

Appendix 2

**Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre Urban Design Framework
Submission Summary and Council Response**

November 2019

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
1	22 July 2019	1.1	Registered Aboriginal places are located with the area affected by the UDF, not just areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage sensitivity. These places, and any other Aboriginal cultural heritage which has yet to be identified, are protected under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006 and will have to be managed in accordance with the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006. This should be explicitly acknowledged in the report.	<p>Change recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify Guideline 13 from the Kororoit PSP to provide improved clarity for landowners that they need to respond to the presence of areas with Aboriginal cultural heritage values: <p><i>Proponents undertaking development of land identified on the Victorian Aboriginal Heritage Register, and/or with Aboriginal cultural heritage values, should liaise with the designated Registered Aboriginal Party (or Aboriginal Victoria and Traditional Owner Groups in its absence) to ascertain whether heritage interpretation is appropriate in these identified locations, and how the heritage site(s) should be incorporated into the design of the subdivision.</i></p>	<p>Insert a new guideline within the Land Use Guideline Section at 2.5.8:</p> <p><i>Proponents undertaking development of land identified on the Victorian Aboriginal Heritage Register, and/or with Aboriginal cultural heritage values, should liaise with the designated Registered Aboriginal Party (or Aboriginal Victoria and Traditional Owner Groups in its absence) to ascertain whether heritage interpretation is appropriate in these identified locations, and how the heritage site(s) should be incorporated into the design of the subdivision.</i></p>
		1.2	The Wurundjeri are now officially known as Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation.	<p>No change recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Wurundjeri are not specifically referenced in the UDF document. It is our understanding that there is no Registered Aboriginal Party for the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre area or the Cobblebank Employment and Mixed Use area. 	No change recommended

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
2	8 August 2019	2.1	With the future planned town centre in terms of the retail, is there potential with the supermarket and speciality shops that in the future there will be cafes, restaurants and cinemas? Also it will be great in future if Aldi, Woolworths got on board too. It's a great location.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The town centre can support 70,000sqm of retail which could accommodate three supermarkets, two discount department stores and a series of mini major shops and speciality shops as well as 10,000sqm of restricted retail. The shops will be built by developers and private businesses. The full development of the centre will be achieved over a long period of time (approximately 30-40 years). 	No change recommended
		2.2	It be great to have a health food store for Melton. As there are no health stores close by. It be great if Go Vita, Healthy Life, or some sort of health store be close by. As there isn't any close. As I do have a number of food intolerances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shops will be built by developers and private businesses – it is unknown at this time which shops will be developed in the town centre. It is likewise unknown who the tenants of the shops will be. 	No change recommended
		2.3	Will the end of Ferris Road, closer to Bridge Road, become an asphalt road in a few years' time? At the current moment it's a gravel road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lend Lease, as part of the development of Atherstone, will be urbanising the section of Ferris Road south of Bridge Road to its current end. Urbanisation of the road includes sealing the road with asphalt, construction of kerb and channel drainage, and the installation of public lighting etc. Works have commenced on site and will be delivered this financial year. 	No change recommended
		2.4	I like the way Caroline Springs have setup the streets and tree lined trees in the streets amongst the shops, cafes, and restaurants. Also like the way Watergardens is setup with the shopping centre plaza is near the train station, shops, cafes, restaurants etc. It would be great if the new project of Cobblebank Town Centre is similar to Caroline Springs and Watergardens.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre (CMAC) will be similar to Watergardens and Caroline Springs town centres, and will eventually be larger and provide a wider range of uses. The road cross-sections require the planting of trees along the roads. The CMAC could take 30-40 years to evolve and fully develop. CMAC is planned to be the largest centre in the municipality and within 	No change recommended

		<p>the wider region. It will accommodate 70,000sqm of retail as well as a wide range of uses such as residential, office, civic, medical, justice, tertiary education and recreation uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Cobblebank Train Station will be located in the centre of CMAAC and include a bus interchange. The station is due to be completed by the State Government by the end of 2019. 		No change recommended
2.5	<p>In terms of developing more tennis courts for Cobblebank. It be great to have a Tennis Club developed for Cobblebank if there was an opportunity to do so. It be great to have competitive tennis, tennis coaching. Either indoor or outdoor. It would be a great way to meet new people in the area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eight future tennis courts are planned for the Bridge Road Recreation Reserve. In addition future active recreation reserves are planned within the suburbs of Weir Views and Thornhill Park that will also feature tennis courts. Currently the tennis club servicing the Cobblebank / Strathulloch area is the Melton South Tennis Club at the Melton South Recreation Reserve (19-23 Northcott Street, Melton South). To get in touch with the club, please visit the club's website below: http://www.meltonsouthtennis.com.au/ 		No change recommended
2.6	<p>It be good to have a feature for the Town Centre. Either a fountain, art display or lake. It be good to have a designed sign to know you are in Cobblebank.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These attributes will be considered at different points during the evolution of the town centre. There will be urban plazas, local parks, an active recreation facility, and civic facilities where Council has opportunities in the future to provide public art. Developers will also have opportunities to provide public art on their land. 		No change recommended

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
3	3 September 2019	3.1	The submitter has been involved in the UDF workshops and has provided advice on drainage servicing requirements for the UDF areas. This information included land take requirements for future drainage infrastructure for the purpose of flood protection, conveyance and storm –water quality treatment for the proposed urbanisation of these areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter has not requested any changes to the drainage infrastructure shown in the UDF • As the Drainage Service Schemes that affect the UDF area have not been finalised a note will remain on the plans that the drainage reserves as shown in Figure 10 are in draft form only and are subject to the water authority. 	No change recommended
		3.2	The submitter notes the conceptual nature of the content of both documents and can confirm that both UDFs appropriately cater for the future drainage infrastructure requirements of the corresponding Development Services Schemes through the proposed urban structure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See response to item 3.1 above. 	No change recommended

