

23 December 2024

Doc No: D/24/4302

Ms Sarah Carlisle  
 Lead Chair  
 Victorian Planning Authority Projects Standing Advisory Committee  
 Planning Panels Victoria

Sent via: [planning.panels@transport.vic.gov.au](mailto:planning.panels@transport.vic.gov.au)

Dear Ms Carlisle,

**DRAFT AMENDMENT C296CASE TO THE CASEY PLANNING SCHEME – CROSKELL (EMPLOYMENT) PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN  
 REFERRAL OF SUBMISSIONS TO THE VPA PROJECTS STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

I refer to draft Amendment C296case to the Casey Planning Scheme (draft Amendment), which proposes to facilitate the use and development of the Croskell (Employment) precinct for employment and residential uses generally in accordance with the Croskell (Employment) Precinct Structure Plan (PSP).

On 18 August 2024, the Minister for Planning gave approval for the VPA to use a streamlined planning process to progress the PSP and amendment, undertake informal public consultation about the matter and delegated to the VPA Chief Executive Officer (CEO) the power to refer any unresolved submissions on the matter directly to the VPA Projects Standing Advisory Committee (Committee).

Between 11 September to 9 October 2024, the VPA undertook a targeted public consultation process for the Croskell (Employment) PSP and the associated draft Amendment. A total of 31 submissions have been received.

**Referral**

In accordance with clause 12 of the terms of reference for the Committee (July 2020) and delegation provided to the VPA, I am writing to refer unresolved submissions relating to the Croskell (Employment) PSP, Croskell (Employment) Infrastructure Contributions Plan and draft Amendment for advice.

I enclose all submissions received in relation to the draft Amendment and a submissions summary table, which provides an analysis and current status of all issues raised (resolved or unresolved) by each submission. The Committee’s advice is only requested in relation to the issues in Table 1.

**Key issues referred**

In accordance with clause 4 of the terms of reference, the VPA has identified key issues it is seeking the Committee to focus its advice on to assist with streamlining the Committee’s assessment and hearing process:

**Table 1 – Key Issues**

KEY ISSUES	ADVICE SOUGHT
Land use	<p>The PSP provides a mix of industrial and commercial land, in line with the Melbourne Industrial and Commercial Land Use Plan (MICLUP), and residential land.</p> <p>Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The balance of industry and commercial employment areas are appropriate to facilitate outcomes consistent with the precinct’s designation as a Regionally Significant Commercial Area under MICLUP,</li> <li>Appropriate provisions, including appropriate applied zones, are included to facilitate employment outcomes on parcels within both industry and business employment areas.</li> </ul>

KEY ISSUES	ADVICE SOUGHT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of sensitive uses within identified buffers is appropriate.</li> <li>• Provisions in the UGZ that mandate additional assessments to support the use and development of land for sensitive uses within identified buffers are appropriate to manage land use conflict or potential contamination.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Drainage &amp; Staging</b></p>	<p>The PSP outlines drainage areas and requires the ultimate delivery of Development Services Scheme (DSS) assets prior to the issue of a statement of compliance for any stage of subdivision. Each precinct parcel is responsible for delivering particular drainage assets, and if multiple parcels are liable for a particular asset, the first to develop will be accountable for delivery. While the intent is for the ultimate DSS assets to be delivered up front - the wording of R36 includes the statement “unless otherwise agreed in writing by the responsible authority and Melbourne Water” – meaning that R36 has flexibility and does not preclude the delivery of interim assets should such solutions be deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location and size of drainage areas, as shown in the PSP, is an appropriate envelope within which to subsequently resolve the detailed design of required infrastructure,</li> <li>• Requiring parcels to deliver DSS assets prior to the issue of statement of compliance for any stage of subdivision is appropriate,</li> <li>• Parcel specific liability for delivering assets is appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Infrastructure Contributions Plan (ICP)</b></p>	<p>Submissions have been made that the draft ICP does not accurately reflect true costings and there have been requests for the inclusion of additional items – notably the inclusion of Shared User Paths (SUP) within the high voltage electricity easement within the ICP.</p> <p>SUPs along the Melbourne Water pipe track, within drainage assets adjoining Thompsons Road and two crossings over the Victorian Desalination Project (VDP) assets within the high voltage electricity easement are currently included within the ICP. The remainder of the SUPs shown on Plan 4 – Movement and Network are expected to be delivered as developer works.</p> <p>Additionally, Casey City Council oppose being specified as the Development Agency for intersection and pedestrian signal projects on declared State Arterial Roads.</p> <p>Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed ICP costings are appropriate, specifically: whether benchmark costings provide sufficient contingency for cost increases on account of ‘up-scoping’ infrastructure for State Arterial Roads and costing for IN-04 is accurate.</li> <li>• The SUP within the electricity easement should be included within the ICP,</li> <li>• The SUP adjoining Thompsons Road not within DSS assets should be included as inner public purpose land.</li> <li>• Casey City Council should be specified as the Development Agency for intersection and pedestrian signal projects on declared State Arterial Roads.</li> </ul>

