

Amendment C244melt – Melton East PSP

Melbourne Water Submission – Agency Evaluation Comments Table

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
1	S3.4.2 Guidelines section	Public Realm	Create additional guideline in S3.4.2	<p>Specific MW Asset and modelling Guidelines should be referred to in the 'Guidelines' section.</p> <p>Drainage assets must be designed according to Drainage Assets guidelines including Melbourne Water's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- MUSIC and Wetland Design Guideline- Retarding Basin Design Assessment Guideline- Constructed Waterway Design Manual- Waterway Corridors- Rain Garden Guideline <p>In response to query from VPA regarding maintenance or access requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Maintenance and access requirements for drainage infrastructure are asset specific. Refer to relevant Melbourne Water's Asset Guidelines.	Y	Requested items have been provided in Guideline G23 (page 33).
2	Public Realm and Water plan	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Separate plan for drainage/waterways	For legibility, it would be beneficial to have a 'drainage and waterways' plan which is separate to the open space plan, so that drainage information can be clearly communicated.	Y	This has been addressed by way of Plan 7 (Water)(page 39). However, MW has identified various other issues in relation to Plan 7 elsewhere through this submission.
3	Place Based Plan; Public Realm and Water plan	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Update place based plan/waterway and drainage plan to be consistent in description of land take area. Add note to Plan 4 regarding asset symbols.	<p>Plan consistency and legend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the place based plan (Plan 1) depicts drainage assets as 'other uncredited open space' whereas the Public Realm and Water plan (Plan 4) describes land take area as 'waterways and drainage'.- the depiction of assets as blue shapes does not have a description in the Plan 4 legend.- MW requests a prominent disclaimer/note on Plan 4, to state that the blue shapes symbolize indicative asset locations, and do not represent asset size, shape and exact location. <p>Note: It is MW's experience with Office South employment precinct PSP, that the asset shapes on plan can be misleading, and fail to communicate that the assets are subject to change in the finalization of the DSS.</p>	N	Various updates required as addressed through this submission .

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
4	Conservation area concept plans - Appendix 2	Conservation Areas	<p>Update PSP document/plans subject to findings of cultural heritage, biodiversity and eco-hydrology investigations.</p> <p>Include additional concept plans similar to 'conservation area concept plans' for the pre-European wetland areas, which incorporate the cultural heritage and biodiversity objectives.</p>	<p>Melbourne Water notes the following information gaps in the PSP which have implications for completeness of MW's drainage strategy and the future urban structure/place based plan (implications for the shape and size of waterway/drainage assets and land take).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Cultural heritage- Biodiversity- Eco-hydrology <p>These investigations should be completed and the findings presented in the section of the PSP that addresses existing conditions/features of the site (such as Section 1.4-1.5 'Precinct Features/Cultural Context'); and the PSP plans and requirements updated accordingly.</p> <p>There is still work to be completed in the area of the pre-European wetlands in terms of both cultural and biodiversity values, and this will have implications for the shape and size of waterway/drainage assets (and land take). Once established, the cultural and biodiversity values will need to be presented as objectives via cultural heritage and biodiversity/conservation concept plans.</p>	Y	<p>MW accept this outcome. CH information is now included in the PSP and MW working with Council can continue to progress the Co-Design of the wetlands / escarpment as needed separate to the PSP.</p> <p>R39 appropriately addresses the need for stormwater to "achieve the hydrological requirements of retained wetlands", which is suitable.</p>
5	Cultural heritage and waterways/wetlands (no specific PSP section)	Cultural Heritage	Potential changes subject to RAP advice.	<p>It is noted that at the meeting with VPA on 17 April 2024, Wurundjeri RAP expressed the position of wanting to maintain and enhance ephemeral waterway/s and pre-European wetlands, and advised they were still working on their input to the ACHI and Values assessment and that would inform their response. Other than stating they wanted to see the wetlands retained and maintained/enhanced we are yet to fully understand what they seek for the PSP.</p>	Y	<p>Plan 10 (Aboriginal Cultural Values) (page 41) identifies the ephemeral waterways. Rehabilitation may need to be further described. ACHIA and Cultural Values reports released with PSP for public exhibition.</p>