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
4	3 September 2019	4.1	The submitter supports the CMAC UDF vision and key urban design principles	Noted.	No change recommended
		4.2	Extensive number of guidelines and requirements raises concerns regarding the plans ability to adapt to the evolving market and project investment needs and as such we encourage Council to consider a simplified version of the CMAC UDF that does not to predict every potential development scenario.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Toolern PSP includes a large number of statutory requirements that must be met in the preparation of the UDF, which has resulted in the UDF being larger than most typical UDFs. Normally UDFs have less words, however as the UDF covers a Metropolitan Activity Centre this UDF covers more ground than other UDFs. Council policies have informed the UDF requirements and guidelines such as Council's Industrial Design Guidelines. 	No change recommended
		4.3	<p>Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Table 1, to remove 'supermarkets' and 'department stores' from the North East and South West Precincts Remove Figure 9 and amend Figure 7 to delete the cross reference to Figure 9. Concerns regarding the inclusion of department stores and supermarkets within the North East Precinct and a supermarket within the South West precinct as the broad distribution of supermarkets runs the risk of significantly diluting the 'core retail' role that the South East precinct will play in delivering, in the medium to long term, a fully integrated retail mixed use outcome. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CMAC is identified as a Metropolitan Activity Centre and therefore a regional centre through Plan Melbourne. The Metropolitan Activity Centre is proposed to be a true retail destination. The retail offer should include a variety of supermarkets such as speciality supermarkets (such as Asian grocers), and retail offer that does not normally exist within an enclosed shopping centre. With 70,000 sqm of retail planned for within the centre, there is enough space to spread around the three identified precincts. With each precinct catering for different needs. Council prefers to continue to show retail located in the north-east, south-east, and south-west precincts. This will enable a variety of retail offering to be provided through the precinct to meet local and regional shopping needs. A supermarket has been approved in the south-west precinct in a neighbourhood 	On Figure 6 change the retail area shown north of the active open space to a new category retail / commercial / office with residential / commercial above.

	<p>activity centre in the Atherstone Estate, which will meet the local shopping needs of residents in Atherstone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Figure 6 change the retail area shown north of the active open space to a new category retail / commercial / office, with residential / commercial above. See comments to item 4.4 for commentary on Figure 9. 			
<p>4.4</p>	<p>Framework Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter requests that the 'Residential/Commercial above ground floor uses' hatched areas' in figures 6 and 7 are removed from the UDF. The submitter is concerned that the UDF's Framework Plan suggests their site is designated 'Retail and Residential/Commercial above ground floor uses' over their entire area. 	<p>The plan is flexible and allows the construction of multi-storey buildings that contain a variety of uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Figure 9, change the vertical land use figure for the retail core (area 7C in Figure 7) to state commercial / retail at the second floor, and residential / commercial at the upper levels to illustrate greater flexibility regarding the development of the retail core. 	<p>In Figure 9, change the vertical land use figure for the retail core (area 7C in Figure 7) to state commercial / retail at the second floor, and residential / commercial at the upper levels.</p>	
<p>4.5</p>	<p>Urban Plaza</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 6 – <i>CMAC Framework Plan</i> and Figure 15 – <i>Public Realm and Landscape Plan</i> and all subsequent base maps to remove the Urban Plaza – 'Retail and Dining Forecourt' from the subject land. The submitter does not support the location and size of the 'urban plaza' on their site. The submitter believes the designated 0.32ha is excessive and lacks the fine grain human scale that is otherwise being sought in the CMAC. 	<p>The Tooleen DCP identifies 0.40 hectares of major activity centre public space to the subject site in the Land Use Budget. The open space will be acquired by Council through the DCP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UDF currently allocates 0.32 hectares of this land to the urban plaza adjacent the bus interchange, and 0.08 hectares to the town square adjacent the health precinct. It is proposed that the name of the plaza adjacent the bus interchange be changed from <i>Urban Plaza - Retail and Dining Forecourt</i> to <i>Urban Plaza – 'Bus Interchange'</i>. The plaza in its current location and configuration meets the proposed place making function of the plaza, which is to create direct view lines and connections from the retail core to the bus interchange. This 	<p>On Figure 15 and section 2.6.3 change the name of the plaza adjacent the bus interchange from <i>Urban Plaza - Retail and Dining Forecourt</i> to <i>Urban Plaza – 'Bus Interchange'</i>.</p> <p>At section 2.5.7 add a new requirement after R15: <i>A 24 hour, open to the air, pedestrian route must be provided between the bus interchange plaza and the health precinct.</i></p>	

	<p>will form part of an important connection between the bus interchange and the health precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pedestrian link between the southern edge of the bus interchange plaza and the health precinct should be open 24 hours a day to provide a high amenity pedestrian route. This should be reflected in a Requirement at section 2.5.7 in the UDF. 			<p>Insert a new Guideline after G2: <i>Specific civic uses will be encouraged as part of the retail core. They should be embedded in the retail development and could be located on upper levels.</i></p>	<p>There is adequate civic facility land located on the west side of Ferris Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dedicated land for an additional civic facility land is required within the retail core of the activity centre. <p>Recommend that a guideline be prepared which states: <i>Specific civic uses will be encouraged as part of the retail core. They should be embedded in the retail development and could be located on upper levels.</i></p>	<p>Civic Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 6 – <i>CMAC Framework Plan</i> and all subsequent base maps to remove the Civic Facilities from the subject land. The UDF does not provide an explanation as to the size, role and function of this space. Given the extensive civic facilities that have been designated on the western side of Ferris Road, the submitter does not believe that additional land will be required. The Toolern PSP does not designate land for a civic facility and the Toolern DCP does not designate funding for a smaller civic facility but rather a larger parcel for a library, which council has stated they no longer require. 	<p>4.6</p>	<p>Change references to the Ferris Road and East Road overpasses to <i>Grade Separation, subject to future investigation.</i></p> <p>Add a note to Figures 20 and 22: <i>Grade separation is proposed. An overpass is shown for illustration purposes only. The cross-</i></p>	<p>Change references to the two road overpasses on Ferris Road and East Road to ‘Grade Separation, subject to future investigation’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The manner of the grade separation will need to be resolved by the State Government when the Ferris Road level crossing is removed, and when East Road is constructed. 	<p>Overpass Batters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 6 – <i>CMAC Framework Plan</i> and all subsequent base maps to remove the Overpass Batters. Amend Section 2.6.8 to remove any reference to landscaped batters and 	<p>4.7</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	---	------------	---	--	--	------------

