

**A Proud Community
Growing Together**



C146 PLUMPTON PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN

Exhibition Submission by Melton City Council, 22 August 2016

Item 12.10 Amendment C146 to the Melton Planning Scheme -
 Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan Council Submission
Appendix 2 Melton City Council Submission to C146 Plumpton Precinct
 Structure Plan

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

Contents

1. Introduction 4

2. Key Issues 5

 2.1 Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP) 5

 2.2 Delivery and Staging 5

 2.3 Facilitating North-South Movement 6

 2.4 Applied Zones in Residential Areas 7

3 Comments and Recommended Changes 8

 Table 1: Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan 9

 1.0 Introduction 9

 2.0 Outcomes 12

 3.0 Implementation 20

 4.0 Integrated Water Management and Utilities 40

 5.0 Infrastructure Delivery and Staging 42

 6.0 Precinct Infrastructure 43

 7.0 Appendices 46

 Table 2: Infrastructure Contributions Plan 53

 Table 3: Planning Scheme Ordinance 55

 Table 4: Background Report 61

4 Conclusion 66

Item 12.10	Amendment C146 to the Melton Planning Scheme - Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan Council Submission
Appendix 2	Melton City Council Submission to C146 Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

1. Introduction

The City of Melton welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Planning Scheme Amendment documentation for C146 which comprises the following:

1. Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan;
2. Kororoit and Plumpton Background Report;
3. Planning Scheme Ordinance including UGZ Schedule 11, SUZ Schedule 10, Public Acquisition Overlay Schedule 3 and DCPO Schedule 10.

Melton City Council has reviewed the documentation and is generally supportive of the vision and intent of the Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan.

There are however a number of key concerns about some of the content within the PSP, and how the plan will be implemented. Of greatest concern are the following:

- The absence of an Incorporated Contributions Plan (ICP) and associated costings to support the PSP and provide a framework for the delivery of infrastructure during implementation;
- The timing of infrastructure delivery within the precinct (particularly the delivery of Hopkins Road); and
- The proposed application of Residential Zones.

Melton City Council considers the above high level concerns, in addition to the table of issues identified in the documentation below, require resolution prior to the approval of the PSP.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

2. Key Issues

As previously discussed there are a number of key issues which Council requests are addressed prior to Council providing support for the amendment. These are issues that are considered to have a significant impact on Council's ability to implement the PSP.

2.1 Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP)

The exhibition of the draft PSP before the full implementation of the new ICP system presents a risk to Council. Without the information to be provided in the Ministerial direction, Council cannot be sure of the final per hectare rate relevant to the development of land in the Precinct, the final list of allowable items or the costs of the proposed infrastructure items. This may have an impact on Council's service delivery and spending in the future, and in addition to the uncertainty of the implementation, and included items, affect the appropriateness of the future urban structure.

Council considers there are a number of omissions with regards to infrastructure items within this PSP. Land acquisition and construction for the proposed district level Plumpton Aquatics Centre is a significant omission. Additionally the embellishment of the Beattys Road reserve has been excluded – Beattys Road reserve is proposed to be a significant pedestrian and cycle route connecting populations both within the Plumpton PSP and surrounding populations to the Plumpton Major Town Centre.

The omission of these key infrastructure items prior to the release of the Ministerial Direction is premature. Council considers that all required infrastructure items should be identified within the PSP until such time as the final ICP items list and per hectare rate are available.

It is particularly concerning that the Aquatics Centre has been omitted. Council has an adopted *Aquatics Centre Strategy* which identifies that the facility will be used by the Plumpton and Kororoit PSP population, hence at least a portion of the acquisition and construction for the facility should be included as part of the joint ICP for Plumpton and Kororoit PSP.

In addition, the MPA has not provided costs for the infrastructure projects that are identified through the PSP in 'Table 9 – Precinct Infrastructure of the PSP', Plan 12 – Precinct Infrastructure – Transport (ICP)', or 'Plan 13- Precinct Infrastructure Plan – Community and Open Space (ICP)'.

The information to be provided under the ICP system is critical to understanding what infrastructure can be funded, what Councils contributions to infrastructure are and, importantly, the financial risks to Council.

In the absence of the ICP information being available, Melton City Council cannot provide full support for Amendment C146 until the ICP has been developed and subject to a planning scheme amendment process.

2.2 Delivery and Staging

Council is concerned about the orderly provision of infrastructure to ensure communities which develop enjoy at least the minimum infrastructure required to support a viable community function. The PSP does not go far enough to ensure the delivery of infrastructure will be delivered in a timely and orderly manner.

To ensure this occurs, Council would like to see the PSP documentation consider in more depth, the staging of development. It is important to note that Council is not seeking to limit development fronts or prevent competition in the market. Council's sole interest is to ensure that development proceeds

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

in a manner which ensures that appropriate infrastructure is delivered with development. Furthermore, where development occurs in a fashion which is 'out of sequence', the PSP should be clear insofar as requiring the delivery of the ICP funded and non-funded infrastructure items within the precinct.

Council considers out of sequence development as development which does not constitute a logical progression or continuation of development fronts and where the infrastructure available requires substantial augmentation to facilitate development.

Given the above, as per previous submissions to the Mt Atkinson and Tarneit Plains and Rockbank PSPs, Melton City Council seeks for this matter to be addressed as new requirements in the Infrastructure Delivery and Staging section of the PSP. Council seeks a requirement to the effect that:

All development must deliver any ICP funded infrastructure and/or any non ICP funded infrastructure necessary to support the development. Out of sequence development must as necessary deliver ICP funded items prior to the indicative timing within the PIP and all non ICP funded infrastructure appropriate for the development.

Wording should also follow in the ICP document yet to be prepared which requires early delivery of infrastructure items where out of sequence development occurs. It should also specify that where development is out of sequence, the collecting agency requires the provision of works in kind for the provision of necessary ICP items with deferred reimbursement secured through section 173 agreements.

The inclusion of this requirement and wording in the ICP will assist in the proper administration of the ICP.

2.3 Facilitating North-South Movement

North – South movement through the Kororoit and Plumpton PSP areas is currently provided along Plumpton Road (Plumpton PSP) and Sinclairs Road (Kororoit PSP). These roads are currently two lanes (one lane in each direction), and sections of these roads are currently approaching capacity.

In the exhibition draft Plumpton and Kororoit PSPs, Plumpton and Sinclairs Roads are proposed to be connector roads and remain one lane in each direction. The majority of the north-south vehicular movement will be facilitated through the development of a new six lane road through the PSP areas which will be the extension of Hopkins Road from Neale Road to the Melton Highway (with a possible extension north to Sunbury). Given that Plumpton and Sinclairs Roads are currently operating at near capacity, the additional traffic that is projected to result from the development of the PSP areas will result in these roads operating over capacity, and at a poor grade of service. Given this, there is a need to ensure that Hopkins Road is constructed in a timely manner, to ensure the increased traffic flows being generated by development are appropriately managed.

There is little guidance in the PSP triggering the acquisition and construction of Hopkins Road as traffic volumes require it, particularly the first stage from Neale Road to Taylors Road (including a bridge over the Kororoit Creek). Council Officers would like to discuss potential mechanisms that may be used within the PSP to expedite the delivery of Hopkins Road, in line with the increasing traffic volumes. In addition, Council recommends a new requirement be included in the PSP that limits access to Plumpton and Sinclairs Roads until the first stage of Hopkins Road are constructed. This will reduce traffic congestion on these roads to allow a greater level of service whilst they are performing as interim arterial roads until Hopkins Road is constructed.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

2.4 Applied Zones in Residential Areas

Council does not support the applied Residential Growth Zone (RGZ) as the default residential zone. This matter was recently tested as part of the Rockbank PSP Panel in which Council requested for this to be changed to General Residential Zone (GRZ). This is for the following reasons:

- The nomination of applied zones should be principally based on the purposes of those zones and the extent to which those purposes are appropriate for the identified areas within the PSP to which they are to be applied;
- There is no policy basis supporting the global application of the RGZ in Melbourne's growth areas;
- The PSP already shows areas for 'higher density residential opportunity' which provides an opportunity for increased densities in appropriate locations. The application of the RGZ precinct wide will undermine this intended approach;
- The application of the residential zones should be principally based on the purposes of those zones and the extent to which the purposes are to be applied. The identification of higher density residential land has been determined strategically as part of the PSP, the proposal to allow the RGZ will go against this strategic work;
- The application of the RGZ may give rise to other development not permitted in the GRZ and could result in the proliferation of non-residential uses which may prejudice the establishment of activity centres. Whilst it is recognised that these types of uses can be written out of the UGZ, it is Council's position that this is a complicated approach which could be simplified with a more appropriate zoning outcome; and
- The application of the RGZ will result in residential areas with increased density in locations over one kilometre from services such as schools, community facilities and shops. This is a poor outcome for future residents who should be able to access services in close proximity to their place of residence.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

3 Comments and Recommended Changes

The following tables summarise Council officers' comments on the draft documentation and recommended changes to each document. The following documents have been reviewed:

- Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan;
- Planning Scheme Ordinance, including UGZ11, SUZ10 and associated mapping and overlays;
- Explanatory Report; and
- Background Report.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

Table 1: Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan

1.0 Introduction

Item No.	Section, Page Number	Comment	Recommended Change
1	Plan 1, p.4	<p>The <i>Western Interstate Freight Terminal</i> is referred to as two different items in this Plan.</p> <p>The legend refers to it as being a <i>Metropolitan Intermodal System Terminal</i>, whereas the label on the plan refers to it as <i>Future Western Interstate Freight Terminal</i>.</p> <p>The project is referred as the <i>Western Interstate Freight Terminal</i> in <i>Plan Melbourne</i>.</p> <p>It is noted that the Freight Terminal is coloured with yellow hatching which isn't reflected in the Legend.</p>	<p>Change the legend from <i>Metropolitan Intermodal System Terminal</i>, to <i>Metropolitan Interstate Freight Terminal</i> and include yellow hatching in Legend.</p>
2	Plan 1, p.4	<p>Not all of the activity centres in the City of Melton are shown.</p> <p>The existing activity centres in Melton Township – <i>Woodgrove</i> and <i>High Street</i> are missing.</p> <p><i>Watergardens</i> is also missing, which is proximate to the Plumpton PSP.</p>	<p>Add the <i>Woodgrove</i> and <i>High Street</i> activity centres to Plan 1.</p> <p>Add <i>Watergardens</i> activity centre to Plan 1.</p>
3	Plan 1, p.4	<p>Caroline Springs train station which is under construction is not shown on the plan.</p> <p>A number of proposed train stations are not shown on the plan – <i>Hopkins Road</i>, <i>Paynes Road</i>, and</p>	<p>Add Caroline Springs train station to the plan.</p> <p>Add the proposed train stations to the plan at <i>Hopkins Road</i>, <i>Paynes Road</i> and <i>Ferris Road</i>.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

		Toolern (Ferris Road).	
4	Section 1.1, p.7	Reference to Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 is not correct, include the word 'Conservation' after Biodiversity to read <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i>	Add word 'Conservation'
5	Section 1.2, p.7	It is noted that this section refers to 'Draft' PSPs. Given these PSPs will be approved over time, will this document be updated to reflect this? Alternatively, could remove reference to 'draft' or include a date which refers to when they were identified as 'draft'.	With reference to discussing surrounding PSPs, remove 'draft' wording, or include date when referring to 'draft' PSPs.
6	Section 1.3, p.7	Given Council's position on the ICP and gazettal of the PSP document (within the General Comments section) it is anticipated that this wording will be amended prior to the PSP being finalised. Any amendment should ensure that all references to the <i>Incorporated Contributions Plan Overlay</i> (ICPO), proposed to implement the Plumpton and Kororoit Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP), into the Melton Planning Scheme cannot be used until the Victoria Planning Provisions have been updated to incorporate the ICPO. Currently there is an inherent conflict with the PSP wording and the Planning Scheme Ordinance, as the ordinance proposed to apply a <i>Development Contributions Plan Overlay</i> (DCPO). Council does not support the use of the DCPO to implement an ICP.	Wording to reflect final status of ICP and associated amendments to VPP.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

7	Plan 2, p.8	<p>Many of the trees in the <i>Arboricultural Assessment</i> for the PSP, August 2013, are not shown on this plan.</p> <p>It is also difficult to determine which trees are shown.</p>	<p>Plan 2 should be modified to take a consistent approach to the mapping of trees, it should either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • show all trees identified in the <i>Arboricultural Assessment</i> irrespective of their level of significance; or • show all trees identified as being of moderate (or greater) significance.
8	Plan 2, p.8	<p>Plan 2 should show Pipeline Measurement length as this is an existing Precinct Feature that should be acknowledged up front.</p> <p>Council requested this as part of Mt Atkinson and Tarneit Plains PSP also.</p>	<p>Koroit and Plumpton PSPs should adopt the same approach in relation to what's shown.</p> <p>Add pipeline measurement length to Plan 2.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission