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
6	Plan 4	Ecology	If this is not addressed in PSP planning phase, additional requirements should be added to the PSP.	<p>For discussion with VPA and Council: MW is seeking for the following to be undertaken as part of the PSP planning process (ideally, pre-panel phase) given the implications for roads and land take, however is aware of VPA time constraints and therefore discussion is required as to how this can be addressed.</p> <p>Buffers for pre-European wetlands need to be determined by ecological and cultural studies, including appropriate uses within buffers (pathway, other drainage assets, etc.). Buffer areas should be incorporated into the PSP (and reflected in plans) prior to PSP gazettal, in order to have certainty around the location of roads, and Melbourne Water land take.</p> <p>An ecological and hydrologic study will be required to ascertain the requirements for the pre-European wetlands to maintain the pre-development values. The ecological study will define buffer distances and any appropriate uses within the buffer in addition to the values within the wetland. Treated pre-development hydrology (to maintain existing vegetation watering requirements) will need to be achieved with control structures as proven by appropriate hydrologic regime and water balance modelling. Where groundwater dependent ecosystem, appropriate additional assessments required.</p>	Y	MW acknowledges VPA response.
7	R42, R46	Post-Contact Heritage	Interface cross-section of Heritage Stone Wall interface which communicates objectives.	<p>Regarding the Dry Stone Wall: further consultation and discussion is required between MW, Council, VPA to determine the objectives and interface requirements. This should ultimately be reflected in a cross section in the PSP.</p> <p>R42 specifies a 5m setback. Please note that this might not be achievable on parts of the eastern side, requires further investigation.</p> <p>Please note: it is not part of Melbourne Water's requirements to maintain/manage the interface/setback area because it does not perform a drainage function.</p>	N	It is noted that Appendix 10 (Selection Wall Cross Section)(page 98) has been added. However, as per discussions with Melton City Council, MW seeks a requirement that a waterway crossing is provided at the location of the dry stone wall, which has not been incorporated into the PSP.
8	Plan 1, Place Based Plan. Plan 4, Public realm and water	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Changes pending to Plans 1 and 4.	For discussion/progression with VPA/Council: The Public Realm and Water plan will need to be updated subject to updates/refinements to Melbourne Water's drainage strategy, and therefore the layouts for Plan 1 and 4 will be subject to change. Melbourne Water are looking to consolidate the Water Quality assets, particularly in the High Street Melton Development Services Scheme.	N	Various updates required to Plan 7 Water as addressed through this submission.
9	Appendix 2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Interface cross-section to be updated.	To provide an appropriate visual representation, the conservation area interface cross section showing 'conservation area/waterway' should depict water (1%AEP Flood) and indicative slope into the system.	N	<p>The PSP should include a slope cross-section, as per Agency Validation comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 1, which is a cross-section extracted from the Toolern PSP as an example of a slope/interface cross-section.</p>

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
10	Infrastructure and Development Staging Plan. Outcomes from staging workshop will affect Pg 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, O31, R71, R75, R79 R86, G38.	Infrastructure Coordination	Updates to staging plan required, including post workshop with VPA and stakeholders on 30 April.	<p>The PSP staging plan is to prioritise delivery of critical drainage infrastructure. This will allow for flooding safety during implementation, and help limit the amount of interim temporary infrastructure required. To facilitate adequate staging for drainage infrastructure, the downstream ultimate assets should be constructed first. We agree with Stage 1A proceeding initially to service the Iramoo DSS (currently without an outfall). Active development is occurring upstream of Stage 2A (Shogaki DSS) and this stage should be prioritized at the same time as Stage 1A. Stages 3 and 2B should occur prior to 1B in order to facilitate an outfall for 1B, as per the current DSS concept.</p> <p>The staging response should also provide guidance of the servicing mechanism of stormwater infrastructure amongst different agencies.</p>	N	MW maintains that the staging plan should be reviewed and updated as per its earlier response.
11	Application requirement for IWM	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Separate requirements for IWM from DSS related requirements.	Application requirements for integrated water management should be separated from application requirements relating to DSS/drainage strategy, to avoid confusion and for completeness. MW can put forward proposed drafting in its submission to public exhibition.	N	MW is concerned about the lack of distinction between 'water' versus 'stormwater' (IWM v. DSS), noting that IWM responsibility is shared with Council and Greater Western Water. The plan may give the impression that it is all under the charge of MW. This may create confusion for developers as to who to engage with and seek approval from for IWM matters. Some notes on plan could assist in conveying this division in responsibilities. E.g. detail which authorities are responsible for 'indicative class B recycled water trunk main'.
12	R80	Infrastructure Coordination	<p>Reword R80: Development staging must provide for the delivery of ultimate waterway and drainage infrastructure, including stormwater <i>detention</i>, quality treatment, <i>flow management and volume control (as applicable)</i> and consider opportunities for early establishment of waterways to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority. Where it cannot be demonstrated to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water that this is not possible, staged development proposals must demonstrate how any interim solution adequately manages flow rates and flow volume, treats</p>	Suggested rewording of R80 to ensure that interim solutions do not create other adverse impacts (in accordance with MW proposed drafting for Officer South Employment PSP).	N	<p>MW consider that the Croskell EPSP (requirement and guideline) drafting for DSS delivery should be applied (tailored) to this PSP. It also addresses consideration of staged delivery and interim alternatives. This drafting was the result of collaboration between the VPA and MW to respond to concerns of landowners about a lack of clarity in the PSP regarding discretion when MW assesses alternatives to upfront ultimate delivery. Please also refer to Additional Comments (Item 16).</p> <p>It is also noted that the Plan 12 (Infrastructure and Development Staging) does not address drainage delivery, and does not feature the critical outfall locations.</p>

