



Mildura Rural City Council

Riverside Report

for
Residential Development Plan
for
Mildura Rural City Council

January 2007



CLIENTS | PEOPLE | PERFORMANCE

DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES
URBAN DESIGN AND TOWN PLANNING



Contents:

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Context of the Site

Section 3: The Onsite Issues and Characteristics

Section 4: Engineering Constraints

Section 5: Residential Development Plan

Section 6: The Concepts - Indicative Components of the RDP

Section 7: The Concepts - Design Guidelines

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Feedback

Appendix 2: Summary of Consultation Amendments

Appendix 3: Summary of Amendments in Response to Submissions made at Exhibition

Appendix 4: Flora and Fauna Report

Appendix 5: Revisions Table

Section I

Introduction

Final report – Mildura Residential

Development Plans

This report is one of four that outlines the Residential Development Plans (RDP) for four areas in Mildura that are expected to be the focus of residential development in the city in the near future. These areas are known as Etiwanda, Irymple, Riverside and Nichols Point . The RDP’s identify the characteristics of development that will achieve the optimum benefit for both the incoming residents and the wider Mildura community by ensuring the new neighbourhoods are at once seamlessly stitched into their surroundings yet with their own distinctive character and identity.

The concept seeks to ensure the people who will live in these areas will enjoy a good quality of life with minimal demands on finite environmental resources.

The RDP does this by identifying the design characteristics that ensure these people can enjoy environments that they can be proud of, that are attractive, stimulating, facilitate greater sustainability and foster social engagement.

This has been achieved by engaging the local community, council, stakeholders and the consultants in a collaborative process to ensure design conclusions are firmly based on a broad understanding of all the issues.

The process by which in this study was undertaken has three principal stages;

Understanding the context of the site (section 2), understanding the on site issues and characteristics that affect the development of the site (section 3), understanding the engineering constraints (section 4) and then identifying a concept that achieves a high standard of design and can be demonstrated to address the issues identified above (section 5 -7).

The context (section 2) identifies the relationship between the sites and the important social and physical infrastructure around which a community can coalesce (schools, shops, the city, etc).

The issues (section 3) identifies those factors felt to be important by the various parties who attended the first round of consultation in February 2006. (See appendix 1) and includes community, consultants, council and stakeholder observations. It is important to note that solutions were not invited at this stage so we could concentrate on the underlying issues and ensure we had as good an understanding of those as possible before

we started drawing conclusions. Consequently recommendations have not been recorded so “we want larger blocks” were not recorded at this stage as what was of interest is the underlying concern or hope e.g. “because we value our rural outlook”, which is helpful. This is important if we are to treat all the issues equally and ensure the design agenda is not skewed by a suggestion that may not be the best way of achieving the proponents underlying objective.

The engineering constraints (section 4) relates mainly to dealing with drainage, sewerage and road issues and seeks to identify and “look on” the built form implications of ensuring the site can be adequately serviced and does not impact inequitably on its surroundings.

The concepts (section 5-7) are in three parts; the first part describes indicative road and open space layouts and identify other environmental enhancement projects where appropriate. The second part identifies the key characteristics of the different types of roads and open spaces to ensure they can fulfil the objectives of the study. The third part suggests the aspects of house and garden design that should be controlled if each house lot is to fulfil its responsibility in achieving a more liveable environment.

However an exploration of submissions made and the recommended changes can be found in Appendix 2. At this workshop the attendees were asked whether we have understood their concerns correctly and if we have addressed them to their satisfaction. If we have not we committed to either change our understanding or explain it better. The ideas were explored and if appropriate amended. After the workshop sessions a final draft concept was prepared and the changes documented in order to ensure a wide ownership of the final design.

Note: Whilst the process is committed to treating everyone’s contribution with equal respect, there is no commitment to making a change just because a change is requested.

The Process

This document was initially prepared for the second workshop and has been varied from the intermediate document prepared following the feedback from the workshop. The process undertaken can broadly be described as;

Stage 1. Site Review and Research

Existing plans and studies (workshop 1)

Stage 2. Stakeholder Consultation

This established the issues that surround the potential development of the sites. These relate to the various agencies that are involved in development, the relevant council officers and members of the local community (workshop 2)

Stage 3. Understanding the Issues and developing a Vision

This stage involved developing a concept, testing it against our understanding of the issues and confirming our understanding of the communities concerns through a workshop held 31st March - 1st April.

At this workshop the attendees were asked whether we have understood their concerns correctly and if we have addressed them to their satisfaction. If we have not we will need to either change our understanding or explain it better. The ideas were explored and if appropriate amended. After the workshop sessions a final draft concept was prepared and the changes documented in order to ensure a wide ownership of the final design. Whilst the process is committed to treating everyones contribution with equal respect, there is no commitment to making a change just because a change is requested. The report however will explain why (see appendix 2).

Stage 4. Focus Group Workshops

To further develop and test the concept.

Stage 5. Preparation of Draft Development Plans

Outlining the concept, their key components and describing what they are trying to achieve.

Stage 6. Exhibition

To facilitate final consultation of draft plan

(This occurred between 28th of October and 27th of November.) To consider submissions made on exhibition and amend where appropriate.

Stage 7. Determine Final Plan

This document has been prepared at the end of stage 7 and contains the final RDP for this area.

Stage 8. Council Adoption

Neighbourhood principles

The detailed design of the new neighbourhoods is envisaged to reflect the neighbourhood principles outlined under Clause 12.05.2 and in Section 56 of the Planning Scheme, which can be summarised as:

- Compact walkable neighbourhoods where neighbourhood Centres support local services and facilities. Reduced car use is encouraged because public transport is easy to use and walking and cycling are promoted.
- Environmentally friendly development where lot layout and design supports more energy efficient dwellings.
- Integrated water management that conserves our drinking water and locally manages the quality of urban run-off.
- Socially responsible development that comprises connected streets open spaces are overlooked welcoming and feel safe.

Detailed Design Principles

These neighbourhood principles will be implemented through application of detailed design principles;

- Provide an attractive sense of arrival at each entrance to the site and to each character precinct, through the use of water and landscape
- Articulate decision points in the movement network through the use of attractive and distinctive built form and landscape
- Provide a permeable movement network for pedestrians and cyclists
- Ensure that all streets and parks are overlooked by houses, to enhance their safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Promote traffic speeds and behaviour appropriate to a residential environment through the design of local streets and appropriate traffic calming measures
- Use a distinctive combination of views, landscape and built form in each street to create a sense of place and aid legibility
- Ensure that the swales and overland flow paths are attractive spaces even when dry

Key Features

In addition to the principles described above the key features embedded within this RDP are;

Responding to Existing Characteristics

The vision plans seek to ensure desire lines are catered for, encouraging walking and cycling a relatively more attractive way of getting around for shorter journeys. Routes are designed to link up key destinations and site assets with primary movement routes to provide for direct and logical movement through the site.

The road alignment is designed to respect drainage lines and use the natural fall of the land to provide an ecologically sustainable stormwater management system.

The roads and open spaces are designed to retain healthy trees and use them as a generator of local identity.

The layout emphasises the ridgeline to reinforce the sense of the area responding to its surroundings.