2.0 Outcomes

Item Number	Section, Page Number	Comment	Recommended Change
9	Plan 3, p.8	<p>Melton Highway within the Plumpton PSP has a rural highway cross section. The PSP document does not address the urbanisation of the Melton Highway, ie, construction of kerb & channel, drainage & lighting.</p> <p>How is the existing 2 lane rural highway to be upgraded to a 2 lane urban arterial road standard?</p>	<p>Further discussion required with Melton City Council, VicRoads & MPA</p>
10	Plan 3, p.8	<p>Council has concerns about the proposed 1.1ha community hub located in the Plumpton North Community Hub.</p> <p>Council would like to see justification for needing this hub as part of an addendum to the <i>Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment (CINA)</i> prepared for the Plumpton and Kororoit PSP areas.</p> <p>Council has prepared calculations for the future needs for the area and these indicate the provision for this facility may not be required.</p> <p>Council is also concerned about the proposed location and land allocation of the facility. 1.1ha is allocated, which is the size required for a Level 3 community centre.</p> <p>If required, Council expects that the centre will be a Level 1 centre (0.8ha in footprint).</p>	<p>MPA to provide justification for the proposed community hub as part of an addendum to the CINA prepared for the PSP.</p> <p>Following receipt of this justification, Council would like to discuss the need, size and location of this hub with the MPA.</p>
11	Plan 3, p.8	<p>Also within the abovementioned CINA and Background Report, prepared for Plumpton and Kororoit PSPs, the need for an additional non-</p>	<p>MPA to include the additional non-government primary school in the Plumpton PSP. Council and MPA to discuss the location of this school.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

			<p>Plumpton PSP area. It is noted that MPA tried to source interest for this school site from both the Catholic Education Office and non-Government school providers, when no interest was shown it was deleted from the Future Urban Structure.</p> <p>Given the population for Plumpton PSP is proposed to be increased by around 1000 residents from the original CINA, the need for this school is increased. Council therefore believes the school should be shown once again. There is a mechanism built within the PSP to allow unclaimed school sites to go through a process to be rezoned. Considering this, Council requests the addition of the non-Government primary school in the Plumpton PSP.</p>	
12	Plan 3, p.8	Reservation for Plumpton North Active Open Space not supported as it results in an irregular area of residential land. Council would like to meet with MPA to discuss reconfiguration of this.	Plumpton North Active Open Space reserve not supported. Results in awkward residential areas. Council requests this area is redesigned.	
13	Plan 3, p.8	The local access street shown in the Beattys Road reserve appears to be located where there are existing dry stone walls. Please review location of street to ensure walls can be retained.	Review location of local access street in Beattys Road to ensure protection of dry stone walls.	
14	Plan 3, p.8	Council officers have an ongoing concern regarding the location of Council's 0.8 ha community centre on Plumpton Road. This centre should be sited adjacent to the AOS to enable shared facilities if required.	Change location from south-western to north-western corner of Government Primary School in Plumpton Local Town Centre hub.	
15	Plan 3, p.8	Plan 3 – Define what is meant by 'Service Open Space' and 'Credited Open Space'	Provide definitions	
16	Plan 3, p.8	Are school providers happy with the proposed shapes for government and non-government	Clarification sought.	

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

			schools?	
17	Plan 3, p.8	It is noted that there has been a local access street added over the high pressure gas pipeline easement. Has this been considered in costings and has the pipeline owner (APA) provided consent for the application of this road?	MPA to confirm whether consideration has been given to location a local access street over the high pressure gas pipeline, particularly in regards to the additional costs and for whether APA have approved the design.	
18	Plan 3, p.8	It is noted that there has been water infrastructure added to locations over the high pressure gas pipeline easement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this been considered in DSS costings and design of water infrastructure? • Has the pipeline owner (APA) provided consent for this proposed solution? 	MPA to confirm whether MW has consulted with the Pipeline owner regarding the proposed design and whether the extra costings have been considered in the DSS.	
19	Plan 3, p.8	Council doesn't support the provision of 'small local enterprises'. This has not been accounted for in the <i>Economic Assessment</i> which was prepared to inform the PSP and relevant town centres. The applied zoning which is proposed for these centres (C2Z) allows uses such as shops and supermarkets 'as of right', which could compromise the intended hierarchy of the Plumpton local town centre.	Remove reference to 'small local enterprises'. They are not supported as they could jeopardise the intended hierarchy of the Local Town Centre in Plumpton or clearly articulate what they are and a mechanism for implementing this undefined use.	
20	Plan 3, p.8	How do will residential areas located at eastern edge of PSP be accessed and developed? 	Need a concept to illustrate how the triangular piece of land to the east of the PSP will be accessed and developed.	

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

21	Plan 3, p.8	Open space terminology confusing and not consistent across the document (ie. Plan 3, Plan 4, Plan 6 and Appendix J). Ensure consistency of wording and provide definitions for open space areas identified.	MPA to review document to ensure consistency of open space terminology throughout. Ensure definitions provided for all open space categories.
22	Plan 3, p.8	Remove 'business' precinct in Local Town Centre which proposes 'small local enterprises'. Council has concerns with the delivery of these uses and the impact they will have on the proposed town centre hierarchy and localised amenity. The economic assessment prepared for this PSP has not considered these types of uses.	Remove 'business' area from the local town centre on Plan 3, which proposes 'small local enterprises'.
23	Plans various pp. 8, 12, 21, 22, 40	Consistency across the document in regards to the terminology in the 'key' of plans / and figures in regards to active open space . For example: Page 8 – active open space provision on Plan 3 is referred to as credited open space Page 12 – active open space provision on Plan 4 is referred to as local sports reserve Page 21 – active open space provision on Figure 1 is referred to as sports reserve Page 22 – active open space provision on Figure 2 is referred to as local sports reserve Page 40 – (OPEN SPACE PLAN) – active open space provision on Plan 6 is referred to as local sports reserve.	MPA to review plans for consistency ensuring Active Open Space is labelled consistently.
24	Plans various	Consistency across document with pedestrian bridge allocated in Employment Land. Shown on	MPA to review plans for pedestrian bridge to ensure consistency across document.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	pp. 8, 16, 40, 48, 52, 56, 60	some plans not others.	
25	Plans various pp.8, 16, 40, 48, 52, 56, 60, 64, 66	Consistency across document showing road access through employment precinct to Warrensbrook PSP. All Plans should show arrow connecting through to the west.	MPA to ensure all plans show access from employment precinct to Warrensbrook PSP.
26	Plan 2 and Plan 3, p.6 and p.8	Council notes the number of archaeological sites on Plan 2 is not replicated on Plan 3. MPA to provide advice on why only some sites are replicated on Plan 3. If this is an oversight MPA to update Plan 3 showing all archaeological sites.	MPA to confirm why Plan 3 is showing only a portion of archaeological sites in comparison to Plan 2. Update Plan 3 as required.
27	2.2, p.10	O5 – change reference to the train station at Mt Atkinson to Hopkins Road.	O5 – change reference to the possible future rail station at Mt Atkinson to Hopkins Road.
28	2.2, p.10	O11 – Remove all references to ‘small local enterprises’. Council has concerns with the delivery of these uses and the impact they will have on the proposed town centre hierarchy and localised amenity. The Economic Assessment prepared for this PSP has not considered these types of uses.	Remove small local enterprises from the plan and remove. These uses are not supported as they could become an extension to the proposed town centre.
29	2.2, p.11	O16 – Reference to ‘conservation’ should be removed. These easements are not for conservation purposes.	O16 – Remove reference to ‘conservation’
30	2.2, p.11	O20 – Needs to be consistent with draft Rockbank PSP O15	O20 – Update as per the draft Rockbank PSP O15 that states: ‘Ensure the health and wellbeing of residents is protected by delivering a built environment of facilities and amenities that promote healthy lifestyle practices, social interaction, civic engagement and access to services.’
31	2.2, p.11	It is noted that there are no objectives that relate specifically to community facilities. A new or amended Objective should be included based on	Draft objectives based on the delivery of community facilities. Wording should be consistent with in the Rockbank PSP:

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

32	2.2, p.11	<p>O11 in the Rockbank PSP to ensure consistency in objectives across different PSPs in the City of Melton.</p> <p>The Rockbank PSP has an objective for bushfire management which is not included in this PSP: <i>Ensure that bushfire hazards are identified and that protection measures are considered in the layout and design of the local street network, subdivisions and buildings and works.</i></p>	<p>O11 - Develop a walkable network of community hubs that provide access to social, education, recreation and health services within each neighbourhood.</p> <p>MPA to confirm whether a bushfire management objective is required.</p>
33	2.2, p.11	<p>O24 – Given sensitive land uses are recommended to be located outside the pipeline measurement length in the relevant Australian Standard, it is considered that they should be prohibited within the pipeline measurement length to avoid issues into the future. Council does not have the technical expertise to determine the extent to which these uses are to be acceptable. Council believes they should be prohibited, unless the relevant pipeline operator is comfortable with these uses being allowable within the measurement length and they are in a position to determine the appropriateness of these uses as part of a planning referrals process (ie. they should become a Determining Authority). Should changes be made they must be made throughout the document. It is also understood that development AND construction of land can be an issue within the pipeline measurement length hence include 'development and' construction when discussing risk mitigation.</p>	<p>O24 – Amend wording relevant to sensitive land uses within the pipeline measurement length unless the pipeline operator will accept being the determining authority for these types of uses in the measurement length area. Any change should be reflected throughout the document.</p>
34	2.2, p.11	<p>O25 – What mechanism is MPA proposing to achieve this objective?</p>	<p>The MPA is to provide details on how this objective (delivery of Hopkins Road and bridges early in the staging of the precinct) can be implemented.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

35	2.2, p.11	There should be an objective around developing safely around the high voltage transmission lines and the gas pipeline easement.	Can the ICP include a priority list for infrastructure delivery? Include new objective around developing safely around the high voltage transmission lines and the gas pipeline easement.
36	Plan 4 and Table 1, p. 12, 13, 15	What is a local network park? This does not accord with MPA hierarchy at Appendix J – Park Hierarchy. Council does not support this terminology as it is not consistent with open space categories identified within this document.	MPA to remove reference to 'local network park' and instead use terminology as per Appendix J of the PSP.
37	Plan 4 and Table 1, p. 12, 13, 15	There is a discrepancy between the wording in Table 1 and the ICP Plan – Table 1 refers to Local Network Park, whereas the Precinct Infrastructure Plan – Community & Open Space (ICP) refers to Local Park. The terminology should be consistent in both documents and all references to Local Network Park should be removed.	The terminology in the ICP and the PSP for items should be consistent e.g. Local Park. Remove all references to Local Network Park
38	Plan 4 and Table 1, p. 12, 13, 15	Land allocation for Local Community Facilities is incorrect. Should read 4.82ha, not 4.61ha.	Calculation for Local Community Facilities incorrect, change 4.61ha to 4.82ha.
39	Plan 4 and Table 1, p. 12, 13, 15	What is the difference between a local network park within a residential area and a local network park in the employment areas?	MPA to provide advice on the difference between local network parks
40	Plan 4, p. 12	Arterial road reserves are shown stopping either side of waterways (Taylors Road, Tarletons Road and Hopkins Road), has the land in this section been included in the Arterial Road land use budget or included in the Waterways & Drainage Reserve land use budget?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify for arterial road reserves shown stopping either side of waterways (Taylors Road, Tarletons Road and Hopkins Road), whether the land in this section been included in the Arterial Road land use budget or included in the Waterways & Drainage Reserve land use budget?
41	Plan 4, p. 12	Have the intersections serving the industrial land and the related land budget for flaring been	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide truck turning plans; Provide details of design trucks;

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

		designed to accommodate High Productivity Freight Vehicles? What is the truck type used for the design of these intersections?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide CAD/GIS information
42	2.3, p.13	The summary land use budget expresses medium density housing as 'up to 25 dwellings per hectare'. Medium density targets are not a maximum number, but rather an average minimum number.	Change 2.3 to read: Based on a residential development yield average of 16.5 dwellings per net developable hectare, the PSP will generate approximately 10,680 dwellings. Medium density housing where provided will generate an additional XXX dwellings and high density dwellings will generate XXX dwellings above the conventional density average. In total, the precinct will accommodate 29,900 residents in 10,680 dwellings. Change AC01 to 4ha throughout entire document.
43	Table 1, p.13	Table 1 - Aquatic Centre size query. Land Budget shows 3.6ha and AC01 shown as 4ha on pages 45 and 78.	
44	2.3 p.12-13	Table 1 - Land budget for Arterial Road – New/Widening and Intersection Flaring (ICP Land) Without functional layout plans for intersections and GIS/CAD information the land budget for arterial roads cannot be checked.	Land budget for roads and intersections is potentially incorrect, MPA to clarify / provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide functional layout plans of roads & intersections; Provide CAD / GIS layout of PSP.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

