

Please find below submission for prepared information relating to Precinct Structure plan PSP
Area of concern ,further discussion, and clarification
We have some dialogue going already on some of these topics with VPA and WCC but have included them.
I will add this to engage website now

This is submitted on behalf of



1Densities HPH15-18

We would prefer consideration for Diversity over density

The practical realities of delivering the proposed densities suggested on 34 and 36 with imposed infrastructure on this area

This may inhibit practical implementation of higher density in these areas and may need flexibility

a)proposed RbWL 05- area 2.19 Ha

b)proposed local network park -POS -area 1Ha

c)will need roads either side of above to connect -further reducing yield

d)proposed north south road from dales road into IN02-can only yield off 1 side

e)restriction of Boiling down road use , so will need more internal road networks.

f)site is now fragmented.

2)Consideration to implementation limitations with the potential upfront funding of RB prior to starting development .

3)the need for designs on IN-02 to include the introduction of the North south road into intersection and be included in DCP

DRG 3002

4)The cost of proposed bridge over a trickle for 15M is not good value. Overindulgent infrastructure that could be achieved with more economically efficiency. Culverts

I believe we should consider alternatives.

This only increases cost to end consumer and adds to DCP unnecessarily

5)DCP allowances and calculation for RBWL05 do not seem adequate from our calculations. In particular capacity of the RB for downstream discharge

reports by Smec assume 1200mm outfall when its only 525mm.

We need to do further work on this as RB may need to be larger

6)How will the open space work in practical implementation.

le- if no funds from POS available how can this be funded.

Estimate 600k will need to come from somewhere-what if no one else develops -Timelines

7)general comment that there is way too much public open space in development. The POS marked on our land seems excessive considering the proximity to other proposed and existing public spaces that will be available

There are considerable long terms costs in having so much POS and associated infrastructure/ this will eventually impact costs to ratepayers for many years to come. This is currently in progress for new POS strategy-for further discussion

8)Potential and advantage to add more detail to potential development sequence and timelines for infrastructure delivery.(WCC/ developer)
Implimentation!

9)I believe it should be noted in reports and acknowledged Wannon Waters responsibility.

a)Wannon Water are gaining the most benefit for roads around the water reservoirs and are not contributing to the Development

b)it could be argued that these roads should be in DCP so all development shares the cost of their advantage.
Has this been requested by Wannon Water

c)Its been raised previously with VPA that there is a lot run off /drainage that is coming from Reservoir and we do not accept the financial burden of costs associated with water runoff from their land. I can't see this discussed in any Drainage reports and believe this should be acknowledged.

10) Interested in reasoning for different valuations for properties that are very close.

le straight across the road values are \$250,000 more per Ha

EA-C1-01-\$850 Ha

EA-RBWL-05 \$600 Ha

Look forward to discussing in more detail

Always happy to gain greater understanding of EOA precinct.

Regards