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
			stormwater generated from the development (<i>without causing adverse impacts to other properties within or outside the precinct, the environment, cultural heritage, or other infrastructure</i>) and how this will enable delivery of an ultimate drainage solution, to the satisfaction of Melbourne Water and the responsible authority. Development construction staging and interim solutions must avoid or mitigate the risk of soil erosion and water and waterway degradation from sodic and/or dispersive soils.			
13	Section 3.2.2, Guidelines	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Possible ICP implications.	Meetings required with VPA and DTP Transport: There are MW DSS Principles (no.7) and requirements for servicing, contributions, and funding when road and stormwater infrastructure intersect. This is for both hydraulic and stormwater quality purposes. DTP (Transport) also has its own requirements and obligations under other legislation. To avoid confusion between agencies, the arrangement for servicing and funding should be confirmed prior to public exhibition.	N	Culvert cost responsibility is still being resolved between DTP, MW and VPA.
14	Section 3.2.2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Additional PSP requirements: - Roadways must be located outside of buffers for pre-European wetlands. - Road crossings to consider GGF Crossing Guidelines, fence or other structure, to limit wildlife interaction with roads.	For planning of infrastructure around natural wetlands: - Roadways must be located outside of buffers for pre-European wetlands given the impacts to fauna values. - Road crossings must consider GGF Crossing Guidelines, fence, or other structure to limit wildlife interaction with roads.	Y	The PSP now aligns with DEECA advice.
15	G25	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Amend dot point #4: Enable any potential supply of treated stormwater for existing and future GGF wetlands and pre-European wetlands to be gravity fed	Include pre-European wetlands when discussing gravity fed treated stormwater supply to wetlands.	Y	Addressed in Guideline G22 (page 33)
16	G27	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Amend dot point #5: Supplying stormwater of the right quality and quantity to existing and future Growling Grass Frog wetlands and pre-European wetlands.	Include pre-European wetlands when discussing gravity fed treated stormwater supply to wetlands.	Y	Addressed in Guideline G22 (page 33)

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
17	Section 3 application requirements for subdivision	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Amend dot point #7: A hydrogeological assessment of the groundwater conditions on the site and the potential impacts on the proposed development <i>and protected ecological features including pre-European wetlands</i> , including any measures required to mitigate the impacts of groundwater on the development and the impact of the development on groundwater.	Dot point 7: The application requirement for a hydrogeological assessment, should also address pre-European wetlands.	Y	Pre-European wetland section is now included.
18	Section 3 application requirements for subdivision	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	New second level dot point for Dot point 10, A landscape masterplan that: -Incorporates relevant EVCs and ecological requirements in planting selection surrounding waterways and pre-European wetlands.	Dot point 10: include additional Landscape masterplan requirement to incorporate relevant EVC and ecological requirements in planting selection surrounding waterways and pre-European wetlands	N	Not included. MW maintains that additional dot point should be included as per its earlier response.
19	S3.7.2 - R83	Bushfire	Development must provide for a minimum 19 metre perimeter road bushfire interface at the conservation area boundary, drainage reserves, pre-European wetlands, constructed waterways. Where a setback from a bushfire hazard area is required by Plan 7: Bushfire Hazard Areas, vegetation within the setback must be managed as follows, unless otherwise agreed by the responsible authority and relevant fire authority: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass must be short cropped and maintained during the declared fire danger period • All leaves and vegetation debris must be removed at regular intervals during the declared fire danger period • Shrubs must not be located under the canopy of trees • Individual and clumps of shrubs must not exceed five square metres in area and must be separated by at least five metres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The canopy of trees must be separated by at least two metres • There must be a clearance of at least two metres between the lowest tree branches and ground level 	Additional bushfire requirement needed to specify requirements for perimeter fencing shown in Plan 7. (Similar to Officer South Employment PSP requirement). MW won't take on management of drainage reserves to meet bushfire standards therefore the bushfire interface (19m or otherwise) should NOT include any drainage reserve land that will be managed by MW. Note: The UFZ area beside Leakes Rd requires further discussion about suitable buffer.	Y	Bushfire plan now provided in Plan 9 (page 41), with relevant requirements provided in Requirements R51 and R52 (pages 31-32).