The RDP seeks to introduce new qualities in parts of the site with little intrinsic quality.

Open space and movement networks

In keeping with best practice water sensitive urban design (WSUD) and as reflected in SPPF clause 12.07.2 public open space provision is focused on the stormwater management areas and a road layout that emphasises their importance. Reducing the impact of stormwater by incorporating WSUD to protect and enhance natural water systems and integrate stormwater management into the landscape. The resulting public open space network will contribute significantly to the area's character and provide parks within a comfortable walking distance of anywhere in the study area, and promote walking and cycling.

Secondary streets are aligned where possible to provide a direct visual link to these key features and ensure that swale drains can be used to filter stormwater run-off and mitigate peak flows. This alignment can also capitalise on their value as an attractive view termination. The design of secondary streets and adjoining built form and landscape will provide a clear expression of the street hierarchy, which will help make the neighbourhood more legible and less homogenous.

In residential 1 zoned land where the smaller lots make getting good solar access issues more of a challenge, most streets will be generally orientated north-south to ensure the long side of most lots face north to facilitate good solar access.

Intersections will be designed to avoid conflict and ensure there is no ambiguity as to priority.


Developing character areas

Landscaping, road layout, lot layout and lot size are all used to create a range of different character areas.

This will enhance the visual interest and distinctiveness of the area and provide an appropriate way of accommodating the transition from urban to rural common to all areas. A green skyline and shaded streets will improve the amenity of the roads and other public spaces of the area and facilitate more pedestrian activity during summer.


Section 2

Context of the Site



Section 3

The Onsite Issues and Characteristics



Section 4

Engineering Constraints

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONE DP02

Infrastructure & Servicing

The site comprises the next staged development fronts for the “Riverside” area.

Stormwater drainage

- Mildura Rural City Councils (MRCC) is the relevant service authority for stormwater drainage and associated infrastructure.
- A brief assessment of existing topography and drainage services, and discussions with the Mildura Rural City Councils Engineering department have indicated that the drainage to these areas is possible via “Stormwater Management Areas”(SMA’s), within the determined catchment areas. The SMA’s will be able to connect to existing drainage infrastructure when specific Catchment Capital Works (CCW) improvements have been carried out.
- The SMA’s and CCW infrastructure works are included as a part of the existing and/or proposed Development Contributions Plans (DCP) for these areas. The DCP will provide specific information, including size requirements on the required contribution for each catchment area. If individual developments provide SMA’s or CCW works then due consideration/compensation will be assessed for their contribution to the catchments.
- Indicative drainage areas / catchments are included in the “Drainage and Wastewater” plans, in this report. The detailed design for developments will have to follow the intent of these plans, and should be formulated in conjunction with Councils Engineering department and any specified / required DCP works.
- Development of drainage concepts will have to be in accordance with current planning scheme controls and local MRCC policies.
- Water Sensitive Urban Design principles (WSUD) will have to be used, during development designs; in accordance with current planning scheme controls and local MRCC policies.
- Where appropriate SMA’S have been incorporated with public open space (POS) areas

Potable Water and Wastewater

- Lower Murray Water (LMW) is the relevant service authority for potable water and wastewater. Consultation with LMW, during the design development stage, will clarify the specific infrastructure augmentation works and pump station requirement for wastewater connections.
- Water and wastewater services can be incorporated in developments by extensions to existing infrastructure. Some developments will require augmentation to existing systems.
- Designs will have to be carried out in accordance with current planning scheme controls and LMW policies.

Electricity Supply

- The provision of electricity infrastructure is not expected to cause any problems in these areas.
- Powercor will need to be consulted, during the design development stage, to confirm power supply easements; including transformer substation locations.

Telecommunications Services

- The provision of telecommunications services is not expected to cause any problems in these areas.
- Telstra and Neighbourhood Cable will need to be consulted, during the design development stage, to confirm telecommunication service requirements, supply easements and alignments.

Natural Gas service

- The provision of natural gas service can be made available in these areas, subject to demand and current nearby infrastructure.
- Origin Energy need to be consulted, during the design development stage, to confirm natural gas service availability, supply requirements, easements and alignments.

Horticultural irrigation and drainage

- The First Mildura Irrigation Trust (FMIT) currently provides horticultural water supply and drainage services to the area. The FMIT was consulted during the preparation of this plan. Their requirements are summarised below.
- The study areas were / are horticultural properties that may include irrigation and drainage services, within the allotments, controlled by the FMIT.
- Some of the existing services will become redundant; due to redevelopment to residential purposes. These services can be disconnected in accordance with the requirements of the service provider (currently FMIT). The developed areas will be excised out of the district as required by FMIT.
- Some of the existing services will have to remain; due to servicing areas outside the development plan area. These services can be identified in the design development stage, and redirected as required in accordance with the requirements of the service provider (currently FMIT). Typically service easements may be required over these services.
- Coordination and design of subdivision and/or developments should refer to the FMIT to determine specific service requirements and allow designs to accommodate services that are required to remain.

Traffic & Public Transport

- Subdivision and/or Development designs shall consider traffic and public transport design issues in accordance with current planning scheme controls, local MRCC policies and Vic Roads requirements.
- Mildura Bus lines were consulted, during this study, and did not indicate any issues with public transport to these areas. Designers shall liaise with the service provider to confirm any specific requirements.
- The Riverside area includes a railway reserve that runs adjacent to this part of the study area. Design of Subdivision and/or developments in these areas will have to coordinate with the relevant Railway Authority, if any works impact on the railway reserve, including but not limited to stormwater culverts.
- The Development Contribution Plan (DCP) considers requirements for road works, including intersections, bus stops/shelters and bicycle paths required due to the demand created in each area.

Common Service trenching

- MRCC has been using common service trenching designs in the area for many years.
- Common service trenching is encouraged with specific planning controls for all new developments and should be accommodated within road reserves and coordinated with all relevant service providers.

Salinity Analysis and Management

Generally during the design phase subdivision within the Salinity Management Overlay will require a Site Capability Report and Salinity Action Statement addressing the requirements of the ‘Site Salinity Management Plan (Final Report) REM 2004’.

The details and implications of any salinity analysis done on the land should be considered in accordance with current planning scheme controls and local MRCC policies.

This applies to the Riverside Avenue area only as there is no Salinity Management Overlay (SMO).

Flora and Fauna “Riverside” area

Additional flora and fauna investigation and reporting is required for designated areas along allotments that adjoin to Lake Hawthorn and Lake Ranfurly.

For detailed information, regarding the area, refer to the Preliminary Flora and Fauna inspection report in the Appendices of this report.

Section 5	Residential Development Plan
-----------	------------------------------

Section 6

The Concepts

Indicative Components of the RDP

High quality streets and open spaces

The streets and open spaces of the study are will need to reconcile a wide range of functional and aesthetic requirements whilst also responding to the issues raised by the community and important stakeholders.

The streets and open spaces in this section of the report identify how these changes can be met on the ground. In particular the streets and open spaces are designed to support “water sensitive urban design”. This allows the drainage infrastructure to be used as an aesthetic asset that naturally supports and irrigates a high standard of landscaping.

This ensures the streets and open spaces are not just good for moving through but also look good as well as well providing attractive safe places to walk, cycle, chat to friends and play.

