1 Moora 2 Victor Autho 3 City W	Moorabool Shire Council	•			Moorahool Amendment C81 is awaiting a Panel Report it would be
			conflict in the non-urban areas adjacent the parts of Moorabool identified for future development in Parwan and Hopetoun Park North as part of the Bacchus Marsh Urban Growth Framework (Amendment C81, not heard by a Planning Panel yet).	pre dev beé	provide our principal relation of the manual of the future premature to make any reference to Moorabool and the future development of the area until such time as a recommendation has been approved by the Minister for Planning.
		•	<ul> <li>Reference should be made to mitigating the potential for land use conflicts</li> <li>with the Parwan Waste Water Treatment Plant, noting that the buffer for this facility extends inside Melton's administrative boundary. It is also noted that the plant is likely to require future expansion to accommodate increased population growth, which may result in an increase to the existing buffer.</li> </ul>		Proposed Clause 21.02 Settlement, is considered to address the matters raised in the submission. Specifically 21.02-3.3 strategy 1.2 states: ensure that interfaces between urban and rural areas are planned to minimise land use conflict.
	Victorian Planning Authority (VPA)	•	he proposed changes to the Melton Planning Scheme and requested.	• Not	Noted, no changes requested.
	City West Water	•	<ul> <li>Clause 21.11-2.1 Protection of Infrastructure Suggest paragraph 2, sentence</li> <li>1 be reworded to remove some ambiguity regarding responsibility for the management and development of water and sewerage networks, as follows:</li> </ul>		Agree Clause 21.11-2.1 could be improved for clarity in respect of City West Water and Western Water.
		•	<ul> <li>"Both City West Water and Western Water are responsible for the management and development of water supply and sewerage across their respective services area in the City of Melton".</li> </ul>		
4 Enviro Autho	Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Victoria	. <del>ö</del>	<ul> <li>EPA supportive of the amendment, but have provided suggested recommended changes for Council consideration as follows:</li> <li>Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile</li> </ul>	Clar add sigr	<b>Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile</b> – Council will consider incorporating additional text within the Municipal Profile and specifically the state significant industrial and Ravenhall Precinct.
		• 5	<ul> <li>Provides an overview and regional context of the municipality, however</li> </ul>		Clause 21.02-1 Urban Growth Areas – Council will consider the
		•	<ul> <li>does not currently identify existing industry of significance.</li> <li>EPA recommends consideration be given to including reference to the role</li> </ul>	inclade	inclusion of the additional key issue of encroachment and the additional Strategy under Objective 1 at Clause 21.02-1.3 to the effect
			of industrial land and industry of state-wide significance as a relevant consideration upfront within the Municipal Profile. Industry including the	of: exis	of: 'avoid encroachment of sensitive use into the separation distance of existing industry and infrastructure'.
			Nevential Landinii, closed Meton Janguii, waste water treatment plants, high pressure pipelines and materials recycling are important	• Cla	Clause 21.02-3.2 Non-Urban Areas- Council will consider an additional
		Ű	considerations in the regional context.	sep sep	key issue to be included as suggested: 'protecting and maintaining separation distances between existing industry and infrastructure to anoid future land use conflicts'
		•	<ul> <li>As identified in the Municipal Profile the City of Melton has a forecast</li> </ul>	5	
			population of more than 400,000 people. With increasing pressure for residential development appropriate consideration should be given to the potential for interface issues between existing industrial areas within the		

Clause 21.11-2 nrotection of Infrastructure

		• •	EPA supports the recognition at Clause 21.11-2 in the overview that planning for development must protect existing infrastructure and prevent encroachment from sensitive uses. FPA supports Objective 1 and recommends an additional strategy		
			considering maintaining required separation distances. EPA also supports the further strategic work and other actions and would welcome the opportunity to provide assistance to Council.		
ы	Sustainability Victoria (SV) & Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group (Metro Group)	•••	SV notes that the <i>Municipal Strategic Statement Rewrite Background</i> <i>Report- (June 2017)</i> , indicates that it provides an opportunity to ensure the Planning Scheme aligns with other state and local policy. Section 21.11-2 <i>Protection</i> of <i>Infrastructure</i> , highlights the importance of Surbiton Park as integral to the development of Melton. While it is	• •	<b>Clause 21.11-2 Protection of infrastructure</b> Council will consider the inclusion of the Ravenhall Precinct, and specifically Melbourne Regional Landfill, being explicitly highlighted as a hub of state importance. Council will consider the text from the State-wide plan.
			recognised that landfill sites are significant infrastructure assets within the City of Melton, we submit that, due to its importance to Melton and the State of Victoria, the Ravenhall Precinct, and specifically MRL, should be expressly highlighted as a hub of state importance. This would ensure	•	<b>Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile</b> – Council will consider the inclusion of additional text within the Municipal Profile around the state significant industrial and Ravenhall Precinct.