<p>update the text to contemplate an underpass option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A landscape batter outcome is unacceptable in what is to become a highly urbanised environment. During past planning processes it was understood further consideration of the options would be required as there became a greater understanding of the design requirements and cost implications, particularly with the construction of the railway station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that Figures 20 and 22 add the following note - <i>Grade separation is proposed. An overpass is shown for illustration purposes only. The cross-section is subject to further detailed engineering design.</i> It is recommended that the grade separation diamonds are retained as it is still unknown what form the grade separation will take, and it may be necessary to construct road overpasses with landscape batters. The removal of the diamond may therefore prejudice the removal of the at-grade level crossing. 	<p>section is subject to further detailed engineering design.</p>
<p>Commercial/Office</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 6 – <i>CMAC Framework Plan</i> and all subsequent base maps to remove the Commercial / Office from the subject land. The current permit is likely to occupy the site for a number of years before further retail development occurs on the east side of Coach Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UDF sets a long term vision for the development of the Metropolitan Activity Centre. As such it is appropriate to show the preferred development of land for a long period. Extensive land is required in the CMAC area for office and commercial use which are uses that you would expect to find in a Metropolitan Activity Centre. This can include uses such as banks, medical centres, real estate agents, travel agents, and general office space (such as for accountants). 	<p>No change recommended</p>
<p>Retail and Residential/Commercial above ground floor uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 6 – <i>CMAC Framework Plan</i> and all subsequent base maps to remove the Retail and Residential / Commercial above ground floor uses from the land west of Ferris Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comments to items 4.3 and 4.4, which address these matters. 	<p>No change recommended</p>
<p>Movement and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the designation of Mintaro Street as a 'key pedestrian route' on Figure 12. Remove the designation of Mintaro Street as an 'Urban Core Street'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mintaro Street has been approved in the live planning permit with a road cross-section of 16m (a service road). Figures 13, 14 and 18 are to be updated to show Mintaro Road (shown as an urban core street south of Hollingsworth Drive) as a 16m cross-section (Local Access Street B). 	<p>Figures 13, 14 and 18 are to be updated to show Mintaro Road (shown as an urban core street south of Hollingsworth Drive) as a 16m cross-section (Local Access Street B).</p>

<p>In Figure 12 delete the key pedestrian route from Mintaro Street.</p>	<p>cross-section (Local Access Street B cross-section).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the key pedestrian route from Mintaro Street on Figure 12. Coach Street is shown as a 22m wide road reserve as it will be the main pedestrian route from the train station through the retail core to the health and justice precinct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the extent of Urban Core Street A throughout the centre to avoid unnecessary spatial barriers across urban streets. Given the urbanized environment that is set by the vision of the CMAC the submitters believe that the width of Coach, Toolern and Mintaro streets is excessive. <p>Street Cross Sections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Figure 20 – <i>Arterial Overpass Section (25.4m)</i> to 20 metres. 	<p>4.11</p>
<p>No change recommended</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response to item 4.7 earlier. 		

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
5	3 September 2019	5.1	<p>Land Use Allocation</p> <p>The Draft CMAC UDF (2019) reallocates a greater proportion of health, tertiary and justice land uses on the subject sites which have not specifically been identified within the Toolern PSP and the Toolern DCP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health, tertiary education and justice facilities are state government infrastructure and therefore are not eligible for funding through the Development Contributions Plan (DCP). Land purchase for health, tertiary education and justice facilities can be funded through GAIC or via the State Government land acquisition processes. 	No change recommended
		5.2	<p>Land use allocation for 'Community' and 'Unencumbered Land for Recreation' is to accord with Table 2 of the Toolern PSP and the Toolern DCP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hospital has been relocated to this site – see response to item 5.6 below for commentary on why the hospital has been located on this site. 	No change recommended
		5.3	<p>Only land uses with a committed funding source and timeframe (i.e. GAIC, Development Contributions Plan) should be specifically sited within the Precinct Structure Plan and subsequently the CMAC UDF (2019).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Government through <i>Plan Melbourne</i> has identified Cobblebank as a Metropolitan Activity Centre. <i>Plan Melbourne</i> identifies Metropolitan Activity Centres will play a major service delivery role, including government, health, justice and education services, as well as retail and commercial opportunities. Medical facilities and justice facilities are identified within the Major Activity Centre (now the Metropolitan Activity Centre) within the Toolern PSP. Both medical and justice facilities are important state infrastructure items that need further work in regards to timing, funding and design due to the larger scale and costs associated. Council notes that GAIC funds are not pre-emptively allocated to projects. 	No change recommended
		5.4	<p>Funding sources and delivery timeframes should be clearly confirmed in the Toolern PSP and Toolern DCP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Government are currently preparing a business case for the hospital to be located in the City of Melton. The business case will provide the following information – the exact location, size and 	No change recommended

	<p>range of services the new Melton Hospital will provide, and how it will link to other public hospitals in the Western Region</p>	<p>The Toolern PSP / DCP Review should incorporate the outcomes of the hospital business case.</p> <p>The land required for health facilities should be added to Table 2 in the Toolern PSP / DCP.</p>	
<p>5.5</p>	<p>If required, a Planning Scheme Amendment should be undertaken to facilitate any changes to Table 2 of the Toolern PSP and the Toolern DCP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Toolern PSP and DCP are currently being reviewed. It is anticipated that the PSP review in regards to health facilities will be updated to reflect the outcomes of the business case and State government direction. 	
<p>5.6</p>	<p>Inclusion of health land warrants further consideration based on the emerging business case for the Melton Hospital. Should the future Melton Hospital will be delivered within the CMAC it will have significant implications on future urban structure outlined in the Toolern PSP and the Land Use Plan set out in draft CMAC UDF (2019). Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater land area for the hospital would be required. Road hierarchy to be reviewed to accommodate increased traffic demand, loading and servicing requirements, emergency vehicle access. Allied and co-located private health services could potentially be incorporated within the precinct. There is an emerging trend for complementary land uses to be located within, and immediately around, hospitals including retail, food and beverage, beauty and wellbeing, and leisure. Co-location of residential opportunities within, and immediately surrounding, the hospital precinct is also strongly supported in strategic planning policy (Plan Melbourne 2017-2050). This could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council can confirm that the 'health facilities' identified within the draft CMAC UDF is Council's preferred hospital site. Council have also consulted with the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Justice and Emergency Services throughout the UDF process who have provided information as to indicative size requirements of best practice urban hospitals and justice facilities etc. The site is the most appropriate because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not affected by industrial buffers from surrounding existing industries as identified by the GHD Toolern Buffer Assessment, October 2018. Much of the UDF area north of the railway line and the 2012 UDF health precinct site is within industrial buffers. It will be well accessed by two connector roads and an arterial road and two grade separations over the rail line. It is in a walkable catchment to the railway station and bus interchange (due to open end of 2019) It is co-located with the justice precinct which share correlations in regards to community use. Co-location of health and justice facilities was suggested by health 	<p>Add text to 2.4.8 to make clear that the health precinct is Council's preferred site for a public hospital and link it to Council's Build Melton Hospital Campaign. Also add text here about complementary and ancillary uses permitted on the sites such as aged care services, serviced apartments, and student accommodation.</p> <p>Add text to the UDF that addresses how the land shown as the health facility can be developed if the business case does not identify this site.</p>