In short they are designed to be places to stay rather than just spaces to pass through.

This section describes some of the key streets and open spaces that will help achieve this goal.

Part 1 describes the common features to all the areas, these are; entrance features that provide an attractive threshold to the neighbourhood and tell people they are entering a residential area and a distinctive neighbourhood. This section also describes the characteristics of stormwater management areas that ensure they are aesthetic assets and are environmentally better than existing drainage basins.

Part 2 describes the streets and open spaces that will be found in this area that will ensure that those streets and spaces are tailored to the needs and values of the community and the circumstances and character of the neighbourhood.

Please note that whilst the section illustrates how a high standard of design can be achieved here to meet these objectives, it is recognised that the dimensions may be able to be varied where it can be demonstrated that the standard of design can be achieved by an alternate design. Meeting this standard will require:

- That the long term survival of the landscaping required will not be disadvantaged by an alternate design
- Where adequate room is given to footpaths and cycle paths
- Where the road parametre does not dominate (generally accepted to be around 1/3 of the total width)

Part I


Gateway feature

Gateway features will provide a memorable and distinctive threshold to the area that tells people they are entering somewhere special and tells vehicle drivers they are entering into a residential area.

Indicative plan showing one way of providing such a gateway feature

Characteristics:

- 3m high sign which has artistic merit and says something of the area it provides the gateway to
- Feature set in landscaped area to provide attractive composition of structure and landscape
- Materials and colours chosen to reflect local “genus locii” or sense of place.



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.1 Key Components - Gateway Feature

Part I

Stormwater management and open space areas

Stormwater management areas will provide an aesthetic and ecologically responsible way of dealing with drainage.

This sketch shows one way of providing such a drainage area

Characteristics:

- Shallow banks of varied slope
- Curved rather than straight edges where appropriate
- Shallower and larger rather than deep and smaller
- Planted with trees and indigenous understorey planting



Mildura Residential Development Plan
Figure 6.2 Key Components - Stormwater management areas

Part 2

Blueway Perspective

Perspective illustrating how the blueway will be designed to evoke a dry creek character.

This illustrates how the drainage swale may be landscaped to reflect its function as a water channel, even if it only carries water occasionally.

This could provide an important landscape asset for the area that could help establish a strong and attractive character for the area.

The swale also facilitates ecologically responsible drainage which should minimise the need for downstream works, minimise the need for irrigation and increase habitat value on site.

Additional road width required for Blueways to be incorporated in DCP contribution.



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.5 Key Components -Blueways


Part 2

Avenue

Avenue/Boulevards will provide the main spines through the development area . Theywill be designed to ensure that the landscape makes a strong contribution to the areas character because of the area and significance dedicated to trees and vegetation.

Characteristics:

- 25.3-30m wide road reserve (wider with indented parking bays).
- Capable of accommodating a bus route and cycle paths.
- Accommodates 'structural landscaping' in the wider nature strip.
- Capable of accommodating indented parking.
- Indigenous planting or to MRCC specification.
- The significant landscaping will offer shade and shelter for the adjacent footpath to facilitate a safe and comfortable walking route.
- Engineering components, roads, footpaths and kerbs to satisfaction of MRCC local policies.



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.6 Key Components - Greenway

Part 2

Avenue/Boulevard Perspective

This illustrates how the greenway treatment will enhance the areas character and emphasise the importance of the key routes through the development

The significant landscaping will have a better chance to thrive because of the wider nature strips and in doing so ensure the area has a green skyline that is not dominated by a roofscape.

This will help retain the areas valued rural character.

The trees are shown at 15 years maturity.



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.7 Key Components - Greenway


Part 2

Edge Road

Edge roads provide the edges to open space. They will ensure the open spaces are safe, overlooked and will facilitate walking, cycling and local vehicular access

Characteristics:

- 15-16m wide road reserve
- Well landscaped edge between open space and residential development.
- Edge roads allow for views from adjacent residences to open space.
- Engineering components, roads, footpaths and kerbs to satisfaction of MRCC local policies.



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.10 Key Components - edge road


Part 2

Standard Road

Most of the roads in the area will be standard roads. The roads will be designed to provide a green skyline and foreground, helping to evoke a rural character. This character is further strengthened because the actual road pavement is approximately a third of the road reserve which will ensure the road does not dominate.

Characteristics:

- 21m wide road reserve
- Allows for significant vegetation
- Possible car parking in bays between trees
- Engineering components, roads, footpaths satisfaction of MRCC local policies and kerbs to



Mildura Residential Development Plan

Figure 6.11 Key Components - Standard Road

Section 7

The Concepts

Design Guidelines

Design Guidelines

We envisage that the sensitivity of the environment and the imperative to achieve a high standard of development requires that design guidelines cover the following aspects of development:

Undertaking a site analysis

House type;

- Building setbacks;
- Building height;
- The front of the house;
- Garage and car port design;
- Fences;
- Landscape; and
- Driveways/crossovers.

The guidelines should be promotional in character and seek to explain not just what needs to be achieved but why. The guidelines should include examples of appropriate development and include both requirements and suggestions. The scope of the guidelines has been drawn up to ensure nothing is controlled unless it is essential and everything that is essential is controlled.

The guideline requirements express what would be acceptable for that design element but to enable the applicant to make a case for non-conforming proposals as long as they could explain how their solution better met the objective of the guideline.

The suggested content of the guidelines, objectives and key points are illustrated in Table I.

The table envisages three types of lots that each have guidelines prepared for their particular circumstances.

Type A lots are only present to RIZ zoned sites adjacent to a neighbourhood focal point/village green. They have controls to ensure that these houses provide an appropriate edge to these important open spaces.

Type B lots are other RIZ lots.

Type C lots are the residential lots in the LDRZ area

Table I Urban Design Guidelines

<i>Element</i>	<i>Objective</i>	<i>Requirements</i>	<i>Suggestions</i>	<i>Notes</i>
The aspect of design covered by the guidelines	What that aspect should achieve	The specific development requirement that would be deemed to fulfill the objective of the guideline	Other issues that would be beneficial to be considered at the time of design but cannot be required	
Site analysis	Ensure the building design responds to the particular circumstances of the site	Applications to incorporate description of the following aspects of the site; Site orientation Vegetation Drainage lines Views and view-sheds (where appropriate)	Application to incorporate a statement saying how it responds to the aspects listed in requirements.	
House type	Ensure the house type is appropriate for the location	Lots adjacent to neighbourhood focal point to fulfill specific guidelines identified for lot type A. Lots zoned LDRZ to fulfill specific guidelines identified for lot type C. Most house lots do not require the controls relevant in these locations and so are subject to a reduced set of specific guidelines identified for lot type B. (see RDP)		
Building Setbacks	Ensure buildings facilitate good surveillance of the public realm and can facilitate significant planting adjacent to the public realm	Type A lots: Front setback 1-3m side 0m Type B lots: Front setback 5-7m side min 2m All lots outside of the drip line of existing trees identified to be retained Type C lots: Front setback min 10m side min5m		In case of conflict with above guideline the guideline higher up will take precedence. Setbacks defined
Building Height	Minimise intrusion on the landscape Minimise intrusion on surrounding properties Ensure equitable view sharing	Type A lots 2 storeys up to a maximum height Type B lots 1-2 storeys up to a maximum height 1-2 storeys up to a maximum height	Encourage useable space within the roof-form.	Maximum height defined to avoid over development or loss of solar access.
The front of the house	Provide adequate passive surveillance of the public realm Facilitate social interaction	Ensure front door faces street Ensure at least one habitable room window faces the street Ensure all house fronts facing north have a verandah at least 1.5m in depth over at least a third of the width of the house-front	Encourage outdoor sitting space in front of lots with other orientations	

