

**Appendix 2**

**Cobblebank Employment and Mixed Use Urban Design Framework  
Submission Summary and Council Response**

**November 2019**

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	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"> <li>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:</li> </ul> <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"> <li>The Wurundjeri are not specifically referenced in the UDF document.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
2	30 August 2019	2.1	The north-south industrial connector street leg on 1-15 Ferris Road be moved 250m east of the western title boundary where shown in the UDF and the internal alignment be discretionary to allow for an expanded 'gateway' precinct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The gateway precinct is identified in the UDF to show restricted retail land uses along both sides of Ferris Road as a consistent entry to CMAAC. The north south connector is needed to facilitate entry into all of the restricted retail area as there will be no direct access off Ferris Road.</li> <li>The UDF seeks to show a legible and easy to navigate road layout.</li> <li>It is recommended that a note to be added to the UDF: <i>The UDF provides a degree of flexibility that will allow detailed design matters such as the road layout to be dealt with at the planning permit stage.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Insert the following note to Figure 9: <i>The UDF provides a degree of flexibility that will allow detailed design matters such as the road layout to be dealt with at the planning permit stage.</i></p>
		2.2	There is an inconsistency with the line work of Figures 5 and 6 in regards to precincts and land use as it pertains to this site. Update figures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend that Figure 6 be changed to reflect the line work in Figure 5</li> </ul>	Change the line work in Figure 6 to reflect the restricted retail land use line work shown in Figure 5.
		2.3	Make the 'Restricted Retail/Showroom/Ferris Road Gateway Precinct' areas line work more consistent with C10 in the Toolern PSP Plan 7 (recognition of greater northern frontage).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Gateway site as per C10 in Table 3 in PSP is referencing design and built form, not land use.</li> <li>Specific uses are to be determined at the planning permit stage.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		2.4	Who is responsible for associated works within the freeway interface cross section?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Freeway interface needs to be provided by the developer between their land and the Freeway (VicRoads) title boundary.</li> <li>Works within the freeway reserve will normally be undertaken by the road owner, or at the request of the road owner.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		2.5	The submitter is seeking direct access to the site via a four way signalised intersection utilising the existing access to the site opposite the entry to TabCorp Park and want this shown in the UDF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type of access being requested are subdivision works to be developed and paid for by the developer. There is no need for these subdivision works to be shown in the UDF.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

Additional Submission	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
<p><b>Submitter 2 additional Submission dated 1.10.19</b></p>	<p>Enquiries by the submitter in regards to urban design elements and pedestrian/shared path access along the northern leg of the industrial connector. The submitter notes that the shared path location should be discretionary rather than fixed with this to be determined at the permit application stage.</p>	<p><b>Response by Council Officer Matthew Milbourne, via email on 1.10.19</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location of buildings, the location of car parking, and the road layout will need to be determined through detailed design phase associated with obtaining a planning permit.</li> <li>• Council recommends arranging a pre-application meeting with our Major Developments unit to discuss the proposed masterplan.</li> <li>• The purpose of the cycling and pedestrian network is to provide businesses with an opportunity for their employees / visitors / customers with an opportunity to arrive by foot or bike. The shared path along the freeway will form part of a wider bicycle network which will eventually enable people to ride from Melton Township to the City (and places in between).</li> <li>• Currently it is not possible for people to safely ride a bicycle between Melton Township and Caroline Springs as the possible routes in between are on the shoulder of the Western Freeway or the Melton Highway. All development abutting the Freeway will provide their section of the shared path (see the recent development in Thornhill Park as an example of this).</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
3	29 August 2019	3.1	Submitter is generally supportive of the draft CEMU UDF and thank Council for the opportunity to comment on the draft.	Noted	N/A
		3.2	UDF is generally in accordance with the requirements of Clause 4.3.6 of the Toolern PSP.	Noted	N/A
		3.3	In a number of places the UDF mentions that the landfill is subject to the ongoing Environmental Audit. This process is coming to a close, with a further report expected in coming weeks. The submitter will provide this report to Council when it comes to hand. Its findings may necessitate alterations to the UDF. The submitter will make a further submission on what they may be when the report is provided to Council.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council will consider making any changes to the UDF as a result of the audit when they are finalised and approved by the EPA.</li> <li>• The UDF in its current form will not hinder development within the landfill buffer provided that the audits are finalised and approved by the EPA.</li> <li>• The UDF could be updated at a later stage to reflect the audits, noting that it is best practice to update strategic planning documents every five years.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		3.4	The designation of 'privately owned active leisure and recreation' has not been set out in the UDF (page 17 and 65).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 5 of the UDF designates the landfill area as 'Leisure and Recreation (privately owned)' that is subject to an environmental audit.'</li> <li>• Page 17 of the UDF identifies the opportunity for 'privately owned active leisure and recreation' following an audit on the old landfill site. It is recommended that the text on page 17 be expanded to read 'The former Melton Landfill site occupies a large portion of this precinct. Following the environmental audit, privately owned active leisure and recreation that complements the adjoining Harness Racing track could be a component of this precinct.'</li> <li>• 'Leisure and recreation (privately owned)' has been applied to three sites not owned by Harness Racing Victoria. To rectify this the relevant plans within the UDF will show 'leisure and recreation (privately owned)' on the landfill site within the submitter's</li> </ul>	<p>Modify Figure 5 to change the land use of private properties located in the south east corner of the 'Leisure and Recreation' polygon to 'Light Industrial / Business'.</p> <p>Change paragraph on page 17 as follows: <i>The former Melton Landfill site occupies a large portion of this precinct. Following the environmental audit, privately owned active leisure and recreation that complements the adjoining Harness Racing track could be a component of this precinct.</i></p>