<p>include medium density dwellings, hotel accommodation, short-term housing, build-to-rent.</p>	<p>and justice departments early on in the consultation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It is located next to a significant open space precinct, directly south of the UDF area. Open space is currently an important consideration for new health precincts and future hospitals in Victoria and Australia in regards to co-location and health benefits. o It located on one land holding as opposed to fragmented ownership making it an easier process in regards to potential transfer of land for a health precinct • 10ha has been identified for the health precinct as it co-locates the public hospital with a private hospital and ancillary tertiary education facility which is current best practice for hospital delivery in Victoria. • The location, size and funding of the hospital will be determined by the State government business case. • In regards to the justice precinct, Court Services Victoria (now a part of the Department of Justice which now incorporates justice, courts and emergency services) have identified a future Level 3 court within Melton (Strategic Asset Plan 2016-2031). The Justice precinct within the UDF also provides opportunities to co-locate with emergency services required for the community. • The UDF is flexible enough that if the business case identifies an alternative site, the submitter can still apply for a planning permit and provide Council with an alternative plan for the site based on the Commercial 1 Zone and the intent of Plan Melbourne's metropolitan activity centres. • Need to add text to Section 2.4.8 about complementary and ancillary uses permitted on the sites such as aged care services,

			<p>serviced apartments, and student accommodation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UDF should provide guidance on how the land shown as the health facility can be developed if the business case does not identify this site as the State Government's preferred site for the hospital. 	
5.7	<p>Allocation of land for the Melton Hospital as part within the CMAC UDF is premature and requires further consideration following finalisation of the Melton Hospital Business Case.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As mentioned in item 5.6, in the event that the business case is radically different from what is shown in the UDF, the UDF can be amended at that time. 	No change recommended	
5.8	<p>While it is recognised that 'satellite' tertiary education sites may be established to conjunction with the future Melton Hospital, there is no commitment to this outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tertiary education should be identified as a potential opportunity land use within the Cobblebank Urban Design Framework without being specifically designated to a particular site. Land designated in the draft CMAC UDF (2019) as 'Tertiary Education' should default back to mixed use or commercial offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See commentary to item 5.6 on why a tertiary education site has been identified adjoining the hospital. As mentioned in item 5.7 in the event that the business case is radically different from what is shown in the UDF, the UDF can be amended at that time. 	No change recommended	
5.9	<p>Residential opportunities within the 'mixed-use' precinct should be re-instated. The 'Commercial/Office' land use is to be re-instated as a 'Mixed-use' incorporating residential as a potential land use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The UDF identifies Council's preferred land uses, and built form outcomes. Commercial / office uses are proposed around the health and justice precinct. Council prefers this land use as these sites are well located for businesses that like to be co-located with health and justice facilities such as medical specialists, pathology services, and legal firms. As identified in the submission residential land uses are permitted in the zone above ground level, however it is not Council's 	<p>On Figure 6 change the commercial / office areas east of East Road (south of the railway line), and south of Bridge Road to a new category retail / commercial / office with residential / commercial above.</p>	

	<p>preference to locate this use in this location as there is adequate supply of residential land elsewhere in the Toolern PSP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On Figure 6 change the retail area shown north of the active open space to a new category retail / commercial / office, with residential / commercial above to the sites east of East Road (south of the railway line) and south of Bridge Road. This would encourage the development of uses such as student accommodation, residential hotels, serviced apartments, and apartments. 			
<p>No change recommended</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Toolern PSP includes a large number of statutory requirements that must be met in the preparation of the UDF, which has resulted in the UDF being larger than most typical UDFs. Normally UDFs have less text, however as the UDF covers a major employment area next to a Metropolitan Activity Centre this UDF covers more ground than other UDFs. Council policies have informed the UDF requirements and guidelines such as Council's Industrial Design Guidelines. 	<p>Overall the draft CMAC UDF (2019) is overly prescriptive and is too detailed.</p>	<p>5.10</p>	

Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
6	3 September 2019	6.1	<p>The CMAC is overly prescriptive. Built form design guidelines within Section 2.7 relating to setbacks, interface treatments and more general urban design issues are overly prescriptive.</p>	<p><u>Prescriptive Nature of UDF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Toolern PSP includes a large number of statutory requirements that must be met in the preparation of the UDF, which has resulted in the UDF being larger than most typical UDFs. Normally UDFs have less text, however as the UDF covers a Metropolitan Activity Centre this UDF covers more ground than other UDFs. Council policies have informed the UDF requirements and guidelines such as Council's Industrial Design Guidelines. <p><u>Building Height and Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed in response to item 6.4 <p><u>Interfaces</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interface treatments have been used for the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to avoid unsightly development in the MAC adjacent to high amenity areas such as public open space; and to manage noise where development abuts the rail corridor (as identified in the ARUP report). Interface requirements and guidelines have been used to manage high quality interfaces to ensure negative amenity outcomes are avoided, and to ensure that the UDF facilitates safe and accessible environments for the community to enjoy. <p><u>Urban Structure – Local Park and Road Layout</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of local access streets is generally to the discretion of developers. This is reflected in R19 which states that <i>the road network must be designed generally in accordance with Figure 13.</i> 	<p>Add the following note under Figure 13: <i>The local access street network can be modified to accommodate built form outcomes provided that the revised road network provides suitable quality design outcomes to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.</i></p> <p>Make the following changes to the road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Coltan Avenue to the Civic Centre and take it down to intersect with Stadium Drive. Reorient the local park north of the mixed use site from north-south to east-west so it better connects to the dry stone wall linear park. Locate a local access street on the north side of the reoriented local park. Create an additional local access street between Coltan Avenue and the railway line.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended that a note be placed under Figure 13 stating that the local access street network can be modified subject to Council discretion to accommodate built form outcomes provided that the revised road network provides suitable quality design outcomes to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. It is recommended that the following changes be made to the road network: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Coltan Avenue to the Civic Centre and take it down to intersect with Stadium Drive. Reorient the local park north of the mixed use site from north-south to east-west. Locate a local access street on the north side of the reoriented local park. Create an additional local access street between Coltan Avenue and the railway line. 		
<p>6.2</p>	<p><u>Urban Structure - Road Layout</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the scale and complexity of the UDF, local roads have been included to both inform preferred urban design outcomes and to establish feasible developable scenarios. Rockbank UDF showed the location of possible local access roads. It is noted that it was easier to make assumptions about the ultimate design layout as Rockbank is an Activity Centre and is not a Metropolitan Activity Centre. 	<p>There is significant difference in detail between the draft Rockbank UDF which employs a more broad and flexible arrangement to the proposed urban structure. Local roads should not be shown in a UDF.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
<p>6.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As requirements must be met – the word ‘must’ is used in requirements. As discretion is used when using a guideline – the word ‘should’ is used in guidelines. Council has reviewed whether an outcome should be dealt with as a requirement or a guideline, and is satisfied that the 	<p>The requirements and guidelines specify ‘must’ rather than a more appropriate ‘should.’ This creates mandatory planning policies and may inhibit site responsive designs and innovative architectural responses.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>