KEY ISSUES	ADVICE SOUGHT
<b>Cultural heritage</b>	<p>The Bunurong Land Council Aboriginal Corporation (BLCAC) have identified a 5.41 hectare patch of vegetation in Parcel 20 as having cultural significance and requested its retention. The PSP seeks to protect the vegetation and the cultural values by identifying the area as encumbered open space.</p> <p>Please advise whether the designation of a portion of Parcel 20 as encumbered open space is an appropriate mechanism for retaining and protecting cultural values in this circumstance and if not what the most appropriate mechanism would be to achieve this purpose.</p>
<b>Transport</b>	<p>Submissions have been made on as to the location of a proposed Left-In-Left-Out access to Council's Active Open Space adjoining Berwick Cranbourne Road and the alignment of IN-01 so as to minimise impacts to the existing abattoir buildings.</p> <p>Please advise whether the road network alignment is suitable, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the location of the proposed Left-in-Left-out access for Council's Active Open Space to Berwick-Cranbourne Road is appropriate or if this access point is better moved northwards within the high voltage electricity easement.</li> <li>• If the alignment of IN-01 can be shifted so as to avoid bisecting the existing abattoir buildings</li> </ul>
<b>Bushfire</b>	<p>Plan 10 – Bushfire of the PSP includes setbacks based on potential vegetation of drainage assets, which would occur outside of the PSP process by Melbourne Water.</p> <p>Please advise whether it is appropriate to consider the bushfire risk of potential vegetation in drainage assets and other open space as opposed to existing conditions.</p>

Drainage matters have been referred, as described above. However, the VPA requests the Committee focus its consideration on the discrete strategic planning aspects of drainage in Table 1 instead of detailed technical matters as the final drainage outcomes will be determined through Melbourne Water's Development Services Scheme. Drainage, which is not usually part of an ICP, has been included in the PSP for spatial planning purposes and not to fetter Melbourne Water's decision making discretion.

Matters relating to crossings of the Victorian Desalination Pipeline (VDP) have been referred as described in Table 1. The VPA notes there is 'in principle' cross-government agreement for the proposed crossings as shown in the PSP, and final approval of crossings is subject to technical assessment at the permit stage. Similarly to drainage, the VDP crossings have been included in the PSP for spatial planning purposes and not for detailed technical review.

Without limiting its powers under the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, including the power to regulate its own proceedings, I encourage the Committee to consider whether to adopt any of the following hearing procedures to provide an efficient and timely process for the assessment of the draft Amendment for this State significant Housing Statement project:

- Specifying a time limit for submitters seeking to be heard.
- Regulating evidence in chief to balance efficiency and fairness.
- Limiting cross examination to matters which are of interest or importance to the Committee, and to avoid repetition.
- Directing submitters focus preparation of submissions and appointment of experts only on the specific matters the VPA has requested your advice on and raised in their submissions as outlined in Table 1.

The SAC should consider the submissions in the manner it sees fit in accordance with its terms of reference.

The VPA requests the Committee secure the following dates:

- a Directions Hearing commencing in the week of 3 February 2025 – with a preference for the 3, 4 or 6 February 2025
- a Hearing commencing in the week of 3 March 2025.

The VPA will continue to seek to resolve matters with submitters, including the submissions that are not contained in Table 1, and will advise the Committee if further matters are resolved that the VPA no longer requires advice on.

Please find enclosed the supporting documents required by clause 13 of the terms of reference.

If you would like further information, please email Justin O'Meara, Executive Director Metropolitan Melbourne at [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely,



**STUART MOSELEY**  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

Encl. Croskell (Employment) PSP and ICP  
Draft Amendment C296case to the Casey Planning Scheme documentation  
Referred submissions and submitter details  
VPA Submissions Summary Table  
Croskell (Employment) Public Consultation Report (draft)  
Supporting background reports

cc. Glenn Patterson, Chief Executive Officer, Casey City Council