	owned land only, and not the three properties located in the south-east corner.		
3.5	<p>The UDF appears to confine the 'privately owned active leisure and recreation' use to the area covered by the former Melton Landfill (page 17). It is also possible that the land to the north of the landfill should be included.</p>	<p>In regards to land north of the landfill, the Mixed Use Zone is the applied zone of Schedule 3 to the Urban Growth Zone. Council's preference is to allow flexibility on the use of the land to the north of the landfill. The planning permit process and detailed design stage is the appropriate process to assess the use and development of this land.</p>	No change recommended
3.6	<p>On page 28, Requirement R17 notes no vehicle crossovers along Ferris and Abey Roads are allowed, with 'all access to proposed uses from side streets'. This is restrictive and appears to rule out a range of suitable access arrangements including service roads, slip lanes and the like.</p>	<p>There will be no direct access off of primary and secondary arterial roads. There is a requirement in the UDF that side streets will be spaced at a minimum of 400m intervals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frontage roads/slip lanes were not utilised to ensure high amenity and consistent built form along arterial roads and a narrower right of way cross section.</li> <li>The use of vehicle access arrangements such as service and loop roads increases the visual and physical scale of Ferris Road further reinforcing the roads arterial character and intensifying the perception of the road being a physical barrier.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
3.7	<p>On page 61 the Tabcorp Park Interface is referenced. It is submitted that it should only apply to the land fronting Shakamaker Drive (the inset map needs amending) and that the upper level setbacks shown both front and rear should be removed.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a consistent treatment should be applied to all properties abutting Tabcorp Park, and therefore the Interface as shown in the inset plan in Figure 28 should not be changed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst acknowledging that the depiction of buildings in the road cross-section are indicative only, and are not intended to show the preferred built form outcomes of upper levels, we agree to remove the upper level setbacks (front and back) as shown at Figure 28, page 61.</li> </ul>	Remove the upper level setbacks (front and back) as shown at Figure 28, page 61.

Subsequent Submission	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Change
<p><b>Submitter 3 subsequent Submission dated 3.10.19</b></p>	<p>The submitter confirmed the completion of the Environmental Audit reports in regards to the old Melton landfill. The submitter requests that the UDF be updated to reflect the Audits.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The UDF will stay in its current form in regards to the 500m buffer area around the old landfill.</li> <li>• The UDF in its current form will not hinder development within the landfill buffer as the relevant audits have been finalised.</li> <li>• The UDF could be updated at a later stage to reflect the audits, noting that it is best practice to update strategic planning documents every five years.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
4	3 September 2019	4.1	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"> <li>• Submitter has not requested any changes to the drainage infrastructure shown in the UDF</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		4.2	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"> <li>• See response to item 4.1 above.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
5	3 September 2019	5.1	Provides support for the CEMU UDF vision and key urban design principles and land use distribution however have concerns of the prescriptive nature of the CEMU UDF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Council policies have informed the UDF requirements and guidelines such as Council's Industrial Design Guidelines.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		5.2	Amend Figure 9 to delete the Industrial Access Street from the north eastern part of the site. A road frontage is not required along the Mt Cottrell Road frontage and in the first part of the Western Highway frontage as the buildings can be designed to appropriately address the road frontages and ensure car parking is located to the rear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The UDF proposes to locate a combination of a 26 metre industrial connector road along the Western Freeway (western end) and a 22 metre industrial access street along the Western Freeway (eastern end). These roadways would use a 24.45 metre wide driveway that has been constructed to connect the property to the west to Mt Cottrell Road.</li> <li>The purpose of the industrial connector road and the access street is to provide an activated frontage to the Western Freeway.</li> <li>If the road is not constructed on the driveway area adjacent the Freeway there is a question on how this land will be used in the future as it will not be developable.</li> <li>There is a discrepancy between the cross sections in Figures 16 and 23. Figure 16 shows a cross-section of 26 metres and Figure 23 shows a cross-section for the same length of road at 25.7 metres.</li> <li>There is a discrepancy between Figures 17 and 23. Figure 17 shows a cross-section of 22 metres, and Figure 23 shows a cross-section for the same length of road at 25.7 metres.</li> <li>It is preferable to have a road on the eastern boundary adjacent Mt Cottrell Road which will likewise present an active frontage to Mt Cottrell Road.</li> </ul>	<p>In the inset plan of Figure 16 delete the connector roads shown along the Western Freeway interface as these are dealt with in Figure 24.</p> <p>In the inset plan of Figure 17 delete the section of industrial access street that abuts the Western Freeway.</p> <p>Create a new Western Freeway interface plan after Figure 24 that deals with the section of industrial access street abutting the Western Freeway. This section of road should be widened by 1.5 metres to allow the pedestrian path on the freeway side to be widened by 1.5 metres to make it a shared path.</p>