3.0 Implementation

Item Number	Section, Page Number	Comment	Recommended Change
	3.1	Image, character, heritage and housing	
	3.1.1	Image and character	
45	Plan 5, p.16	Plan 5 should be revised to show higher densities which lead to defendable/easily recognisable boundaries. This ensures delivery of higher densities can be delivered easily.	MPA and Council to discuss a review of Plan 5 to ensure higher density development can be delivered effectively by allocating clear defendable boundaries.
46	Plan 5, p.16	There is a mismatch between the communities hubs shown on Plan 5 and the allocated higher densities identified in Table 3. Table 3 identifies increased densities within the community hubs however the hub boundaries on Plan 5 don't include this higher density housing areas. To ensure Table 3 can be delivered, the boundaries of each community hub should be amended to include this increase in density. Alternatively, wording within Table 3 should be amended to reference exact location of proposed higher densities.	Amend community hub boundaries on Plan 5 to include areas allocated for higher dwelling density or alternatively amend Table 3 to reflect exact location of proposed higher density areas. MPA and Council to discuss as required.
47	3.1.1, p.17	R2 – The text in R2 should be changed to be consistent with the agreed wording in R2 of the Rockbank PSP.	R2 – Make the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the street tree interval and height table as agreed for Rockbank PSP and Paynes Road PSP. Reword to match the wording in the Rockbank PSP: <i>Street trees must be planted on both sides for all roads and streets (excluding laneways) at regular intervals appropriate to tree size at maturity, in accordance with relevant Council landscaping policy</i> unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>48</p> <p>3.1.1, p.17</p> <p>G9 – Amend wording to read Built form on corner lots should provide a positive address to both frontages. This can be achieved through the use of appropriate use placement of glazing, location of and other architectural treatments and appropriate and high quality boundary fencing.</p> <p>G9 – reword as shown: Built form on corner lots should provide a positive address to both frontages. This can be achieved through the use of appropriate use placement of glazing, location of and other architectural treatments and appropriate and high quality boundary fencing.</p> <p>Fencing has been removed as it does not articulate.</p>	
<p>49</p> <p>3.1.1, p.17</p> <p>G11 – include reference 'except in pipeline measurement length' where it is understood that the Australian Standard does not support increased densities within the pipeline measurement length.</p> <p>G11 – include the wording 'except in pipeline measurement length', confirm with the pipeline owner.</p> <p>Given Council are not technical experts in this field, MPA to confirm this with the pipeline owner.</p>	
<p>3.1.2 Heritage</p>	
<p>50</p> <p>3.1.2, p.18</p> <p>R7 – Reword to 'Beattys Road Reserve must be retained for public use with connector road and local road functions, with a continuous off-road shared path and local parks and community uses at designated locations and dry stone walls retained as required by this PSP.'</p> <p>Reword R7 to: 'Beattys Road Reserve must be retained for public use with connector road and local road functions, with a continuous off-road shared path and local parks and community uses at designated locations and dry stone walls retained as required by this PSP.'</p> <p>Reference to Figures and cross sections should be removed from Requirement and instead form a new Guideline as they are 'indicative' in nature.</p> <p>Include reference to Figures and Cross Sections in a new Guideline as they are indicative in nature.</p>	
<p>51</p> <p>3.1.2, p.18</p> <p>R8 – Reword the third dot point from Be checked and repaired by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions.</p> <p>R8 – reword as shown: Be checked and repaired by a suitably qualified dry stone waller for any loose stones. Any loose stones are to be reinstated in the wall in secure positions</p>	
<p>52</p> <p>3.1.2, p.18</p> <p>G14 – Will be difficult to achieve given there is no RAP for this area. Consider reference to Aboriginal Affairs Victoria (AAV) in the absence of a RAP.</p> <p>G14 – Consider including reference for RAP.</p>	

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>53</p> <p>3.1.2, p.18</p> <p>G16 – Given walls which trigger a planning permit are already controlled by Council. This Guideline should discuss the walls which do not trigger a planning permit.</p>	<p>Reword G16 as follows: 'Where it has been agreed with the responsible authority that an existing dry stone wall is to be removed, landowners should consult with Council to determine whether the stone should be retained for use in repairing other walls within the PSP or in landscape designs.'</p>
<p>3.1.3 Housing</p>	
<p>54</p> <p>3.1.3, p.19</p> <p>R15 and Table 2 – In regards to direction on housing types Council and MPA agreed on changes to Guidelines to ensure Table 2 is effective as per Rockbank PSP.</p>	<p>Reword R15 to be consistent with R12 in Rockbank PSP as follows: R15 – 'The Majority of housing within and adjacent to the Plumpton Major Town Centre, along public transport routes and in key amenity areas of the precinct must be medium or higher density, as illustrated by Plan 5 and defined by Table 3. Council requests a consistent approach to this requirement across all PSPs.</p>
<p>55</p> <p>3.1.3, p.19</p> <p>R16 – There is an identified conflict in the wording of R16: Lots and dwellings, where possible... 'Where possible' is wording you would find in a Guideline. Reword R16 to read as a Requirement.</p>	<p>Reword R16 to read: Lots and dwellings, where possible must front or side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage channels, waterways • All open space and utilities easements • Arterial and connector roads (including the Outer Metropolitan Ring road and Western Freeway (refer Appendix I)) <p>The siting of lots to the above must be kept to a minimum.</p>
<p>56</p> <p>3.1.3, p.19</p> <p>G20 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA to define measurement for 'in close proximity' • It is Council's understanding that aged care facilities and the like should not be located within the Pipeline Measurement Length. Include additional dot point 'Must not be located within the Pipeline Measurement Length'. This should also be moved to requirements. 	<p>G20 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA to define measurement for 'in close proximity' • Include additional dot point. 'Must not be located within the Pipeline measurement length' and move to requirements

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<i>Must not be located within the Pipeline measurement length.</i>	
57	<p>3.1.3, p.20</p> <p>Table 3 – It is noted that additional columns have been added to this Table which do not accord with the Table 3 in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP.</p> <p>Table should be amended to reflect Table 3 in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP ie. showing Catchment, Average Minimum Dwellings Per Net Developable Hectare and Lot Yield only.</p> <p>Amend Table 3 to reflect Table 3 in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP, ie showing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catchment • Average Minimum Dwellings Per Net Developable Hectare • Lot Yield
58	<p>Figure 1, p. 21</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title Powerline Easement Interface.</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title</p>
59	<p>Figure 1, p. 21</p> <p>Remove mountain bike circuit wording as this creates expectations for the community. Refer to Powerlines Easement Uses for Table 6.</p> <p>Remove specific references to use and instead refer to Powerlines Easement Uses Table 6</p>
60	<p>Figure 1, p. 21</p> <p>Remove graphics showing bike circuit as this creates expectations for the community.</p> <p>Remove graphic relevant to Mountain Bike Circuit</p>
61	<p>Figure 2, p. 22</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title Local Sports Reserve Interface.</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title</p>
62	<p>Figure 2, p. 22</p> <p>Remove graphics showing rectangular fields. Again this is too prescriptive and creates expectations for delivery.</p> <p>Remove graphics showing rectangular fields. Again as per Legend - Local Sports Reserve</p> <p>It is noted there is a colour allocated for Local Sports Reserve so instead just colour the area to note the Active Open Space uses proposed.</p>
63	<p>Figure 3, p. 23</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title Connector Street and Direct Frontage Interface.</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title</p>
64	<p>Figure 4, p. 24</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title Local Access Street & Community Facilities Interface.</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to title</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

65	Figure 5, p. 23	Include word 'indicative' to title Retarding Basin Interface.	Include word 'indicative' to title
66	Additional Figure (Concept Plan) required	MPA to prepare additional indicative concept plan showing Beattys Road treatment west of Plumpton Road (inclusive of dry stone walls). Walls should show the requirement for a 5m clearance either side.	MPA to prepare additional indicative concept plan for Beattys Road west of Plumpton Road Plan should show how dry stone walls will be protected as part of Beattys Road linear trail and local access street network
3.2 Employment and Town Centres			
67	All Figure 6 plans, p.28-29	Include word 'indicative' to all Figure 6 plans.	Include word 'indicative' to all Figure 6 Plans
68	Figure 6c, p.29	Remove reference to Beattys Road being 'tree lined', this is not reflective of the history of this road reserve.	Remove reference to Beattys Road being 'tree lined', this is not reflective of the history of this road reserve.
69	Figure 7, p.30	Include word 'indicative' to Major Town Centre Concept Plan.	Include word 'indicative' to Figure 7 title
70	Figure 7, p.30	'Large Format Retail' and 'Anchor Retail' very similar colours, revise.	Amend colours for 'Large Format Retail' and 'Anchor Retail' – too similar
71	Figure 7, p.30	Hard to see 'Mix of Commercial Uses (residential over)'.	Review colouring for 'Mix of Commercial Uses (residential over)
72	Figure 7, p.30	Beattys Road colour similar to 'residential'.	Amend Beattys Road colour – too similar to residential colouring
73	Figure 7, p.30	Shape of community facility buildings to be amended. Particularly eastern most building.	Review building envelopes for Community Facilities, currently too irregular in shape.
3.2 Employment and Town Centres			
3.2.1 Local Town Centres			
74	3.2.1, p.31	R19 - Council officers have ongoing concerns about the amount of retail floor space being allowed for within the MTC and the chance that this would affect the localised City of Melton retail catchment.	Council has ongoing concerns about the provision for commercial floorspace within the Major Town Centre and the impact it may have on surrounding centres. Council's Retail and Activity Centre Strategy identifies that this Major

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

		The 45,000m ² of floorspace (excluding 'restricted retail') is much higher than the 35,000m ² identified in Council's <i>Retail and Activity Centres Strategy</i> .	Town Centre will have 10,000m ² less retail (which includes food and drink premises).
75	3.2.1, p.31	Include additional requirement indicating a soft floorspace cap for restricted retail uses, which have been identified as 23,000m ² within the Major Town Centre and just west of Hopkins Road.	Include soft floorspace cap for restricted retail uses as per Economic Assessment for PSP as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP.
76	3.2.1, p.31	R21 – Council does not support the wording which indicates that the PSP 'must' respond to Figure 6, Figure 7 and Appendix B. Council considers all Plans are indicative and the most important considerations for design and development of the Specialised Town Centre are the requirements in Appendix B and the most of the requirements within R21.	Council does not support wording which indicates that the PSP must respond to Figure 6 and Figure 7. MPA and Council to discuss alternative wording for R21 to make the 'indicative nature' of the concept plans clear.
77	3.2.1, p.31	R21 – Order of matters to be addressed as part of UDF should be more logical. i.e. like requirements should be grouped together.	R21 – Reorder to ensure requirements are grouped in accordance with relevance to each other
78	3.2.1, p.31	R21 – 8 th dot point refers to higher density housing within and surrounding the town centre. Should refer to higher density housing to the 'north/east/south' of the town centre.	Amend wording when referencing housing density to include reference to north, east and south.
79	3.2.1, p.31	R21 – 12 th dot point should refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pinwheel 'intersection', not 'structure' • 'waterway corridor/retarding basin', not 'waterway corridor'. 	Amend dot point 12 as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pinwheel 'intersection', not 'structure' • 'waterway corridor/retarding basin', not 'waterway corridor'
80	Table 4, p.32	Delete Table 4 as this was agreed for removal as part of Rockbank PSP. It does not provide any useful information and retaining it will result in inconsistencies with other PSPs within Melton.	Delete Table 4.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>81</p> <p>Figure 8, p.33</p> <p>Remove all references to 'small local enterprises'. Council has concerns with the delivery of these uses and the impact they will have on the proposed town centre hierarchy.</p> <p>The Economic Assessment prepared for this PSP has not considered these types of uses.</p>	<p>Remove small local enterprises from the plan. These uses should be incorporated within the town centre and not an extension to it.</p>
<p>82</p> <p>Figure 8, p.33</p> <p>As identified previously, Council does not support the proposed location of the community centre and requests that it be moved to the north-west corner of the Government Primary School. This will allow efficiency in delivery of Council facilities.</p>	<p>Move the community centre from the south-west to the north-west corner of the Government Primary School.</p>
<p>83</p> <p>3.2.2, p.34</p> <p>Remove references to small local enterprises as these are not supported by Council and have not been accounted for in the Economic Assessment prepared for this Precinct.</p> <p>It should be noted that the range and mix of business and employment opportunities will be delivered by the market.</p>	<p>Remove reference to 'small local enterprises or define and provide a mechanism for implementation.</p>
<p>84</p> <p>3.2.2, p.34</p> <p>R22 – Council does not support the wording which indicates that the PSP 'must' respond to the Concept Plan in Figure 8.</p> <p>Council considers this Plan is 'indicative' and the most important considerations for design and development of this Local Town Centre are the requirements in Appendix C.</p>	<p>Council does not support the wording which indicates the PSP must respond to Figure 8.</p> <p>MPA and Council to discuss alternative wording for R22 to make the 'indicative' nature of the concept plans clear.</p>
<p>85</p> <p>3.2.2, p.34</p> <p>R22 – Order of matters to be addressed as part of UDF should be more logical. ie. like requirements should be grouped together.</p>	<p>R22 – Reorder to ensure requirements are grouped in accordance with relevance to each other</p>
<p>86</p> <p>3.2.2, p.34</p> <p>Include additional requirement which details the maximum shop floorspace allowance of 7200m²</p>	<p>Include additional requirement which provides maximum allowable shop floorspace – 7200m²</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