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 10 metres of a building, flammable objects must not be located close to the vulnerable parts of the building • Plants greater than 10 centimetres in height must not be placed within three metres of a window or glass feature of the building. <p>Consultation is required with Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action Melbourne Strategic Assessment (DEECA MSA), Country Fire Authority (CFA), Melbourne Water and council to confirm the conservation area planting and bushfire risk implications prior to undertaking a development application.</p>			
20	Plan 4 - Public Realm and Water	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management		<p>To note: There appears to be an unmapped ephemeral watercourse within the PSP site. In assessing whether to retain it as a natural waterway, an initial assessment indicates that it would be difficult to confirm this as a waterway under the DELWP 2022 identification of waterways guide. There is a clear flow path but it is unclear once the flow path reaches the wetland (which isn't a waterway). There also doesn't appear to be any mapped vegetation values in relation to this waterway. Requires further consideration, and if necessary, incorporation into PSP. Refer to attachment showing location of ephemeral watercourse.</p>	Y	Ephemeral waterways identified by a Wurundjeri led investigation are provided on Plan 10.
21	R26	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<p>...Achieve the objectives of BPEM CSIRO 1999... <i>and demonstrate that activities are managed to avoid the risk of environmental damage under the GED and EPA publication 1739.1...</i> or words to that effect.</p>	<p>Include reference to the General Environmental Duty, which has updated stormwater management guidelines.</p> <p>Note: From EPA website "The general environmental duty (GED) is central to the laws. It requires all Victorians to manage risks to human health and the environment that their activities create. Everyone must take steps to prevent or minimize those risks."</p>	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R41 (pages 29-30) with GED wording.

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
22	R49	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	"Applications must demonstrate, through the preparation of IWM plans, that development will appropriately contribute towards: ..." to the satisfaction of etc.	"Applications must demonstrate, through the preparation of IWM plans, the extent to which development will contribute towards:" This wording is not strong enough - technically any application can demonstrate the "extent" to which it contributes even if that extent is minimal/unacceptable.	N	There is potential for the IWM requirements to be clearer and more specific. MW wish to consult further with the VPA and Council.
23	R49	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<i>Opportunities</i> identified in the Melton East IWM Assessment (Alluvium, May 2023). - and refer to table 14 <i>if</i> table 14 is going to include them.	Requirement refers to "outcomes" in the Melton East IWM Assessment (Alluvium, May 2023). The outcomes in the assessment are the IWM forum outcomes. Should this instead refer to the opportunities identified in this document?	Y	Requested changes generally addressed in the Integrated Water Management Strategic Outcomes in Table 15 (page 37).
24	R49	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Include additional dot points: * <i>Stormwater risk management under the GED</i> * <i>The delivery of infrastructure for the Regional Stormwater Harvesting Scheme</i> * <i>The delivery of the applicable Melbourne Water approved development services scheme(s).</i>	Include reference to the General Environmental Duty and the regional SWH scheme and MW DSS	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R41 (pages 29-30) .
25	R38	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Design of open space within waterway corridors, utilities easements and any other encumbered open space must maximise the amenity value of that open space and provide for flexible recreational opportunities <i>without negatively impacting the purpose or maintenance of these areas.</i>	Concerned that this wording would mean amenity is the main goal and cause issues for whatever the utility/encumbrance is. MW have requirements of drainage reserves to maintain flood and waterway function (including ecological, cultural, conveyance), which must be first priority.	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R40 (page 29).
26	Table 15: Integrated Water Management Strategic Outcomes	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Headings 3,5 and 6 should read: 3 - Existing and future flood risks are managed to maximise outcomes for the community, 5 - Healthy and valued urban and rural landscapes, 6 - Community values are reflected in place-based planning, Dot points should include full list of opportunities from the Melton IWM report.	Update all outcome headings to match the Werribee Catchment IWM Plan (2023) <u>not</u> the Werribee IWM Forum Strategic Directions Statement (SDS) (2018). https://www.water.vic.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0030/677406/werribee-catchment-iwm-plan-summary.pdf It is not clear where the list of headings referenced in Table 14 have come from. Each of the PSP outcomes has a number of different options and touch points beyond what's listed in the SDS.	N	There is potential for the IWM requirements to be clearer and more specific. MW wish to consult further with the VPA and Council.