		•	further strategic planning processes recognise the site, and ensure that future sensitive uses are avoided within any relevant buffer zones. Council may want to consider including some, or all of the following text, as provided in the hub description of the Statewide Plan (p67): RAVENHALL PRECINCT (including Boral Quarry, Cleanaway Melbourne Regional Landfill Ravenhall)	•	Council will consider the inclusion of an additional Strategy at 21.11-2.3 related to resource recovery and its function being an important part of the whole waste system.
			The Ravenhall precinct supports the largest putrescible landfill in the state and receives significant tonnes of inert industrial waste as well as Category C soils and asbestos. Significant quantities of C&D material including aggregates, masonry and soil are reprocessed at the hub.		
			<ul> <li>The hub is located within Metropolitan Melbourne and close to sources of waste generation, has good transport networks, and supports compatible activities including quarrying.</li> <li>The hub is located within a state significant industrial precinct. Adjoining land is subject to precinct structure planning and is expected to provide for a mix of residential, business and industrial activity centres and railway stations</li> </ul>		
		•	<ul> <li>SV also notes that under Section 21.09 <i>Economic Development</i>, the following strategies and implementations are described:</li> <li>Strategy 1.3: Support the preparation of Precinct Structure Plans for employment areas and the release of additional land for employment purposes.</li> <li>21.09-1.4 Implementation: Advocate for the preparation of Precinct Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government areas are</li></ul>		

		<ul> <li>The Ravenhall Precinct is at the centre of an employment precinct and would further benefit from acknowledgment as an area that can attract investment and employment, i.e. non-sensitive related uses, that may</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>work in synergy with the precinct.</li> <li>Clause 21.09-3 <i>Industry</i> further indicates that, "There are also several sites with licences for extractive industry which should be protected from the encroachment of incompatible land uses".</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Council may also want to consider mentioning the hub, as it also has a buffer that should be protected.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>SV and Metro Group recommends that appropriate recognition of the</li> <li>SV and Metro Group recommends that appropriate recognition of the Ravenhall Precinct, specifically as a hub of state importance, be included, as this will provide transparency to all stakeholders and make it easier for planners to both recognise the site as a hub of state importance and to</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Resource reactions appropriatery.</li> <li>Resource recovery is an important part of the waste system, and we also recommend that it could be further encouraged throughout the MSS. Improved resource recovery would ultimately reduce reliance on landfills, which can create additional jobs, add value to the Victorian economy and minimise potential adverse impacts to community, environment and public health.</li> </ul>	
9	Matt Evans Planning on behalf of Mobile Carriers Forum (MCF)	Within the exhibited Clause 21.11 "Infrastructure", we find reference to Objective 5, which reads:	<ul> <li>Given the importance of significant landscapes within the City of Melton, Clause 21.1.1.3 seeks to highlight the importance of significant landscapes and for new telecommunications infrastructure</li> </ul>
		"Objective 5 - To ensure that new communications infrastructure does not adversely impact upon sensitive uses and landscape features whilst also	to respond appropriately.
		facilitating a world class communications network".	Clause 21.11-1.3 Strategy 5.1 is therefore important to Council in a local context as opposed to the State context. Council considers Strategy 5.1
		We consider that the current provisions of the SPPF (Clause 19.03-4), requirements in section 52.19 and the Victorian Code already adequately	and 5.2 reasonable and appropriate in this context.
		provide for an appropriate balance as envisaged in Objective 5.	<ul> <li>The comments in relation to Clause 21.11-1.3, Strategy 5.1 and 5.2 are unresolvable and will be referred to a Planning Panel.</li> </ul>
		The MCF's comments on each Strategy are as follows: Strategy 5.1	1
		<ul> <li>In relation to "Strategy 5.1 Protect significant landscape features including volcanic cones from any adverse visual impact through careful design and citized of the facility," the MCE considers that the the theorem consider little</li> </ul>	
		atimized the facting the work considers that this strategy provides incre- meaningful support to Clause 19.	