<p>6.4</p>	<p>In relation to Section 2.7 Built form, Massing, interfaces, Setbacks and Density in the UDF, a number of built form and massing statements and requirements are of significant concern, as per the following:</p> <p><u>Building Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum 2 storey prescriptive height limit at 2.7.1 has the ability to prohibit market driven residential built forms of single storey. <p><u>Building Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please remove prescriptive requirements regarding setbacks at upper floors. Setbacks should be included in the UDF as recommendations only. <p><u>Landscape Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A 3m landscaped street setback for the mixed use site is identified, which is incongruous with a commercial setting, typically a 0m setback to allow activation with the streetscape is encouraged. <p><u>Mixed Use Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mixed use site within the South West Precinct is identified as having three different interface treatments specified in 2.7.3 as well as a 3m street setback specified in 2.7.6. There needs to be flexibility in the built form design response which these interfaces would prevent. 	<p>requirements and guidelines are appropriate to deliver the UDF vision.</p> <p><u>Building Height</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter's request to allow single storey buildings in the Metropolitan Activity Centre is not supported. R70 requires a minimum building height of 2 storeys at the street frontage which reflects the higher density and more urban character expected within a Metropolitan Activity Centre (MAC). A similar outcome has been undertaken around the Caroline Springs Town Centre (which is a lower order activity centre). <p><u>Building Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of setbacks is to provide a consistency in scale of street wall arrangements, break up building mass, introduce a sense of façade modulation and to avoid the appearance of a 'wall of towers' given the limited planning controls in the Commercial 1 Zone. The upper level setback in R70 states <i>building height must be a minimum of two storeys at the street frontage in the Centre. Additional storeys must be set back 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise noted.</i> It is recommended that this be modified to read <i>'building height must be a minimum of two storeys at the street frontage in the Centre.'</i> Additional storeys must be set back 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise noted. <u>Upper levels above the third floor must be setback 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise noted.</u> 	<p>Change R70 to read <i>building height must be a minimum of two storeys at the street frontage in the Centre. Additional storeys must be set back 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise noted. Upper levels above the third floor must be setback 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise negotiated during the permit process.</i></p> <p>On Figure 17 change the mixed use site interface to Hollingsworth Drive from 3m land scape setback to 0m setback.</p> <p>On Figure 16 delete the 'urban core interface' from the Hollingsworth Drive frontage of the mixed use precinct, and from the site located directly west over Hollingsworth Drive.</p>
------------	---	--	--

			<p><u>Landscape Setbacks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape setbacks are shown on Figure 17. Landscape strips are proposed along Hollingsworth Drive, Stadium Drive and the active open space reserve. Council support zero setback along the Hollingsworth Drive frontage of the mixed use site given that it is on the south side of Hollingsworth. This would be consistent with setbacks proposed on the NAC site to the south-west. Setbacks to Stadium Drive and Active Open Space should remain at 3m to provide a degree of transition with adjoining interfaces. <p><u>Mixed Use Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council agrees that the built form interfaces shown on Figure 16 for the mixed use site could be rationalised. Recommend the following change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the urban core interface for the mixed use site, and the site located directly to the west over Hollingsworth Drive See comments to items 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8 below 		
6.5	<p>The CMAC UDF does not accord with previous as built designs. Proposed road cross sections and connections in the UDF are inconsistent with existing roads and do not connect to the existing road network already constructed and/or approved.</p>				No changes recommended
6.6	<p>Local Access Street C Cross Section at Figure 29 page 74 (21.8m):</p> <p>The road along the rail line is currently allowed for in approved plans to the west of the UDF area as a 14.5m local access street with no allowance for a shared path. The shared path associated with the connector road has been relocated to Coltan Avenue. No vegetation buffer to the railway line has</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Access Street C section for Jester Drive does not match the cross-section of the rail interface roads to the west. It is recommended that the cross-section in Figure 29 be modified to match the cross-section approved further west of the UDF area. 			Modify the cross-section in Figure 29 to match the approved cross-section further west of the UDF area.

	<p>On figure 11 show Coltan Avenue as a bus capable road.</p> <p>On figure 13 show a roundabout at the intersection of Coltan Avenue and Hollingsworth Drive.</p> <p>On figures 13 and 14 show Coltan Avenue as Connector Road.</p>			<p>On figure 11 show Coltan Avenue as a bus capable road.</p> <p>On figure 13 show a roundabout at the intersection of Coltan Avenue and Hollingsworth Drive.</p> <p>On figures 13 and 14 show Coltan Avenue as Connector Road.</p>
<p>6.7</p>	<p>been required and constructed along this road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coltan Avenue should be referred to in Figure 13 page 31 as connector road to actually reflect how it has been constructed. Coltan Avenue carries a shared pedestrian path network and should accommodate a bus route in the future and be the key east-west movement path in the north of the precinct. Figure 11 on page 25 of the UDF should be amended to show Coltan Avenue as a bus capable route. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to change Coltan Avenue to a Connector Road. Council notes that the current detailed engineering plans for the roundabout shows the northern leg consistent with an access street (16m road reserve). Agree to update Figure 11 to show Coltan Avenue as a bus capable road Agree to show a roundabout at the intersection of Coltan Avenue and Hollingsworth Drive Agree to update Figures 13 and 14 to show Coltan Avenue as a Connector Road (Type A) 	<p>Figure 12 to be modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete shared path along the south side of the railway line (Jester Drive) in the south west precinct. Show a shared path along Coltan Avenue Show a shared path along the east-west local access street south of Coltan Avenue (Stonehenge Drive) Show shared paths that connect the Coltan Avenue and Stonehenge Drive shared paths to the shared path along the railway line Show the dry stone wall linear park as a key pedestrian route 	<p>Modified cross-section required for the east-west local access road shown to the south of Coltan Avenue (Stonehenge Drive) to show a shared path on the northern side.</p>
<p>6.8</p>	<p>The Pedestrian and Cyclist Network plan (Figure 12 page 29):</p> <p>The proposed shared path along the rail corridor does not connect to Melton, existing streets (i.e. Jester Drive) or crossing at Toolern Creek.</p> <p>There is a lost opportunity to capture the existing shared path alignment coming from the west along the dry stone wall that will deliver pedestrians to the town centre and Hollingsworth Drive.</p>	<p>Figure 12 to be modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete shared path along the south side of the railway line (Jester Drive) in the south west precinct. Show a shared path along Coltan Avenue Show a shared path along the east-west local access street south of Coltan Avenue (Stonehenge Drive) Show shared paths that connect the Coltan Avenue and Stonehenge Drive shared paths to the shared path along the railway line Show the dry stone wall linear park as a key pedestrian route Modified cross-section required for the east-west local access road shown to the south of Coltan Avenue (Stonehenge Drive) to show a shared path on the northern side. 	<p>Figure 12 to be modified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete shared path along Jester Drive Show a shared path along Coltan Avenue Show a shared path along Stonehenge Drive Shared paths that connect the Coltan Avenue and Stonehenge Drive shared paths to the shared path along the railway line Show the dry stone wall linear park as a key pedestrian route 	<p>Modified cross-section required for the east-west local access road shown to the south of Coltan Avenue (Stonehenge Drive) to show a shared path on the northern side.</p>
<p>6.9</p>	<p>The Public Realm and Landscape plan (Figure 15 page 39):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A centralised east-west oriented open space is better located adjacent Hollingsworth Drive as an extension of the dry stone wall reserve. This will still have links to the civic facilities, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The realignment and relocation of the local park so it connects to the dry stone wall linear park is supported. In Figure 15, section 2.6.4 and 2.6.6 rename open space 8 'heritage linear reserve' to 'dry stone wall reserve' 	<p>Change the location and orientation of open space 6 in Figure 15 to better connect it to the dry stone wall linear reserve, whilst ensuring that the minimum dimension is 50 metres.</p>	