	<p>Amend Figure 16, Industrial Connector Street by reducing nature strips to 2.5 metres to achieve an overall cross section to 25 metres: This proposed cross section is excessive and an inefficient use of land.</p>	<p>Recent Precinct Structure Plans approved in the City of Melton have adopted a standard connector road cross-section for industrial areas that is 26 metres in width. This width takes into account wider parking bays are required for trucks (0.5 metre on each side of the road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council seeks consistency in industrial connector roads across the municipality.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Remove Figure 25 Mt Cottrell Road interface with frontage road as this depicts the preferred road treatment adjacent to the site. This cross section has not considered the future overpass interface.</p> <p>In the event that the aim of the cross section at Figure 25 is to create separation between the built form and Mt Cottrell Road, it is noted that a 5m landscape setback for Mt Cottrell Road and that a 3m landscape setback must be provided for all other roads as per the UDFs requirements will ensure that the visual bulk of the built form is softened to a significant separation from the Mt Cottrell Road pavement is achieved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 22 metre wide industrial access street is proposed along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent Mt Cottrell Road. The purpose of the industrial access street is to provide an activated frontage to Mt Cottrell Road.</li> <li>• The section of industrial access street should be removed from the inset plan in Figure 17, and a new cross-section created which converts this section of road as a loop road. The revised cross section will remove the footpath adjacent Mt Cottrell Road, and the parking bays on the eastern side.</li> <li>• The use of a loop road increases adjacent to Mt Cottrell Road will create additional separation between the employment uses on the west side of Mt Cottrell Road from the residential uses located on the east side of Mt Cottrell Road.</li> </ul>	<p>In the inset plan of Figure 17 delete the industrial access streets that abuts Mt Cottrell Road.</p> <p>Create a new cross-section for the Mt Cottrell Road industrial access street section that removes the footpath and the parking bays on its eastern side.</p>
<p>5.4</p>	<p>Amend Figure 23 Freeway Interface (without sound wall) by reducing the nature strips to 2.5 metres and the landscape strip to 2.75 metres to achieve an overall cross section on 24.45 metres.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See earlier comments on the freeway interface at item 5.3.</li> <li>• It is preferred to adopt a consistent cross-section for the connector road along the Western Freeway frontage, which has a reduced width from the ordinary industrial connector road.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
6	4 September 2019	6.1	The UDF provides for relatively low density car base uses to locate within a 'walkable catchment' of 800m of the Cobblebank Train Station and CMAC as shown in plan below.	<p>The employment area north of the railway line has been divided into four precincts. The mix of uses include industrial / business precincts, a bulky goods / showroom precinct, and a high amenity research precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The south-east precinct is a research and high amenity business precinct which will contain research and development centres and offices, which maximises the opportunity presented by its proximity to the Cobblebank train station and the proposed station at Thornhill Park.</li> <li>Residential uses are not possible due to the presence of existing industries in the employment area that have buffers that are incompatible with residential use.</li> <li>It is possible that the industries with buffers will never relocate.</li> <li>The employment area and the mixed use area were identified within the Toolern Precinct Structure Plan (PSP). Applied zones of Commercial 2 and Mixed Use Zone were respectively applied to each area through the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 3 (UGZ3) in the <i>Melton Planning Scheme</i>.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
		6.2	Discourage light industrial and other car based uses from locating to the south of Abey Road and instead locate them further north away from the walkable catchment of the CMAC and station.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As discussed in item 6.1 there are a number of existing industrial uses operating in the employment area with buffers e.g. Melton Recycle Facility, ABMT Textiles, Technochem, MHG Plastic Industries, Bertocchi etc</li> <li>These industries may never move, and may seek to expand into the future.</li> <li>Some of these industries are located in close proximity to the train station.</li> <li>The nature of these industries do not lend themselves well for the development of intensive land uses such as high amenity office buildings.</li> <li>The land surrounding the buffer industries have therefore been identified as industrial / business</li> </ul>	No change recommended

