

No.	Submitter	Submission	Council Response
1	Moorabool Shire Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference should be made to mitigating the potential for future land use 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). Reference should be made to mitigating the potential for land use conflicts 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moorabool Amendment C81 is awaiting a Panel Report; it would be 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. 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.
2	Victorian Planning Authority (VPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VPA supports the proposed changes to the Melton Planning Scheme and no changes are requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted, no changes requested.
3	City West Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 21.11-2.1 Protection of Infrastructure Suggest paragraph 2, sentence 1 be reworded to remove some ambiguity regarding responsibility for the management and development of water and sewerage networks, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree Clause 21.11-2.1 could be improved for clarity in respect of City West Water and Western Water.
4	Environment Protection Authority (EPA) Victoria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA supportive of the amendment, but have provided suggested recommended changes for Council consideration as follows: <p>Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides an overview and regional context of the municipality, however does not currently identify existing industry of significance. EPA recommends consideration be given to including reference to the role of industrial land and industry of state-wide significance as a relevant consideration upfront within the Municipal Profile. Industry including the Ravenhall Landfill, closed Melton landfill, waste water treatment plants, high pressure pipelines and materials recycling are important considerations in the regional context. <p>Clause 21.02 Settlement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As identified in the Municipal Profile the City of Melton has a forecast 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile – Council will consider incorporating additional text within the Municipal Profile and specifically the state significant industrial and Ravenhall Precinct. Clause 21.02-1 Urban Growth Areas – Council will consider the 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: 'avoid encroachment of sensitive use into the separation distance of existing industry and infrastructure'. Clause 21.02-3.2 Non-Urban Areas– Council will consider an additional key issue to be included as suggested: 'protecting and maintaining separation distances between existing industry and infrastructure to avoid future land use conflicts'.

<p>municipality. This is particularly in the Toolern Metropolitan Activity Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA notes that the issue of encroachment of sensitive uses within the separation distances of existing industry is considered at Clause 21.09-3 Industry and Clause 21.11- 2 Protection of Infrastructure. Council may wish to consider whether it is also relevant within this Clause due to the lack of triggers within the planning scheme for 'reverse buffers.' Clause 21.02-1.2 Key Issues - EPA recommends Council consider including encroachment as a key issue. This could also extend to incorporating a Strategy under Objective 1 at Clause 21.02-1.3 with words to the effect 'avoid encroachment of sensitive use into the separation distance of existing industry and infrastructure.' Clause 21.02-3 Non-Urban Land - EPA supports the intent of protecting and conserving the environmental values of land within the municipality and the objectives and strategies seeking to avoid land use conflicts. At Clause 21.02-3.2 Key Issues - EPA suggests the key issues could include 'protecting and maintaining separation distances between existing industry and infrastructure to avoid future land use conflicts' as consistent with strategies 1.2 and 2.5, 2.10 and 2.13. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 21.09-3 Industry – Council will consider the addition of another strategy under Objective 3 clause 21.09-3.3 to 'direct development of sensitive uses away from industrial areas.' The matter of directing development of sensitive uses away from industrial areas is addressed at 21.11-2.3, Objective 1. Clause 21.11-2 Protection of Infrastructure Council will consider an additional Strategy under Objective 1 to the effect of: maintaining required separation distances. We note that Clause 52.10 of the Melton Planning Scheme addresses separation distances. <p>Clause 21.03 Environment and Landscape Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA supports the intent of this policy in protecting significant environments and landscape values. <p>Clause 21.09-3 Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overview recognises there is existing industry within the municipality that is likely to have an increasing role in industrial and commercial development over the next 20 years. This section identifies EPA licenced sites and extractive industries and the importance of protecting them from encroachment. EPA supports Strategy 1.3 under Clause 21.09-3.3 which requires adequate separation distances between industry and sensitive land use. EPA supports Objective 3 under clause 21.09-3.3 to minimise conflict between industrial and other uses and recommends an additional strategy be included to 'direct development of sensitive uses away from industrial areas.' <p>Clause 21.11-2 protection of Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA supports Objective 5 at Clause 21.11-1.3 to ensure new infrastructure does not adversely affect sensitive uses and landscape features. Council could also consider a strategy to ensure appropriate separation distances are maintained.
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. EPA 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clause 21.11-2 Protection of infrastructure Council will consider the inclusion of the Ravenhall Precinct, and specifically Melbourne Regional Landfill, being explicitly highlighted as a hub of state importance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council will consider the text from the State-wide plan. Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile – Council will consider the inclusion of additional text within the Municipal Profile around the state significant industrial and Ravenhall Precinct. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
<p>5 Sustainability Victoria (SV) & Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group (Metro Group)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SV notes that the <i>Municipal Strategic Statement Rewrite Background 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 of Infrastructure</i>, highlights the importance of Surbiton Park as integral to the development of Melton. While it is 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 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 Borai Quarry, Cleanaway Melbourne Regional Landfill Ravenhall) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The hub is located within Metropolitan Melbourne and close to sources of waste generation, has good transport networks, and supports compatible activities including quarrying. 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 SV also notes that under Section 21.09 <i>Economic Development</i>, the following strategies and implementations are described: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy 1.3: Support the preparation of Precinct Structure Plans for employment areas and the release of additional land for employment purposes. 21.09-1.4 <i>Implementation: Advocate for the preparation of Precinct Structure Plans for employment areas with the State Government and the Victorian Planning Authority.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 work in synergy with the precinct. 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". Council may also want to consider mentioning the hub, as it also has a buffer that should be protected. <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ensure that it is considered appropriately. 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. 	<p>6 Matt Evans Planning on behalf of Mobile Carriers Forum (MCF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the exhibited Clause 21.11 "Infrastructure", we find reference to Objective 5, which reads: "Objective 5 - To ensure that new communications infrastructure does not adversely impact upon sensitive uses and landscape features whilst also facilitating a world class communications network". <p>We consider that the current provisions of the SPPF (Clause 19.03-4), requirements in section 52.19 and the Victorian Code already adequately provide for an appropriate balance as envisaged in Objective 5.</p> <p>The MCF's comments on each Strategy are as follows: Strategy 5.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to "Strategy 5.1 Protect significant landscape features including volcanic cones from any adverse visual impact through careful design and siting of the facility" the MCF considers that this strategy provides little meaningful support to Clause 19. Neither Strategy 5.1, Councils' Background Issues Paper or Council's Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework provide any tangible guidance about how the siting and design of a Telecommunications Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the importance of significant landscapes within the City of Melton, Clause 21.11-1.3 seeks to highlight the importance of significant landscapes and for new telecommunications infrastructure to respond appropriately. 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 and 5.2 reasonable and appropriate in this context. 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.
---	---