Element	Objective	Requirements	Suggestions	Notes
Garage and car port design	Minimise dominance of garages Provide adequate passive surveillance of the public realm	Type A lots Ensure garages are not visible from the primary street frontage Other lots Ensure garages are not forward of the house front.	Incorporate garages into the building form Garage doors no more than 6m wide	
Fences	Contribute to the character of the public realm Minimise spread of wild fire	Ensure front fences are no more than 1.2m high Ensure vegetated fences in front of the dwelling are broken by gaps of at least 5 metres every 20m linear length of frontage		
Landscape	Contribute to the character of the public realm Maximise habitat value Maximise the amenity enjoyed within houses on the land	Type B and C lots Require at least one canopy tree that will grow to a height greater than the house on all lots Ensure all planting is indigenous apart from those immediately to the north of a dwelling which should be deciduous to facilitate good solar access in winter	Council to provide list of preferred plants	
Driveways/ crossovers	Minimise intrusion into the landscape Minimise impact of development on the areas hydrology	Type B and C lots Driveways no more than 3m wide at entry to block Crossovers radii to accommodate vehicles with trailers	Minimise area of impermeable surfaces Construct driveway from permeable material such as granitic sand or Lilydale toppings where possible.	

Appendix I	Summary of Consultation Feedback
------------	----------------------------------

Area/observation	Source	Agree?	Disagree?	Comments
Riverside				
Current overlays/zones AEO2,DCPO,DPO2,SMO,LDRZ	co			College lease component not in DCPO. Confirm if revision required on freehold area – TBC by Assets department. C20 currently responding to submissions. Amendment approx mid year into PS. TBC
Development approaching from south	C	Yes		
Drainage line heading n/ne to Lake Ranfurly	C	Yes		DG>Concept area identified MRCC to confirm land area of Wetland reqd. to align with DCP
Railway line partially blocks drainage line	c/r	Yes Can be rectified		Rectification not in current DCP would be part of subdivision costs DG>Cuvert under rail line could be sufficient to allow flows to Lake Ranfurly.
Long Term transport plan sees railway removed in this location	co			Impact if any at this stage-opportunities for future bike/walking tracks
Victrack not leasing any new land	co			Impact if any at this stage
Some old gums along Riverside Avenue	C	Yes		These are some of the few trees on the site
Long views along Riverside Avenue	C	Yes		DG> undulating road
Long views towards lakes	C	Yes		
Site has open character	C	Yes		
Tip adj railway land	r/c	Yes		DG> Include site contamination requirements to ensure clean site. Some loose asbestos pipes observed above ground.
Poor access along railway line	r/c	Yes		DG> Victrack may not allow use of rail reserve for access
Two high points along Riverside Avenue	r/c	Yes		
Issues with college lease land	r/c sk	Yes		should not hold back freehold DG> Likely that no development will proceed in the CLL areas within the next 10 – 20 yrs.
College lease no DCP as it is anticipated this land will not develop in the short time if at all.				If it develops the DCP, which is reviewed, every 3 years will adjust and include college lease
Smells from lake when water low and wind in the right direction	r/c	Yes		Not apparent at time of visit DG> to be expected in this area. Well known locally.
(too) narrow outlet underneath railway	r/c	Yes		DG> Outlet may be OK subject to detailed drainage area calculation from MRCC.
16th street edge big engineered drain	C			DG> Drain is withing the entire road reserve.
Sewerage ponds issue	r/c			GPT has been installed - Beautification works are planned and designed but works not high priority due to funding constraints – drawing available DG> ponds not in use. 15th St drain discharges to pond.
Some existing house blocks along avenue with varied intentions to retain	r/c	Yes		DG> Staged subdivision option/methods, as requested by MRCC
Suggestion for riverside open space made	r/c sk	Yes		Maybe not on site but in other local areas
Value of bird hide recognised	R	Yes		
Enhance connections to existing walking track to lake	sk			
Area of Feedlot land turned into park with bbq's etc -	r			From member of the bird club Letter from member of bird club
Difficulty legally crossing railway recognised	r/c	Yes		DG> pedestrian overpass / lookout???
Residents keen to get on with the process	R	Yes		Staging to reflect / Freehold land cf College Lease land.

Area/observation	Source	Agree?	Disagree?	Comments
Drainage issues	r/c	Yes		Stormwater basin for 1/100 year storm On site catchment / reuse options and Communal system for larger storm events. To be confirmed by MRCC. Use of Water Sensitive Urban Design – report by PB to Council
View of site across lake?				Might need to confirm view of site across lake
Address Salinity issues – land covered by SMO & in schedule to DPO	sk/r			Council have resolved a publicity campaign is preferable in lieu of s173 on water wise issues Survey response
Opportunities for grey water recycling	Co/r			Can it be accommodated by LMW – currently working through early stages of these issues through CI 56 Survey response
Sewer connection a possibility in lieu of ATWS system	sk			
Impact on local schools generally	sk			Study to 2015 – chase up a copy – encourage submission from Garry Weir
Relationship/connection with Mildura South wetlands	sk			
Bike path route	co			How does it connect to o/a mrcc bicycle plan
Need for a community garden location? 2 hectares	sk			Community facility planned on corner I6th and Deakin Not sure when –
Maintenance of Lake Ranfurly and increase in mosquito's	co			Health and Local Laws issue
Consideration of sustainable housing and commitment to sustainability	sk			From Sunraysia ATA Survey form response Also mentions CL56 provisions
Sunraysia ATA developing proposal for community environmental education centre				They are considering riverside college lease land as a possible site
Aboriginal cultural heritage. Advise /recommendations received from AAV on all sites				Generally no recorded sites but other recommendations provided.
Future needs for family and children services in yet to be developed areas future needs difficult to estimate	co			survey form response
Other observations? R = Resident C = Consultant SK – Stakeholder CO – Council officer DG=Danny Grazan (GHD)				Salinity Management Overlay –Salinity Action statements. Same as current Overlay for RIZ land – MRCC to confirm. Smart water usage / reuse systems / options. LMW agreed that sewerage would be possible. Alternative, reuse systems with substantial hydrogeological investigations. Beautification of lakes and walking tracks. Access to walk around Lake Hawthorn to allow access LH primary school and to Murray river via Lakeside Drive area. Comment on Airport Env overlay. MRCC to confirm the overlay will be reduced as a part of Amendment C20. DCP process running parallel to RDP process. Comment on ½ acre lots – State govt issue to reduce lots to less than 1 acre. Opportunities for grey water collection and reuse on parks, etc

Appendix 2	Summary of Consultation Amendments
------------	------------------------------------

Appendix 2:

Summary of Consultation Amendments

This appendix outlines the feedback received as a result of the workshops held on the 31st March and the 1st April. After these workshop sessions a final draft concept was prepared with the appropriate ideas amended. The following documents the community, stakeholder and council feedback and explains why a change was or was not appropriate to the concept.