		<p>precincts, and the bulky goods / showroom precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing industries with buffers identified were established lawfully through Clause 53.10 of the <i>Melton Planning Scheme</i> and it is not possible for Council to require the industries to make changes to their development or operation to reduce their buffers.</li> <li>Council engaged GHD to map the buffers associated with existing uses. The buffers are identified in Figure 7 of the UDF.</li> <li>The UDF therefore must take into account the existing operation of the buffer industries, and make decisions about land use based on their presence.</li> <li>In the event that an industry relocates or makes changes to their operations that reduces or removes the buffer, it may be possible for sensitive uses to establish in areas in the CEMU UDF area that are currently subject to a buffer.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
6.3	<p>Given the significant impact of the buffer assessment on the location of sensitive land uses within Cobblebank Council should consider further work to refine the buffers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council is concerned that 85% of residents need to leave the municipality for work. The UDF will allow businesses to open in Cobblebank, which will create jobs for residents.</li> <li>Light industry is a permitted use within the Commercial 2 Zone and two precincts have been identified for this use.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
6.4	<p>The vision of the CEMU UDF referencing a comprehensive jobs hub and light industrial and office uses needs to be more nuanced to discourage low density car based uses from locating within proximity to CMAC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office uses are encouraged to be located behind the restricted retail. The two industrial / business precincts list an office as a supported land use in these precincts which is based on Section 1 uses in the Commercial 2 Zone.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
6.5	<p>In regards to 2.4 light industrial shown behind the restricted retail, more direction should be given to location of office, with a preference for low density, car based uses to be located further from the MAC and not within the southern side of Abey Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commercial / business areas have been identified for offices along residential interfaces and in close proximity to the train station.</li> <li>It is additionally noted that office is identified and is a permitted use in the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre (CMAC).</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
6.6	<p>2.4, paragraph 6 – Office uses should be encouraged within or close to the walkable catchment to the train station and CMAC with light industrial north of Abey Road.</p>		<p>No change recommended</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This paragraph does contemplate that some transition may occur over time if industries with buffers relocate, however this cannot be relied upon.</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.1 Buffer Assessment, Paragraph 2 – The UDF needs to start with a clear vision of the ultimate land use otherwise built form and uses that establish in the interim will erode the opportunity to maximise the potential of infrastructure and urban form, including investment in the station.</p>	<p>6.7</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The UDF seeks to establish Ferris Road as an arrival corridor to the Metropolitan Activity Centre from the Western Freeway.</li> <li>The preferred land use along Ferris Road are restricted retail premises and showrooms, which will provide a consistent built form along Ferris Road.</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.4 Ferris Road Gateway Precinct – the final sentence states that restricted retail will not extend beyond the railway line. This allows for restricted retail, a car based use to extend into the walkable catchment of the station and CMAAC. If this does go ahead the built form and urban structure should be designed to be able to adapt to intensive land uses.</p>	<p>6.8</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ample land is provided within the Metropolitan Activity Centre and CEMU for high density land uses that take advantage of its proximity to a train station.</li> <li>As discussed in item 6.3 there are existing uses with buffers that make it difficult to establish high density uses in the eastern precinct.</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.4 Western Light Industrial/Business Precinct paragraph provides some distinction between the eastern equivalent, more guidance is required to ensure the opportunity presented by the train station is not squandered. Divide eastern equivalent into two or three precincts.</p>	<p>6.9</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements are mandatory controls, and guidelines are discretionary controls.</li> <li>Applications for planning permits will need to provide a response to the requirements and guidelines in the UDF.</li> <li>The UDF will not be implemented into the <i>Melton Planning Scheme</i>. The UDF carries enough weight through its requirement to be prepared in both the Toolern PSP and UGZ3 within the <i>Melton Planning Scheme</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.7 Land Use Requirements and Guidelines - Clarification is required in regard to the application of requirements and guidelines and if they are mandatory and discretionary, respectively? How will they be implemented through the planning scheme?</p>	<p>6.10</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that changes be made to the references to buffers in the UDF to better align with the recommendations in the <i>Toolern Buffer Assessment Report</i> prepared for Council by GHD in 2019.</li> <li>In the legend for Figure 7 change the following descriptions:</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.8 Land Use Requirements R2. Sensitive uses... must only be located in the areas identified in Fig. 7 - Figure 7 does not clearly identify locations for sensitive uses. It does not form part of the legend.</p>	<p>6.11</p>	<p>In the legend for Figure 7 change the following descriptions:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred Location of Non-Sensitive Uses to Areas affected by buffers of existing uses.</li> <li>Preferred Location of Transitional Uses to Areas not affected by buffers of existing uses.</li> </ul> </p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Preferred Location of Non-Sensitive Uses to Areas affected by buffers of existing uses.</li> <li>o Preferred Location of Transitional Uses to Areas not affected by buffers of existing uses.</li> </ul>		
6.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a requirement from the Toolern PSP, and therefore is required to be in the UDF.</li> </ul>	<p>2.5.9 G1 – what is the rationale for this guideline and what is the expected average size of lots? This is likely to reinforce light-industrial uses at locations in close proximity to the CMAC, precluding the opportunity for an office of business park. Also this is not strictly a 'land use' guideline.</p>	No change recommended
6.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals will make the choice on whether it is practical or desirable for them to get to the CEMU or CMAC areas by train.</li> <li>• The UDF provides a framework that encourages walking, cycling and the use of public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>2.6.1 Public Transport – greater emphasis should be placed on the direct use of the train station. While bus connections are important being within a walkable catchment to fixed rail will always be more convenient.</p>	No change recommended
6.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents in the future mixed use area north of Abey Road will be closer to the train station located in Melton South than the train station in Cobblebank.</li> <li>• If residents make the decision to ride a bicycle to a train station they will have a choice in which route they take, and what station they will use. Figure 8 in the UDF demonstrates that the mixed use residential area north of Abey Road will be connected to the train stations located in Melton South and Cobblebank by a legible on-road and off-road cycling network.</li> </ul>	<p>2.6.3 – Cyclists Figure 8 – Cyclists will need to travel through a light industrial area along Abey Road from residential area to reach the CMAC and station and therefore does not provide a safe cycling environment that is sought.</p>	No change recommended
6.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In PSP areas the public acquisition overlay is not normally applied.</li> <li>• When a planning permit application is lodged it needs to demonstrate compliance with the land use budget, and whether it is delivering transport infrastructure identified in the PSP and DCP.</li> </ul>	<p>2.6.4 Motor Vehicles – Is there an intention to apply Public Acquisition Overlays to provide for identified road widenings and intersections?</p>	No change recommended
6.16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No work has been undertaken by Council to justify a reduction in car parking rates in the preparation of this UDF.</li> </ul>	<p>2.6.10 Car Parking Requirements – Reductions in the car parking ratio required by 52.06 should be considered particularly for office uses in</p>	No change recommended

