

Mat Garner

Director, South East Metropolitan Melbourne

VPA

Sent via email: Mat.Garner@vpa.vic.gov.au

Dear Mat,

Re: Devon Meadows and Casey Fields South PSP and ICP, Amendment C295case

I refer to the above matter and the earlier submission that was lodged on 31 March on behalf of the consortium of landowners and developers within the Clyde South Precinct Structure Plan area. The submission that was lodged on 31 March referred to an intention to provide a further written submission by 2 April.

This submission is the further written submission that has been prepared on behalf of the consortium of landowners and developers within the Clyde South Precinct Structure Plan area in response to the above Amendment. This further submission should be read in conjunction with a more detailed submission that has been prepared by Beveridge Williams on behalf of one of the members of the landowner/developer consortium.

The Clyde South land owner/developer group (hereafter referred to as the consortium) generally support planning for Deavon Meadows and Casey Fields South as a combined planning unit. Planning for the combined PSP areas has enabled infrastructure and other land use planning issues to be considered holistically. It is also noted that it is intended that the ICP will be prepared without the need to apply a supplementary levy. This is supported by the consortium noting that DSS costs are likely to be significant however the consortium members are keen to understand how the ICP will address Clyde Five Ways Road including any upgrade and/or funding of proposed intersections.

Notwithstanding the general support for adoption of a holistic planning approach, detailed analysis that has been completed by Beveridge Williams has identified some significant limitations that are associated with the current drainage proposal and potential impacts that are likely to be associated with the lack of outfall through the adjoining Clyde South PSP area.

As noted in the Beveridge Williams submission, application of the PAO and the indicative arterial roads within the Clyde South PSP are not supported in the absence of resolution of the broader issues with the drainage proposal.

In addition to the detailed design and implementation matters that have been raised by Beveridge Williams, the consortium members are also concerned about the potential funding and delivery implications that may be associated with a rigid approach to infrastructure and development staging.

The infrastructure and development staging background report states that:

'Drainage infrastructure must be delivered in the south of Devon Meadows and to the east of Casey Fields South before significant urban development can proceed. As such, development staging will broadly follow these directions.'



While the consortium is not directly involved in development of land in the current Amendment area, it is noted that the infrastructure co-ordination and delivery context (involving fragmented land etc) may require adoption of a staged delivery approach possibly requiring interim solutions. The consortium is keen to ensure that practical solutions are identified that can also be delivered within the Clyde South PSP area.

Given the infrastructure funding and delivery relationship between the Deavon Meadows and Casey Fields South PSP and the Clyde South PSP, the consortium request is that this submission be treated as an objecting submission but with the desire to identify potential improvements to the drainage scheme that may assist with its delivery.

Finally, it is noted that the PSP contains a density target for the 'amenity areas' of 30 per ha of NDHA and a target across the PSP area of 24/ha. These targets exceed the PSP Guidelines and warrant careful consideration before they are implemented in this PSP and possibly within the adjoining Clyde South PSP area.

If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on

Yours faithfully,

Chris De Silva

Executive Director