

Department Response to ACSAC Recommendations



Department
of Transport
and Planning

In August 2024, the Minister for Planning appointed the Activity Centres Standing Advisory Committee (Committee) to provide advice on specific matters relating to the Activity Centres Program (ACP) – an initiative of Victoria’s *Housing Statement, The decade ahead, 2024-2034*.

The objective of the Activity Centres Program is to introduce clear planning controls in and around 10 activity centres capable of delivering an additional 60,000 homes. These activity centres are Broadmeadows, Camberwell Junction, Chadstone, Epping, Frankston, Moorabbin, Niddrie (Keilor Road), North Essendon, Preston (High Street) and Ringwood.

The Activity Centre Program seeks to implement the new planning controls within a short timeframe to enable housing delivery to promptly respond to Victoria’s housing needs.

Scope

A total of 11 referrals were made to the Committee, with 1 referral regarding the new header provisions, 1 referral regarding common matters applicable to all activity centres and 9 referrals for each place specific centre.

The scope of the Committee was limited to providing advice on specific referred matters to enable the Committee to provide timely advice that could facilitate the prompt introduction of the proposed planning controls.

The Committee’s Terms of Reference required it to provide consistent advice for activity centre planning and outcomes in relation to the Activity Centres Program.

To inform the provision of advice, the Committee was referred a range of materials, including the following:

- Draft Activity Centre Plans for each activity centre
- Draft Walkable Catchment Zone (WCZ)¹
- Draft schedule to the Built Form Overlay (BFO)²
- Draft Urban Design Background Report
- City of Centres Report
- Select submissions which were relevant to each referral.

Consultation

A range of consultation was undertaken with the community, local councils, industry groups and key stakeholders to inform preparation of the Activity Centre Plans and the planning controls. Select submissions received during consultation that were relevant to each referral were provided to the SAC for their consideration.

This valuable feedback from consultation was also considered by the Department alongside the SAC referral advice when determining the response to these matters and corresponding changes to the Activity Centre Plans and the planning controls.



Recommendations

The Committee provided its report to the Minister for Planning in November 2024. Its recommendations were organised under the referral matters, as summarised in the tables below, and these related to both the Activity Centre Plans and the proposed planning controls

Department's response

The Department of Transport and Planning (DTP) considered all the recommendations made by the Committee alongside the consultation feedback from the community, local councils, industry groups and key stakeholders and made a range of changes to improve the Activity Centre Plans and the relevant planning controls.

DTP broadly accepts the Committee's recommendations regarding the referred matters and notes that the final form of the planning controls provided for in Amendments GC252 were refined and developed by reference to the Committee's reports.

DTP acknowledges that the Committee had a limited timeframe and scope to consider the matters referred to it and the Committee's findings therefore should be interpreted within that context. Accordingly, DTP have considered these findings alongside other considerations outside the scope of the referral, including feedback from community and stakeholder groups.

DTP further acknowledges the Committee's view that the intent of the catchment zone could be achieved through the use of existing zones, however it was considered that existing zones do not sufficiently encourage land consolidation and housing delivery around activity centres.

A summary of the Committee's findings and the DTP response to each matter are outlined in the table below.