<p>In Figure 15, section 2.6.4 and 2.6.6 rename the heritage linear reserve to a dry stone wall reserve.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
<p>provide amenity and outlook for the mixed-use site to the south and form the logical primary east-west pedestrian and cycle movement route through the Precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter also notes that only the dry stone wall is the heritage element not the entire reserve itself. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See comments at item 6.6 regarding the proposed changes to the cross-section for Jester Drive Requirement 11 in the UDF includes guidance on the acoustic assessment and noise attenuation measures to be undertaken when proposing development in the railway noise amenity area shown in Figure 10.
<p>Section 2.4.10 Rail Noise Amenity Area (page 22):</p> <p>The submitter has concerns that Local Access Street C does not accord with previously approved and constructed interfaces further west along the rail corridor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Permit PA2018/6828 was granted 8 April 2019. The permit allowed the site to be developed with a neighbourhood shopping centre, medical services, a gymnasium, a swim school, a childcare centre and five townhouses. The Preferred Land Uses Matrix at 2.4.1 of the CMAC UDF shows section 1 uses within the applied Commercial 1 Zone. In regards to the Bridge Road LAC, a dwelling is not a Section 1 use and therefore is not included in the table.
<p>6.10</p>	<p>6.11</p>
<p>6.12</p>	<p>On Figure 6 change the retail area shown north of the active open space to a new category retail / commercial / office with residential / commercial above.</p>

	<p>development to meet market demand.</p> <p>Ferris Road Overpass:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferris Road will be the main visual entry into the MAC from the north and the visual impression of such large areas for batters must be carefully considered. The UDF should include further detail of how the Ferris Road overpass regarding design, land take, funding and delivery is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change references to the two road overpasses on Ferris Road and East Road to 'Grade Separation, subject to future investigation' The manner of the grade separation will need to be resolved by the State Government when the Ferris Road level crossing is removed, and when East Road is constructed. It is recommended that Figures 20 and 22 add the following note - <i>Grade separation is proposed. An overpass is shown for illustration purposes only. The cross-section is subject to further detailed engineering design.</i> It is recommended that the grade separation diamonds are retained as it is still unknown what form the grade separation will take, and it may be necessary to construct road overpasses with landscape batters. The removal of the diamond may therefore prejudice the removal of the at-grade level crossing 	<p>Change references to the Ferris Road and East Road overpasses to <i>Grade Separation, subject to future investigation.</i></p> <p>Add a note to Figures 20 and 22: <i>Grade separation is proposed. An overpass is shown for illustration purposes only. The cross-section is subject to further detailed engineering design.</i></p>
<p>6.13</p>			

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU					
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
7	4 October 2019	7.1	<p>It is noted that Cobblebank (Toolern) is identified within <i>Plan Melbourne</i> as a future <i>Metropolitan Activity Centre</i> (MAC), one of only nine centres designated as such throughout metropolitan Melbourne. As an emerging hub it is essential that high quality integrated public transport is prioritised to avoid the MAC becoming dominated by private vehicle movements and to facilitate well sequenced logical development patterns.</p>	Noted.	No change recommended
		7.2	<p>Implementation and Staging An indicative staging strategy should be included within the document as ‘<i>Staging is critical in the strategic development and planning of a town centre. This should consider the timing for the level crossing removals which will affect the movement of traffic from the north.</i>’.</p>	<p>This is addressed in Section 3.2 of the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre: <i>Any part of the proposed development within the UDF area could occur independently, although there are some key pieces of infrastructure such as the timely construction of arterial roads and rail overpasses that would make the development process smoother.</i></p> <p>It is noted that there is limited ability for Council to control sequencing as Council is not the owner of a majority of the land in the CEMU / CMAC area, and is not developing a majority of the land.</p>	No change recommended
		7.3	<p>Western Rail Plan The draft UDF documents should reference the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investments Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities.</p> <p>Review The draft UDF documents should include a trigger for review of the framework to respond to the infrastructure required for the introduction of metro rail service between Melbourne and Melton following completion of planning for this service upgrade.</p>	<p>In Section 2.5 in CMAC add a new paragraph at the end: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The project will include site investigation, planning and delivery of new electrified metropolitan rail lines, overhead electrification, signalling, and stabling areas to park and maintain metropolitan trains.</i></p> <p><u>Review</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insert a new paragraph at the end of Section 2.5 in CMAC: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The project will include site investigation, planning and delivery of new electrified metropolitan rail lines, overhead electrification, signalling,</i>