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
27	3.2 and Appendix 4	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Include pipeline easements/pump station footprints in cross sections.	Regarding roads cross sections - The High quality public realm section refers to the Melton East IWM Assessment which says "Allow space for pipeline easements and pump stations footprints." to allow the Regional SWH scheme. This is required to meet the flow targets for the area under the GED and in the Healthy Waterways Strategy. It is not clear if the plans and cross sections for roads will require consideration/allowance to service this scheme.	N	There is potential for the IWM requirements to be clearer and more specific. MW wish to consult further with the VPA and Council.
28	Table 14: Integrated Water Management Strategic Outcomes (Healthy and valued waterways and marine environments)	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<p>Replace the existing dot point with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan waterway corridors to retain or improve habitat connectivity (e.g. for Growling Grass Frogs), minimizing impacts of crossings (Melbourne Water); - Secure suitable water sources to supply the hydrological requirements of retained wetlands (pre-European) and future GGF habitat wetlands (Melbourne Water). 	The dot point ("Identify creek and road crossing locations for Growling Grass Frog to improve habitat connectivity (Melbourne Water)") requires rewording.	Y	Requested changes addressed in Table 15 (page 37)
29	R29	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<p>Reword R29 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stormwater infrastructure within or adjacent to the BCS Conservation Area or retained wetlands (pre-European) must be designed to supply treated stormwater to achieve the hydrological requirements of retained wetlands (pre-European) and GGF habitat wetlands, unless otherwise agreed to by the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action and Melbourne Water. 	<p>This requirement should also apply to retained wetlands (pre-European) outside of the BCS Conservation Area.</p> <p>The matter of treated runoff and GGF areas requires further discussion with Melbourne Water and MSA team.</p>	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R29 (page 29).

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
30	G18	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Reword G18 to: - The layout and design of the waterways, wetlands and retarding basins (including the design of paths, bridges and boardwalks and the stormwater drainage system) connecting to the Kororoit Creek should <i>provide biodiversity connectivity and natural systems habitat integration</i> to the satisfaction of the responsible authority, Melbourne Water and the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action.	This guideline should capture 'biodiversity and natural systems habitat connectivity'. The waterway corridors are going to provide the only habitat connectivity between several existing habitats/nodes (e.g. Ryans Creek in Melton and Kororoit Ck; retained wetlands and Kororoit Creek).	Y	MW acknowledges the VPA's response. It is just noted that Guideline G18 (page 32) now includes wording to provide connectivity, however Plan 6 (page 38) and Plan 7 (page 39) do not show the proposed connectivity.
31	Plan 4 - Public Realm and Water	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	See adjoining screenshot for marked up map with comments	Biodiversity connectivity gaps/opportunities: There are two places where biodiversity connectivity gaps/opportunities exist. The highest priority is the gap/opportunity between Kororoit Creek BCS/open space and the drainage assets and Paynes Road retained wetland (Pre-European) to the south. The other gap is the large north-west portion of the PSP, where there doesn't appear to be any current opportunities to create a biodiversity corridor between the proposed Melton East PSP drainage assets and Ryans Creek corridor (Melton, existing). Is this something that the VPA would be open to?	Y	MW acknowledges the VPA's response. It is just noted that Guideline G18 (page 32) now includes wording to provide connectivity, however Plan 6 (page 38) and Plan 7 (page 39) do not show the proposed connectivity.
32	Plan 4 - Public Realm and Water	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Review thematic mapping of drainage assets in BCS Conservation Area for consistent representation.	The sediment pond in the GGF Conservation Area at the northern end of the BCS Conservation Area is different in graphic representation to other drainage (i.e. has a dark shadow)	Y	No longer in Conservation Area.
33	Conservation area concept plans and interface cross sections	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Reword Dot Point 7 on each of the CA Concept Plans (x3) to: - Maintenance access points are subject to <i>Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action and Melbourne Water's determination and satisfaction</i> .	Dot point 7 on each of the Conservation Area Concept Plans (x3) states 'Maintenance access points are subject to Melbourne Water's determination and satisfaction'.	Y	Cross sections have been provided in Appendix 6.