within the Local Town Centre (similar to R25).	
87	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to Business & Industrial Precinct Concept Plan</p> <p>Include word 'indicative' to Figure 9 title</p>
88	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Concept plan shows a disjointed grid pattern, where east-west connectors meeting Plumpton Road do not line up with other streets, local streets being offset by approx 100m from the connector intersection.</p> <p>This area is proposed for industrial use, the proposed offset grid pattern will adversely impact commercial vehicle access and needs to be revised.</p> <p>Re-align local streets to meet east-west connector roads at Plumpton Road</p>
89	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Who delivers road around substation? Will relevant power authority be required to deliver this?</p> <p>MPA to confirm who will deliver road surrounding substation.</p>
90	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Remove court bowl from south-eastern corner of Employment Precinct. They are only supported in areas where accessibility is limited.</p> <p>Remove court-bowl from south-eastern corner of Plan – road network may have to be revised to ensure this occurs.</p>
91	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>'Beattys Road linear park' and 'Landscaping & setback requirement at interface to residential areas' colouring too similar. Revise.</p> <p>Change colours for 'Beattys Road Linear Park' and 'Landscaping and setback requirement at interface to residential areas', currently too similar</p>
92	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Amend wording for 'mixed use' as isn't very clear. Should identify residential only above business and retail uses, abutting Hopkins Road.</p> <p>Amend wording for 'Mixed Use' to better reflect restrictions and requirements for residential land uses.</p>
93	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Concept plan should show specialised interface treatments for residential and green wedge land to the south and north of the employment precinct.</p> <p>Identify sensitive interface areas to the north and south of the employment precinct which abuts residential and green wedge land.</p>
94	<p>Figure 9, p.35</p> <p>Remove subdivision layout from concept plan.</p> <p>Remove subdivision layout from plan. Too prescriptive and will be dealt with at Planning Permit stage.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

95	Figure 9, p.35	Should the delivery of road bridges in Employment areas be allocated as ICP items?	Further discussion required.
96	3.4.2, p. 36	Remove references to dance studios and gyms, these aren't considered to be the best use for employment areas.	Remove references to uses which aren't commonly industrial in nature. Includes reference to dance studios and gyms.
97	3.2.4 , p. 36	R28 – Council does not support the wording which indicates that the PSP 'must' respond to the Concept Plan in Figure 9. Council considers this Plan is 'indicative' and the most important considerations for design and development of Employment areas include within Council's Industrial Design Guidelines, CPTED and Safer Design Guidelines.	Council does not support the wording which indicates the PSP must respond to Figure 9. MPA and Council to discuss alternative wording for R28 to make the 'indicative' nature of the concept plans clear.
98	3.2.4, p. 36	R30 – add wording to the effect of, 'where a street is not proposed along a waterway, buildings must front this waterway and associated shared path'.	R30 - Include additional wording 'where a street is not proposed along a waterway, buildings must front this waterway and associated shared path'.
99	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – Should refer to relevant precinct ie Business and Industrial Precinct	R38 – include reference to Business and Industrial Precinct
100	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – Council does not support the wording which indicates that the PSP 'must' respond to the Concept Plan in Figure 9. Council considers this Plan is 'indicative' and the most important considerations for design and development of the Business and Industrial Precinct are through Council's Industrial Design Guidelines and other relevant guideline documents prepared by Council and the State Government.	Council does not support the wording which indicates the PSP must respond to Figure 9. MPA and Council to discuss alternative wording for R38 to make the 'indicative' nature of the concept plans clear.
101	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – 15 th dot point references pinwheel 'structure', amend to 'intersection'	R38 - 15 th dot point replace 'structure' with 'intersection'

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

102	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – Order of matters to be addressed as part of UDF should be more logical. ie. like requirements should be grouped together.	R38 – Reorder to ensure requirements are grouped in accordance with relevance to each other
103	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – Include additional dot point which requires delivery of appropriate interfaces to residential land to the south and green wedge land to the north of the employment area.	R38 – Add dot point which requires delivery of appropriate interfaces to the south and north of the precinct.
104	3.2.4, p.37	R38 – Include additional dot point which requires street network to be delivered in a manner which can accommodate appropriate connectivity and turning points for truck traffic and heavy haulage vehicles.	R38 – Add dot point which requires delivery of a street network which can accommodate truck and heavy haulage traffic throughout precinct.
105	3.2.4, p.37	Put R37 as first requirement under 3.2.4 as this is most important and onerous.	Put R37 as first requirement under 3.2.3
106	3.2.4, p.37	G23 – Delete this Guideline, this is a standard requirement of Council and priority order is completely depended on context.	G23 Delete this Guideline.
107	3.2.4, p.37	G27 – Delete guideline as this is a double up and will be dealt with using Council Guidelines.	G27 Delete this Guideline.
108	3.2.4, p.37	G28 – Delete guideline as this is a double up and will be dealt with using Council Guidelines.	G28 Delete this Guideline.
3.3 Community Facilities and Education			
109	3.3, p.39	R39 – should be moved to a guideline as agreed in Rockbank PSP. Requirement to be reworded as follows: <i>Schools and community facilities should be designed to front and be directly accessed from a</i>	Move R39 to a Guideline and reword to the following: <i>Schools and community facilities should be designed to front and be directly accessed from a public street with car parking located away from the main entry.</i>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

		<i>public street with car parking located away from the main entry.</i>	
110	3.3, p.39	R40 – the wording of this is not consistent with the agreed change on R22 in the Rockbank PSP.	<p>Change the wording to R40 to be consistent with the wording agreed to at the Rockbank panel hearing:</p> <p><i>Where the responsible authority is satisfied that land shown as a school site is unlikely to be used for school, that land may be used for an alternative purpose which is generally consistent with the surrounding land uses and the provisions of the applied zone. In order to satisfy the responsible authority that a site is unlikely to be used for a school, it is necessary to demonstrate that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The application for an alternative use is not premature having regard to the extent of development in the surrounding residential area; and</i> • <i>The school site is no longer strategically justified having regard to the provision of schools in the locality, including land not within the precinct Structure Plan, as appropriate; and</i> • <i>The landowners provides the responsible authority with evidence that:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Genuine negotiations have been had with a range of education providers including the Lead Agency nominated in the Precinct Structure Plan, regarding the use of the site as a school and the sale of site to the educational provider/s; and</i> ○ <i>The educational provider/s including the Lead Agency nominated in the Precinct Structure Plan, do not intend to purchase the site, and use the site as a school.</i>
111	3.3, p.39	G33 – Amend wording to remove ‘extensive canopy planting’ to state ‘canopy tree planting to provide appropriate shade’.	<p>G33 – Amend wording to remove reference to ‘extensive’ canopy tree planting and include ‘canopy tree planting to provide appropriate shade’.</p>
112	3.3, p.39	G36 – Council does not support this Guideline. Council is currently preparing policies in regards to Community Gardens and will ensure any delivery of community gardens are based on this. It is noted that this Guideline has been removed in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP and agreed to be	<p>G36 – Remove. Council does not support this Guideline. This was removed for Rockbank PSP and has not been included in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

			removed in Rockbank PSP.
113	3.3, p.39	G37 – Wording for this Guideline differs between Mt Atkinson and Tarnet Plains and Plumpton PSP. Please amend to ensure consistency of guidelines.	G37 – revise wording to ensure consistency with Mt Atkinson and Tarnet Plains PSP.
114	3.3.1, p. 39	G37 – make requirement as per other PSPs.	Make G37 a requirement, not a guideline.
115	3.3.1, p. 39	G38 – make requirement as per other PSPs.	Make G38 a requirement, not a guideline.
116	3.3, p.39	G39 - Include comment regarding subject to the location of the pipeline measurement length	Include comment regarding pipeline measurement length.
		3.4 Open Space and biodiversity	
		3.4.1 Open Space and Natural Systems	
117	Plan 6, p.40	It is unclear as to whether LOS-03 applies to the section of Beattys Road between the N-S RD 1 and the Gas Easement or the entire length of Beattys Road.	MPA to clarify what section of Beattys Road LOS-03 applies
118	Plan 6, p.40	Include reference to Aquatic Centre (AC-01) and include in ICP.	As identified in the General comments section above, Council does not support the omission of AC-01 from the list of infrastructure items within the ICP, particularly given the final list of allowable items has not been approved and circulated by the Minister for Planning. The aquatics centre will serve the population of Plumpton and Kororoit PSPs hence should be considered as part of the ICP calculation, at least partially. Given the above Council does not support excluding this facility from Plan 6 and requests at least a portion of the facility to be included within the PIP and relevant ICP.

<p>119</p>	<p>3.4.1, p. 41</p>	<p>Council notes R30 from Rockbank PSP has not been included. Please include this from Rockbank PSP to ensure consistency.</p>	<p>Council would like to discuss this further with the MPA.</p> <p>Include R30 from Rockbank PSP as relevant to Mount Atkinson and Tarnait Plains as follows:</p> <p><i>Further to the public open space contribution required by Clause 52.01 of the Melton Planning Scheme, this provision sets out the amount of land to be contributed by each property in the precinct and consequently where cash contribution is required in lieu of land.</i></p> <p><i>For the purposes of Clause 52.01, a local park in the PSP is public open space.</i></p> <p><i>All owners must provide a public open space contribution equal to XXX% of the net developable area (NDA) upon subdivision of land in accordance with the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Where land on the lot is required for unencumbered public open space purposes as illustrated on Plan X and specified in Appendix A is equal to XXX% of the lot's NDA that land is to be transferred to Council at no cost</i> • <i>Where no land or land on the lot less than XXX% of NDA is required for unencumbered public open space purposes as illustrated on Plan X and specified in Appendix X, a cash contribution is to be made to Council to bring the lot's total public open space contribution to a value equal to XXX% of NDA</i> • <i>Where land on the lot is required for unencumbered public open space purposes as illustrated on Plan X and specified in Appendix A is more than XXX% of the lot's NDA, Council will pay an amount equivalent to the value of the additional land being provided by that proposed development.</i> <p><i>Refer to the Appendix X for detailed individual property open space land areas and percentages specified by the PSP.</i></p> <p>The responsible authority may alter the distribution of public open space as shown in this precinct structure plan provided the relevant vision and objectives of the document are met. A subdivider may provide additional public open space in a subdivision to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. There is no onus on the responsible authority or any other party to provide compensation for public open space provided above</p>
-------------------	---------------------	---	---

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>that required by Clause 52.01 and this PSP.</p> <p>The value of land for equalisation purposes is to be assessed as an equivalent proportion of the value of the whole land, in accordance with Section 18 of the Subdivision Act.</p>	<p>120</p> <p>3.4.1, p. 41</p> <p>R42 – not consistent with the same guideline in other PSPs. For example Rockbank PSP defines this requirement as follows:</p> <p><i>All parks must be located, designed and developed to the satisfaction of the responsible authority in accordance with Plan 6 and Table 5, unless otherwise approved by the responsible authority. An alternative provision of land for a local park is considered to be generally in accordance with that illustrated on Plan 6 provided:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The location does not reduce the walkable access to local parks demonstrated on Plan 6</i> <i>The design does not diminish the quality or usability of the space for passive recreation</i> <i>The land area is equal to or more than the local park provision outlined in Table 5.</i> <p>Council would like to discuss with MPA to ensure consistency across PSPs.</p>	<p>MPA to discuss R42 with Council and ensure consistency across PSPs. For example wording to include:</p> <p><i>All parks must be located, designed and developed to the satisfaction of the responsible authority in accordance with Plan 6 and Table 5, unless otherwise approved by the responsible authority. An alternative provision of land for a local park is considered to be generally in accordance with that illustrated on Plan 6 provided:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The location does not reduce the walkable access to local parks demonstrated on Plan 6</i> <i>The design does not diminish the quality or usability of the space for passive recreation</i> <i>The land area is equal to or more than the local park provision outlined in Table 5.</i> <p>Change the wording of R43 to be consistent with the wording of R27 in the Rockbank PSP.</p> <p><i>All open space and public landscaped area (other than Nature Conservation Conservation Areas) must contain robust large-canopy trees appropriate to the local climate and soil conditions that are suitable to the urban environment, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</i></p>
	<p>121</p> <p>3.4.1, p.41</p> <p>R43 – propose a change to the wording to be consistent with the wording of R27 in the Rockbank PSP.</p>	