		<p>proximity to the CMAC. This would reduce the number of planning permit triggers.</p> <p>2.7.5 Public Realm and Landscape Requirements R38. A 5m landscape setback must be provided on Ferris Road.</p>	6.17
No change recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landscape setbacks are to be provided on private property adjacent the ultimate carriageway.</li> <li>The purpose of the landscape setback is to provide a consistent soft landscape foreground to the built-form behind, and create greening of the entire CEMU area.</li> </ul>		

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
7	3 September 2019	7.1	The UDF is not clear on the alignment of the Industrial Connector Street to the east of Ferris Road and how it relates to the existing Treeleaf Lane. Figure 22 does not show the Industrial Connector Street following the northern boundary of Treeleaf Lane as shown in the other UDF plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council acknowledges that the alignment of Treeleaf Lane as shown diagram at Figure 22 is not consistent with other plans in the UDF. This will be updated to be consistent with other plans.</li> <li>The industrial connector street will be relocated to utilise the driveway to the Melton Recycle Facility.</li> <li>Interim access arrangements that may be required will be addressed as part of a future planning permit application.</li> </ul>	<p>Change the location of the industrial connector street so it utilises the existing driveway to the Melton Recycling Facility.</p> <p>Update the alignment of Treeleaf Lane at Figure 22 to be consistent with other plans within the UDF.</p>
		7.2	<p>The UDF does not provide enough clarity in relation to delivery of the 'potential side street' shown in Figure 22. The UDF does not provide a cross section for this street and it is understood that this can be determined at the planning permit stage, subject to detailed design.</p> <p>It is requested that Figure 22 includes a notation in relation to the 'potential side street'. The notation could be:  <i>The need for a 'potential side street' on the east side of Ferris Road is to be determined at the Planning Permit Stage, subject to detailed design. It may be located in a different location, or replaced with a left in/left out access arrangement to a shared car park area.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be no direct access (driveway access) off of Ferris Road. Access to restricted retail will be from left in-left out side streets at a minimum of 400m intervals.</li> <li>Figure 22 is indicative only noting that the side streets are indicative and subject to detailed design. Council will include wording at Figure 22 to clarify its indicative nature and note that the possible side streets will be subject to detailed design.</li> </ul>	<p>Include wording at Figure 22 to clarify its indicative nature and note that the possible side streets will be subject to detailed design.</p>

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
8	6 September 2019	8.1	The UDF contemplates future residential development to be provided on the land which is consistent with the land use expectations of the PSP. The submitter supports the continued identification of residential development of the land.	Noted.	N/A
		8.2	The identification of areas preferred to support residential development in the UDF is somewhat unclear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The former landfill site to the east of this land has a 500 metre EPA Referral Buffer, which extends into the subject site and may restrict the development of land for residential purposes.</li> <li>The EPA Referral Buffer is in the process of being reviewed by the landowners of the landfill site.</li> <li>The UDF identifies that residential land use is preferred along the Toolern Creek to provide a transition to the residential uses located on the western side of the creek in Melton South.</li> <li>It is not the UDF's intention to restrict residential to only the hatched areas on Figure 5 identified as <i>Residential Preferred Areas</i>. The UDF's intention is that a residential use is needed to address the creek (dependant on the landfill audit). To clarify this, Council will re-word the relevant titles on the legend from <i>Residential Preferred Areas</i> to <i>Residential Interface to Toolern Creek</i> and <i>Mixed-Use to Mixed Use (including residential)</i>.</li> <li>The extent of residential development in the mixed use precinct is at the discretion of Council and will be dealt with at the planning permit stage.</li> </ul>	<p>On Figure 5, re-word the relevant titles on the legend from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Residential Preferred Areas</i> to <i>Residential Interface to Toolern Creek</i>.</li> <li><i>Mixed-Use to Mixed Use (including residential)</i>.</li> </ul>
		8.3	It is submitted that the subject land should support residential development with potential commercial use continuing to the east on adjoining land with the east property boundary representing an improved land use transition. Due to the shape and size of the land the provision of both residential and non-residential use would be problematic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The UDF identifies that residential development is a suitable land use outcome in the mixed use precinct dependant on the outcome of the land fill audit.</li> <li>The UDF identifies that residential land use is preferred along the Toolern Creek to provide a transition to the residential uses located on the western side of the creek in Melton South and is considered a more sympathetic land use to the Toolern Creek.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