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
34		Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<p>A new Appendix, adding an Interface Plan for a 'Local Access Street - Drainage Reserve' containing a pre-European wetland cross section, detailing the fuel reduction area and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>A second interface plan would be useful for Taylors Road south of the Beattys Road Wetland (BCS conservation area) where the wetland and associated drainage infrastructure are cramped for space against Taylors Road.</p>	<p>The Conservation Area Interface drawings (Open space/Local Access Road - Conservation Area) are very helpful to show that the Bushfire Fuel Reduction Setback Area is outside of the BCS area. However there is currently no guidance for the interfaces of the pre-European Wetlands or drainage reserves.</p> <p>A new Interface Plan should be added to clarify what assets are suitable within the Plan 7: Bushfire Plan setbacks, including where shared paths are/aren't suitable.</p> <p>The cross sections need to be explicit to show that the bushfire setbacks adjoin - but are not located within - the conservation areas, drainage reserves or pre-European wetlands. And should show what is permissible within those buffers and how they should be managed.</p>	Y	Cross sections have been provided on Appendix 6.
35	Pg 58 Open Space-Conservation Area Interface Cross Section	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	<p>Update dot point 1:</p> <p>All necessary fire breaks must be outside of the conservation area and/or drainage reserve area when the drainage reserve is interfacing development.</p>	<p>Notes: Dot point 1 must be updated to reflect "all necessary fire breaks must be outside of the conservation area and/or drainage reserve area when the drainage reserve is interfacing development".</p> <p>i.e. MW won't undertake fire breaks or manage for fuel reduction for land managed for drainage/waterway function.</p>	N	MW's requested change has not been incorporated.
36	O21, Table 14	Cultural Heritage	Potential changes to PSP/plans.	Gap identified - Yet to be provided with a draft Cultural Values Assessment. A draft Cultural Values Assessment is critical to inform the protection and integration of Aboriginal cultural heritage values – as per Objective O21, and Integrated Water Management Strategic Outcomes (Table 14). Once received, it will require review and integration with the PSP/plans.	Y	These elements have been integrated in the PSP. Aboriginal Cultural Values Plan has been provided in Plan 10 (page 42) also Appendix 9 comprises a Predicted Archaeological Sensitivity plan (page 97).
37	R41	Post-Contact Heritage	Should there be a specific reference to the Victorian Heritage Inventory listed place?	Potential gap identified - All references to historical cultural heritage listings are places listed on the Heritage Overlay in the Melton Planning Scheme. There is also a State listed Victorian Heritage Inventory listed place within the PSP area: H7822-2301 (BEATTYS ROAD BLUESTONE COTTAGE AND CISTERN).	Y	Resolved.
38	R71	Cultural Heritage	Where services cannot avoid crossing or being located within a conservation area or natural waterway corridor, they must be consolidated and located to avoid disturbance to existing <i>cultural heritage values</i> , waterway values, native vegetation, areas of strategic importance to Growling Grass Frog, to the satisfaction of the Department of Energy, Environment and Climate Action, Melbourne Water, and the responsible authority.	Include cultural heritage values.	Y	Resolved.

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
39	R71	Cultural Heritage	Perhaps this needs to be its own recommendation within 'Infrastructure Coordination' as it is not directly relevant to R71.	Requirements for utility installation should also consider early works that have the potential to impact on cultural heritage values (such as geotechnical works) and where possible relocate these away from waterways, and other culturally sensitive landforms.	Y	Cultural Values Plan has been provided at Plan 10. Refer to Additional Comments regarding cultural heritage.
40	High Quality Public Realm	Cultural Heritage	Perhaps this needs to be its own recommendation within 'High Quality Public Realm'	The PSP should consider the intrinsic/intangible Aboriginal cultural heritage values of landscape features such as wetlands, waterways, escarpments, stony rises and elevated areas, and provide appropriate setbacks (to be determined by the results of the Cultural Values Assessment, CHMPs and ACHIA) to protect these landforms, even where registered Aboriginal cultural heritage places are not present.	Y	Cultural Values Plan has been provided at Plan 10. Refer to Additional Comments regarding cultural heritage.
41	2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	"seasonal herbaceous wetland" to " <i>Seasonal Herbaceous Wetland</i> "	PSP Purpose: 4th para, update: Capitalise first letters of "seasonal herbaceous wetland" because it is a vegetation community name.	Y	Resolved.
42	3.5.2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	New requirement to apply to other types of applications: Active interfaces in the form of a street must be provided along waterway and drainage corridors as well as wetlands and natural stormwater assets, to provide passive surveillance, public access, opportunities for enjoyment of the drainage reserves, as well as uninhibited maintenance access.	Active interfaces in the form of a street must be provided along waterway and drainage corridors as well as wetlands and natural stormwater assets. This is in order to provide passive surveillance and public access and enjoyment of the drainage reserves, as well as uninhibited maintenance access. R2 addresses active interfaces to waterways through residential subdivision applications, but this requirement should stand alone (not just tied to residential subdivision).	Y	Resolved.
43	R2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Active interfaces with the adjacent street, open space, and waterways and <i>drainage reserves</i> .	Update dot point 3 to include drainage reserves.	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R2 (page 14).
44	R22	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Canopy tree coverage within the public realm must achieve a minimum of 30% (excluding areas dedicated to biodiversity or native vegetation conservation or <i>drainage function</i>).	Update wording to exclude areas with a drainage function.	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R22 (page 28).
45	G22	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Revised wording for discussion: Land uses abutting the Selection Wall should enhance public visibility of the wall. Relevant uses include open space, conservation reserve, road verge or property boundary wall <i>drainage reserve</i> .	Consider updating G22 to remove 'boundary wall' and to add ' drainage reserve', noting that MW drainage reserve does interact with the Selection Wall and would require active frontage/access track along waterway (or western side of wall).	Y	Requested changes addressed in Requirement R46 (pages 30-31).