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

122	3.4.1, p.41	R45 – Remove requirement. This is inconsistent with both Rockbank and Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSPs. There are no examples of local parks which span multiple boundaries.	Remove R45
123	3.4.1, p.41	R49 – should be to the satisfaction of RA and Ausnet Services. This will ensure landscaping does not impede access or operation of the powerline easement.	Include referral to Ausnet Services.
124	3.4.1, p.41	R50 – should be to the satisfaction of RA and the pipeline operator. This will ensure landscaping does not impact on the gas easement.	Include referral to the pipeline operator.
125	3.4.1, p.41	G42 – too prescriptive. Not supported by Council. The design and layout of open space areas will occur at the implementation stage in accordance with Council's standards. This guideline is inconsistent with other PSPs	G42 – Remove. Not required and inconsistent with Council standards. Natural surveillance can be adopted without 75% street frontage. Change <i>positive frontage</i> to 'active' frontage.
126	3.4.1, p.41	G43 – change <i>CPTED</i> to <i>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design</i> .	Change G43 from <i>CPTED</i> to <i>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design</i> and change 'positive' frontage to 'active' frontage.
127	Figure 10, p. 43	Change 'positive' frontage to 'active' frontage. Include word 'indicative' on Figure 10, given delivery is subject to future development and approvals.	Include word 'indicative'
128	Table 6, p.43	As per requests made for Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP, Council's Recreation and Youth team are concerned about the specific uses defined in	Please amend Table 6 as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>Table 6. Please remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns and replace with a new column titled Recreation Opportunities (as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP). Specific uses should be removed and each row within this column should include the following wording: 'opportunities for active and passive recreation uses'.</p>	<p>129</p>	<p>Table 6, p.43</p>	<p>Table 6, p.43</p>	<p>Table 6, p.43</p>	<p>Table 6, p.43</p>
<p>Table 6. Please remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns and replace with a new column titled Recreation Opportunities (as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP). Specific uses should be removed and each row within this column should include the following wording: 'opportunities for active and passive recreation uses'.</p>	<p>130</p>	<p>Table 7, pp. 44-45</p>	<p>Table 7, pp. 44-45</p>	<p>Table 7, pp. 44-45</p>	<p>Table 7, pp. 44-45</p>
<p>Table 6. Please remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns and replace with a new column titled Recreation Opportunities (as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP). Specific uses should be removed and each row within this column should include the following wording: 'opportunities for active and passive recreation uses'.</p>	<p>131</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>
<p>Table 6. Please remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns and replace with a new column titled Recreation Opportunities (as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP). Specific uses should be removed and each row within this column should include the following wording: 'opportunities for active and passive recreation uses'.</p>	<p>132</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>
<p>Table 6. Please remove Passive Recreation Opportunities and Active Recreation Opportunities columns and replace with a new column titled Recreation Opportunities (as per Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP). Specific uses should be removed and each row within this column should include the following wording: 'opportunities for active and passive recreation uses'.</p>	<p>133</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>	<p>Table 7, p.44</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

			relevant time.
134	Table 7, p.44	SR-01 and SR-02 – As noted previously, Council does not support the proposed shape of SR-1 and SR-02.	SR-01 and SR-02 MPA to revise shape of Active Open Space in consultation with Council
135	Table 7, p.45	SR-02 – It is noted that SR-01 and SR-02 are linked but Table 7 doesn't show this clearly.	Amend SR-02 to reflect relationship with SR-01
136	Table 7, p.45	As per previous comments Council does not support the exclusion of the Aquatics Centre facility from the ICP. Table 7 should be updated to reflect infrastructure contributions to this facility.	Amend Table 7 to reflect contributions to this facility.
137	Table 7, p.45	SR-07 – It is noted that SR-07 and SR-06 are linked but Table 7 doesn't show this clearly.	Amend SR-07 to reflect relationship with SR-01
3.4.2 Biodiversity and threatened species			
138	3.4.2, p. 47	R51 – there is a noted discrepancy in approach to native vegetation for Plumpton PSP in comparison to other recent PSPs. Given the scattered trees to be retained have not been approved by DELWP, how does MPA and DELWP propose to manage development applications in the absence of this.	MPA and DELWP to confirm process for assessment of habitat compensation obligations in the absence of approved documentation for scattered tree retention.
139	3.4.2, p. 47	G49 in Plumpton is worded slightly differently to like guidelines in Kororoit and Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSPs, which are known as G41 and G51 respectively. Council requests G49 be reviewed to	Reword G49 to accord with the wording in G41 Kororoit PSP and G51 Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	ensure wording is consistent. G49 should also be to the satisfaction of Ausnet Services and the Pipeline Operator given it refers to the embellishment of easements.	In addition to Melbourne Water, include reference to Ausnet Services and the Pipeline Operator.
3.5 Transport and Movement		
3.5.1 Street Network		
140	Plan 8, p.48 As identified in relation to Plan 3 earlier, Council notes the addition of a local access street to cross the gas pipeline. Has this been considered as part of road/street network planning and relevant costings?	MPA to ensure any costings/additional approvals have been considered when placing this local access street over the high pressure gas pipeline.
141	Plan 8, p.48 Council has some concerns about the application of Local Access Street Level 2 throughout the precinct. In particular in the south-east corner of active open space in the Plumpton Major Town Centre Community Hub.	MPA and Council to meet to discuss the application of Local Access Street Level 2 as part of Plan 8.
142	Plan 8, p.48 Are VicRoads happy with the provision of signalised intersections identified on the arterial road network within this PSP?	MPA to confirm whether VicRoads are happy with the proposed arterial road network within this PSP
143	3.5.1, p.49 Two new requirements are needed to manage development along Plumpton Road to manage traffic flows until Hopkins Road is constructed between Melton Highway and Taylors Road. The requirements should restrict direct access to Plumpton Road, and manage access from local access streets.	Add two new requirements to manage access to Plumpton Road until the section of Hopkins Road is constructed between Melton Highway and Taylors Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new direct access to be provided to Plumpton Road (between Taylors Road and Tarletons Road) until the first carriageway for the Hopkins Road alignment and the first carriageway of Tarletons Road between (Hopkins Road and Plumpton Road) are constructed, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority.
144	3.5.1, p.49 R57 – Remove direction in regards to the layout of street networks on property boundaries. This is already standard practice through the development	Remove R57

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

		assessment process and including this in the PSP is unnecessary.	
145	3.5.1, p.49	R59 – this guideline needs to be clear on Melbourne Water roles as distinct from the Responsible Authority. Melbourne Water input should be restricted to the appropriate separation distance from the waterway and not the subdivision design or contents of the housing and design guidelines.	Amend R59 to ensure relevant roles outlined clearly for Melbourne Water and the Responsible Authority.
146	3.5.1, p.49	Unclear on the intention of R61, further clarification required.	Clarification sought and potential rewording of R61 requirement to be clear on the intent of the guideline.
147	3.5.1, p.49	Add new requirement which ensures appropriate access across waterways for local access streets.	Add a new requirement in 3.5.1: <i>Where a local access street is determined to be required to cross a waterway (Service Open Space (Drainage)), the proponent must construct a local access street culvert to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</i>
148	3.5.1, p.51	G51 – Delete final paragraph, Council have guidelines for the design of streetscape including consistent tree planting within a street.	Delete final paragraph in G51 as unnecessary. Council have their own guidelines to deliver this.
149	3.5.1, p.51	G52 - Include reference to Employment area also.	G52 include reference to employment land
150	3.5.1, p.51	G58 –Please delete, this is standard practice as part of road delivery for subdivisions. Too detailed to be included in PSP. Rockbank does not contain this guideline.	G58 – Please delete.
3.5.2 Public Transport			
151	Plan 9, p.52	The on-road bicycle lane on Tarleton Road is inconsistent with VicRoads Growth Area Network Planning Guidance and Policy Principles document which shows two-way bicycle paths along secondary arterial roads.	Remove the on-road bicycle lane on Tarleton Road is and replace with a two way off-road bicycle path.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

152	3.5.2, p. 53	R67 – include reference to industrial and employment land also.	R67 – include reference to industrial and employment land
3.5.3 Walking and cycling			
153	3.5.2, p. 53	R69 – Remove R69, it is essentially a double up of R70. R69 is not included in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP.	Remove R69
154	3.5.3, p. 55	R73 – Reword to be consistent with wording agreed for Rockbank PSP.	Reword R73 as agreed for the Rockbank PSP: <i>‘Shared and pedestrian paths along waterways must be constructed to a standard that satisfies the requirements of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority, and must be:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Delivered by development proponents consistent with the network illustrated on Plan 8</i> • <i>Positioned above 1:10 year flood levels with a crossing of the waterway designed above 1:100 year flood level to maintain hydraulic function of the waterway. Where direct access is provided to the dwelling from the reserve / drainage corridor the path is to be above the 1:100 year flood level.’</i>
155	3.5.3, p.55	R77 – include reference to industrial and employment land also.	R77 – include reference to industrial and employment land
156	3.5.3, p.55	G62 – change G62 into a requirement based on R65 in the Rockbank PSP.	Change G62 into a requirement.
3.5.4 Town Centre Transport, Access and Connectivity			
		No changed requested.	.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

4.0 Integrated Water Management and Utilities

Item Number	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
4.1 Integrated Water Management			
157	Plan 10, p.56	Please verify that these reflect Melbourne Water's current DSS.	MPA and (MW) to share final draft DSS with Council.
158	Plan 10, p.56	It is difficult to distinguish between <i>waterway corridor / drainage asset</i> and <i>active open space</i> and <i>passive open space</i> . Plan 10 in the Rockbank PSP has coloured these assets blue to make them easier to identify.	<i>Waterway corridor / drainage assets</i> should be coloured differently from other open space. Refer to Plan 10 in the Rockbank PSP for how this may be done. Can additional plan showing DSS areas be added or plan amended to make clearer.
159	Plan 10, p.56	As noted previously, WI-18 and WI-14 are proposed to be located over the high pressure gas pipeline easement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this been considered in DSS costings and design of water infrastructure? • Has the pipeline owner (APA) provided consent for this proposed solution? 	MPA to confirm whether WI-18 and WI-14 have considered the additional design and construction requirements have been considered in the costings. MPA to confirm if the pipeline owner has provided consent for these proposed solutions.
160	4.1, p.57	R84 – 4 th dot point requires that 'development will deliver' the IWM requirements of the PSP. This may not be possible due to a range of reasons, therefore <i>will</i> should be changed to <i>should</i> . Given the 'should' then change this Requirement to a Guideline.	R84 – 4 th dot point, change 'will' to 'should' and change to a Guideline.
161	Table 8, p.59	Table 8 relates to stormwater conveyance and treatment design required by R86. All the proposed	MPA must amend Table 8, Responsibility Column – whereby Melbourne Water has responsibility for all items listed in Table 8.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>water infrastructure assets in Table 8 are to be delivered under Melbourne Water Development Services Schemes, therefore the 'Responsibility' column in Table 8 is a design/delivery responsibility and not an ownership/operational responsibility. Considering this entire table must be updated to show Melbourne Water as having responsibility for the relevant infrastructure.</p>	<p>4.2 Utilities</p> <p>It is noted that there is a significant amount of infrastructure proposed to cross the high pressure gas pipeline easement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the crossing of the easement been considered in the plans and associated costings? • Has the pipeline owner consented to these crossings? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPA to confirm whether utility authorities have considered the crossing of the high pressure gas pipeline easement • MPA to confirm whether the pipeline owner has consented to these crossings. <p>162 Plan 11, p.60</p> <p>163 4.2, p. 61</p> <p>R88 – Remove <i>'The plans and cross sections must nominate which services will be placed under footpaths or road pavement, as relevant'</i>.</p> <p>Council does not support the placement of services under road pavements. It is noted that this line was not in the similar requirement as part of Mt Atkinson & Tarnait Plains PSP (R91). Text in R88 Plumpton should replicate R91.</p> <p>MPA to amend R88 to reflect R91 of the Mt Atkinson & Tarnait Plains PSP. In particular, remove the line <i>'The plans and cross sections must nominate which services will be placed under footpaths or road pavement, as relevant'</i></p>
---	---	--