Riverside:

<i>Actions and Agreements</i>	<i>Consultant Response</i>
Generally agreed that the focal point identified adjacent to the railway line is appropriate and that it will be categorized as a minor park within DCP.	Agreed
The foot/bike path shown around Lake hawthorn should run up Dyar through the POS and onto 15th Street in lieu of crossing the railway line and joining with Lake Ranfurly.	Agreed, Vision Plan amended
Noted that in stormwater management areas and public open space the planting should be identified as indigenous but in all street types it should be noted as native.	Agreed
Mildura South maternal and child health and pre school (double size) should be included as a project and colocated in the same location at a new site. Deakin and 16th Street Reserve may be an option.	Outside study area

Appendix 3

Flora and Fauna Report

Appendix 4 | Summary of Amendments in Response to Submissions made at Exhibition

Note:

These submissions cover all four areas of the RDP. This is because some of the submission refer to more than one area.

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

List of Submissions received at closing Monday 27 November 2006:

S/No	SUBMITTOR	DATE RECEIVED
17	SD & E Pica	8 November 2006
10	T & S Violi	13 November 2006
18	K. Steinle on behalf of Horsfall family.	23 November 2006
1,5,6,7,16	Lower Murray Water	23 November 2006
14	Freeman & Freeman – Kedmenec Property	23 November 2006
15	Peter & Wally Kedmenec	27 November 2006
13	Roy Costa on behalf of I & M Dimasi	23 November 2006
12	Roy Costa on behalf of G. Capogreco & M T Nesci	23 November 2006
4	Freeman & Freeman on behalf of Mr Leng	27 November 2006
11	Thomson & Singelton on behalf of Messrs. Ghidinelli & Dimasi	27 November 2006
9	M. de Maria	27 November 2006
3	B. Scott	27 November 2006
8	Powercor	27 November 2006
2	Freeman & Freeman – landowners 15th Street b/n Riverside & Ontario Avenue	27 November 2006

SI	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – 15TH ST BETWEEN ONTARIO AND RIVERSIDE AVE	
Submitter	Lower Murray Water	
<i>Issues</i>	<i>NA</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
This report appears to accurately reflect the comments conveyed to Freeman & Freeman at the consultation stage and we have no further comments to make at this point in time.		N/A

S 2	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – 15TH ST BETWEEN ONTARIO AND RIVERSIDE AVE	
Submitter	Freeman and Freeman	
Issues	<i>Greenway design and location</i>	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
The proposed road reserve widths of 25-30 metres for the boulevard/avenue and 21 metres for the standard road are excessive, too far removed from ResCode standards and out of character with the already surrounding area.		<p>The dimensions suggested are required to achieve amenity standards required by the new section 56 of the VPP and in particular ensure the road pavement does not dominate the road corridor. The sections have been designed to allow room for landscaping to provide shade, create an attractive, walkable environment and enhance its habitat value.</p> <p>However it is accepted that if the road pavement can be reduced then so can overall corridor as long as it maintains the overall proportions described in the RDP.</p> <p>The vision plan should be amended to make this explicit.</p>
Development plan to finish at page 18 or permitted to amend the plan so that it is evident that pages 19-31 are indicative only and that narrow roads will be permitted, providing what is proposed at the time of subdivision can be justified as appropriate.		Road design is important in achieving standards required by section 56 of the VPP. Therefore they should be more than just indicative. However the RDP should recognise some variation would be acceptable as long as it can be demonstrated that design standards can be met with a narrower corridor.
Creation of extra wide nature strips and plantation areas are not appropriate due to water issues.		It is agreed that this is an important issue. However it is primarily a function of plant selection and the land would have maintenance demands whether it would be in private land or road corridors. The landscape proposed in the RDP is intended to help mitigate environmental conditions at street level and so help reduce evaporation
Concern with Etiwanda Avenue boulevard is long and straight and makes no effort to achieve any reasonable solar orientation and the general move is away from court bowls.		<p>This layout was designed to achieve an efficient lot layout, facilitate a straight road to village green which is the shortest and most walkable route and to tie all the areas tighter given shape of site.</p> <p>The concept layout does not suggest court bowls</p>

S3	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NICHOLS POINT	
Submitter	Barry Scott	
Issues	<i>Supports overall concept generally, concerns regarding existing amenity and safety issues of circuit</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
Comments provided during the consultation process do not seem to have been taken into account.		Were considered but may not have been applicable to incorporate.
Values of tranquillity and quietness that existing residencies with long setbacks enjoy will be compromised by the introduction of the continuous road (standard or blueway) adjacent to properties		Roads are designed to be slow speed and be attractive. The circular route around the township is not intended to be continuous road which will minimise intrusion.
The values that existing owners enjoy and the cost at which those values come should be considered when future planning is undertaken.		Agreed, that is important and residents will have the right to make submissions at the Development Application stage
The need to make any new roads continuous is not demonstrated in the plan. The roads north and south of the site plan are designated as not being continuous but are to have a greenway and continuous access for pedestrian and cycle traffic. This principle should be applied in a consistent manner regardless of the presence of restrictive infrastructure.		No need for continuous road (we don't want people to drive all the way around the circular route) but people should be able to walk or cycle around.
The net result of having discontinuous roads will be prevented thus making the roads safer and possibly reducing traffic volumes in some areas while still providing the concept of a continuous greenway with pedestrian and cycle routes.		Noted.
The plan needs to take into account that existing houses may be aligned to existing roads and therefore they will not be aligned to new roads and may not comply with the designated 10m setback.		Agreed, neighbours will be consulted at the Development Application stage. The RDP recognises that slight variations may occur at the Development Application stage to accommodate site specific issues such as this. This should be made explicit in the plan.
Existing residences may have a road reserve 5m from the residence and side fences will adjoin the reserve thus affecting some of the key design concepts of the roads.		Noted requires further investigation at the Development Application stage
Where existing properties exist, any adjoining non-continuos road should be sited such that the property offsets are taken into account and that a single pathway should be located on the other side of the road as demonstrated in the 'shared pathway/ laneway' concept.		Footpath will need to be on consistent side for optimum utility. The side will be chosen for overall amenity.
The area between the property boundary and road/and or swale would be vegetated with indigenous planting with plant selection being determined by the location of the house into consideration.		Noted
I would like to take the opportunity to discuss this further and fully explain my concerns.		Will get opportunity to comment at development application stage.