		Neither Strategy 5.1, Councils' Background Issues Paper or Council's     Communications Inferentiating Dolive Economics activity and the	
		continuutications initiastructure Policy Francework provide any tanglore guidance about how the siting and design of a Telecommunications Facility	

<ul> <li>and and for the citing of releaces was unimacified in equations: a this relates to and and of the the ingo of the citing of releaces was including volcants corens are proposed.</li> <li>A concer of Prankscrupt for the summacinon relation is a this relations in the relations in a function part of the summacinon relations of the summacinon relations and the planning scheme and rests that a relation is allowed accounter in the Planning scheme and encircipation to a significant two word a micritage place, a landmark, a street-communications relation to the relation is allowed by contradictions and the planning scheme and the planning the solution the planning scheme and the planning scheme and the scheme planning to a strengthy and a support the scheme scheme and the planning scheme and the scheme planning that a provision of termuniations intrastructure the planning scheme and the scheme planning to a strengthy and the scheme planning to an advection the scheme planning that a prediction the provest of descreme scheme sch</li></ul>	<ul> <li>including volcanic cones from any adverse visual impact". No tangible standards for the siting of telecommunications facilities as this relates to significant landscape features including volcanic cones are proposed.</li> <li>A Code of Practice for Telecommunications Facilities in Victoria 2004, which is an incorporated document in the Planning Scheme, directs that a telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>and and for the indexperimentations facilities as the relates to significant indexperimentation index on the Plannage of Heaturean Internations Satillites in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications satillates in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications satillates in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications satillates in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications satillates in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications satillates in Neuron 2004, which is an incorporated domanunications and interruption to a significant where a heritago galox a site numbers are a interruption to a significant where a heritago galox is and a stretter stretter</li></ul>	<ul> <li>standards for the siting of telecommunications facilities as this relates to significant landscape features including volcanic cones are proposed.</li> <li>A Code of Practice for Telecommunications Facilities in Victoria 2004, which is an incorporated document in the Planning Scheme, directs that a telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>significant bandcarge decrement in the Polinning Scheme directs that a treatment burning scheme directs that a treatment and the aptimum scheme directs that a treatment and the aptimum scheme directs that a treatment and the polinning scheme direct structure burning scheme directs that a treatment of the polinning scheme directs that a treatment of the polinning scheme direct structure burning scheme directs that a treatment of the polinning scheme directs that a treatment would be protected through the application of the Code of the Planning Scheme direct structure bans and new directs that a structure in Previous that a state of a planning scheme direct structure bans and new diversion and the MCF consider that the CLP of band communications threatment and the communications threatment and the scheme scheme and new diversion and the AC conder scheme scheme direct structure bans and new diversion and the application of the code of a communication structure in Previnct Structure bans and new diversion and the AC code of the code of a structure bane and new diversion and the AC conder structure in Previnct Structure bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Structure bans and new diversion and the AC conder structure bane and new diversion and the AC conder structure bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Structure bane and new diversion and the application of communications infrastructure in the Polin Framework (Lond Band Bandance Structure Bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Structure Bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Structure Bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Structure Bans and new diversion and communications infrastructure in Previnct Struc</li></ul>	<ul> <li>significant landscape features including volcanic cones are proposed.</li> <li>A Code of Practice for Telecommunications Facilities in Victoria 2004, which is an incorporated document in the Planning Scheme, directs that a telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>A Code of Practice for Intercommutations Statistis in Victiona 2004, which is an incorporated document table representation and pharma direct structure information more advisor statistic segment are structure in the Phanning Statistis in Victima Biology and the Ionates (see a reservance, usida or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private a streetscape, usida or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private a streetscape, usida or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private and intervation in the Phanning Scheme (nonegative) and the Ionates (see the paloty, would be Dicates (see the relevance) whether viewed from public or private a streetscape, usida or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private and the policy would be provided to "Strategy 5.1 when any view element overhaps or specific see the policy would be Dicated (see the Phanning Scheme (nonegative) the aphlication of the Code Pracet Scheme (nonegative) the aphlication of the Code Pracet Scheme (see the policy would be providen of communications infrastructure in Precent Structure (see the policy framework (see the see the policy framework (see the policy framework (see</li></ul>	<ul> <li>A Code of Practice for Telecommunications Facilities in Victoria 2004, which is an incorporated document in the Planning Scheme, directs that a telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>which is an encoproted document in the Planning Scheme, direct that a retecommunication rigit (Filly Schould Be brocked so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a hieringe place, a landmark, a stretcaste, which are a given the need form public cor private many every strate of the significant view of a hieringe place, a landmark, a stretcaste write a region man, when there wive a restrang structure strate of the strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the Planning. Scheme direct method for brotecies of the policy would be protected through the application of the code of Plantie.</li> <li>Strategy 2.3 Support the early provision of the code of mark a significant in the Planning. Scheme direct and through the application of the code of marks.