Department Response to ACSAC Recommendations

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – New header provisions (SAC Report 1)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
Built Form Overlay				
1.	The purposes listed in the overlay	<p>The overlay is proposed to only be applied in areas designated for built form intensification, please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the purposes should be amended to include a specific purpose enabling diverse and affordable housing, noting the potential broadscale application of the overlay across metropolitan Melbourne the draft purposes sufficiently guide a responsible authority's discretion. 	<p>Affordable housing is a land use issue, not a built form issue, therefore it should not be referenced in the purpose of the BFO.</p> <p>With some amendments, the purposes of the BFO will sufficiently guide discretion.</p>	<p>Supported in part provisions have been redrafted, but not always to match the committee's recommendations.</p> <p>Affordable housing is not solely a land use issue and can be influenced by the BFO therefore reference in the purpose is considered appropriate.</p>
2.	The Development Framework	<p>The proposed provision seeks a map or maps to be prepared which express the strategic considerations of an activity centre.</p> <p>Please advise whether the proposed instrument will be beneficial in guiding a responsible authority's discretion.</p>	<p>Changes are needed to the BFO to ensure Development Frameworks will be beneficial in guiding discretion.</p>	<p>Supported in principle The list of information that may be contained in a development framework has been refined to support the operation of the BFO and accompanying schedules.</p>
3.	Master planned sites	<p>The proposed provision seeks to guide development outcomes on identified sites. Please advise whether the provision will</p>	<p>Changes are needed to the BFO to ensure master plans will be beneficial in guiding discretion.</p>	<p>Supported in principle The provision has been refined to address the committee's recommendations.</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		be beneficial in guiding a responsible authority's discretion for such sites.		
4.	Community benefit framework	<p>The proposed provision provides a mechanism for planning authorities to prepare and incorporate a community benefit framework (CBF) [<i>now named Benefit Uplift Framework</i>] into the scheme. Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the provision is suitably drafted to achieve the provision's intended purpose – the provision is suitably drafted to facilitate affordable housing – it would be reasonable to amend the provision to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – only apply in circumstances that a deemed to comply standard (compared to a mandatory standard) is not met, and – only facilitate affordable housing, commensurate to how much it exceeds the standard drafting sufficiently reflects the intended purpose. 	<p>The proposed CBF [<i>now named Benefit Uplift Framework</i>] provision requires drafting changes if it is to achieve its intended purpose.</p> <p>The provision is suitably drafted to facilitate affordable housing. It is not reasonable to amend the provision to only apply in circumstances where a deemed to comply standard is not met.</p> <p>It is not reasonable to amend the provision to only facilitate affordable housing (and no other community benefits).</p> <p>The 'uplift' gained in return for providing the community benefit (or the amount of the exceedance) should be proportionate to the community benefit provided by a developer.</p>	<p>Supported in principle</p> <p>The provision has been refined to address the committee's recommendations.</p>
5.	Application of outcomes and standards	The proposed overlay seeks to apply outcomes and standards. Please advise whether the proposed application of outcomes and standards will be beneficial in guiding a responsible authority's decision making.	Changes are needed to the BFO operational provision and to the outcomes and standards themselves to ensure they will be effective in guiding decision making. There is a risk that the overuse of deemed to comply standards will result in poor outcomes.	<p>Supported in principle,</p> <p>The provision has been refined to address the committee's recommendations.</p>
6.	Open space provisions	The public open space contribution mechanism integrated within the provision intends to override the provisions of Clause 53.01.	The integration of the open space provision within the BFO simplifies the interpretation of open space requirements for permit applicants and responsible authorities.	Supported

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		Please advise whether the integration of the open space provision within the overlay simplifies the interpretation of open space requirements for permit applicants and responsible authorities.		
Built Form Overlay				
7.	Locally responsive design Overlay head clause dealing with landscaping as shown in Appendix D:1.	Please advise whether the proposed controls, in combination with the other, existing elements of the planning scheme are capable of facilitating landscaping/tree canopy and locally responsive design outcomes and are suitably drafted.	<p>The BFO should facilitate landscaping, but minor changes are needed to facilitate canopy trees.</p> <p>The BFO should, in principle, facilitate locally responsive design, provided standards and outcomes in schedules are appropriately tailored to the local context.</p>	Supported
Walkable Catchment Zone (now known as Housing Choice and Transport Zone)				
1.	The purpose of the zone	The zone is proposed to be applied in areas designated for built form intensification. Please advise whether the draft purposes sufficiently guide a responsible authority's discretion.	The purposes of the WCZ will not sufficiently guide discretion. The Committee recommends the WCZ purposes be more tailored to the activity centre context	<p>Supported in principle,</p> <p>The purpose of the HCTZ has been refined to include reference to the activity centre context.</p> <p>In addition to the activity centre context, the HCTZ can be applied to other well-served locations (for example around train stations) and this is also reflected in the purpose of the zone.</p>
2.	Building heights	Please advise whether:	It is not possible to advise whether the metrics of the proposed building	Not supported,