S4	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NICHOLS POINT	
Submitter	Freeman & Freeman on behalf of Mr Leng	
Issues	<i>Plan appears to have ignored his concerns previously raised during consultation period.</i>	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
<p>Objections to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the very wide “ through”” road greenway/blueway within his property, due to effect on reducing yield from 9 to 8 housel lots. A maximum road width of 16m is required to achieve the yield. The bend in the road within his property. Belives the road should be straight and be staggered from the proposed road on the other side of Koorlong Ave. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The co-ordinated masterplan approach for the whole area embodied within this study gives certain routes strategic importance which is reflected in the detailed design. The greenway/blueway has strategic importance and therefore needs a design emphasis which requires the wider corridor However it is accepted that it can be narrowed where design objectives can be demonstrated to be met. In particular if road pavement can be narrowed then overall width may be reduced accordingly. There is less scope to reduce the nature strip given its role to accommodate significant tree planting, underground services and in some instances drainage Footpaths of the width suggested are required to facilitate and encourage walkability
General concern about all of the cross roads indicated on the Vision plan.		Needed to achieve design standards and ensure best chance for long term survival of street landscaping.
Gateway Features – are they required as new signs have only recently been erected?		<p>Investigate location and quality of these new signs.</p> <p>Refer DCP#2 for project details.</p>
Would like to see that the road reserve widths are indicative only and open to negotiation with Council at the time of planning a subdivision.		Street character is important to achieve section 56 objectives and other planning and design characteristics. This means creating streets that are not dominated by roads and cars and are attractive, pleasant, safe places to walk. This requires room for landscaping and footpaths and road pavement to generally occupy no more than around a third of the road corridor. However it is recognised that these dimensions many change on a site to site basis where appropriate. RDP should be amended to explicitly recognise this point.

S5	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NICHOLS POINT	
Submitter	Lower Murray Water	
Issues	<i>General issues on technical aspects of RDP</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
Issues Plan – a pump station has been indicated at the southern extremity of the site but ownership or purpose has not been identified.		Site wastewater treatment system to be resolved by LMW / MRCC – see next point
Stormwater & Wastewater Management Plan – the matter of wastewater management has not really been addressed, but this is understandably given that Nichols Point has been included in the Country Towns Water Supply and Sewerage Programme and the concept for sewerage is yet to be approved by DSE. If a pressure sewerage system is adopted each lot is likely to have it's own pump station, therefore the low pressure pump station for blackwater shown at the southern extremity should be deleted from the plan, as indicating it would be misleading.		Delete pump as the provision of the low pressure system will mean each lot requires an individual pump.

S6	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – RIVERSIDE AREA	
Submitter	Lower Murray Water	
Issues	<i>General issues on technical aspects of RDP.</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
Stormwater & Wastewater Management Plan – the alternative to a central sewerage pump station on either side of the ridgeline bisecting the site, is a pressure sewerage system with a grinder pump locate don each lot created, at the building stage on the lot. A S/I73 Agreement on title would be a planning permit condition to support such a system.		NOTED - Plan doesn't seem to indicate a central pump station?
4.0 Low Density Residential Zone – the discussion under this main heading and under the sub-heading 'Potable Water and Wastewater' has erroneously included a fourth point specific to Nichols Point and should be removed.		Noted will amend report
Vision Plans – All vision plans appear basic and do little to assist in the forward planning of services due to their lack of detail.		The purpose of the Vision plan is to establish a framework and not finalise all details.

S7	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Lower Murray Water	
Issues	<i>General issues on technical aspects of RDP.</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
Context Analysis Plan – the identification of the LMW land at the corner of 14th St and San Mateo Ave as a transformer station would appear in appropriate. Better identified as an Office & Depot.		Amend page.
Issues Plan – the area comprising the LMW office and Depot is zoned PUZI and is not land that can be residentially developed as the plan seems to indicate.		
Land identified as future B4Z along Benetook now being considered to be rezoned?		Plan shows <u>no zoning inside study area on this plan</u> Related to the Mildura – Irymple Interface Study.
Stormwater and Wastewater Management Plan – this plan should indicate the land south of Etiwanda Avenue will be sewerer to the pump station at the rear of “Tradelink” therefore a sewerage corridor as well as drainage will be required along the “I5 chain” boundary.		Plan seems to indicate this
The sewer pump station shown closest to Matthew Flinders Drive does not exist and nor is there any intention to locate one in the vicinity.		Noted - Modify plan to suit
The sewer pump station may possibly be located somewhere toward the FMIT Depot as indicated, unless a sewer can be bought through to Etiwanda Ave from the proposed sewer along the “I5 chain” boundary of th eproperties on the south side of Etiwanda Ave.		Noted – subject to detailed design investigation
Vision Plan – Very basic and would be more helpful if greater detail of indicative road hierarchy was shown with nominated drainage corridors etc.		Will amend to show drainage line. Would not be appropriate to have too much detail on framework plan. Intention of the RDP is to establish structure and key character.

S8	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Powercor	
Issues	<i>Buffers to zone substation.</i>	
<i>Submission summary</i>		<i>Response and Recommendation</i>
Powecor's zone substation is located on the corner of Etwanda Avenue and I4th Street.		Is shown on Vision plan
Due to the substation requiring additional transformers in the future to meet demand higher noise emissions will develop.		Screening of substation can include acoustic buffer treatment.
Powercor recommends that a 5-8m greenbelt buffer zone be established along the substation boundary where it adjoins the residential land use.		Agreed, the plan will explicitly require a 5-8m buffer zone.
The buffer may be in the form of shared pathway or laneway as shown in section 6 of 'The Concepts' to provide visual amenity and a noise reduction to the benefit of property owners in close proximity.		Agreed
When a proposed residential design plan is available for comment we will be in a position to review noise level emissions and a reduction in the greenbelt buffer zone may be possible.		Noted
A developer proposal for a 2m high fence may not be appropriate due to the possible two storey townhouse type development adjacent to the substation,		To be resolved at development application stage.
The visual amenity works by Powercor on I4th Street and Etiwanda Avenue have been correctly identified.		Noted.

S9	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	M . de Maria	
Issues	Shared buffer zone	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Disagree with the proposal to have a shared buffer zone consisting of a 2m high wall and building setback of 20m on both sides of fences		An adequate buffer is required for both adjoining uses. In our opinion a greater buffer than that described in the submission is required is required to protect residences from noise intrusion and minimise complaints about business uses.
In preference may I recommend a similar buffer as that of Johnson trucks (B4) AND Brian Reed (RI).		

S10	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	T & S Violi	
Issues	Shared buffer zone	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Concerns raised at the shared buffer zone located between the Etiwanda Avenue residential land and the B4Z & proposed IN3Z in Benetook Ave.		A buffer is required to minimise conflicts between the two uses. An example of such a conflict is the noise of the business and industrial uses compromising the amenity of the residential land.
Buffer is indicated as 20m set back on both sides and a 2.0m high wall of ‘significant mass’ seems excessive.		Buffer as described will protect both uses and avoid future conflicts. Final detail of wall to be discussed at development application stage.
Johnson trucks on the corner of 14th and Benetook have <ul style="list-style-type: none">No wall between the two land zonesNo buffer on the RIZ land,Approx 10m landscaped buffer on the Johnson trucks land.		Buffer as described will protect both uses and avoid future conflicts
Our recommendation would be: 1. That the 2m high wall be deleted from the proposal, and that a landscaped buffer zone to a maximum of 15m either side of the different land uses. 2. Retain the proposal for the 2m high wall but reduce the area of landscaped buffer zone to a maximum of 5-10m either side of the different land uses.		Either option would certainly diminish conflict, but does not address all potential problems.

