

## Attachment 1: Preliminary Issues

The following issues and comments are provided by the Panel on a without prejudice basis for the Metropolitan Planning Authority to consider in their Part A and B submissions as relevant.

**Responses to each of the comments raised by Panel have been provided by the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) in red.**

### CONSISTENCY ISSUES WITHIN THE DOCUMENTATION

1. Land area - referred to as 106, 107 and 108 hectares. The flora and fauna report cites 113 hectares as its study area. Can the correct area be provided? **The correct area is as per the land budget on page 13 of the PSP being 107.82 hectares. The MPA cannot see any reference within the PSP to 106 hectares however the 108 hectares at p.38 within Appendix A within the property specific land budgets is as a result of rounding.**
2. Lot yield - variously referred to as a precise number 1,484, but also as 1,500 and 1,600 at the front of the PSP. What is the likely lot yield? **The anticipated residential yield against NDA is calculated at 1,484. This is calculated by multiplying the NDA which is 78.13 hectares by the dwelling density of 19.**
3. Resident population number - variously referred to a precise number 4156 as well as around 4,400 and 5,000 in the economic analysis. What is the likely population? **The likely population is as per the Summary Budget of the PSP on page 13, being 4, 156 persons. The economic analysis was prepared in July 2014 prior to the MPA finalizing the land budget for this precinct.**
4. The ratio of persons per household cited as 2.8 in the PSP documents but 2.7 in the economic analysis. Which is correct and are there any implications? **The correct ratio is 2.8 as per the state standard as outlined in Victoria in Future data (VIF 2012). The economic analysis was prepared in July 2014 prior to the MPA finalizing the land budget for this precinct.**
5. The SPPF policy for dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area (page 9 Explanatory Report) says 16. How does this compare with Clause 11 of the SPPF which says 15? **Clause 11 of the SPPF is correct, the PSP should read 15 dwellings per hectare of Net Developable Area. MPA to update and amend documents.**
6. In table 8 of the DCP, 36% is the apportioned amount of internal use. In Schedule 19, the DCPO schedule, the figure is 37%. Which will it be? **These numbers refer to different apportionments. The numbers included within the DCP have been apportioned according to the DCP project categories and numbers. Whereas the DCP Schedule categories are more general and therefore the Pavillions and Sports reserve projects have been combined in order to determine the apportionment %. The figures are not directly comparable between Table 9 of the DCP and the Schedule to the overlay. Should the panel seek an explanation of how these % are calculated for the purposes of this Hearing the MPA can provide further detail.**

### BROILER FARM

7. What is the future of the Broiler Farm at 271-275 Pearcedale Road? Is it to continue as a Broiler Farm, and if not what use is proposed for the site? **The MPA had included a buffer on Plan 1 given there are existing use rights still present on the site.**

MPA currently seeking further guidance from the City of Casey regarding a permit application for the use and development of the land for a school. This buffer can be removed from the final version of the PSP.

8. If the use is not to continue will the PSP plans be amended to remove potential buffer requirements? **As per the above response.**

#### **DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS**

9. Projects and land outside the PSP area is included in the DCP. Have any allowances been made in the Cranbourne West PSP and DCP for those projects and land? **The contributions from the Cranbourne West DCP towards have been factored into the final apportionment of the community projects as per Table 9 of the Brompton Lodge DCP. The MPA can provide further explanation of how these projects have been apportioned should the panel seek this detail for the purposes of this Hearing.**
10. Project RD-02 is the upgrading of Chevron Avenue for 587 metres with full cost of the project in the DCP. The trigger for the work is said to be "at time of subdivision". At "the time of subdivision" of what part of the DCP area? **The apportionment and timing trigger of this item is under review and the subject of discussion at the panel.**
11. Is it possible that the power in dot point 2 of section 2.3 Project Timing might enable the Collecting Agency to stipulate when the upgrading is to occur? **This is correct.**
12. Section 3.2.6 refers to the valuations obtained from Herron Todd White. Were they made available to relevant parties? **The site specific valuations were not published given they include all of the property valuations. However it is the MPA's policy to provide this information when requested.**
13. Are the addresses of 1070 Cranbourne-Frankston Road and 1/630 Hall Road correct? This is unclear. **These were the addresses provided by the City of Casey for these properties. Should these not be correct Council should provide the MPA with the correct addresses. The MPA will confirm with the City of Casey.**
14. Section 4.3 and Clause 3.0 of Schedule 19 of the DCPO requires that all capital costs be adjusted quarterly according to relevant indices. Are the indices reviewed quarterly so this requirement can be satisfied? **Yes.**
15. What is the function of the table on page 50 of the DCP viz appendix H? Both deal with the upgrading of Chevron Avenue but contain different figures. Which table applies? **The table on page 50 applies. The Table at Appendix H was an earlier version and is not the correct costing table. This will be removed.**

#### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

16. Bus capable connector roads are required. What is the position of PTV on the timing of provision of buses for those routes? **PTV have not provided an indication of timing of bus services on these routes.**
17. Additional meetings and consultation are mentioned in the PTV submission; can an update on PTVs position on the Amendment be provided. **A meeting was held with MPA, VicRoads and PTV (1 February 2016) to discuss specific issues relating to slip lanes at the local town centre at Chevron Avenue and Cranbourne-Frankston Road. It was agreed at this meeting by all parties that slip lanes were not required at this intersection.**

