centre, LTC) to 2.1 to 2.5 ha NDA (Reduction supported by VPA Part A Submission	Addressed in VPA Part A Submission	Amend Table 7 to indicate LTC NDA of 2.6ha.

Appendices Changes

Appendix Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
4.1	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	<p>Add the unconstructed section of Mt Ridley Road that is not provided for in the Lindum Vale ICP.</p> <p>Add the following projects to the ICP to facilitate the orderly implementation of the PSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • #####as determined by the Advisory Committee 	VPA Agrees. section of Mt Ridley Rd to be included in the ICP.	Include Mt Ridley Rd in the PIP Plan.
	<u>PEET</u>		
	The description of Intersection IN-05 in Table 4.1 be amended to include the following statement: "Construction of a signalized T-intersection (non-standard)";	Disagree. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate this as a non-standard intersection design.	No proposed change.
	<u>Deague Group</u>		
The extension of Marathon Boulevard and the Aitken Creek culvert be included as ICP projects in the precinct infrastructure table.	Disagrees. VPA do not consider that issues with the land fragmentation have been demonstrated by the landowner.	No proposed change.	
4.2	<u>Hume City Council</u>		
	The required land area for the gap drainage asset should be listed in the Parcel Specific land use budget table at 4.2 of the PSP under "waterway and Drainage Reserve"	Agree. The Property Specific Land Use budget will be updated to reflect proposed changes to Plan 4, including the gap drainage asset.	To be updated as per responses in Plan 4.
	<u>PEET</u>		

Appendix Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<p>Amend the Property Specific Land Budget table to alter the land areas of the local parks consistently with the areas shown in the Master Plan in order to, among other things, achieve a public land equalisation outcome across Peet's land.</p> <p>Amend the Property Specific Land Budget table to update the waterway and drainage reserve areas.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Property Specific Land Use budget will be updated to reflect proposed changes to Plan 4.</p>	<p>To be updated as per responses in Plan 4.</p>
	<p><u>JAK Group</u></p>		
	<p>Seeking revision to Plan 6 to reduce waterway width. A consequential reduction in the quantum of encumbered land (drainage) identified for Property 8, from the 2.64ha referenced in the Parcel specific land use budget table to its ultimate size once the resizing has occurred.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The Property Specific Land Use budget will be updated to reflect proposed changes to Plan 4.</p>	<p>No proposed change.</p>
<p>4.3</p>	<p><u>Hume City Council</u></p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete all of Principle 1 (both columns) which is relevant to the preparation of a PSP but not relevant to the grant of a permit. • Delete all of Principle 2 (not relevant to a permit application) • Delete Principle 3 (not relevant to permit application). • In Principle 4 delete the second bullet point. 	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>These are general principles that guide location and development.</p>	<p>No proposed changes.</p>

Appendix Reference	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
	<u>Universal Syrian Orthodox Church</u>		
	Principle 4 should be updated to 'Locate childcare, medical centres and specialised accommodation (for example, aged care, nursing home, student accommodation, and serviced apartments) within or at the edge of the local town centre, to contribute to the centre's activity and the resident's access to services. <u>Outside the local town centre, such uses should be located within a walkable catchment or co-located with existing or future community facilities such as a Place of Worship</u> '	Disagree. This relates to the LTC. No relevant outside of LTCs.	No proposed changes.
	<u>PEET</u>		
4.5	A new Local Access Street – Level 2 (adjacent linear park) cross section is included (in accordance with the Ratio Transport Considerations memo) in Section 4.5 of the PSP.	Addressed in Part B.	See Part B.
	Cross sections for Mickleham and Craigieburn Roads (with and without a frontage road) be included in Appendix 4.5 of the PSP.	Disagree. Addressed in Part A.	No change proposed.
	A cross section for a standard laneway be included.	Disagree. This is a level of detail is not appropriate for a PSP and is resolved at subdivision stage.	No changes proposed.
	<u>Janet Remington</u>		
	Request that any existing design of the cross section for Mickleham Road (entire road reserve) and proposed intersection designs be provided.	Disagree. Addressed in Part A.	No change proposed.

'Other' Changes

Description	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
Mickleham Road	Aitken College		
	Seeks the duplication of Mickleham Road	Addressed in Part A. Part B and Part B Part 2 submissions	No change proposed.
	Greenvale Residents Association		
	The GRA strongly objects to the Amendment and requests that the matter of funding the duplication of Mickleham road and fast tracking its development are prioritised by the VPA with the Victorian State Minister for Roads and Roads Safety – Ben Carroll MP prior to the PSP progressing.	Addressed in Part A. Part B and Part B Part 2 submissions	No change proposed.
Lindum Vale ICP	Stockland		
	The Lindum Vale ICP should be modified to ensure that it provides a sufficient funding source to cover 50% of the cost of active open space SR-01 and community facility CL-01 (as per the evidence of Mr Negri).	Disagree. VPA considers it is fair and appropriate that the Lindum Vale contribution remain as per the Lindum Vale PSP and ICP and that Craigieburn West fund the balance of the active open space and community facility, for reasons outlined in the Part C document.	PIP to be updated to reflect new apportionments.
	Include as a funded ICP item the section of Mt Ridley Road currently omitted, between the R2 PSP land and the Lindum Vale PSP land.	Agreed.	PIP to be updated.
Land in Greenvale investigation area	<u>Satterley</u>		
	Satterley requests the Committee to consider the importance of rezoning the land to the south of the PSP, being Satterley's True North Neighbourhood 4 estate and make any recommendations it feels appropriate.	Noted. Greenvale Investigation Area is a project on the VPA's 20/21 Business Plan.	No proposed changes.
	<u>Francis Baker</u>		

Description	Requested Changes	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
DSS Process:	Seeks any assets proposed within the land to be minimised and for consultations to occur in an open and transparent process with the relevant authorities and stakeholders in a timely manner.	Noted. The VPA will update the waterways and drainage assets as advised by Melbourne Water.	Changes proposed in Part B Part 2.

VPA Proposed Changes

Requirement	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
Table 2	Change proposed in the Part B Submission.	Proposed change to Table 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> revised densities of 25 dwellings/ha inside the walkable catchment; and 19 dwellings/ha in the remainder of the PSP; and including the revised walkable catchment proposed in the Part A PSP.
Appendix 4.5	Change proposed in the Part B Submission.	Include linear park cross-sections and document references to provide example treatments for the linear park and adjoining roads. The cross sections are currently being prepared and have not been reflected in the Part A PSP.
Appendix 4.5	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Update Whites Lane cross-section. The cross section is currently being prepared and accordingly the Part A PSP does not reflect the changes
In accordance with the evidence given from Mr H Allan, the following changes to the PSP are proposed		
R20	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revised R21: "Vegetation within bushfire hazard areas shown on Plan 7 must be managed in accordance with Table 4 during development"
R21	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revised R22: Habitable buildings adjoining bushfire hazards shown on Plan 7 must be setback in accordance with Table 4. However, a lesser setback may be considered subject to a site-specific assessment of bushfire risk, vegetation classifications and setbacks to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and relevant fire authority.
R22	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	VPA propose to delete R23.
G36	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	VPA propose to delete Guideline 36.
G37	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revise G37: Subdivision adjoining bushfire hazard areas 1 & 2 should include a publicly accessible perimeter road.

Requirement	VPA Comments	VPA Proposed Change
G39	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revise G39: "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".
G40	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revise G40: Remove reference to bushfire Hazard area 3.
Appendix 4.1	Changes proposed in the Part B Submission.	Revise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apportionment for IN-03 and additional line item to construct the 4th intersection leg.