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the building height thresholds for above and below 1000sqm are appropriate – the provision is suitably drafted to achieve the intended purpose of facilitating more intense development in the catchment. 	<p>heights are appropriate. They will apply in a wide range of contexts, and their appropriateness will depend on local factors.</p> <p>In the absence of strategic justification for a mandatory three storey height limit for smaller sites, the limit should be discretionary.</p> <p>With changes, the building height provision should facilitate more intense development in the catchments, but the Committee is concerned it may not result in locally responsive design and good planning outcomes in all cases.</p>	<p>The HCTZ specifies mandatory maximum building heights for dwellings, small second dwellings and residential buildings.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the building height and large site provisions in the zone will be sufficient to encourage greater housing development and increased densities around activity centres.</p>
3.	Locally responsive design	Please advise whether the proposed controls, in combination with the other, existing elements of the planning scheme are capable of facilitating landscaping/tree canopy and locally responsive design outcomes and are suitably drafted.	<p>The WCZ will not facilitate landscaping or tree canopy outcomes.</p> <p>The WCZ will only facilitate locally responsive design outcomes to a limited extent. Other planning tools that apply within the catchments may facilitate locally responsive design, provided they are retained.</p> <p>The WCZ should not be applied to areas that are within a Heritage Overlay or a Neighbourhood Character Overlay (NCO).</p>	<p>Supported in part,</p> <p>The HCTZ in combination with other existing planning tools will facilitate locally responsive designs and landscaping or tree canopy outcomes.</p> <p>The spatial application of the HCTZ varies in each centre. The methodology and justification for applying the HCTZ is discussed in SAC reports 2-11.</p>

Note: The title of “Walkable Catchment Zone” has been replaced since the Committee’s review to be the “Housing Choice and Transport Zone” (HCTZ).

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendation – Common matters (SAC Report 2)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Deemed to comply, mandatory and discretionary controls.	<p>It is proposed that consistent built form standards, including building heights and setbacks, be established for application to activity centres across Victoria, depending on the precinct typology allocated.</p> <p>Given the variety of centres and the importance of contextual response in development, please advise on whether the level of discretion (e.g. deemed to comply, mandatory or discretionary) is appropriate for the following standards in each precinct typology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Building height – Street wall/podium height – Front setback above street wall – Side and rear setbacks. 	<p>Building Height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Heritage Main Street Core and Residential areas of the activity centre should have a discretionary building height standard. – The deemed to comply standard is likely to have unintended consequences and may compromise heritage places. <p>Street wall/podium height</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed deemed to comply street wall standard is appropriate for Non-Heritage Main Street Core, Fringe and Limited Sensitivities precincts. – The street wall height for Residential areas should be discretionary. – The proposed standards for Large Opportunity Sites and Enclosed Shopping Centres should be discretionary. – <p>Front setback above street wall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The standard for the Heritage Main Street Core should be discretionary given that the significance of heritage sites are not uniform and a different design response may be warranted. 	<p>Building Height, supported in part;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Building heights in the Heritage Main Street Core and Residential areas are discretionary. – The use of deemed to comply controls is integral to accelerating the permit approval process. <p>Street wall/podium height, supported.</p> <p>Front setback above street wall, supported.</p> <p>Side and rear setbacks, supported.</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed standards for Large Opportunity Sites and Enclosed Shopping Centres should be discretionary. <p>Side and rear setbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The side and rear setback standards should be discretionary for Heritage Main Street Core and Residential typologies. The discretionary controls for Large Opportunity Sites and Enclosed Shopping centres are appropriate. 	
2.	Sun access	<p>It is proposed that the sun access standards vary depending on the type of street or the level of protection required for open parks and space.</p> <p>Please advise whether the level of discretion (e.g. deemed to comply, mandatory or discretionary) is appropriate for the type of street and the level of protection required for open parks and space.</p>	<p>All levels of discretion proposed for streets, parks and open space are generally appropriate.</p> <p>The Urban Design Background Report and BFO Schedule should benefit from clarifying what is meant by 'Other streets' and 'Other parks and open space'.</p> <p>The BFO provisions should be revised as outlined in this report to support the implementation of the level of discretion for sun access.</p>	<p>Supported in part,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of discretion proposed for streets, parks and open spaces has been refined and the geographical application of the controls has been modified to enhance development opportunity. Reference to 'other streets' has been clarified by specifying that it applied to <i>all other streets</i>.
3.	Wind	The proposed standard aims to ensure that the built form, design, and layout of new developments does not generate unacceptable wind impacts within the site or on surrounding	Wind standard findings should be read in conjunction with comments in the Referral 1 Report.	Supported.