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
46	Plan 7	Bushfire	Bushfire plan to be updated to reflect future state drainage reserve risk, particularly natural waterway - Kororoit Creek and constructed waterways and treatment wetland areas.	Bushfire plan, please fix this plan to respond to future vegetated state of drainage reserves and required (19m?) setback from these. To include; Kororoit Creek escarpment areas, constructed waterways, stormwater treatment assets. I.e.MW can't/won't manage fuel reduction for land managed for drainage/waterway function.	Y	Resolved.
47	Conservation Area Concept Plan North and Central and East	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Update Note 2: <i>"conservation area and/or drainage/waterway reserve or whichever is interfacing with development along the Kororoit Creek Corridor, to provide a 19m fuel reduction setback."</i>	Note 2 - Update wording to reflect: "conservation area and/or drainage/waterway reserve or whichever is interfacing with development along the Kororoit Creek Corridor, to provide a 19m fuel reduction setback." I.e. MW can't/won't manage fuel reduction for land managed for drainage/waterway function.	Y	Requested changes addressed in Plan 9 and in Bushfire requirements.
48	Conservation Area Concept Plan North and Central and East	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	For further discussion	Note 8 - Offroad bike pathsto continue under the bridges. Has this bike/shared trail been considered from landform/ engineering design/ risk assessment? ME side and interaction with floodplain and/or escarpment areas may be major constraints. May need to be updated or investigation for trail design to be on a suspended platform or be delivered via road crossings?	N	MW notes that the AustRoad guidelines apply here and therefore Note 8 of Table 28 should be amended to provide for 'Off road shared path and two-way bike paths are to continue underneath the bridges where feasible '. Please refer to Additional Comments (Item 12).
49	High Quality public realm objectives	Public Realm	Add R49 to O13, O17, O19 as "implementation tool"	R49 is an "implementation tool" for O13, O17, O19.	Y	MW acknowledges the VPA's response.
50	G27	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Update final dot point: Regional scale stormwater harvesting systems to service <i>the water demands</i> of the precinct and beyond, <i>and to protect the local waterways from excess urban runoff</i> .	Update final dot point: regional SWH is for water demands (not limited to watering/irrigation) <i>and</i> waterway protection.	Y	MW's requested change has been addressed in Guideline G26 (page 33).
51	2	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Important natural landmarks such as Kororoit Creek and the Seasonal Herbaceous Wetland conservation area will be key, <i>protected</i> features of the community.	Update first sentence second para of 2.2 PSP Purpose. Worth emphasizing that they'll be preserved or protected natural features.	Y	MW requested changes addressed in section 1.2 (page 7).

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
52	O31	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	To plan for an integrated water management system that reduces reliance on reticulated potable water, increases the re-use of alternative water through stormwater harvesting and water recycling, <i>and mitigates urban runoff impacts on the local waterways</i> , contributing towards a sustainable and green urban environment.	Add "reduce impacts on waterways" to IWM planning objective.	Y	Resolved.
53	Table 3, Housing Plan- Amenity Area and High density housing, and G7	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	For further discussion	<p>The PSP does not provide sufficient direction regarding built form in the amenity/housing areas adjacent to drainage reserves and waterways.</p> <p>These areas should be subject to build form (height/setback) controls, potentially presented as cross section requirements for waterway interfaces, to ensure that visual intrusion/bulk and overshadowing impacts are minimised, and view lines protected, particularly for Kororoit Creek.</p> <p>Table 13 describes the built form character for amenity areas as 3-4 storeys. G7 seeks for subdivision and built form to respond to local context and support view line corridors in reference to Kororoit Creek, however further built form direction is needed to ensure there are appropriate built form transitions around waterways.</p> <p>The greatest need is along the escarpment of Kororoit Creek, particularly for areas designated for high density.</p>	Partial	Built form controls should also apply to natural wetlands, not just Kororoit Creek. This is within MW remit and the visual impact to waterways and wetlands forms part of MW's permit application assessment process (visual intrusion assessment). Please refer to Additional Comments (Item 1).
54	Appendix 2: Proposed Floodplain Land Use outside the Regional Open Space	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	For further discussion	Floodplain treatment for the balance of the area next to the regional open space, has been labelled as constructed waterway / drainage asset, however only a smaller land area is to be used for drainage assets with the rest being retained as floodplain in line with current UFZ. The hatch should be updated to differentiate floodplain vs drainage asset areas.	N	<p>Plans 6 and 7 should be amended to differentiate between waterway, drainage assets and the flood plain.</p> <p>Appendix 2 needs to be amended to include reference to regional park.</p>
55	Setback to the escarpment feedback as requested	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	For further discussion	<p>Melbourne Water has provided advice to the VPA regarding risks of allowing development within 30-50m from the top of bank of the escarpment, based on our experience with the Merrimu and Parwan PSPs. MW will have Alluvium undertake Geotech for the suitability of drainage assets (but not of suitability of roads or other infrastructure), and to provide advice on buffer widths.</p> <p>VPA should undertake detailed Geotech studies to determine refinement of escarpment buffers.</p> <p>This analysis could consider a suitable Cultural Heritage setback also.</p>	N	MW supports a minimum 30m buffer from the Kororoit Creek escarpment, however, notes that in any event, the escarpment setback will need to address other issues including geotechnical and cultural heritage related matters and development / infrastructure in proximity to the escarpment.