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

5.0 Infrastructure Delivery and Staging

Item Number	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
5.1 Subdivision Works by Developers			
164	5.1, p.62	R96 – add removal of any soil contamination.	R95 – add removal of soil contamination.
165	5.1, p.62	R97 – add removal of any soil contamination.	R97 – add removal of soil contamination.
166	5.1, p.62	R98 – how does providing access across properties to provide neighbouring access to road network work in practice?	MPA to confirm the mechanism for R98 to work.
5.2 Development Staging			
167	5.2, p.67	Missing requirement as agreed between Council and MPA at the Rockbank Hearing.	Add a requirement: <i>All development must deliver any ICP funded infrastructure and / or any non ICP funded infrastructure necessary to support the development. Out of sequence development must as necessary deliver ICP funded items prior to the indicative timing within the PIP and all non ICP funded infrastructure appropriate for the development.</i>
168	5.2, p.67	G80 – delete or reword as Melton City Council does not support the staged delivery of community infrastructure. This has been deleted for Paynes Road and Rockbank PSPs.	Delete G80

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

6.0 Precinct Infrastructure

Item Number	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
6.0 Subdivision Works by Developers			
169	6.0, p.69	Clarification is sought in relation to the fifth dot-point 'relevant development contributions from adjoining areas'.	MPA to confirm the relationship with surrounding PSPs.
170	Plans 12 and 13, p.64-66	What in particular has been considered? Given the details of the ICP are not yet known (including the relevant rates) and no costings have been provided, Council cannot provide endorsement of the Precinct Infrastructure Plan with allowable items. The column heading 'Included in ICP' is therefore misleading, as Council cannot be sure that the projects listed in this table can all be funded by the ICP. Council does not know what portion of the projects can be fully or partly funded.	Council requests that the PSP not be finalised and gazetted until Council understands the full extent of the ICP and the impacts to Council in the future.
171	Plan 12, p.65	Road Segments 9 and 14 (RD-09 & RD-14) cross the APA trunk gas main. The costing for this road segment should include the works to protect the pipeline required by the APA and the Construction Management Plan.	Additional costs associated with RD-14 crossing over the gas transmission pipeline are to be included as a Supplementary ICP.
172	Table 9, p.67-85	Functional Layout Plans used to inform the land take of bridges, roads and intersections are required to be provided, so Council can verify that adequate land take has been provided for in Tables 1 and 9, and Appendix A.	MPA to provide functional layout plans for bridges, roads and intersections.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>173</p> <p>Table 9, p.67-85</p> <p>Cost estimates are required for all infrastructure items to be included in PSP to ensure Council and MPA can make an informed selection of items to be included in the ICP.</p> <p>It is necessary to cost all infrastructure items as the allowable items list and associated per hectare rate is not known at this stage.</p> <p>Council would also use this information to negotiate with parties in regards to the delivery of infrastructure, and to also understand the funding shortfall for all infrastructure items.</p>	<p>Council requests the cost estimates for all infrastructure projects (including purchase of land).</p>
<p>174</p> <p>Table 9, p.67-85</p> <p>The land totals in Tables 1 and 9, and Appendix A do not match.</p>	<p>The land totals in Tables 1 and 9, and Appendix A should be reviewed and the land take areas should match across all tables.</p>
<p>175</p> <p>Table 9, p.67-85</p> <p>All intersection projects should be identified as being signalised intersections for the interim treatment (Rockbank PSP has signalised intersections as the interim standard).</p>	<p>Amend Table 9 to detail all interim intersection treatments to be signalised.</p>
<p>176</p> <p>Table 9, p.67-85</p> <p>Bridge projects. Clarification is required on whether the bridge projects are standard ICP projects or supplementary ICP projects.</p>	<p>Council requests that Table 9 articulate which bridge projects are standard ICP projects, and which bridge projects are subject to a supplementary ICP rate.</p>
<p>177</p> <p>Table 9, p.75</p> <p>PBR-08 – the cost of the construction of the pedestrian bridge over the Western Freeway is proposed to be apportioned with Mt Atkinson PSP. The apportionment rate is required (e.g. 50/50 split)</p> <p>It should be noted that this bridge is not going to be required for the Plumpton precinct.</p>	<p>The apportionment rate for PBR-08 should be identified in the PSP e.g. 50/50 split.</p>
<p>178</p> <p>Table 9, p.75</p> <p>PBR-08 – VicRoads should be the lead agency for the construction of the pedestrian bridge over the Western Freeway.</p>	<p>Amend the lead agency for the construction of PBR-08 over the Western Freeway to VicRoads.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	Is this a standard item in the ICP or a supplementary ICP item?	MPA to advise whether this is a standard item or a supplementary item in the ICP.
179	The bridge and culvert projects are included in the Table 9, p.75-76 ICP. These should be identified as being within a Supplementary ICP.	The bridge and culvert projects in Table 9 should form part of a Supplementary ICP.
180	Plan 13, p.66 As identified previously AC-01 (Aquatic Centre) needs to be shown on Plan 13 and included in the PIP (Table 9). This is a District Level Facility.	Show AC-01 on Plan 13 and include in the PIP (Table 9).
181	Table 9, p.79-80 SR-01, SR-03, SR-04, and SR-05 should include lighting in their description of ICP allowed works.	Include lighting in the description of SR-01, SR-03, SR-04, and SR-05.
182	Table 9, p. 82 & 83 As requested previously, construction and embellishment of LP-20, LP-21, LP-22 and LOS-03 to be included as ICP items. Council would like to discuss this further with the MPA.	Include LP-20, LP-21, LP-22 and LOS-03 as ICP items. Council to discuss with the MPA.
183	Plan 12, p.64 As per previous requests, include the following in Plan 12 and Table 9 and include as ICP items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian signals at the intersection of Tarletons Road and the Olive Grove shared path (between IN-9 & IN-10); • Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge across WI-01. 	Update Plan 12 and Table 9 to include the following ICP items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian signals at the intersection of Tarletons Road and the Olive Grove shared path (between IN-9 & IN-10); • Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge across WI-01.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

7.0 Appendices

Item Number	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
Property Specific Land Use Budget			
184	Appendix A, p.86 - 89	As discussed previously some of the land totals in Appendix A do not match the corresponding land total areas in Tables 1, 7 and 9.	MPA to reconcile land areas in the various tables in the PSP, and ensure that the land areas provided match.
185	Appendix A, p.86 - 89	As discussed previously, aquatics centre shown as 3.6ha in Appendix A (Land Use Budget). This should identify a land take of 4ha. This ensures consistency across the document.	Amend land take to Aquatics Centre from 3.6ha to 4ha.
186	Appendix A, p.86 - 89	Land budget cannot be verified by Council from the information provided. Council requests a copy of the CAD / GIS layer of the future road reserves so the land take can be verified. This should occur following the implementation of requested amendments.	MPA to provide CAD / GIS layer of the future road reserves following the implementation of requested amendments to the road reserves.
Plumpton Major Town Centre key design principles			
187	Appendix B - general comment p.90 – 92	It is noted that minor tweaks have been made to this Design Principle Section as part of the Rockbank PSP, given this, Council encourages the below to be considered for the Mount Atkinson Specialised Town Centre, particularly given the range of uses and specialised make up of this centre. Can MPA please include an intro paragraph that	MPA to ensure design principles update to reflect changes as part of Rockbank PSP. Add introduction as follows <i>These principles and guidelines inform the design of Major Town Centre and should be read in conjunction with the Major Town Centre concept plan in Figure 7 of this PSP.</i>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	<p>explains that these should inform the design and link back to indicative concept plan. For example,</p> <p><i>These principles and guidelines inform the design of Major Town Centre and should be read in conjunction with the Major Town Centre concept plan in Figure 7 of this PSP.</i></p>	
188	<p>Appendix B, p. 90</p> <p>Connecting The Region, Principle 5 – 1st dot point should include <i>'provide strong connections and continuous paths of travel to the Industrial Area.'</i></p>	<p>Connecting The Region – 1st dot point include the following wording <i>'provide strong connections and continuous paths of travel to the Industrial Area'</i></p>
189	<p>Appendix B - p.91</p> <p>Principle 8 is supported. Suggest adding additional wording around building heights to promote a true mixed-use town centre rather than one dwarfed by a small number of tall buildings (such as 6 storeys plus) that create a 'commercial' feeling town centre character and stagnate further residential development.</p>	<p>Suggest adding another sentence stating: <i>"Avoid excessive building heights, such as 6 storeys plus, for individual buildings but instead create a consistent high density built form with lower heights that fosters a more appealing and liveable neighbourhood town centre character."</i></p>
190	<p>Appendix B, p. 91</p> <p>Respecting the Environment, Principle 13 – 2nd dotpoint include reference to Mt Kororoit.</p>	<p>2nd dot point – include reference to Mt Kororoit</p>
191	<p>Appendix B, p. 92</p> <p>What is the definition of 'Higher order and life-long learning'?</p>	<p>MPA to provide definition.</p>
Appendix C Local Town Centre Guidelines		
192	<p>Appendix C, p.93</p> <p>Can MPA please include an intro paragraph that explains that these should inform the design and link back to indicative concept plan. For example,</p> <p><i>These principles and guidelines inform the design of the Plumpton local town centre and should be read in conjunction with the Local Town Centre concept plan in Figure 8 of this PSP.</i></p>	<p>Insert a preamble for Appendix C:</p> <p><i>These principles and guidelines inform the design of the Plumpton local town centre and should be read in conjunction with the Local Town Centre concept plan in Figure 8 of this PSP.</i></p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>193</p> <p>Appendix C, p.93</p>	<p>Principle 2 – 2nd dot point in guidelines. There are no railway stations proposed in this PSP.</p>	<p>Remove reference to the railway station in Principle 2 as this is not relevant</p>
<p>194</p> <p>Appendix C, p.93</p>	<p>As identified previously Council does not support 'small local enterprises', given this, please remove all reference to them.</p>	<p>Remove all references to 'small local enterprise'</p>
<p>Appendix D</p>		
<p>195</p> <p>General Comments p.99-119</p>	<p>The following were agreed by MPA as part of Agency consultation and through approved PSPs within the City of Melton yet changes have not been made for the relevant cross sections:</p> <p>General comment on all road cross-sections (Appendices D, E and F):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of tree heights and species, these will be determined using Council's landscape Guidelines 2. Note should be added to the road cross-sections regarding tree outstands. <i>Tree outstands should be provided at a maximum interval of 100m and at intersections – for all except industrial areas as trees are not supported in these areas.</i> 3. A note that indigenous grasses are preferred on the nature strip adjacent the conservation area rather than mown exotic lawn. 4. The cross-sections show an exotic tree in the nature strip. Please remove. Tree selection will be made in accordance with Council's Landscape Guidelines. 5. Alter note on indigenous planting to read <i>'Streetscape planting must be Australian natives, and should be an indigenous to the area, and to</i> 	<p>Amend road cross sections as outlined.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<i>the satisfaction of the responsible authority</i>	
6. Adopt consistent wording of notes for cross sections	
<p>196</p> <p>Appendix D, pp 99, 100</p>	<p>Cross sections 1 and 2 – Primary Arterials</p> <p>Joining Two-Way Bike Paths and Pedestrian Path, as shown on the Primary Arterial Road cross sections on the opposite side to the Local Frontage Road, is not supported.</p> <p>It is preferred that separation is provided between the Pedestrian Path and Two-Way Bike Path. The following cross section is proposed as an alternative for the Primary Arterial Road cross section.</p> <p>Cross Sections 1 and 2 – Primary Arterials</p> <p>For all Primary Arterials MPA to prepare a cross section which provides separation between the Pedestrian Path and Two-Way Bike Path; an alternative for the Primary Arterial Road cross section is shown below.</p>
<p>197</p> <p>Appendix D, pp 101, 102</p>	<p>Cross Sections 3 and 4 – Secondary Arterials</p> <p>Council does not support on-road bike lanes on Secondary Arterial Roads. Cross sections for Secondary Arterial Roads are to be amended to provide 'two way off road bicycle paths' on each side of the road reserve, in accordance with the recommended cross section for Secondary Arterials in the <i>VicRoads Growth Area Network Planning Guidance & Policy Principles</i> document.</p> <p>Cross Sections 3 and 4 – Secondary Arterials</p> <p>Council does not support on-road bike lanes on Secondary Arterial Roads. Amend cross section to provide 'two way off road bicycle paths' on each side of the road reserve (as per below).</p>
<p>198</p> <p>Appendix D, p.104</p>	<p>Section 6 – Road cross sections for Plumpton Road</p> <p>Section 6 – Road cross sections for Plumpton Road have incorrect measurements of 0.5m wall clearance, amend to 5m clearance as per Council Guidelines.</p> <p>Section 6 – Road cross sections for Plumpton Road</p> <p>Amend Section 6 cross sections for Plumpton Road to show a 5m wall clearance, not 0.5m.</p>
<p>199</p> <p>Appendix D, p.105</p>	<p>Section 7 – Road cross sections for Plumpton Road</p> <p>Section 7 – Road cross sections for Plumpton Road have incorrect measurements of 0.5m wall clearance, amend to 5m clearance as per Council Guidelines.</p> <p>Section 7 cross sections for Plumpton Road</p> <p>Amend Section 7 cross sections for Plumpton Road to show a 5m wall clearance, not 0.5m.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>200</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 106</p> <p>Section 8 – add the following notes for Local Access Street Level 2 (20m) to ensure cross sections relate to school uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local access streets abutting schools are to be Local Access roads Where roads abut school drop-off zones grassed nature strip areas are to be replaced with pavement. 	<p>Add the following note to a Local Access Street Level 2 (20m) cross section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local access streets abutting schools are to be Local Access Street Level 2 (20m) type roads Where roads abut school drop-off zones grassed nature strip areas are to be replaced with pavement
<p>201</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 108</p> <p>Section 10 – Amend carriageway widths to 3.5m to facilitate safer sharing with bicycles.</p>	<p>Section 10 – cross section to be amended to show carriageway widths of 3.5m</p>
<p>202</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 109</p> <p>Section 11 – Amend carriageway widths to 3.5m to facilitate safer sharing with bicycles.</p>	<p>Section 11 – cross section to be amended to show carriageway widths of 3.5m</p>
<p>203</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 115</p> <p>Section 17 – Need additional wording to highlight height restrictions for all trees shown in cross section. Not just tree in open space/park.</p>	<p>Section 17 – Show height restrictions for all vegetation shown on plan.</p>
<p>204</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 116</p> <p>Section 18 – Show vehicle exclusion measures for the Beauty's Road linear park, this cross section is only one which doesn't show it.</p>	<p>Section 18 – show vehicle exclusion measures similar to other Beattys Road examples</p>
<p>205</p>	<p>Appendix D, p. 119</p> <p>Section 21 – Amend cross section to differentiate between retarding basin and drainage corridor.</p>	<p>Section 21 – amend to differentiate between retarding basin and drainage corridor.</p>
<p>206</p>	<p>Appendix D, Additional</p> <p>Include additional cross section for Beattys Road reserve which shows dry stone wall and overland flow path (west of Plumpton Road). Include 5m flow path (west of Plumpton Road).</p>	<p>Include additional cross section which shows dry stone wall and overland flow path within Beattys Road reserve (west of Plumpton Road).</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	cross section	clearance either side of wall.	
Appendix E Alternative road cross sections			
207	Appendix E, p. 120	Local Access Street Level 1 Section – Council does not support central road drainage options for local access streets. Under these proposed cross sections drainage pits would be in the road and more likely to be damaged, also accessing pits would require a greater traffic management cost and have OHS impacts. (Note: this type of arrangement is only supported for use in laneways).	Delete Local Access Street Level 1 Cross Section
208	Appendix E, p. 121	The location of the tree should be at least 1.2m from the back of kerb, not 0.6m. Otherwise it will conflict with the drainage and public lighting alignment and the tree roots will compromise the road pavement.	Trees are to be offset at least 1.2m from the back of kerb
209	Appendix E, p. 121	Council does not support the meandering footpath option, this will likely result in the lot owner landscaping up to the back of path and may affect future access to underground services by authorities.	Delete the Meandering Footpath option
210	Appendix E, p. 122	Local Access Street Level 2 Section – Council does not support central road drainage options for local access streets. Under these proposed cross sections drainage pits would be in the road and more likely to be damaged, also accessing pits would require a greater traffic management cost and have OHS impacts. (Note: this type of arrangement is only supported for use in laneways)	Delete Local Access Street Level 2 Cross Section

