



Tract

# Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre UDF

## Consultation Report for the Draft CMAC UDF

Prepared by Tract for Melton City Council

11 December 2019



# Quality Assurance.

Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre (CMAC)

Consultation Report

Project Number

**317-0526-00-U-01**

Contract Number **17/028**

Date of Issue

**11 December 2019**

# Contents.

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>04</b>
1.1	Purpose of the Document	04
1.2	Project Context	04
1.3	Consultation History	04
1.2	Report Structure	04
<b>2</b>	<b>Consultation Strategy for Draft UDF</b>	<b>05</b>
2.1	Key Stakeholders	05
2.2	Summary of Consultation Events	05
2.3	Communications	05
<b>3</b>	<b>Summary of Consultation Responses</b>	<b>06</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusions and Next Steps</b>	<b>12</b>

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Purpose of the Document

---

The Consultation Report outlines the Council-led community consultation strategy and consultation outcomes following the release of the Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre (CMAC) Urban Design Framework Draft for comment between 23 July - 3 September 2019.

## 1.2 Project Context

---

Melton City Council developed the draft Cobblebank Metropolitan Activity Centre (CMAC) Urban Design Framework (UDF) UDF (formerly known as the Toolern Metropolitan Activity Centre UDF) over a two year period from September 2017.

The CMAC UDF is required under the Toolern Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) and Schedule 3 to the Urban Growth Zone to guide development within the framework area.

## 1.3 Consultation History

---

Consultation has occurred throughout the process through community consultation sessions, stakeholder workshops and targeted meetings with landowners and state agencies.

The Draft Background Report was publicly released for comment in November 2018 for a one month period. During that period two information sessions were held by Council:

- A Community Information Session open to members of the public
- A Stakeholder Session for landowners, and public agencies

At these sessions the Background Report was presented and explained. Attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.

Section 6 of the Background Report summarises the consultation undertaken during this period.

The second round of consultation occurred between 23 July and 3 September 2019, and is the focus of this report.

## 1.4 Report Structure

---

This report outlines the consultation strategy (Chapter 2) and provides a summary of the consultation responses (Chapter 3). The final chapter (Chapter 4) summarises the proposed next steps.

## 2 Consultation Strategy for Draft UDF

### 2.1 Key Stakeholders

The key project stakeholders are identified as:

- Landowners and occupiers of land within the CMAC UDF area
- Residents
- State government departments and authorities such as Melbourne Water, Department of Transport, etc., and
- Melton City Council (Councillors, Executive team, key internal departments, Project Working Group and Project Control Group)

### 2.2 Recent Consultation Summary

The Draft CMAC UDF was released on Council's website for public comment from 23 July to 3 September 2019.

A drop in session was held on Wednesday 7 August, 2019 between 4.30pm and 8.00pm at the Western BACE, Cobblebank. Over 50 people attended this session. It consisted of an informal drop in session where members of the community could have informal conversations with Council officers and consultants. Key elements of the UDF were displayed and several copies of the UDF document were available for viewing. No written comments were received on the night.

At the close of the public comment period, Council had received 7 formal submissions. In the subsequent weeks Council representatives met with submitters to discuss the submissions.

### 2.3 Communications

Council ran a wide communications campaign to inform residents and stakeholders about the project and encourage them to have their say across a number of platforms. One-on-one meetings were also accommodated by request. Key elements of the communication campaign included:

- Newspaper advertisements – in the Melton and Moorabool Star Weekly promoting the community drop-in session.
- Letter mailout – letters were sent to landowners, occupiers and State government departments and agencies advising them of the consultation period and of ways that they could have their say.

- Website – included information on the community drop-in session, public submission process and Draft UDF with supporting documentation.
- Social media – promoted the project and the drop in session.
- Group emails – sent to community groups for cross posting.



### 3 Summary of Consultation Responses

---

This chapter presents a summary of feedback received from the consultation responses (submissions) of which many raised common issues which have been summarised into themes for ease of reference.

The table outlines the response to the consultation responses (submissions) recieved.