</li> <li>Strategy 2.3 Constrated as the constrate strate of the strate of the code of mark a development, the MCF considers infrastructure lines and new development. The following scheme of communications infrastructure in Precint. Structure Plans and mew development. The following scheme of communications in the place of the plant of the process of the provision of communications infrastructure. However, this is to corrur and the MCF most of the planting scheme of the process of the planting scheme within early or all other process of the provision of communications in the policy framework has been to stateward scheme and the code of statewards. The Blanting scheme within early or all other process of the process of the scheme and the code of statewards. The Blanting scheme and the process of the scheme and the code of scheme as the scheme and the code of schem</li></ul>	<ul> <li>which is an incorporated document in the Planning Scheme, directs that a telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Relecommunications facility 'Should be located to as so minimise any interruption to a parenetization stand reality 'Should be located to a submark, a streetizate, vise will not be located by the will be parenetized for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the Planning Carter and the planning, a submark is a significant in the Planning Carter and the planning of a special planning of the code of vise will be place would be protected through the application of the Code of Practic.</li> <li>We question the relation to 'Strategy 5.2 support the any view already identified as "significant in the Planning".</li> <li>Strategy 4.2.</li> <li>Similay in the Planning Carter planning and the code of monunciations infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: No strategy 1.2 support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: No strategy 2.2 support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: No strategy 4.2 support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Practic.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any provision of communications infrastructure.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any provision of the code of support the any provision of communications infrastructure.</li> <li>Ne helpful guidance: Support the any support the any provision of communications infrastructure in Provision of the code of development the support the any provision of the code of support the any provision of th</li></ul>	<ul> <li>telecommunications facility 'should be located so as to minimise any interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'.</li> <li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Interruption to a significant via da heritage place, a landmark, a streetszape, vista a significant via da entrange place, a landmark, a streetszape, vista a repeatant, whether viawed from public or private and end.</li> <li>We unstation the need of strategy 5.1 when we wave line policy would be protected through the application of the Code of significant in the Planning Scheme through the application of the Code of wave line policy would be protected through the application of the Code of Plactic.</li> <li>Similari, In relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the application of the Code of plactic policing infrastructure in Precinct. Structure Plans and raw development", the MIC considers that the Planning Scheme through the application of communications infrastructure in Precinct. Structure Plans and raw development infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development of the process of developming the Plant process of developming the process of developming the Plant and the Plant plant appendent the Plant plant throughout the process of developming the Plant plant structure induces and new dome of the new development of the structure development of the plant structure induces on the provide structure suggraphilates and the nuclei plant structure induces and the nuclei plant structure plant structure appreciation of the and development provided contru</li></ul>	interruption to a significant view of a heritage place, a landmark, a streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'. • We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as	
<ul> <li>and:</li> <li>We question the meed for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the Planing Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the planing Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the planing Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the planing Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the planing Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the planing Strategy 5.2 support the Code of Practics.</li> <li>Smitary, in the planing Strategy 5.2 support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinit Strategy 5.2 support the Code of Practics.</li> <li>Smitary, in the planing Strategy 5.2 support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinit Strategy 5.2 support the Code of Practics.</li> <li>Smitary, in the Code of all support here any provision of communications infrastructure in Precinit Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No help/liguidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has observed this planit of the Code of the Strategy 2.5 support the Planit Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No help/liguidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has observed this planit of the structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No help/liguidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has observed the more plane structure Plane structure in the Planit structure.</li> <li>No help/liguidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has observed the more structure plane structure and the more structure and the more structure plane structure and the more structure plane structure for the more observed the more of the more structure plane structure and the more structure plane structure the more observed the more of the more structure plane structure for the more of the more structure structure plane structure plane structure plane structu</li></ul>	streetscape, vista or a panorama, whether viewed from public or private land'. • We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as	
<ul> <li>live question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the Planning Scheme through relevant overlays or specific view where policy would be protected through the application of the Code of Practice.</li> <li>Stratiles M. In relation to "Strategy 5.2 support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Presence.</li> <li>Stimilary, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Presence.</li> <li>Stimilary, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Presence Structure Plans and new development", the MCF considers that the Code of communications infrastructure in Presence Structure Plans and new development", the MCF considers that the support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinct. Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>enterphy and the policy framework does not at the Code of the support the early provision of development.</li> <li>enterphy and the policy framework does not at the code of the policy framework does not at the code of the policy framework does not at the code of the policy framework does not at the code of the policy framework does not a provision of communications in threaturcture there existing.</li> <li>enter strategy and the mole structure blans and here strategy as a submany structure blans and the submany and the mole there existing as a submany structure blans and the submany structure blans and the submany of the and the mole structure blans and the submany structure there structure blans and the submany of the exact of the structure blans as a structure there are an exact of the structure blans as a structure plane and the mole structure blans and the structure blans</li></ul>	<ul><li>land'.</li><li>We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as</li></ul>	