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
			<p>Station and Interchange Design</p> <p>The draft Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre UDF should have regard to the design of the Cobblebank Station, commuter car parking and bus interchange currently under construction.</p>
			<p>Station and Interchange Design</p> <p>Figures 6, 11, 12, 13 and 15 in CMAC have incorporated most of the design elements in the Ballarat Line Upgrade drawing BLU-LCS-AA-TLN-DRG-AGE-TLN-A0003. The UDF shows the station (see section 2.5.1), the commuter car parking, and the interchange that is under construction. We note that Figures 6 and 15 only show five bus bays and do not show the additional four bus bays to the east. It is recommended that Figures 6 and 15 in CMAC be amended to show an additional four bus bays to the east.</p> <p>It is assumed that the entry / exit to the east refers to the roundabout. The UDF proposes that Interchange Way will provide the eastern exit from the interchange. There is adequate room in the interchange to allow buses to turn around and exit through Coach Street if this is preferred.</p>
		7.4	<p>Design and layout of bus capable roads</p> <p>Bus access to Cobblebank Station should be insulated from general traffic.</p>
			<p>Section 4 in CMAC and CEMU – add an additional key change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of the Western Rail Plan by Rail Projects Victoria. <p>Station and Interchange Design</p> <p>Figures 6, 11, 12, 13 and 15 in CMAC have incorporated most of the design elements in the Ballarat Line Upgrade drawing BLU-LCS-AA-TLN-DRG-AGE-TLN-A0003. The UDF shows the station (see section 2.5.1), the commuter car parking, and the interchange that is under construction. We note that Figures 6 and 15 only show five bus bays and do not show the additional four bus bays to the east. It is recommended that Figures 6 and 15 in CMAC be amended to show an additional four bus bays to the east.</p> <p>It is assumed that the entry / exit to the east refers to the roundabout. The UDF proposes that Interchange Way will provide the eastern exit from the interchange. There is adequate room in the interchange to allow buses to turn around and exit through Coach Street if this is preferred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend that the following changes are made to Figures 11 and 12 in CMAC which show bus capable roads to improve bus circulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road linking Hollingsworth Drive to Interchange Way; Interchange Way; The loop road circuit located between University Street and the train station; and The east-west road connecting to CEMU east of East Street north of the railway line.
			<p>and stabling areas to park and maintain metropolitan trains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a new additional key change in Sections 4 in CMAC and CEMU: Completion of the Western Rail Plan by Rail Projects Victoria Amend figures 6 and 15 in CMAC to show an additional four bus bays to the east of the five bus bays shown.
			<p>Recommend that the following changes are made to Figures 11 and 12 in CMAC which show bus capable roads. Make the following roads bus capable to improve bus circulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road linking Hollingsworth Drive to Interchange Way; Interchange Way; The loop road circuit located between University Street and the train station; and

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU					
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The above changes focus bus routes around the perimeter of the main activity in the activity centre and place stops outside the train station, hospital, law courts, and the civic facilities. It is recommended that the loop road circuit located between University Street and the train station be shown as bus capable roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The east-west road connecting to CEMU east of East Street north of the railway line. Adapt the road cross-section for Interchange Way and the northern section of Coach Street. Create a new cross-section for the loop road circuit located between University Street and the train station to separate bicycles from buses.
		7.5	<p><u>Interchange Design</u></p> <p>Ensure the interchange design is consistent with the latest plan. The submitter does not object to the proposed road network layout as outlined in the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre Urban Design Framework, noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design does not accommodate a second / alternative entry into the interchange area, as access via East Road will be one way only. The retarding basin will need to be relocated as part of the works. The retarding basin provides a key drainage function for Cobblebank station and parking/bus areas. As the proposed road network impacts the retarding basin, it will need to be relocated and reassessed in terms of a wider drainage strategy for the area. As Cobblebank station and parking areas are nearing completion at this stage, there is no scope for amending the current works as part of the Ballarat Line Upgrade project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is recommended in item 7.4 above that amendments be made to the bus capable road to show the section of Coach Street between Hollingsworth Drive and Interchange Way as a bus capable road. The retarding basin is an interim solution will be removed in the instance that interchange way was extended to the east, or alternative drainage solutions come on line. As indicated in the response to item 7.4 the UDF has been designed taking into consideration the existing design of the station precinct that is currently being constructed. 	<p>Item 7.4 above that amendments be made to the bus capable road to show the section of Coach Street between Hollingsworth Drive and Interchange Way as a bus capable road.</p>
		7.6	<p><u>Access to the interchange</u></p> <p>The submitter understands that the rationale behind the insertion of a new road (Interchange Way) is to provide improved permeability for bus departures within the MAC and reduce the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As recommended in item 7.5 a bus capable perimeter route should be established around the central core in CMAC, providing convenient access to all major points of destination adjacent and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In CMAC insert a new cross-section for interchange Way, and the section of road linking Hollingsworth Drive

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAc and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
			<p>amount of bus traffic at the northern end of the pedestrian friendly Coach Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coach St is identified as an 'urban core street' (Figure 13). This is not a bus capable road (figure 11). Buses are therefore unable to access the bus interchange. Coach Street is also identified as being a shared vehicle and cycle environment (figure 12). Bus operators will not operate within shared environment spaces. The road space must be redesigned to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists are clearly separated from bus movements. Cars must not use the bus interchange area for pickups and drop offs. Specific kiss and ride spaces have been provided in the design of the car park. Conflicts arising from Requirement R16 can be avoided. The entry to the bus interchange, through to East Road, should be redesigned as a bus capable road, with pedestrian and cycling activities clearly separated within the road reserve. No details are provided in relation to the local access street located to the east of the bus interchange. Is it the intention of the UDF that this area be accessible to private vehicles? It appears that Interchange Way will only be one way only exiting onto East Road. If this is correct, then vehicles can only access this road space within interchange way, through the bus interchange. The submitter objects to any plans where private vehicle access relies upon the bus interchange.
			<p>within CMAc's central core. This would take in Interchange Way, and the section of road linking Hollingsworth Drive to Interchange Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coach Street is the centre's Main Street which is envisaged to be high amenity low speed local-street defined by generous landscaping, widened footpaths, and shared vehicle / cycle environment with strong pedestrian focus. It has been designed to provide a point of difference both in the centre's core road hierarchy and in the experience for shoppers, commuters and workers. Incorporating buses along this street would require significant redesign of the street's configuration which is felt would erode the principles underpinning the street's design and would result in a 'disconnect' of treatments and experience with adjoining 'urban core streets' such as Toolern Street to the east. It is recommended that a new cross-section be created for Interchange Way, and the section of road linking Hollingsworth Drive and Interchange Way, which shows the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buses being insulated from general traffic and bicycles; Bicycles and pedestrians being separated; and Whilst maintaining a continuation of landscaping treatments and strong pedestrian focus of urban core streets. Seek confirmation from the submitter that the roads can be used by service traffic during limited times of the day (such as garbage trucks). The continuation of Coach Street north of the railway line must maintain the 'urban core street' character to ensure a consistency with main section of Coach Street. Interchange Way should be modified in line with recommendations in item 7.5.
			<p>and Interchange Way, which shows the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buses being insulated from general traffic and bicycles; Bicycles and pedestrians being separated; and Whilst maintaining a continuation of landscaping treatments and strong pedestrian focus of urban core streets. <p>In Fig 11, Fig 13, and Fig 14 in CMAc show a 'bus only' route that runs between the commuter car park entrance to the west, and the full length of Interchange Way.</p>