#### Theme 1 Cultural Heritage

---

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
1	UDF area covers both Registered Aboriginal places and Aboriginal cultural heritage sensitive sites and this should be explicitly acknowledged in the document.	<b>Response</b> Agree. <b>Recommendation</b> A proposed new Guideline will read: <i>“Proponents undertaking development of land identified on the Victorian Aboriginal Heritage Register, and/or with Aboriginal cultural heritage values, should liaise with the designated Registered Aboriginal Party (or Aboriginal Victoria and Traditional Owner Groups in its absence) to ascertain whether heritage interpretation is appropriate in these identified locations, and how the heritage site(s) should be incorporated into the design of the subdivision.”</i>

---

## Theme 2 Movement and Access

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
2	Supports urbanisation of Ferris Road from a gravel road to an asphalt road.	<b>Response</b> Agree <b>Recommendation</b> No changes required
4	Designation of grade separated crossings should not refer to overpass/underpass. Landscape batters are not a suitable grade separation treatment for a highly urbanised Metropolitan Activity Centre.	<b>Response</b> There is no confirmation as to the future method of grade separation. The manner of the grade separation will need to be resolved by the State government when the Ferris Road level crossing is removed, and when East Road is constructed. <b>Recommendation</b> Remove all references to a road overpass in the text, redefine in the UDF as 'grade separation, subject to future investigation'.
4, 6	Role and function of certain streets should be reconsidered, and road cross-section widths reduced, with consideration of existing approved road cross-sections approved adjacent the MAC.	<b>Response.</b> The role and function of some roads may be reconsidered in context of the overall UDF area if that function is provided elsewhere nearby. <b>Recommendation</b> The UDF will update pedestrian and cyclist network plan, and key street cross sections to ensure that they align with existing as-built roads and pedestrian/shared path alignments and planning permits.
6	The UDF should not provide definitive detail regarding local road and passive open space network, and should allow for flexibility and future market trends to determine an appropriate local road/park configuration.	<b>Response</b> There does need to be a level of consideration at the UDF stage regarding the local road and open space layout and how it integrates into the existing and future development. <b>Recommendation</b> An additional note will read as " <i>The local access street network can be modified to accommodate built form outcomes provided that the revised road network provides suitable quality design outcomes to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.</i> "
6	Acoustic assessment compliance within the noise amenity area is overly prescriptive.	<b>Response</b> Requirements within the railway noise amenity area are necessary and reasonable at a UDF level. This requirement is consistent with requirements included in the Mt Atkinson and Rockbank PSPs. <b>Recommendation</b> No changes required.
4	Request to amend arterial overpass section to 20m instead of 25.4m.	<b>Response</b> References to overpasses will be changed to 'Grade Separation, subject to future investigation'. <b>Recommendation</b> Add a note to relevant cross sections: 'Grade separation is proposed. An overpass is shown for illustration purposes only. The cross-section is subject to further detailed engineering design.'
6	Coltan Ave should be a connector road to match existing roads beyond UDF boundary.	<b>Response</b> Agree that Coltan Ave will be a connector road and bus capable. <b>Recommendation</b> Coltan Ave will be shown as a connector road, bus capable with a roundabout at the intersection of Coltan Ave and Hollingsworth Drive.