8.4	<p>The vehicle access connection to Abey Road as shown in the UDF is not considered to be satisfactory due to its proximity to the Abey Road bridge, change of level from the road into the site and the inability to provide a deceleration left turn lane due to these same reasons.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The local road shown along the Toolern Creek interface is shown to illustrate that an active frontage is required to the creek.</li> <li>The location of local roads within the development will be determined during the planning permit stage.</li> <li>The landowner can work with Council to determine where the entry road will be to the development from Abey Road.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>
8.5	<p>It is suggested that improved clarification be provided in Figure 7 to more clearly direct desired land use outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that changes be made to the references to buffers in the UDF to better align with the recommendations in the <i>Toolern Buffer Assessment Report</i> prepared for Council by GHD in 2019.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the legend for Figure 7 change the following descriptions:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Preferred Location of Non-Sensitive Uses to Areas affected by buffers of existing uses.</i></li> <li><i>Preferred Location of Transitional Uses to Areas not affected by buffers of existing uses.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>In the legend for Figure 7 change the following descriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Preferred Location of Non-Sensitive Uses to Areas affected by buffers of existing uses.</i></li> <li><i>Preferred Location of Transitional Uses to Areas not affected by buffers of existing uses.</i></li> </ul>
8.8	<p>The direction concerning residential density found in section 2.8.3 is somewhat unclear and should be improved.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The residential density cited in section 2.8.3 is consistent with the density cited in the Toolern PSP – 15 dwellings per net developable hectare.</li> <li>It is anticipated that the density will be greater in this mixed use area as per the purpose of the Mixed Use Zone, however there are no density requirements to be met within the UDF beyond the stipulated 15 dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>

Sub#	Date of Submission	Items	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
9	16 September 2019	9.1	Generally the submitter supports Council's approach to the UDF as providing a flexible UDF that will seek to encourage development rather than requiring a staged approach possibly dependant on the timing of specific development sites.	Noted.	No change recommended
		9.2	The 'supported land uses' on page 19 are very prescriptive.	The 'supported land uses' on page 19 are identified as section 1. uses within the Commercial 2 Zone.	No change recommended
		9.3	Concern with the relocation of the east west industrial connector as it has changed from where it is identified in the PSP. Understand it was likely to avoid the Melton Recycling Centre, however the site is land locked with no ability to commence development until the sites to the south have developed and access is arranged with the southern landowner.  CEMU UDF should be revised to consider sharing the land and construction costs of the proposed east west industrial connector. This can be achieved by relocating it – of the 26m, 17m located on subject site and remaining 9m in the land to the south (808 Mt Cottrell Road).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed realignment of the east-west industrial connector over two land parcels is problematic due to servicing issues. A number of utility services (electrical, communications, gas, water, sewer, drainage and street trees) need to fit within the verges either side of a road pavement. By having the road straddle property boundaries, all services will have to fit in the one verge, which is highly unlikely due to clearance requirements and having utility services located under the road pavement is problematic for future maintenance for Council and Service Authorities.</li> <li>It is recommended the submitter works with Council's planners and engineers to design an interim outcome to facilitate development.</li> <li>Council acknowledges that access into many of the sites within the employment area will need to be worked through carefully at the detailed design stage.</li> <li>The UDF is flexible in that at the time of detailed design through the application process alternate alignments can be proposed to achieve a better outcome. The UDF uses the 'generally in accordance' principle like the Precinct Structure Plans.</li> <li>Council encourages the submitter to contact adjoining landowners to discuss the issue of access which may assist with detailed design outcomes.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

9.4	<p>Access to the subject site should be maintained to Mt Cottrell Road as defined in the Toolern PSP. This can still occur with a realignment of the road to avoid the Melton Recycling Facility. This will ensure early access to the submitters land and will ensure the site isn't landlocked and waiting on other developments for access.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct access to Mt Cottrell Road will only be restricted when Mt Cottrell Road is upgraded to a primary arterial road.</li> <li>• Direct access may also be restricted when the Mt Cottrell Road freeway overpass is constructed.</li> <li>• Interim access can be provided to Mt Cottrell Road until the connector road network is developed, which will provide alternative access to the businesses operating on the subject site.</li> <li>• The nature of the interim access can be dealt with through detailed design / planning permit process.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
9.5	<p>Consideration should be given to the provision of a signalised intersection of the proposed east west industrial connector with Mt Cottrell Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No traffic modelling has been provided to demonstrate that the intersection needs to be signalised, and that this cost should be added to the Toolern DCP.</li> <li>• The developer may elect to provide traffic signals to facilitate full movements through this intersection, however the cost of this would be considered to be developer works.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
9.6	<p>As outlined in the GTA UDF transport study, Mt Cottrell Road should be designated as a secondary arterial providing ultimately 4 lanes instead of a primary arterial with 6 lanes. This has not been translated into the UDF movement and place plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GTA Transport Strategic Modelling report dated 10 April 2019 compares the modelled volumes against the AustRoads Capacity Limit. The report notes that the volumes do not exceed the theoretical daily capacity at 1.4 and that the VITM model demonstrates traffic is distributed in accordance with the proposed classification and functions of the key streets in the UDF.</li> <li>• The modelling demonstrates that in 2051 it is expected that four lanes would still be suitable if the rest of the road network is built to distribute traffic. Land is required to be retained for six lanes in the future to facilitate access to the Western Freeway and the train station at Thornhill Park as outlined in the Toolern PSP.</li> </ul>	No change recommended
9.7	<p>The GTA traffic modelling suggests Shogaki Drive will operate as a 2 lane road even in ultimate 2051. As such Shogaki Drive should be changed from a primary arterial to a secondary arterial.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shogaki Drive is proposed to be a primary arterial road to divert traffic away from the heart of the Metropolitan Activity Centre.</li> </ul>	No change recommended