<ul> <li>We question the mend for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as significant in the Planning Scheme (through relevant overlays or specific view line polity would be protected through relevant overlays or specific view line polity would be protected through relevant overlays or specific view line polity would be protected through relevant overlays or specific view line polity and the Cude of Parateke.</li> <li>Strategy 5.2</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this to corm. and the WCF has consistently relevant on the NCF has consistently valued this point throughout the process of developing the provision of communications infrastructure Plane and the condex strategines and the condex strategines and the condex strategines are strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction in doma and through the provision of communications infrastructure in Power, this hiterarchy does not the provision of communications infrastructure in the strate strategines as prediction that strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction that strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines as prediction the strategines a</li></ul>	We question the need for Strategy 5.1 when any view already identified as	
significant in the Planning Scheme through relevant overlays or specific view line policy would be protected through the application of the Code of Practica. <b>Strategy</b> 5. Similarly, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development", the MCE consider that the Cuty of Methon Commission micratorians infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development. The MCE consider that the Cuty of Methon Commission micratorians infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development. The MCE consider that the Cuty of Methon Commission of communications infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development. The MCE consider that the Cuty of Methon Commission of communications infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development. Note that the Cuty of Methon Commission of communications infrastructure in Precinc Structure Plans and new development. The Structure Plans and new development is provided as to the Plans Structure Plans and new development. The Structure Plans and new development is the Cuty of Iand uses which is descendent as the Cuty of Iand uses which is descendent as the Cuty of Structure Plans and new development.		
<ul> <li>vive line policy would be protected through the application of the Code of Practics.</li> <li>Strategy 5.1</li> <li>Strategy 1.1</li> <li>Similary in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Predict Structure Plans and the Markov and evelopment". In the Nath Provision of communications infrastructure in Predict Structure Plans and the Markov and Andrews and Markov and Andrews and And</li></ul>	significant in the Planning Scheme through relevant overlays or specific	
<ul> <li>Practice.</li> <li>Similarly, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Predicts Structure Plans and new development." The MGF considers that the City of Melino Communications infrastructure in Predict Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently reside this point throughout the process of developing the Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework tables to the Policy Framework table in Predict Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently reside this point throughout the process of developing the Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework table to provide siting opportunities within cases of developing the provide siting opportunities within cose proximity to allow a carrier to select an addeuts a prediction in the canon'd policy framer, both table to provide siting opportunities within cose proximity to allow a carrier to select an addeut allow the carrier's of the council's provide so further necessary guidance con the process on obtenes frames on the case of the submit of the case of the three sign tables to council's prediction that simply cannot the more framework provides to further necessary guidance cound be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> <li>Reterne Data alto the process of a council's policy framework provides to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	view line policy would be protected through the application of the Code of	
<ul> <li>Strategy 3.2</li> <li>Similarly, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new development", the MCF considers that the City of Melton Communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new of communications infrastructure in Provision of communications infrastructure in Precinc. Structure Pais and new substructure in Previous and new provision of provide sting provide sting the provide sting. Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this hierarchy does not provide sting protontine state stim within cose provide sting suburbs in Melton. Where there is simply not the mix of fland use within forse provide sting suburbs in Melton. Where there is simply not the mix of fland use within for the mix of allow of the council's preferred land use area.</li> <li>Council's intertion to provide for "early provision of communications in frastructure in Presestions regarding how council's preferred land use area.</li> <li>Council's primery structure in Presestions regarding how council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's primery provides no further necessary guidance on the process any versions.</li> <li>Predementarchy and the areast guidance could be supplied to carrier structure in Provides no further necessary guidance on the process any versions.</li> <li>Reference Douting Predement documents, including: Clause 21.11.13 refers to a lite of "Reference documents".</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Similarly, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development", the MCF considers that the Lky of Method Communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>An beilbug indirates is provided as the hwy in the carbo provision of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>An beilbug indirates is provided as the hwy in the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>An beilbug indirates is provided as the hwy when sithin a consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the bolicy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate ap provide of and use within enverging suburbs in Mitton.</li> <li>Convolis sither and your difficult of and use within one of Council's point on a carrier to safet an adquate site within one of Council's policy framework has been to simply a mode and and an and and a safet and equate site within one of Council's policy framework has been to simply a mode and an advance - a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison within cose provingion of communications infrastructure<sup>1</sup> in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile infrastructure<sup>1</sup> in PSP areas requires a prediction in the carrier's divides on the process to and/so council's policy remember a prediction in the carrier's divides on the process to and/so constructure's not evel and/so council's policy framework provides to further necessary use welcome). The adverse carrier's a prediction in the carrier's divides on the process council's policy carriers within energing pSP areas.</li> <li>Council's policy framework provides to further necessary sublements. "Including: Pareas requires a prediction in the careas and/so provides to further necessary sublementes areas and/so provide singer provides to fu</li></ul>	Strategy 5.2	