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
56	Table 12 Drainage asset list	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Provide plan for drainage assets to correspond to Table 12	No plan provided for drainage assets as of yet.	Partial	MW notes that there are some minor discrepancies between the PSP plans and the shape files provided to the VPA by MW. MW also notes that there will be further refinements to the DSS and drainage asset related land-take post public consultation.
57	TBC	Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Leakes Road Bridge (Advice requested by VPA, which may have implications for PSP)	Leakes Road Kororoit Creek Crossing (Creek Flooding) - The proposed flood plain at 1% AEP flood event under existing conditions.	N	Latest existing scenario flood information will be completed by end of the financial year by the Flood Information Team.
70		Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management		<p>Design in floodplains criteria - Prior to development, appropriate modelling of the proposal must be submitted and approved by Melbourne Water. The modelling will be assessed using the following criteria.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No impact on existing flood levels in relation to impacts on Kororoit Creek and the safe/sustainable conveyance of flows. 2. No impact on flood plain storage for all storm events i.e. any development within the flood plain will be required to demonstrate a balance of the existing flood storage. Any modifications to the flood plain will be required to assess the impacts to the conveyance of flows associated with the Kororoit Creek (velocities, shear etc.). 3. The proposal must meet safe access criteria. 4. The proposal must meet freeboard requirements including buildings and the level of flood protection. 5. A setback from creek will be required. 6. The proposal must meet Melbourne Water maintenance requirements/considerations for Kororoit Creek (type of planting, access points, etc.). <p>An overarching item is the consideration of including climate change modelling and future flood conditions in order to assess the proposal. Site specific characteristics, including the complexities surrounding the flooding of Leakes Road, add another layer of complexities to these criteria. Plans and supporting flood modelling must be provided to Melbourne Water which demonstrate how the proposal will satisfy all of the floodplain criteria as listed above prior to Melbourne Water providing any in principle support on the regional park options within the Melton East PSP.</p>	N	<p>The modelling for the post development floodplain scenario (Aintree Town Centre, new Leakes Road design, and Melton East PSP) will be completed in the next 18 months. Floodplain implications for the Melton East PSP will be determined as part of further modelling. The PSP should provide some information/context about this matter.</p> <p>Additionally, the new climate change guidelines are being applied to the DSS design, this will be complete by end of financial year, and will also need to be factored in.</p>

Item	Reference	Topic	Change requested by MW	MW Submission to Agency Validation	MW issue resolved? (Y/N)	MW Comment (on public version of PSP)
71		Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management	Arrangement to be reflected in PSP document.	<p>Council Agreement - The use of floodplain for sporting use scenario identifies Council as a key stakeholder. There needs to be understanding that Council will be the ultimate asset owner therefore the ultimate level of service will need to be provided by Council.</p> <p>These include items such as clean up after a flood event, design for maintenance, variability in costs from flood damage, and timing of repair for a regional facility. This is to be reflected in the PSP documentation if adopted.</p> <p>Agreement from Council on the flooding extents of the ovals (if proposed) will be required, as flooding could occur after the storm event, as the creek peak levels can lag after the storm event.</p> <p>Even if there is an agreement with Council to locate the ovals within a floodplain, post PSP gazettal (during the implementation phase) there is an identified risk that Council may reverse their position and request flood immunity of the oval. This could arise from a change in community demands, future climate change modelling and future flood conditions at time of implementation. Difficulties in planning and usage will arise for this site.</p>	N	Council is considered as Lead Agency on Table 23 (page 57) for the Sporting Reserves SR-03a & SR-03b, but nothing has been mentioned about ownership and maintenance responsibilities.
72		Drainage, Waterways and Integrated Water Management		<p>Flood plain oval design and other remarks- If there is a Council agreement to allow flooding of the future ovals (or any other uses), the following include high level comments relevant to the design of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is to be designed as per the flood plain criteria. • There is potential for implementing a different drainage asset type for the ovals, as well as potential opportunities for innovation in the area to Melbourne Water and Council satisfaction. • It is noted the use of sporting ovals is an efficient use for encumbered land as it formally maintains the flood plain. <p>Prior to Melbourne Water's support for the regional park location within the PSP, flood safety conditions and criteria associated with the development will be required as per the design in floodplain criteria.</p>	N	The PSP does not provide any specific information or guidance regarding floodplains.

APPENDIX 1

Extract from Toolern Precinct Structure Plan – slope cross-section example

TOOLERN PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN - JULY 2011 (Amended June 2022)