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

Appendix F Outer metro ring interface cross section	
211	Appendix F – add 'Shared path is to be delivered by developer' in notes Appendix F – add 'Shared path is to be delivered by developer' in notes
Appendix G Waterway cross section	
212	Appendix G, General comment Adopt consistent wording of notes.
213	Appendix G, p.125 Specify a minimum width for the 'Vegetated Buffer'
Appendix H Easement cross sections	
214	Appendix H, General comment Adopt consistent wording of notes.
Appendix I Service placement guidelines	
215	Appendix I, p.121 Appendix I – Service Placement Guidelines - Service placement table Council does not support the placement of services under road pavements.
Appendix J Open Space Delivery Guidelines	
216	Appendix J, General comment Remove reference to 'draft', Council's Open Space Plan is now adopted.
217	Appendix J, p. 129, 130 At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 4 April 2016, Council adopted the Open Space Plan 2016-2026. Appendix I needs to be updated to reflect the new MCC Open Space Plan which was agreed as part of Rockbank PSP. Change the current headings to reflect the adopted Open Space Plan 2016-2026. Update wording to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update Neighbourhood Parks heading to: <i>Neighbourhood Parks 0.2-1Ha. (Defined as Local 0.2- 2Ha in Melton City Council's Open Space Plan 2016-2026)</i>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Community Parks heading to: <i>Community Parks 1-5Ha. (Defined as Local 0.2- 2Ha then District for 2Ha+ in Melton City Council's Open Space Plan 2016-2026)</i> • Update District Parks heading to: <i>District Parks 5-15Ha. (Defined as District for 2Ha+ in Melton City Council's Open Space Plan 2016-2026).</i> • Update Municipal Parks heading to: <i>Municipal Parks 15-50Ha+. (Defined as District Park for 2Ha+ then Regional for 20Ha + in Melton City Council's Open Space Plan 2016-2026)</i> • Update Metropolitan Parks heading to: <i>Metropolitan Parks variable – 50Ha+. (Defined as Regional for 20Ha + in Melton City Council's Open Space Plan 2016-2026)</i>
--	--

Table 2: Infrastructure Contributions Plan

Item No.	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
218	General Comments	As identified earlier in this submission, Council is concerned that this PSP proposes an ICP without knowing the details of the legislative requirements, per hectare rate and allowable infrastructure items. Given this, Council is concerned that the current PSP may be incompatible with the final approved	General Comments

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	<p>ICP framework.</p> <p>Furthermore, provide functional layout plans for intersections.</p> <p>Following the above, should the network be an appropriate outcome, costings for the proposed infrastructure should be provided.</p>	
<p>219</p>	<p>General comment</p> <p>Please note requested changes in regards to Staging of infrastructure within the Service and Utilities section of the PSP document.</p>	<p>General comment</p>
<p>220</p>	<p>Additional items for ICP</p> <p>Council has identified additional supplementary inclusions in the ICP. These need to be included in the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land allocation and construction of the Aquatics Centre (portion given District level facility); • Pedestrian signals at the intersection of Tarletons Road and the Olive Grove shared path (between IN-9 & IN-10); • Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge across WI-01; • Construction of paths, off road bicycles paths and nature strips within Melton Highway; and • Additional construction requirements to construct road segments over the APA gas transmission pipes. 	<p>Include additional in ICP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land allocation and construction of the Aquatics Centre (portion given District level facility); • Pedestrian signals at the intersection of Tarletons Road and the Olive Grove shared path (between IN-9 & IN-10); • Pedestrian/Cycle Bridge across WI-01; • Construction of paths, off road bicycles paths and nature strips within Melton Highway; • Construction and embellishment of LP-20, LP-21, LP-22 and LOS-03; and • Additional construction requirements to construct road segments over the APA gas transmission pipes.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

Table 3: Planning Scheme Ordinance

Item No.	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
221	Cl. 37.01	Special Use Zone , Schedule 10 No additional changes requested.	
222	Cl. 37.07 Section 2.2, p.2	Urban Growth Zone , Schedule 11 The applied zone provisions identify 'connector streets' as Clause 36.04 – Road Zone Category 2 The purpose of Clause 36.04 is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To identify significant existing roads; or To identify land which has been acquired for a significant proposed road. Neither of these purposes has been fulfilled, and therefore it is not appropriate to identify these roads for RDZ2 at this stage. This is inconsistent with the approach taken to the approved PSPs in the City of Melton.	Delete connector streets from the Table 1.
223	Section 2.2, p.2	The applied zone provisions for residential land is shown as Clause 32.07 - Residential Growth Zone. Council does not support the applied 'Residential Growth Zone' (RGZ) as the default residential zone. This matter was recently tested as part of the Rockbank PSP Panel in which Council requested for this to be changed to General Residential Zone (GRZ). This is for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nomination of applied zones should be 	Change Residential Growth Zone to General Residential Zone.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>principally based on the purposes of those zones and the extent to which those purposes are appropriate for the identified areas within the PSP to which they are to be applied;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no policy basis supporting the global application of the RGZ in Melbourne's growth areas; • The PSP already shows areas for 'medium density housing' which provides an opportunity for increased densities in appropriate locations. The application of the RGZ precinct wide will undermine this intended approach; • The application of the residential zones should be principally based on the purposes of those zones and the extent to which the purposes are to be applied. The identification of medium density residential land has been determined strategically as part of the PSP, the proposal to allow the RGZ will go against this strategic work; and • The application of the RGZ may give rise to other development not permitted in the GRZ and could result in the proliferation of non-residential uses which may prejudice the establishment of activity centres. Whilst it is recognised that these types of uses can be written out of the UGZ, it is Council's position that this is a complicated approach which could be simplified with a more appropriate zoning outcome. 	<p>Delete Section 2.4</p> <p>224 Section 2.4, Section 2.4 – Delete p.2 Section 2.4 has not been included in Mt Atkinson and Tarnait Plains PSP, therefore including this in Plumpton PSP will result in inconsistencies across PSPs. It should also be noted that Council considers there to be merit in requiring buildings and works permits</p>
--	--

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

for facilities to ensure accordance with the PSP.	
<p>225 Section 2.5, p.3</p>	<p>Table 2 and Section 2.8 – Council has concerns with the permit required uses identified within the high pressure gas pipeline within this PSP.</p> <p>Council considers that uses identified as being 'sensitive' in the Australian Standards should be prohibited for clarity to ensure relevant standards are met.</p> <p>Council is also concerned that there is an inconsistent approach in wording to that in Mt Atkinson and Tarnet Plains PSP. It is noted that there are additional items listed under Mt Atkinson and Tarnet Plains.</p> <p>Council requests a meeting to discuss this matter with the MPA and the pipeline operator.</p>
<p>226 Section 2.8, p.4</p>	<p>Section 2.8 and Section 6</p> <p>Council has concerns with the referral process for works within the Pipeline Measurement Length. Council requests further discussion on this matter.</p> <p>In particular, within this section Council is incorrectly identified as the responsible authority. What happens if an application triggers this clause but they have not triggered a planning permit (e.g. demolition)?</p> <p>The operator of the pipeline needs to review the CMP, therefore the CMP should be referred to Energy Safe Victoria (or other relevant authority) for consideration, not the RA.</p>
<p>227 Section 2.8, p.4</p>	<p>Section 2.8 and Section 6</p> <p>Council is not the technical expert in relation to gas infrastructure; therefore referral to Energy Safe Victoria (or other relevant authority) is required.</p>
<p>225 Section 2.5, p.3</p>	<p>MPA to amend the schedule to prohibit sensitive uses in the pipeline measurement length.</p> <p>MPA and Council to discuss this matter.</p>
<p>227 Section 2.8, p.4</p>	<p>MPA to provide advice on the mechanisms of this provision and amend the relevant authority.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>Council needs more information on how this will work and how we can trigger something under the planning scheme when a permit is not triggered?</p> <p>This should be managed by the relevant authority with the technical expertise, and not Council.</p>	<p>Section 2.9, p.4</p> <p>Council strongly objects to the Growth Areas Authority (GAA) being identified as part of the Urban Design Framework process and all references to the GAA must be removed from this section.</p> <p>Council is responsible for the implementation of PSPs and hence is responsible for the design and delivery of PSP areas. Inclusion of the GAA as part of this process is unnecessary and will create unnecessary complexities for the preparation and approval of this Framework.</p> <p>It should also be noted including reference to GAA has not been included in Mt Atkinson and Tarnett Plains PSP hence there is an inconsistent approach with these PSPs.</p>	<p>Section 2.9 – MPA to delete all references to the Growth Areas Authority. Council does not support the GAA being responsible for this process.</p>
<p>3.1, p. 6</p> <p>Include additional dot point <i>'Potential bus route and bus stop locations prepared to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Transport'.</i></p>	<p>Further discussions required, based on discussions requirement may be warranted.</p>	
<p>3.2, p. 6</p> <p>Text in this Section should be updated to correctly reflect the elements included in the PIP and should relate to the ICP, not a Development Contributions Plan.</p>	<p>Include relevance to the ICP.</p>	
<p>Section 4.6, p.9</p> <p>Change as per agreed wording with CFA (as per the agreed approach in Rockbank PSP).</p>	<p>Change as agreed in Rockbank PSP.</p>	