<ul> <li>communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development'. The NGC considers that the CM envisions for Meticon Communications infrastructure Policy Framework does not stal support the early provision development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently raised this point introaghout the process of development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently raised this point incurvations infrastructure howsev, this hierarchy does not stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses which side the provision infrastructure howsev, this hierarchy does not provide sting opportunities within emerging subtush in Methon, where there is simply not the mix of land use within does proving the land use the tot stipulate a preferred hierarchy of and use within does proving in the and use arriter to select an adequate site within one of council's preferred land use a arrive to select an adequate site within one of council's preferred land use there is simply not the mix of land use within does proving the land use arrive there is simply not the mix of land use within does proving the land use arrise to adequate site within one of council's preferred land use there is simply not the mix of land use within does proving the land use arrise to adequate site and use arrises aprediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services narry versin land use intersecture. The advection is considered to mobile telecommunications revises and reduction the recession of the mix of and use vithin encessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 52. We not the the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's policy framework could be supplied to carries within emerging 59 areas.</li> <li>Advectore Documents and the second bearce and the supplied to carries within emerging 79 areas.</li> </ul>	Similarly, in relation to "Strategy 5.2 Support the early provision of	
<ul> <li>development", the MCF considers that the City of Melton Communications infrastructure Policy Trantwork does not at all support the early provision of communications infrastructure Policy Trantwork does not at all support the early provision of communications infrastructure Policy Trantwork does not at all support the more support the early provision of communications infrastructure Policy Trantwork thas been to substanting the provide siting opportunities within energing suburbs in Melton, where Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to subtable in Melton the more siting Telecommunications infrastructure However, this hierarchy does not provide siting opportunities within energing suburbs in Melton, where the tere is simply not the mis of land use when the molecy approach in the Policy Framework has been to subtable in Melton. Where the tere is simply not the mis of land use when a carrier to sellert an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's Policy Framework policy is preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's Policy Framework policy is not provided constructions of ministructure is policy framework policy barses to supplied to carriers to supplied to carriers to a list of "Reference documents", including:</li> </ul>	communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new	
Infrastructure Policy Framework does not at all support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Predinct Structure Plans and new development. • No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently residentish point throughout the process of developing the Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when siting Telecommunications infrastructure. In wever, it is herarchy does not provide sliting opportunities within emerging submits in Melton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas. • Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure." In PSP areas requires a prediction in the mand of mobile telecommunications services many vasis in advance – a prediction mobile telecommunications requise failed in the carriers (which we welcome). Council's preferred land use areas. • Council's intention to provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Stratery 2. John one think the ACF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to arrier solution areas. Reference Documents. Clause 2111-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". Including:	development", the MCF considers that the City of Melton Communications	
<ul> <li>of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the policy Framework. Council's approach in the POI(cy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when siting. Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this interarchy does not provide simply one there is simply one there within consection of the model of land use within communications infrastructure. However, this interarchy does not provide simply one there is simply one of Council's preferred land use a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proving to allow a carrier to select an adequate size within close proving to the advious services many years in advance – a prediction that areas a services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaiston with the carriers (which we welcome). Council's policy Framework provide on the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how. Council's Policy Framework provide to the process to adview estartery 5. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how. Council's Policy Framework provided constructive suggestions regarding how council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> <li>Reference</li></ul>	Infrastructure Policy Framework does not at all support the early provision	
<ul> <li>development.</li> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when siting Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this hierarchy does not provide sting opportunities within energing suburbs in Metton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use there is simply random to provide for "early provision of communications areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many vars in divance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other han regulation with the carriers (which we velocome). Council's Policy Framework provides for "curriers (which we velocome). Council's Policy Framework provides to that the CF has guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestors regarding how Council's Policy Framework provides to that useful guidance could be sufference and any taken to carriers (which we velocome). Council's Policy Framework provides to the strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the CF has guidance to close that a regulating how Council's Policy Framework provides to strategy 5.2. We note that the CF has guidance to a development. There supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new	
<ul> <li>No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when sithin the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when sithin the Policy Framework has been to provide siting opportunities within energing suburbs in MEton, where there is simply not the mix of land uses within dose provintly to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use within the carrier to movide site apportunity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use wethin the metaging suburbs in the carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use wethin the metaging suburbs in the carrier's to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use wethin to provide for "early provision of communications.</li> <li>Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestors how Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PS areas.</li> <li>Reference Documents</li> </ul>	development.	