## Theme 2 Movement and Access continued

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
6	Consideration needs to be given to how shared paths connect to the broader area.	<p><b>Response</b> Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> A coordinated network will be shown on Coltan Ave, Stonehenge Drive and north to railway line. Shared path along railway line will be reduced and diverted into south west precinct.</p>
7	There needs to be careful management to ensure a logical sequencing of appropriate development to the south of Cobblebank Station	<p><b>Response</b> Sequencing is addressed in Section 3.2 Staging of the UDF Council also notes that there is limited ability to be able to control sequencing as Council is not the owner of a majority of the land in the CMAC.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change recommended.</p>
7	The UDF should reference the Western Rail Plan which sets out the future investments Victoria needs for a fast, high-capacity rail network. The UDF should also include a trigger for a document review to respond to the infrastructure required for the introduction of metro rail service between Melbourne and Melton.	<p><b>Response</b> Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> A new paragraph in Section 2.5 <i>Movement and Access</i> will be added, which references the Western Rail Plan.</p> <p>Text to be added in Section 4 of UDF regarding Western Rail Plan as it may trigger a UDF review.</p>
7	<p>Bus access to the station should be insulated from general traffic</p> <p>Bus access to the north side of the station will alleviate congestion on south side of station.</p> <p>The UDF should also accommodate future expansion of the bus interchange.</p>	<p><b>Response</b> Bus circulation will be improved throughout the CMAC and particularly around the station, north and south.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> An expanded network of bus capable roads will be included, including to the north side of the station.</p> <p>Bus access to the south side of the station on Interchange Way will provide insulated bus access, which will be reflected in a new cross section.</p> <p>The UDF will accommodate future expansion of the bus interchange by allowing for additional future bus bays in the bus turnaround.</p>
7	<p>Whilst the Strategic Cycling Corridor (SCC) is yet to be determined, any future designs should avoid conflicts between cyclists and places of activity.</p> <p>Better accommodate and make safer cycling environments on Ferris Road specifically, but throughout newly developed areas generally.</p>	<p><b>Response</b> Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> A separate cycling and pedestrian paths along length of SCC is included in the UDF, despite the fact that its location is yet to be identified.</p> <p>On Ferris Road show pedestrian paths as shared paths, and increase width of road bicycle lanes. Add a new requirement outlining the minimum standards for widths of footpaths and shared paths, and safe and convenient crossing points.</p>

## Theme 3 Land Use

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
2	Supports the proposed range of diverse retail and entertainment offering in the MAC that is supported by quality landscaping and al-fresco dining along with the inclusion of sporting facilities west of Ferris Road.	<p><b>Response</b> Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change required.</p>
4, 6	Concern regarding the spread of the retail core as shown with retail in north east and south west precinct. Would prefer retail to be just the south east precinct (70,000m <sup>2</sup> of retail under one roof).	<p><b>Response</b> The CMAC is identified as a Metropolitan Activity Centre and therefore a regional centre through Plan Melbourne. The Metropolitan Activity Centre is proposed to be a true retail destination with a retail offer that should include a variety of supermarkets. This will enable a variety of retail offering to be provided through the precinct to meet local and regional shopping needs consistent with the intent of the zone.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Introduce a new land use category, 'Retail/Commercial/Office in the south west precinct, to promote diverse specialty uses, whilst acknowledging/encouraging other uses.</p>
4	Vertical land uses in across the south-east precinct are too prescriptive, and should provide more flexibility for location of retail, civic, commercial and residential uses.	<p><b>Response</b> Considered that flexibility can be accommodated to allow for land uses to integrated within the retail core at various levels within the current UDF however agree this could be made clearer.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Update land use diagram figures to include commercial/office/retail/civic/residential uses at the upper levels, similar to the new 'Retail/Commercial/Office' category (mentioned above).</p>
4	Concern around the location of office/commercial uses where a current permit exists for a different land use, and the anticipated timeframe for that existing use exceed 10 years.	<p><b>Response</b> The UDF is showing the anticipated ultimate configuration of the land. As such, current permits may not align with the future land uses of the Metropolitan Activity Centre. The UDF acknowledges that alternate land use configurations are permissible in the interim to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority providing they do not prejudice the development of the town centre as set out in the UDF.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change required</p>
5	Land uses regarding health and tertiary uses do not have committed funding sources or timeframes, and are premature to be shown in the UDF.	<p><b>Response</b> The State Government through Plan Melbourne has identified Cobblebank as a Metropolitan Activity Centre. Plan Melbourne identifies Metropolitan Activity Centres will play a major service delivery role, including government, health, justice and education services, as well as retail and commercial opportunities. Medical facilities and justice facilities are identified within the Major Activity Centre (now the Metropolitan Activity Centre) within the Toolern PSP.</p> <p>Land purchase for health, tertiary education and justice facilities can be funded through GAIC or via the State government land acquisition processes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change required.</p>