SII	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Thomson & Singelton on behalf of Messrs Ghidinelli & Dimasi	
Issues	<i>Boulevard being straight, Buffer issues, Drainage issues,</i>	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Problems are for seen in the following areas:		The reasons why straight roads are typically used are:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Boulevard being straight		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mildura is on a grid Allows views to be framed Straight roads minimise distances to the village green <ul style="list-style-type: none">Lot sizes are regular/efficient layoutProtect amenityInvestigateRoad alignment makes for efficient lot layout. Site would not be developed without owners selling/redeveloping.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">20m building setbacks		<ul style="list-style-type: none">20m is required to provide at least a degree of buffering between uses. It is intended that this zone can be used for landscaping and outbuildings to further screen the B4Z.This should be made explicit within the RDP
<ul style="list-style-type: none">House on Lot 4 in line with boulevard		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Development will not be forced on any landowner and landowners will have the right to comment on neighbours proposals at Development Application stage. Also note that the RDP concept is expected to vary slightly in detailed design where these issues can be considered.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Drainage does not appear to follow contours		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Our advice is this layout addressed drainage issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Problems with shareway along curved boundaries		Detailed plan subject to variations in detailed design
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Not managing a good lot ratio with wide roads		The road widths suggested are necessary to meet current design standards and will achieve better quality subdivision
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Every driveway through a swale drain will need a culvert to allow water to drain to the basin		Shared driveways will help minimise crossovers, this works well elsewhere.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">There may be problems with direct access from RIZ to the proposed B4Z/industrial land abutting on the south east.		Agreed, the final form of this link will be subject to further studies to ensure the amenity of the residential area is not compromised.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">As the old FMIT channel is no longer in existence it may be preferable to realign internal road		Detailed plan subject to variations in detailed design to consider circumstances that may change between now and the implementation of the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The requirement for solar orientation will be a problem with the boulevard – Etiwanda Ave being on 45 degrees		Agreed that this is an issue but feel need for efficient lot layout more important given the shape of the site and competing objectives of creating accessible community infrastructure for the whole development area.

SI2	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Roy Costa on behalf of G.Capogreco & M. Nesci	
Issues	Detailed design issues, buffer issues	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Stormwater basin comments as follows:		To be discussed and finalised as part of the development application process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Will the owners be compensated by Council at a rate for the value of the land as a RIZ is the basin as indicated is established.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Will Council construct the proposed basin and associated works with the monies to be contributed by the Development Contribution Plan over the land and no additional contributions will be required.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Can you confirm that the owners of the land are able to develop once the development plan is approved, without the requirement of the construction of the basin.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Objection to the sewerage pump as indicated on the plan being relocated onto the owners property due to the affect on the agricultural holding.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">If the basin is required prior to the subject land being developed will Council compensate for the operation impact on the property		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Will the owners be able to continue operation of the vineyard should this occur.		
Buffer Area comments as follows:		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Confirmation that residential allotments can be created between the boulevard and rear boundary.		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Confirm if outbuildings can be located within the buffer – 20m is to the rear of the dwelling only?		Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none">We believe that other outbuildings associated with swimming pools, outdoor entertaining areas etc should be allowed in the buffer.		No its not the buffer but the adjoining land use that is the problem. Buffer is required to ensure adjoining land is not blighted
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The subject land has a buffer indicated along the south and eastern boundaries – if this occurs would Council compensate the owners due to the restrictions that would be placed on the land, 2 acres would be lost.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">2.0m high wall		Comments associated with the above:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Who will be contributing to the cost of the wall construction		The developer of the B4Z land
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The wall should be a requirement of the only for the B4Z land to ensure no adverse effects on the surrounding properties by way of noise emissions.		Agreed, the trigger to develop wall will be the development of B4Z land, not residential land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposed wall along the southern boundary should not be proposed as the B4 land is mostly developed.		As the requirement is triggered by development there will be no retrospective requirement on the already developed land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">How will Council be able to receive contributions from the developed land for construction of the wall given their land is already developed? Colourbond fencing along this boundary is adequate; currently there are no issues with noise emissions.		Refer comment above.
Fencing requirements are not determined by Planning Schemes and therefore to enforce such may be difficult as such would be in accordance with the relevant fencing regulations.		To be discussed and finalised as part of the development application process.
Gateway Feature – comments relating to:		Yes and in other locations as shown on the Vision plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Please confirm the gateway features are established in the road reserve along Etiwanda Avenue.		Refer to DCP#2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Please advise who will bear the cost of the features.		
Conclusion – Given the above we believes their needs to be further information provided to determine the issues raised and request we be given the opportunity to make a further submission on the development plan proposed for the subject area.		Noted for further discussion at detailed design stage.

S13	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Roy Costa on behalf of I & M Dimasi	
Issues	Buffer issues, split zoning of land and access	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Comments on subject land as follows:		This land is outside of the study area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The subject land is 7.212ha with road frontage only to Etiwanda Avenue and no access to Benetook.3.746ha is zoned RIZ and the balance id B4Z.Service easements exist at the boundary between the zones.		
Development Plan comments as follows:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The buffer area will be through the middle of the property making it difficult to develop the rear portion of the land.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Buffer is required on edge between land usesThis is a zoning matter, not within scope of study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The 2m high wall would land lock the rear of the property – would Council compensate the owners at the value of the land zoning.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">B4Z area not within study area
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The development plan must provide access to the entire land parcel and as such needs to be determined prior to the development plans being approved.		Development plan doesn’t preclude link, however would not be appropriate to take industrial/commercial traffic through residential area Detailed design issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none">If access is provided to the B4Z via Etiwanda Ave than how will this effect the boulevard and associated roads with industrial vehicles required to utilise the proposed roads.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Access will be off Benetook Ave. Link may only be pedestrian and would be subject to a future study which would consider these issuesWill need further (+ separate study) before the form and location of this link can be confirmed. Will consider these issues.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">When will Council require the wall to be constructed if the agricultural holding continues to operate? How will FMIT & council easements be accommodated.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Wall will be constructed as part of the B4Z development.
The RDP indicates a possible link between the boulevard and Benetook Ave – this needs to be created and determined immediately to ensure the land can be fully developed.		Noted
Conclusion – Given the above we believes their needs to be further information provided to determine the issues raised as they are important and could jeopardise the future of the property.		Noted for further discussion at detailed design stage.