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<p>Council shouldn't be responsible for approving a site management plan for bushfire risk as we are not technical experts in this area.</p>	<p>Council does not support the use of the DCPO to incorporate an ICP into the PSP.</p> <p>Council requests that the PSP not be finalised and gazetted until Council understands the full extent of the ICP and the impacts to Council in the future.</p> <p>MPA to provide Council with the costings of the proposed ICP items.</p> <p>MPA to provide Functional Layout Plans to Council, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truck turning plans; • Details of the design trucks; and • CAD / GIS layout of the PSP.
<p>232</p>	<p>Cl. 45.06 Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO10)</p> <p>Council does not support the use of a DCPO to incorporate an ICP into the PSP. The objective of the DCPO is</p> <p><i>'To identify areas which require the preparation of a development contributions plan for the purpose of levying contributions for the provision of works, services and facilities before development can commence'.</i></p> <p>Furthermore, as identified earlier in this submission, Council is concerned that this PSP proposes an ICP without knowing the details of the legislative requirements, per hectare rate and allowable infrastructure items. Given this, Council is concerned that the current PSP may be incompatible with the final approved ICP framework.</p> <p>Council also has concerns about the lack of functional layout plans for intersections.</p> <p>Costings for all proposed infrastructure should also be provided.</p>
<p>Cl.45.01</p>	<p>Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO 3)</p> <p>No additional changes requested.</p>
<p>Cl. 52.01</p>	<p>Public Open Space Contribution and Subdivision</p> <p>No additional changes requested.</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

<p>233</p>	<p>Cl. 52.02 Easements, Restrictions and Reserves</p>	<p>Council would like to understand whether notification (outside the exhibition process) has occurred to remove these covenants. Council would also like to make sure MPA have reviewed all relevant titles to ensure this is the finalised list of properties affected.</p>	<p>MPA to confirm if additional notification proposed for the properties affected. MPA to confirm whether all affected properties have been included.</p>
	<p>Cl. 52.17 Native Vegetation</p>	<p>No additional changes requested.</p>	
	<p>Cl. 66.04 Referral and Notice Provisions (Schedule to 66.04)</p>	<p>No additional changes requested.</p>	
	<p>Cl. 66.06 Referral and Notice Provisions (Schedule to 66.06)</p>	<p>No additional changes requested.</p>	
	<p>Cl. 81.01 Incorporated Document</p>	<p>No additional changes requested.</p>	
<p>234</p>	<p>Explanatory Report</p>	<p>As discussed previously, Council has concerns with the use of the DCPO and does not support gazettal of this PSP until the ICP has been prepared, consultation has occurred and any relevant changes made to the PSP document.</p>	<p>Council does not support the use of the DCPO and will not support Gazettal of the PSP until the ICP has been prepared and consultation has occurred and any relevant changes made to the PSP document.</p>
<p>235</p>	<p>p. 6</p>	<p>The following matters are missing from the 'Environmental Effects' section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of potential contamination identified in the background report; • The existing high pressure gas transmission pipeline and associated easement; and 	<p>The following matters should be considered and discussed in the 'Environmental Effects' section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas of potential contamination identified in the background report; • The existing high pressure gas transmission pipeline and associated easement; and

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing high voltage transmission line easement. The existing high voltage transmission line easement.
236	p. 8	<p>Council notes that <i>Ministerial Direction No. 1 – Potentially Contaminated Land</i> as this relates to a number of potentially contaminated sites identified in the background reports and UGZ11.</p> <p>Council notes that <i>Ministerial Direction No. 1 – Potentially Contaminated Land</i> has not been included in the explanatory report. Discussion should be added to the explanatory report regarding this Ministerial Direction.</p>
237	p. 10	<p>The following clause in the SPPF have not been included, which are of relevance to this PSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 11.02 – Urban growth Clause 12.04-2 – Landscapes Clause 15.01 – Built environment and heritage Clause 19.03 – Development infrastructure <p>The following clause in the SPPF have not been included, which are of relevance to this PSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 11.02 – Urban growth Clause 12.04-2 – Landscapes Clause 15.01 – Built environment and heritage Clause 19.03 – Development infrastructure

Table 4: Background Report

Item No.	Section, Page number	Comment	Recommended Change
238	Section 1.0, p.1	Section 1.0 – In the second paragraph also make reference to commercial areas and community facilities.	In Section 1.0 change the second paragraph to read: ... It identifies broad transport networks, <i>commercial</i> , industrial and employment zones, residential areas, and <i>community and recreation precincts</i> .
239	Section 1.0, p.1	Section 1.0 - In the third paragraph add reference to commercial areas.	In Section 1.0 change the third paragraph to read: The area will undergo a full transition of land use as part of a large scale residential, <i>commercial</i> and industrial development....
240	Plan 1, p.2	Plan 1 – The plan should highlight both the Plumpton and Kororoit PSP areas.	In Plan 1 – show Kororoit PSP as well as the Plumpton PSP.

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

<p>241</p>	<p>Plan 1, p.2</p>	<p>Plan 1 – Add the following items to Plan 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show the activity centres in Melton Township – High Street and Woodgrove Show the activity centre on Melton Highway in Sydenham - Watergardens Show the proposed rail stations at Hopkins Road, Paynes Road, and Ferris Road (Toolern) The Western Interstate Freight Terminal is referred to as the <i>Metropolitan Intermodal System Terminal</i> in the legend. 	<p>Make the following changes to Plan 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show the following missing activity centres – High Street (Melton), Woodgrove, and Watergardens; Show the proposed rail stations at Hopkins Road, Paynes Road and Ferris Road (Toolern); and Change the legend from <i>Metropolitan Intermodal System Terminal</i>, to <i>Metropolitan Interstate Freight Terminal</i>.
<p>242</p>	<p>Section 2.2, p.3</p>	<p>Section 2.2 – In the Rockbank North PSP, Taylors Hill West PSP and Caroline Springs and Taylors Hill PSP sections remove all references to estate names. Estates can change ownership and branding over time, it is assumed MPA has not had approval for using these names it is also important to note that Woodlea Estate does not own the entire Rockbank North PSP area and Delfin is no longer affiliated with Caroline Springs.</p>	<p>In Section 2.2 remove all references to development and estate names.</p>
<p>243</p>	<p>Section 2.2, p.3</p>	<p>Section 2.2 – In the Taylors Hill West PSP section, amend the last sentence to read: ... and complements <u>the existing residential areas in Taylors Hill and Caroline Springs</u>.</p>	<p>In Section 2.2 change the last sentence in the Taylors Hill West PSP to read: ... and complements <u>the existing residential areas in Taylors Hill and Caroline Springs</u>.</p>
<p>244</p>	<p>Section 2.2, p.34</p>	<p>Section 2.2 – Western Plains North Green Wedge section, it should be noted that additional tree planting may occur on either side of Melton Highway, not just north.</p>	<p>Amend wording to reflect possible tree planting north and south of the Melton Highway.</p>
<p>245</p>	<p>Section 3.1, p.5</p>	<p>Section 3.1 – The second paragraph identifies that a number of sites in the Kororoit and Plumpton PSPs are crown reserves. It would be beneficial if the crown reserves were shown on a plan in the PSPs.</p>	<p>Show existing crown reserves on a plan in the PSPs.</p>
<p>246</p>	<p>Section 4, p. 7 - 10</p>	<p>Section 4 – It is noted that the Background Report indicates all parties have provided approval for the</p>	<p>Section 4 – MPA to confirm if Wurundjeri have provided approval for proposed bridge crossings. If not, need to amend wording/</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

	<p>proposed bridge locations along Kororoit Creek. Given the Wurundjeri was not in attendance for these specific inspections, has the MPA been given separate approval for the proposed locations from the Wurundjeri?</p>	
247	<p>Section 5.11, p.15</p> <p>It is noted that Melton Highway Cobbled Road Surface hasn't been identified on Plan 2 of the PSP document.</p> <p>What is the mechanism to ensure 'historical and archaeological investigations are carried out', particularly if this cobbled surface isn't represented in PSP?</p>	<p>MPA to confirm why the Melton Highway Cobbled Road Surface hasn't been identified on Plan 2.</p> <p>MPA to confirm mechanism to ensure VHI sites have 'historical and archaeological investigations carried out'.</p>
248	<p>Section 5.14, p.16</p> <p>In the last paragraph it states that dry stone walls should be located in 'unstructured open space' – what does this mean?</p>	<p>MPA to clarify what is meant by 'unstructured open space'.</p>
249	<p>Section 6.1, p.16</p> <p>In the contamination section there is reference to 14 sites which have a medium or high risk of potential contamination. In the recommendations in 6.6 (p.19) it is identified that sites of high risk should be identified in the schedule to the UGZ, and sites of medium risk should be subject to environmental site assessments.</p> <p>It is noted that of the 14 sites identified, only five of them are listed in the UGZ schedules – Kororoit has three identified properties and Plumpton has two.</p>	<p>MPA to clarify why the <i>Background Report</i> for the Plumpton and Kororoit PSPs identifies that there are 14 sites with medium to high potential for land contamination, but only five of these are listed in the schedules to the UGZ – Kororoit has three properties listed and Plumpton has two.</p> <p>Better linkages between the UGZ listed properties and the Background Report text is required. ie. the Background Report should clearly identify those sites of medium risk in comparison those with high risk.</p>
250	<p>Section 9.0, p.25-27</p> <p>Council officers have ongoing concerns about the amount of retail floor space being allowed for within the MTC and the chance that this would affect the localised City of Melton retail catchment.</p> <p>The 45,000m² of floorspace (excluding 'restricted retail') is much higher than the 35,000m² identified in</p>	<p>Council has ongoing concerns about the provision for commercial floorspace within the Major Town Centre and the impact it may have on surrounding centres.</p> <p>Council's Retail and Activity Centre Strategy identifies that this Major Town Centre will have 10,000m² less retail (which includes food and drink premises).</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
 Melton City Council Submission

<i>Council's Retail and Activity Centres Strategy.</i>	
251	<p>Section 9.0, p.25-27</p> <p>There should be discussion in Section 9.0 about local convenience centres, what role they play in the hierarchy, their size and their aims.</p> <p>In Section 9.0 add discussion about local convenience centres.</p>
252	<p>Section 9.0, p.25-27</p> <p>As identified previously Council does not support 'small local enterprises', given this, please remove all reference to them.</p> <p>Remove references to 'small local enterprises'</p>
253	<p>Section 10, p.29</p> <p>As stated previously, Council requests that the Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment be amended to reflect the proposed population changes and associated provision of community centres.</p> <p>Following this Council requests a meeting with the MPA to discuss the need, size and location of the proposed 1.01ha community centre in Plumpton North Community Hub.</p> <p>MPA to provide justification in the form of an update to the Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment for the proposed community centre in Plumpton North Community Hub.</p> <p>Following this, Council would like to discuss this matter with the MPA.</p>
254	<p>General</p> <p>Missing sections. The Background Report is missing sections regarding Development Staging and Infrastructure Funding.</p> <p>Add the following sections to the Background Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Staging; and • Infrastructure Funding. <p>Add a section on Development Staging: To ensure development is staged in an orderly manner in response to the provision of infrastructure. Council requests words around staging which indicates where development should start and how the area will be best developed over time.</p> <p>Add a section on Infrastructure Funding: This section should detail how the ICP was drafted, what the costings are, and which items are standard ICP items and which are supplementary items.</p> <p>It is noted that Council does not support the approval of the PSP until the costings of the ICP items are known, what the value of the items is known, what</p>

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

the rate of the ICP is, and it is known what will be the
standard items and the supplementary items are.

Item 12.10	Amendment C146 to the Melton Planning Scheme - Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan Council Submission
Appendix 2	Melton City Council Submission to C146 Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan

C146 – Plumpton Precinct Structure Plan
Melton City Council Submission

4 Conclusion

In conclusion, Melton City Council officers are generally supportive of the proposed Future Urban Structure Plan which accompanies the amendment documentation, however cannot provide full support of the PSP documentation itself until a number of issues have been resolved. Of particular note are the following:

- Approval of the ICP Ministerial Direction and subsequent preparation of the ICP for the Plumpton PSP;
- An identified mechanism to ensure the development of the precinct occurs in an orderly manner with infrastructure provision to be delivered in appropriate stages;
- Resolution of mechanisms to manage north-south traffic movement in the short to medium term;
- Resolution of the applied zones in residential areas within the precinct; and
- Inclusion of additional items as part of the ICP document, including the Aquatics Facility.

It should also be noted that Council will not provide full endorsement of the PSP being gazetted until ICP Legislation has been approved and a draft ICP for the Plumpton PSP has been prepared and consulted upon.

Council officers would welcome the opportunity to have further detailed discussion with the Metropolitan Planning Authority and other State agencies required to resolve outstanding issues and finalise the PSP documentation.