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Toolern PSP identifies that north-south traffic will be directed to the primary arterial network along Ferris Road – Shogaki Drive – Mt Cottrell Road.</li> <li>If Shogaki Drive was to be dropped to a secondary arterial road, Ferris Road through the centre of the Metropolitan Activity Centre would need to be increased to a primary arterial road.</li> <li>These changes would affect the broader road network in the Toolern PSP area.</li> </ul>		
	9.8	The proposed secondary arterial road cross sections should be modified to match the current VPA standard and satisfy current design requirements for shared paths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cross-sections for secondary arterial roads are consistent with recent cross-sections prepared in Mt Atkinson and Plumpton PSPs. These have been prepared using the VPA's standards.</li> </ul>	No change recommended	
	9.9	The industrial access street cross section adjacent Mt Cottrell Road needs to be modified or additional notes added to ensure a footpath is not provided immediately adjacent to Mt Cottrell Road to allow the verge to be reduced adjacent to open space and other road reserves with the consent of the RA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 22 metre wide industrial access street is proposed along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent Mt Cottrell Road. The purpose of the industrial access street is to provide an activated frontage to Mt Cottrell Road.</li> <li>The section of industrial access street should be removed from the inset plan in Figure 17, and a new cross-section created which converts this section of road as a loop road. The revised cross section will remove the footpath adjacent Mt Cottrell Road, and the parking bays on the eastern side.</li> </ul>	<p>In the inset plan of Figure 17 delete the industrial access street that abuts Mt Cottrell Road.</p> <p>Create a new cross-section for Mt Cottrell Road industrial access street section that removes the footpath and the parking bays on its eastern side.</p>	
	9.10	There are inconsistencies between the land use outcomes in the PSP and the draft UDF. There is a clear opportunity to utilise the eastern part of the site for higher amenity and landmark development opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has no objection to the land owner / developer treating the eastern part of their site for high amenity and landmark development opportunities, as long as the uses are consistent with the zoning of the land.</li> <li>Character area 8 as nominated in the PSP applies to the subject site, which requires an attractive streetscape through well designed a high quality buildings and landscaping. This is reflected in the UDF in Figure 11 and section 2.8.2.</li> </ul>	No change recommended	

	<p>9.11</p> <p>The subject site represents an excellent location to expand the yellow hatched area further north to provide a higher quality entry to the CEMU precinct and a more secure buffer for the existing Thornhill Park Estate from the Western Industrial Precinct</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The High Amenity, Business Park, Research area identified in the UDF is based on the Essential Economics Economic Input Report, January 2018. This area is within a defensible boundary of Shogaki Drive and is in close proximity to the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre due to the nature of the future uses. Council notes that this area is zoned Commercial 2 which is the same zone as the surrounding employment area and therefore subject to the same Section 1 and 2 uses. Council notes that 'residential hotel' will be deleted from the Supported Land Uses Table 1 of the UDF as it was an oversight as it is a section 2 use under the Commercial 2 Zone (only Section 1 uses should be listed in the Supported Land Uses Table).</li> </ul>	<p>In Table 1 delete Residential Hotel from the Research and High Amenity Business Precinct.</p>
<p>9.12</p> <p>The purple commercial/business transition area to move further to the west to the internal north-south industrial connector and therefore expand.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council notes that both the Commercial / Business area and Light Industrial / Business areas are both zoned Commercial 2 and therefore subject to the same Section 1 and 2 uses. The purple Commercial / Business area identified along Mt Cottrell Road are identified as a transitional use from Industrial/Business uses to the residential estate in Thornhill Park. Therefore there is no reason an application for business and commercial uses cannot be applied for outside of the purple area under the Commercial 2 Zone.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>	
<p>9.13</p> <p>General simplification and less prescription of the preferred land uses for all precincts shown at Table 1 of the draft CEMU UDF.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supported land uses are proposed to demonstrate the types of uses that may be supported in the different precincts in the CEMU area and are Section 1 uses under the Commercial 2 Zone.</li> <li>The lists are not exhaustive and provide guidance on the types of uses that may be suitable.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended</p>	