### Theme 3 Land Use continued

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
4	Remove civic uses in south east precinct	<p><b>Response</b> No dedicated land for an additional civic facility is required within the retail core of the activity centre, however civic uses will still be encouraged.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> A new guideline will read “<i>Specific civic uses will be encouraged as part of the retail core. They should be embedded in the retail development and could be located on upper levels.</i>”</p>

### Theme 4 Compliance State Government Agencies

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
3	The UDF appropriately caters for future drainage infrastructure requirements.	<p><b>Response</b> Agree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change necessary.</p>

### Theme 5 Built Form

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
4	Concern regarding the size, location, and appropriateness of the number of public open spaces shown around the retail core area.	<p><b>Response</b> The Toolern DCP identifies 0.40 hectares of major activity centre public space in the Land Use Budget within the retail core area. The open space will be acquired by Council through the DCP. The UDF currently allocates 0.32 hectares of this land to the urban plaza adjacent the bus interchange, and 0.08 hectares to the town square adjacent the health precinct.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Change the name of the plaza adjacent the bus interchange from Urban Plaza - Retail and Dining Forecourt to Urban Plaza – ‘Bus Interchange’, for clarity.</p>
6	Prescriptive building requirements reduce the opportunity for innovative market led built form. This includes mandatory minimum two storey building heights, prescriptive upper level/ground floor/landscape setbacks, which can inhibit architectural expression, emerging markets trends regarding medium density housing, and urban living.	<p><b>Response</b> A minimum building height of 2 storeys at the street frontage reflects the higher density and more urban character expected within a Metropolitan Activity Centre (MAC). Upper level setbacks vary depending on built form location, however setbacks generally provide a consistency in scale of street wall arrangements, break up building mass, introduce a sense of façade modulation and to avoid the appearance of a ‘wall of towers’ given the limited planning controls in the Commercial 1 Zone.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amend recommendation to read building height must be a minimum of two storeys at the street frontage in the Centre. Upper levels above the second floor must be setback 5m from the building frontage unless otherwise negotiated during the permit process. Also, change the retail/commercial/office site interface to Hollingsworth Drive from 3m land scape setback to 0m setback, and delete the ‘urban core interface’ from the Hollingsworth Drive frontage of the mixed use precinct, and from the site located directly west over Hollingsworth Drive.</p>

## Theme 6 Other

---

Submission No.	Summary of Comment	Council Response and/or Recommendation
4, 5	The UDF is overly prescriptive.	<b>Response</b> Toolern PSP includes a large number of statutory requirements that must be met, which has resulted in this UDF being larger than most typical UDFs. The UDF contains requirements that must be met and guidelines that should be met to ensure the appropriate framework to assess planning permit applications as required by the Toolern PSP and other relevant clauses of the <i>Melton Planning Scheme</i> . <b>Recommendation</b> No change.
	Clarify requirements and guidelines definitions.	<b>Response</b> Requirements are mandatory, and guidelines are discretionary controls. This is defined in the UDF. <b>Recommendation</b> No change.
	Correct inconsistencies in road way alignments between figures.	<b>Response</b> Agreed. <b>Recommendation</b> Will correct.

## 4 Next Steps

---

### 4.1 Next steps

---

Overall there is a high degree of support for the proposal within the UDF with some specific concerns raised by individual landowners which are outlined above, which are minor in nature, or not consistent with the requirements of the PSP and other relevant clauses of the *Melton Planning Scheme*.

The revision to the UDF will be completed throughout October and November. Final documents will be made available following the December 2019 Council meeting.





## Contact Tract

### **Melbourne**

Level 6, 6 Riverside Quay,  
Southbank  
VIC, Australia 3006  
61 3 9429 6133  
melbourne@tract.net.au

**Brisbane**  
**Sydney**  
**Adelaide**  
**Geelong**