<ul> <li>consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses where siting.</li> <li>Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this hierarchy does not provide siting opportunities within energing suburbs in Melton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within lose proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSD areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile infrastructure" in PSD areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommutations services many years in adout the carriers (which we welcome). Council's Policy Framework provides on further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructure suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	No helpful guidance is provided as to how this is to occur, and the MCF has	
<ul> <li>Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to stipulate a preferred hierarchy of and uses when siting.</li> <li>Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this lierarchy does not provide siting opportunities within emerging suburbs in Methon, where there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services any vides not domine a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services (which we welcome). Council's Policy Framework provides no tytuhe recessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework provides to further necessary guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	consistently raised this point throughout the process of developing the	
<ul> <li>stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when siting Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this literarchy does not provide sting opportunities within emerging suburbs in Melton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile ttelecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome). Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided costructure suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	Policy Framework. Council's approach in the Policy Framework has been to	
Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this hierarchy does not provide siting opportunities within emerging suburbs in Melton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within lose proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas. Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular laison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11.3 refers to a list of "Reference documents", including:	stipulate a preferred hierarchy of land uses when siting	
<ul> <li>provide siting opportunities within emerging suburbs in Metton, where there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use area:</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular laison with the carriers (which we welcome). Council's policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	Telecommunications infrastructure. However, this hierarchy does not	
<ul> <li>there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile thelecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cammot be made. Other than regular laison with the carriers (which we welcome). Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework provide to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul> <b>Reference Documents</b>	provide siting opportunities within emerging suburbs in Melton, where	
<ul> <li>carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome). Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework provides to could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> </ul>	there is simply not the mix of land use within close proximity to allow a	
<ul> <li>areas.</li> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> <li><b>Reference Documents</b></li> <li>Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:</li> </ul>	carrier to select an adequate site within one of Council's preferred land use	
<ul> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas.</li> <li>Reference Documents</li> <li>Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:</li> </ul>	areas.	
infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:	<ul> <li>Council's intention to provide for "early provision of communications</li> </ul>	
telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:	infrastructure" in PSP areas requires a prediction in demand for mobile	
simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents", including:	telecommunications services many years in advance – a prediction that	
we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents", including:	simply cannot be made. Other than regular liaison with the carriers (which	
guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents", including:	we welcome), Council's Policy Framework provides no further necessary	
provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:	guidance on the process to achieve Strategy 5.2. We note that the MCF has	
Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to carriers within emerging PSP areas. <b>Reference Documents</b> Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents". including:	provided constructive suggestions regarding how Council's Policy	
ergi o a	Framework could be altered so that useful guidance could be supplied to	
еo	carriers within emerging PSP areas.	
оa	Reference Documents	
	Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of "Reference documents", including:	

		<ul> <li>"City of Melton Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework - Background Analysis Paper May 2017"; and,</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>"City of Melton Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework December 2017"</li> </ul>	
		The MCF participated in a workshop convened by the City of Melton during the development of the Framework. On behalf of its' members, it also made a comprehensive submission on aspects of the Background Analysis Paper and the Policy Framework. Rather than repeat the MCF's submission about the shortcomings of these Reference Documents in this letter, that submission is enclosed.	