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
		7.7	<p>Active Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alignment of the Strategic Cycling Corridor (SCC) within Cobblebank MAC has yet to be determined. Any future design must ensure that potential conflicts between cyclists and places of activity area are suitably avoided. No information is provided outlining how cyclists would cross the rail corridor, should active transport be delivered to the north and south of the rail corridor. The proposed Ferris Road (Arterial overpass) should maintain a separated cycling connection rather than becoming a dedicated on-road cycling lane at the overpass. It is noted that Ferris Road, south of Shogaki Drive, is proposed to be a secondary arterial (i.e. council arterial) and will be a 60km/hr road. However, as Ferris Road is identified as part of the Strategic Cycling Corridors, the preference is to maintain off road cycling paths. Is there a reason why there is both a shared path and on road cycling proposed at this location (Figure 14 of CEMU)? The preference would be to utilise this road space to form off road cycling lanes with separated pedestrian path. If this cannot be achieved, then the preference is for the on-road cycling lane to be 1.8m wide with 0.5m to 1.0m wide buffer from traffic lanes. The cross-section diagrams should be updated to reflect these requests. It is recommended that the section 2.5.7 be updated to include requirements and guidelines outlining how cycling infrastructure is to be achieved.
			<p>Council Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As identified in the submission the location of the Strategic Cycling Corridor is not yet defined, and therefore it is difficult to determine where cyclists and pedestrians should be separated. It is noted that the railway interface drawings (Fig. 26 in CMAC, and Fig. 27 in CEMU) provide landscape strips adjacent the rail line that is adequately dimensioned to allow off-road bicycle lanes and pedestrians to be separated. The redesign should consider whether the landscape areas between the railway line and the back of kerb should be redistributed to improve tree canopy cover. Section 2.5.3 states that pedestrians will be able to use the pedestrian overpass at the train station, and pedestrians and cyclists will use the shared-path overpasses on Ferris Road and East Road. Figure 19 shows a shared path on both sides of Ferris Road, whereas the overpass accidentally omits the shared path on the grade separation (shows pedestrians only). Modify Fig 20 in CMAC to show the pedestrian paths as shared paths. The Victorian Planning Authority requires secondary arterial roads to have on-road bicycle lanes. Council challenged this in the Mt Atkinson, Kororoit and Plumpton PSPs, and the Panel agreed with the VPA that on-road bicycle lanes should remain on secondary arterial roads. It is recommended that the bicycle lanes be widened from 1.7m to 2m (which is consistent with the cross-sections in Mt Atkinson PSP) in Fig 19 in CMAC and Fig 14 in CEMU. This widening needs to be achieved within the existing cross-section width. It is recommended that a requirement similar to R63 in the Kororoit PSP be included in Section 2.5.7 – Pedestrian and Cycle – Requirements:
			<p>Recommended Changes</p> <p>Make the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify Fig 26 in CMAC and Fig 27 in CEMU to replace the 3m wide shared path with a 3m wide dedicated bicycle path. In Fig 26 in CMAC a 1.5m wide pedestrian path is to be created within the landscape strip alongside the railway line. Modify Fig 20 in CMAC to show the 2.5m wide pedestrian paths as shared paths. Modify Fig 14 in CEMU and Fig 19 in CMAC to increase the width of on-road bicycle lanes on secondary arterial roads from 1.7m to 2m (within the existing cross-section width). Add a new requirement to Section 2.5.7 – Pedestrian and Cycle – Requirements: <i>Design of all subdivisions, streets and arterial roads must give priority to the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpaths of at least 1.5 metres in width on both sides of all streets, roads and bridges, unless otherwise specified in relevant cross-sections in Appendix 1; Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1;

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAc and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
		Council Response	Recommended Changes
			<p>Design of all subdivisions, streets and arterial roads must give priority to the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Footpaths of at least 1.5 metres in width on both sides of all streets, roads and bridges, unless otherwise specified in relevant cross-sections in Appendix 1; ○ Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where as shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated at Appendix 1; ○ Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines; ○ Pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings on all slip lanes; and ○ Safe and convenient transition between on- and off-road bicycle networks. <p>All to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority and the responsible authority.</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On road bicycle lanes where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1; ○ Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines; ○ Pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings on all slip lanes; and ○ Safe and convenient transition between on- and off-road bicycle networks. <p>All to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority and the responsible authority.</p>
			<p>R11 requires the assessment to be undertaken by the party seeking to develop near the railway line. Developers are required to do these works approved by a planning permit.</p>
		7.8	<p><u>Rail Corridor</u></p> <p>The submitter is accepting of the noise levels suggested / recommended for assessment as outlined within the ARUP Melton Rail Corridor Potential Acoustic Impact Assessment, 2016, as highlighted under section 2.4.10 of the Cobblebank MAC UDF. It is noted that these noise levels reflect those contained within the Passenger Rail Infrastructure Noise Policy, April 2013.</p> <p>The submitter is also comfortable with the approach proposed by Council for a draft requirement (discussed outside of the context of</p>

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU				
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Recommended Changes
			<p>the MAC UDF) for rail noise attenuation within UGZ3 (the Toolern PSP UGZ Schedule) being:</p> <p>The submitter recommends that the MAC UDF clearly outline whose responsibility it is for mitigating noise, the developer or the rail operator.</p>	

Subsequent Submission	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
<p>Submission 7 dated 11 November 2019</p>	<p>Update proposed text at the end of section 2.5 from: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The project will include site investigation, planning and delivery of new electrified metropolitan rail lines, overhead electrification, signalling, and stabling areas to park and maintain metropolitan trains</i></p> <p>To: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The planning work will investigate upgraded infrastructure to enable metropolitan style services to operate, and segregation of the regional and metropolitan network.</i></p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Replace the following: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The project will include site investigation, planning and delivery of new electrified metropolitan rail lines, overhead electrification, signalling, and stabling areas to park and maintain metropolitan trains</i></p> <p>With text below: <i>In 2019 the State Government commenced the planning work for the Western Rail Plan (WRP) which sets out the future investment Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network servicing our growing suburbs and growing regional cities. The planning work will investigate upgraded infrastructure to enable metropolitan style services to operate, and segregation of the regional and metropolitan network.</i></p>
	<p>Can Council Officers provide further information regarding the comment '.....Access for refuse vehicles to the bus interchange area? Seek confirmation from the submitter that the roads can be used by service traffic during limited times of the day (such as garbage trucks).'</p>	<p>In response to the submitter: It is likely that other vehicles such as emergency service vehicles, garbage trucks and Australia Post may need to use the interchange area albeit in very low frequencies. It is likely that adjacent buildings may be fronting the bus interchange, Council officers understand that the interchange is designed so that buses can pass each other so we presume other services wouldn't impede bus movements, hence the question to confirm with the submitter.</p>	<p>N/A</p>