#### **FLORA AND FAUNA**

18. Clause 3.1 dot point 6 of the UGZ schedule requires a Conservation Management Plan for preservation of the Dwarf Galaxias at the subdivision stage. Is this control the principal manner of securing on-going arrangements for the sustainability of the Dwarf Galaxias colony? **This is correct.**
19. The flora and fauna report says no referrals are required to the Commonwealth under the EPBC Act. The timing and relationship to state processes of any Commonwealth referrals for Matters of National Environmental Significance required should be articulated to the Panel. **These approvals will be summarized within Part A of the MPA's submission to the panel.**

#### **PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

20. Rename the front page prior to approval to remove the 'Draft for consultation' notation. **Yes.**
21. Section 2.3, paragraph 2 appears to wrongly repeats the statement in the Explanatory Report that 16 lots per hectare NDA is policy? **MPA to correct.**
22. Table 1 needs a 'D' on the word 'service'. The table is repeated elsewhere. **MPA to correct.**
23. The word 'curb' should be 'kerb' in R19. **MPA to correct.**
24. The provisions of R20 have the same objective but are worded differently to Clause 4.4 of the UGZ S19. Is there double-up or are these provisions additional? **Agreed. MPA to clarify.**
25. In R21, what is a frontage road? Compare the use of the term 'A service road' in R27. **A local internal loop road is the same as a frontage road. MPA will ensure these terms are consistent.**
26. R22 uses the term 'square mile'. In metric measures, this is vague. In Appendix B at principle 1, uses the term 'square mile' but adds in brackets (2.58km<sup>2</sup>). Consistency is required. **R23 includes the term 'square mile'. MPA to include the metric measure of 2.58km<sup>2</sup>.**
27. What is the benefit of variations allowed under R28 on page 25 if roads are required to be constructed in accordance with cross-sections in appendix C? **Approximately 70% of streets will be designed in accordance with the standard cross-sections, however, the MPA encourages variations to the standard cross-sections for connectors and local streets. The purpose of these variations for local and connector streets is to encourage variety in streetscapes, producing more diverse and vibrant neighbourhoods in our growth areas. The MPA encourages variations in the design of the following elements of street cross-sections:**
- a. **variants in tree placements within the nature strips, e.g. trees in groups or naturalistic placement**
  - b. **a wider verge on one side of the road to allow for a meandering footpath**
  - c. **tree outstands including in parking lanes, this could also include planting or WSUD features and different pavement in parking bays.**
- While variations are encouraged for the above elements all cross sections must meet the minimum standards outlined in R28. The MPA will include some examples of street cross-section variations as part of the final version of the PSP and can also provide these to panel should they be sought for the purposes of this planning Hearing.**
28. Delete the word 'that' on line 1 of R30 **Agreed.**
29. R52 and R53 'mandate' requirements to install infrastructure for recycled water provision where Clause 56 requires such infrastructure only where a scheme is declared. Is there a conflict? **South East Water have the power to mandate such requirements. However the MPA will explore whether this requirement is more suitable as a guideline or planning permit condition.**
30. G39 is a repeat of G38. **Agreed MPA to delete G39.**
31. G43 is a repeat of G40. **Agreed MPA to delete G43.**

32. In table 7, the timing should be updated prior to approval of the PSP. **MPA have agreed to delete this column as requested by the City of Casey.**
33. In R60, page 36:
- Dot point 2 repeats clause 4.3 of the UGZ S19 which deals with Conditions for Public Transport. **Noted.**
  - Dot point 7 says; "Bicycle parking as required in this document". Where are the relevant provisions? Principle 8 in appendix B, Local Town Centre Design & Principles, at dot point 7 has one standard. How does an open statement such as "as required in this document" assist an applicant or a decision maker to understand if all requirements are dealt with? **Agreed. MPA to review.**
34. The contents of Appendix B appear as generic principles and not as provisions tailored to the Brompton Lodge PSP. For example:
- Principle 1 cites a population double the expected population number of the Brompton Lodge PSP; **The Brompton Lodge PSP is unique as it provides for a wider retail catchment as compared to other PSP areas.**
  - Figure 1 on page 18 depicts a layout of the Local Town Centre yet the language of principle 2,3 and 4 have little regard to figure 1; **The MPA considers that the design of the local town centre is consistent with these principles. The design of the town centre has been agreed to as part of the exhibition process with the City of Casey, MPA and the landowner (UDIA).**
  - Similarly with principle 5 for the location and size of the town square which are shown in plan form and in the legend to state the proposed size. **As above.**
- These are generic principles for local town centre design. The MPA intends on providing some additional principles within Figure 1 to reiterate the key principles sought within the design of the Brompton Lodge Town Centre.**
35. In principle 9:
- Dot points 9, 10, 11 and 12 as they appear should present as sub-points of dot point 8.
  - Dot point 15 purports a control should be exercised over 'excessive window advertising'. Is such a control possible under the planning scheme?
  - Dot point 25 is a repeat of dot point 17.
- The MPA will be reviewing the Local Town Centre Design Principles, although it is noted that this issue was not raised in any submission as part of this amendment.**
36. In principle 10, after dot point 2, some of the sub-points need to be reformatted. **Noted, MPA to update.**
37. In appendix C:
- are the cross sections standard as per previously approved PSPs. **MPA to update relevant cross-sections to ensure standard cross-sections are included.**
  - are the widths shown to the standards of other agencies: for example, road lanes, shared paths, reserve areas alongside waterways. **Yes.**