SI4	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	Freeman & Freeman on behalf of P & W Kedmenec	
Issues	<i>Location of boulevard and POS</i>	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Comments on subject land as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The land parcel consists of all horticultural land fronting Etiwanda on the San Mateo Ave side between the recent residential development and the FMIT depot.		Noted
Development Plan comments as follows: <p>The proposed extension of the Matthews Flinders Drive out to Etiwanda Ave along the common boundary between our clients and the FMIT depot does not seem appropriate or practical in relation to the existing house.</p> <p>The through road would be better suited on the 15th Street side of our client's house.</p> <p>This would allow the proposed SMA and POS area proposed on our clients land to the public open space and drainage areas proposed by the approved subdivision to the north.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Alignment puts drainage in public realm and uses landscape amenity, However it is recognised that the final alignment may vary in detailed design.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">We believe RDP should not encourage the creation of roads along common boundaries so avoiding the problem of who constructs the road.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The concept plan applies best practice subdivision principles and seeks to provide an efficient lot layout. In some locations, as here, the layout assumes two adjacent landowners can be developed together because of the efficiencies it allows and the benefits of a co-ordinated approach to design. It is recognised this may not always be possible and if not an alternative layout that retained the underlying structure may be acceptable.The concept plan illustrates how the principles described in the RDP can be applied to the site. It is recognised that the objectives might be achieved with minor variations to the plan and that this would be acceptable, subject to demonstrating design objectives have been met.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Who will be responsible for the construction of Matthew Flinders Drive, which is 400m long and has different landowners on either side.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">The developer has in similar situations paid for the cost. Detailed discussions required at subdivision stage.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The development plan should state FMIT's intention to remain and generally should be encouraged to relocate their depot in the future.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">NotedCheck (Sarah?)
The 'Stormwater & Wastewater Plan and Vision Plan indicate different requirements with regard to the SMA & POS required		Noted, the plan should be amended.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerned by the significant amount of space indicated for public open space but are "comforted" by discussions that they will be appropriately compensated.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Owners are proposing a centrally located POS within the subdivision rather than on the fringe.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Central to broader neighbourhood and open space located to accommodate drainage infrastructure.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Believes neighbourhood character has already been set and the proposed wider roads etc would not be appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed road standards are required to meet higher standards (new section 56) and the area is large enough to develop its own identity and character.• The proposed concept has been drawn up to ensure a higher standard of amenity and character than exists in the surrounding area,
Believes the Avenue/Boulevard should be 20 metres and not 25-30 metres and the Standard roads should be 15 and 17m wide rather than 21 metres.	Street character is important to achieve section 56 objectives and other planning and design characteristics. This means creating streets that are not dominated by roads and cars and are attractive, pleasant, safe places to walk. This requires room for landscaping and footpaths and road pavement to generally occupy no more than around a third of the road corridor. It is recognised that these dimensions may change on a site to site basis where appropriate. Consequently it is suggested the plans be amended to show a degree of narrowing possible where road pavement can be reduced.

S15	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – ETIWANDA AVENUE	
Submitter	P & W Kedmenec	
Issues	Location of boulevard and POS	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Development Plan comments as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">No objection to the continuation of Matthew Flinders Drive but do not believe it should be wider than 20metres due to existing neighbourhood character.The proposed extension of the Matthews Flinders Drive out to Etiwanda Ave along the common boundary between our clients and the FMIT depot does not seem appropriate or practical in relation to the existing house. No intention of demolishing house.The through road would be better suited on the I5th Street side of our client’s house.Consider adjusting the size of the basins indicated and relocate to forma a village green concept as public open space.Construction cost of Matthew Flinders Drive – who will pay due to Council owning apportion of existing easement and two separate owners either side. One owner has no intention of developing his property in the near future.Believe the road layout and streetscape is best left to the developers who have the opportunity to liase with planners, agents, engineers and consult with Council to best suit individual subdivision requirements.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Refer S14 responseCan move alignment where proposed alternative demonstrates connectivity and design standards are met.Refer S14 response.“““

SI6	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – IRYMPLE AREA	
Submitter	Lower Murray Water	
Issues	General issues on technical aspects of RDP.	
Submission summary		Response and Recommendation
Context Analysis Plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none">The strip shops indicated do not extend beyond Hassell Street.The oasis Aged Care Home is not indicated.The 8ha subdivision fronting Sandilong is not indicated.A subdivision application for land on the north side of Sandilong next to Irymple Primary School has not been indicated.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Noted, will be amended on plan.Noted, will be amended on plan.““
Issues Plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none">Does not show the Francesca Drive subdivision along Karadoc Ave and as an existing subdivision.Does not show the RIZ land next to Irymple Primary School.The rail crossing boom gates have been installed.The strip of shops includes houses.The location of the proposed IGA supermarket is not shown to connect to the note on the margin.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Land is outside study area and on the edge of the plan.Noted, will be amended on plan.Noted, will be amended on plan to show location of IGA.
Stormwater & Wastewater Management Plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none">The construction of an outfall sewer through the grounds of Irmple Secondary College will be carried out in January 2007, which will provide for the Sandilong residential subdivisions.The Note: Rising Main to be located on public land, shoul indicate it refers to the sewer rising main required for Irymple Ave sewer pumping stations. This means the area of P.O.S should ‘touch” the rear of lots in Chandon Court to provide access to a suitable discharge sewer for the rising main.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Noted, will be amended on plan.
Vision Plan – <ul style="list-style-type: none">The Plan does not provide the POS link– (see above) therefore does not make adequate provision for the sewerage outfall.More expensive sewerage solution would be to direct the rising main out of Irymple Ave and then along Irymple Ave to a maintenance hole at Fifteenth St. The preferred solution would be Chandon Court.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Noted, will be amended on plan.

SI7	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – IRYMPLE	
Submitter	SD & E Pica	
<i>Issues</i>	<i>Supports overall concept generally</i>	
Submission summary		Response/ Recommendation
Concerns mainly to do with the area between Sandilong and Karadoc Avenues in 15th Street.		Not in study area
Current application for bulky goods outlet on the corner of Sandilong and 15th Street despite the VCAT comment on the ‘mish mash’ of 15th Street. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerns due to the proximity to schools, safety issues etc.There should be no more bulky goods outlets between Mildura and Irymple if the concept of a welcoming entrance is to occur.		Forwarded to relevant planner allocated planning permit application for this land.
The concept of a village green and an upgrade for Irymple is the correct one as this will prevent the infiltration of Mildura into Irymple and provide Irymple with a focus of its own.		Noted
Wide streets, open space, the identification of entering a residential area and encouraging neighbourhood interaction are all social features which will enhance the area environmentally and socially.		Noted
The avenue/boulevard perspective will also enhance the entrance to Mildura when travelling along 5th Street.		Noted
Essential that caveats or covenants are placed on any subdivision defining the type of home to be built, height and construction will either make or break his concept overall.		Noted
This is an opportunity in all areas in the study to ‘get it right’ and not build the slums of the future but build sustainable homes in sustainable and user friendly environments.		Noted

S18	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – IRYMPLE	
Submitter	K. Steinle on behalf of the Horsfall family.	
Issues	Supports overall concept generally	
Submission summary		Response/ Recommendation
Preliminary draft subdivision plan in response to the Irymple RDP.		
We note that the RDP plan as documented has some flexibility in terms of street alignments, types and locations.		Noted
Plan therefore provided for discussion purposes only.		
In essence the preliminary draft subdivision plan adds weight to and supports the principles outlined within the Irymple RDP.		
Matters that require further attention include:		
• Possible access point across the north-south reserve as an alternative access to lot 26, in lieu of creating a parallel access road as shown on the plan.		Requires further investigation during development application stage.
Lots sized are intended to be in the medium size range. With smaller lots to the west of Koorlong Avenue and larger lots to the east.		Noted
Understand that the subdivision and development will be encumbent upon the provision of utility services, including drainage and stormwater head works provision.		Noted
Appreciate the area is identified as Stage 2 and may proceed to development in the 1 to 5 year timeframe.		Comment in relation to stormwater infrastructure provision.

Appendix 5

Revisions Table

Revisions table

[illegible]