<p>could contribute to improved protection of “significant landscape features 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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’. • 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 Practice. <p>Strategy 5.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 City of Melton Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework does not at all support the early provision of communications infrastructure in Precinct Structure Plans and new development. • 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 siting 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. • 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. 	<p>Reference Documents</p> <p>Clause 21.11-3 refers to a list of “Reference documents”, including:</p>
---	---

<p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "City of Melton Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework - Background Analysis Paper May 2017"; and, • "City of Melton Communications Infrastructure Policy Framework December 2017" <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>In summary, we consider that proposed Clause 21.11 of the Melton Planning Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Is not sufficiently linked to an objective or strategy in the MSS; • Will not help council make a decision; • Will not help any other person to understand whether a proposal is likely to be supported or not; and, is not clear. </p>	<p>7 Town Planning Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Currently the boundaries of the Regional Park as shown on the proposed Strategic Framework Plan are consistent with the West Growth Corridor Plan August 2012. • 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. • In relation to 21.03-4 in Implementation, Council could consider wording around: "working with DELWP to investigate the removal of land from the Environmental Significant Overlay, where no significant environmental factors are demonstrated." <p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • The Regional Park boundaries are to be considered by the Advisory Committee. The boundaries shown on Figure 2 are not consistent with 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 Regional Park (subject to review)." • Within "21.03 Environmental and Landscape Values", the Council nominates a number of objectives and strategies that seek to impose restrictions on private land. </p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Implementation 21.03-4, we requested that within "Further Strategic Work" that Council insert the following "Remove land from Environmental Significant Overlay, where no significant environmental factors are demonstrated." • We object to the inclusion of the "Melton Landscape – Significant Landscape Features Strategy May 2016" as a reference document within Clause 21.03, as it does not display an accurate position of the environmental values of the Kororoit Regional Park area, noted as a "Conservation Areas and Parklands" within that reference document. The document should be amended or removed. • Within Clause 21.04-2 Floodplains it notes that the land should seek to 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." • The two functions of protecting the community from flooding and 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council maintains the inclusion of the <i>Melton Landscape – Significant Landscape Features Strategy May 2016</i> as a reference document, this has also been recently tested through a Planning Panel process as part of Amendment C173 where the content and methodology was supported by the Panel. • At Clause 21.04-2 Floodplain Council will investigate the inclusion of the words "where possible and practical for the development" be added to the two strategies.
<p>8 Transport for Victoria (TFV)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport for Victoria supports the intent of the objectives at proposed Clause 21.10. • TFV encourages Council to continue to closely engage with TVV to support specific strategies proposed in Clause 21.10. We particularly support Strategy 1.2 relating to development of transit oriented development at existing and future stations. We support Council working with TVV 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. • However, the staging of development often hinders quality outcomes, 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, no changes requested.