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU					
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
10	4 October 2019	10.1	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.	Noted.	No change recommended
		10.2	<u>Implementation and Staging</u> 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> .	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>	No change recommended
		10.3	<u>Western Rail Plan</u> 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.  <u>Review</u> 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.	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.  <u>Western Rail Plan</u> 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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></li> </ul>

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
			<p>Station and Interchange Design 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>Review Section 4 in CMAC and CEMU – add an additional key change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of the Western Rail Plan by Rail Projects Victoria.</li> </ul> <p>Station and Interchange Design 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>
			<p>Design and layout of bus capable roads Bus access to Cobblebank Station should be insulated from general traffic.</p>
10.4			<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"> <li>Road linking Hollingsworth Drive to Interchange Way;</li> <li>Interchange Way;</li> </ul>
			<p>and stabling areas to park and maintain metropolitan trains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a new additional key change in Sections 4 in CMAC and CEMU: Completion of the Western Rail Plan by Rail Projects Victoria</li> <li>Amend figures 6 and 15 in CMAC to show an additional four bus bays to the east of the five bus bays shown.</li> </ul>
			<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"> <li>Road linking Hollingsworth Drive to Interchange Way;</li> <li>Interchange Way;</li> </ul>



NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item	Submission Summary
			<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 amount of bus traffic at the northern end of the pedestrian friendly Coach Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
			<p>established around the central core in CMAC, providing convenient access to all major points of destination adjacent and 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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"> <li>Buses being insulated from general traffic and bicycles;</li> <li>Bicycles and pedestrians being separated; and</li> <li>Whilst maintaining a continuation of landscaping treatments and strong pedestrian focus of urban core streets.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
			<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>
			<p>Recommended Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In CMAC insert a new cross-section for interchange Way, and the section of road linking Hollingsworth Drive and Interchange Way, which shows the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buses being insulated from general traffic and bicycles;</li> <li>Bicycles and pedestrians being separated; and</li> <li>Whilst maintaining a continuation of landscaping treatments and strong pedestrian focus of urban core streets.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <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
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the section 2.5.7 be updated to include requirements and guidelines outlining how cycling infrastructure is to be achieved.</li> </ul>
			<p>Modify Fig 20 in CMAC to show the pedestrian paths as shared paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>It is recommended that a requirement similar to R63 in the Kororoit PSP be included in Section 2.5.7 – Pedestrian and Cycle – Requirements:</li> </ul> <p><i>Design of all subdivisions, streets and arterial roads must give priority to the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footpaths of at least 1.5 metres in width on both sides of all streets, roads and bridges, unless otherwise specified in Appendix 1;</li> <li>Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1;</li> <li>On road bicycle lanes where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1;</li> <li>Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines;</li> <li>Pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings on all slip lanes, and Safe and convenient transition between on- and off-road bicycle networks.</li> </ul> <p>All to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority and the responsible authority.</p>
			<p>requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1;</li> <li>On road bicycle lanes where shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated in Appendix 1;</li> <li>Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines;</li> <li>Pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings on all slip lanes, and Safe and convenient transition between on- and off-road bicycle networks.</li> </ul> <p>All to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority and the responsible authority.</p>
			<p>Modify Fig 20 in CMAC to show the pedestrian paths as shared paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>It is recommended that a requirement similar to R63 in the Kororoit PSP be included in Section 2.5.7 – Pedestrian and Cycle – Requirements:</li> </ul> <p><i>Design of all subdivisions, streets and arterial roads must give priority to the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where as shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated at Appendix 1;</li> <li>Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines;</li> </ul>
			<p>Modify Fig 20 in CMAC to show the pedestrian paths as shared paths.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>It is recommended that a requirement similar to R63 in the Kororoit PSP be included in Section 2.5.7 – Pedestrian and Cycle – Requirements:</li> </ul> <p><i>Design of all subdivisions, streets and arterial roads must give priority to the requirements of pedestrians and cyclists by providing:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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;</li> <li>Shared paths or bicycle paths of 3.0 metres in width where as shown on the relevant cross sections illustrated at Appendix 1;</li> <li>Safe and convenient crossing points of connector and local streets at all intersections and at key desire lines;</li> </ul>

NOTE – This is a joint submission that covers both CMAC and CEMU			
Sub#	Date of Submission	Item Submission Summary	Council Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Pedestrian and cyclist priority crossings on all slip lanes; and</li> <li>o Safe and convenient transition between on- and off-road bicycle networks.</li> </ul> <p>All to the satisfaction of the coordinating road authority and the responsible authority.</p>
			No change recommended
			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><b>Rail Corridor</b></p> <p>The submitter is accepting of the noise levels suggested / recommended for assessment as outlined within the ARUP <i>Melton Rail Corridor Potential Acoustic Impact Assessment, 2016</i>, 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 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>	
10.8			

Subsequent Submission	Submission Summary	Council Response	Recommended Changes
<p>Submission 10 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>