		We are concerned that many of the issues raised by the MCF which directly relate to proposed Objective 5, and Strategies 5.1 & 5.2, have not been sufficiently addressed. In sufficiently addressed. In successed Clause 21.11 of the Melton Planning Scheme:	
		<ul> <li>Contradicts the State Planning Policy Framework, in that it does not seek a balance between the provision of important telecommunications services and the need to protect the environment from adverse impacts arising from telecommunications infrastructure;</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Is not sufficiently linked to an objective or strategy in the MSS;</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Will not help council make a decision;</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Will not help any other person to understand whether a proposal is likely to be supported or not; and, is not clear.</li> </ul>	
	Town Planning Group	<ul> <li>Within Clause 21.01 the regional park is noted on the Figure 2 of the plan. This is inconsistent with the boundaries outlined within the GC99 Melton Planning Scheme and should not be noted as "Regional Park" within the document.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Until such time as GC99 is considered by a Planning Panel, it would be premature to amend the boundaries of the Regional Park within the Strategic Framework Plan.</li> <li>Currently the boundaries of the Regional Park as shown on the</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>The Regional Park boundaries are to be considered by the Advisory Committee. The boundaries shown on Figure 2 are not consistent with</li> </ul>	proposed Strategic Framework Plan are consistent with the West Growth Corridor Plan August 2012.
		these boundaries, as they include parts of my clients' land, and others' land, that is not within the now proposed boundary for consideration, and it excludes land to the north-east within DEWLP control. The boundaries should be amended, and the remainder noted as "Possible location for	<ul> <li>Council could however, remove the designation on specific properties depicting the location of the Regional Park and show the general area using an icon within the legend and the map at Figure 2 - Strategic Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Within "21.03 Environmental and Landscape Values", the Council nominates a number of objectives and strategies that seek to impose</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>In relation to 21.03-4 in Implementation, Council could consider wording around: "working with DELWP to <i>investigate the removal of</i></li> </ul>
		restrictions on private land.	land from the Environmental Significant Overlay, where no significant environmental factors are demonstrated."

		Strategic Work" that Council insert the following "Remove land from Fouriernmental Significant Overlay where no significant environmental	<ul> <li>Council maintains the inclusion of the <i>Weiton Lanascape – Significant</i>. Landscape Features Strategy May 2016<sup>w</sup> as a reference document, this has also been recently tested through a Planning Panel process as part</li> </ul>
		factors are demonstrated."	of Amendment C173 where the content and methodology was
		<ul> <li>We object to the inclusion of the "Melton Landscape – Significant</li> </ul>	supported by the Panel.
		Landscape Features Strategy May 2016" as a reference document within	
		Clause 21.03, as it does not display an accurate position of the	At Clause 21.04-2 Floodplain Council will investigate the inclusion of the
		environmental values of the Kororoit Regional Park area, noted as a	words "where possible and practical for the development" be added to
		"Conservation Areas and Parklands" within that reference document. The	the two strategies.
		document should be amended or removed.	
		<ul> <li>Within Clause 21.04-2 Floodplains it notes that the land should seek to</li> </ul>	
		protect the community from flooding and then maintain for environmental	
		processes, which such strategies as "maintain natural drainage functions	
		when land is developed" and "Avoid the filling of flood prone land."	
		<ul> <li>The two functions of protecting the community from flooding and</li> </ul>	
		maintaining environmental process are not exclusive, and therefore as we	
		see that "where possible and practical for the development" be added to	
		the two strategies.	
∞	Transport for Victoria (TfV)	<ul> <li>Transport for Victoria supports the intent of the objectives at proposed Clause 21.10.</li> </ul>	Noted, no changes requested.
		<ul> <li>TfV encourages Council to continue to closely engage with TfV to support</li> </ul>	
		specific strategies proposed in Clause 21.10. We particularly support	
		Strategy 1.2 relating to development of transit oriented development at	
		and the state of the second state of the secon	
		existing and ruture stations. We support council working with 11V and the	
		private sector to prioritise development of high quality places immediately	
		adjacent to stations early in the development process. Precinct Structure	
		Plans and Urban Design Frameworks set out a positive future vision for	
		new and redeveloped station areas.	
		<ul> <li>However, the staging of development often hinders quality outcomes,</li> </ul>	
		where the key pedestrian connections between stations and active retail	
		and service areas is hindered by the presence and design of at grade	
		parking provision. In conjunction with supporting active transport	
		objectives and strategies (Objective 2 in particular), challenging this	
		development norm will support achievement of the overall vision outlined	
		in Clause 21.10-1.1.	