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		areas. Please advise whether the provision is suitably drafted to achieve the provision's intended purpose.	The wind provision is suitable to achieve the provision's intended purpose subject to the drafting changes recommended in the Referral 1 Report.	
4.	Active Frontage	<p>The proposed standard aims to support a vibrant, active and safe pedestrian environment. It is proposed that active frontages vary depending on whether they are a primary or secondary frontage. Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the standards are drafted to suitably achieve the intended purpose – the additional guidance included in the Urban Design Draft Background Summary Report will be beneficial in guiding a responsible authority's decision making. – 	<p>The active frontage standard is suitable to achieve the provision's intended purpose.</p> <p>Matters of scale and visual interest appear unrelated to active frontages and it is unclear how they would assist in achieving the intended purpose.</p>	Supported.
5.	Heritage	<p>The proposed standards seek to ensure new development appropriately responds to the significance of identified heritage places. Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the application of discretionary standards are appropriate in this context – the appropriateness of deemed to comply provisions for sites adjacent to sites on the Victorian Heritage Register, 	<p>It is appropriate to apply discretionary standards with respect to places of heritage significance.</p> <p>Mandatory and deemed to comply standards should not be applied to heritage places unless the specific circumstances of the heritage place are known, and the standard ensures the significance of the place is appropriately protected.</p>	Supported.

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		and/or contributory/significant sites.		
6.	Large opportunity sites and enclosed shopping centres	<p>The proposed standards seek to manage development of sites over 5,000sqm. Please advise of the appropriateness of the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 5,000sqm threshold standard – master planning requirement – tower floor plate size standard – building separation standard – deep soil standard – pedestrian link standard. 	<p>5,000sqm threshold standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed 5,000 square metre threshold guidance generally achieves the intended outcome, however there is no information to explain 5,000 square metres is an appropriate measure for designating large opportunity sites. – There should be flexibility to consider moderately smaller sites that would benefit from the same process. <p>Master planning requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The master planning provisions are suitable to achieve the intended purpose subject to changes recommended in the Referral 1 Report. <p>Tower floor plate size standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed discretionary tower plate size standard is suitable to achieve part of the intended purpose, as it only applies to apartments. – A suitable standard should be considered for non-residential tower floor plates. 	<p>5,000sqm threshold standard – supported in part,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The 5,000 square metre threshold has been retained, greater flexibility to the size is likely to create ambiguity to the control’s application. <p>Master planning requirement, supported in part;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provisions have been redrafted, but not always to match the committee’s recommendations. <p>Tower floor plate size standard, supported in part;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The discretionary tower plate size standard has been retained, a minimum floor plate is not established for non-residential towers to allow flexibility for different size floor plates informed by the land use needs. <p>Building separation standard, supported.</p> <p>Deep soil standard, supported.</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			<p>Building separation standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The discretionary building separation standards in Table 12 of the Urban Design Background report and Table 12 of the example BFO Schedule are suitable to achieve the intended purpose. <p>Deep soil standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The discretionary deep soil standard is suitable to achieve the intended purpose. <p>Pedestrian link standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The discretionary pedestrian link standard is suitable to achieve the intended purpose. – There would be benefit in providing guidance through a diagram showing how the standard is intended to operate. 	Pedestrian link standard, supported.
7.	Tree canopy	The proposed inclusion of further canopy tree guidance in the Urban Design Draft Background Summary Report seeks to enhance the amenity of established areas. Please advise whether the additional guidance will be beneficial in guiding a responsible authority's decision making.	The proposed decision guideline would be appropriate in circumstances where a canopy tree may be considered desirable in a landscaped setback. The BFO header provision provides very general decision guidelines and it would seem incongruous to include a detailed matter dealing with canopy trees in this provision.	Supported.
8.	Catchment boundary	It is proposed that the catchment is the area within walking distance of the local jobs, services and public	<p>Defining the catchment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Victoria Planning Authority's (VPA's) methodology for defining 	Supported in part, The methodology for defining the catchment has followed

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<p>transport of the Activity Centre. Please advise whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Defining the catchment from the edge of the activity centre or from the edge of commercial areas of the activity centre is suitable to achieve the intended purpose. – The proposed boundaries respond adequately to station locations, where stations are located outside the activity centre. – Other considerations should inform the setting of the boundary. 	<p>the catchment to be generally sound, but has not been applied consistently across the activity centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The Walkable Catchment boundary should be defined no more than 800 walkable metres (10 minutes) from the activity centre ‘core’ and from a train station located within the activity centre boundary. – Activity centre plans that do not show any Built Form Typologies should be revised to define the Main Street Core to enable their walkable catchment areas to be measured. – Chadstone, Epping and Broadmeadows should have separate consideration and criteria because they differ from all other referred centres. <p>The proposed boundaries respond adequately to station locations, where stations are located outside the activity centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The proposed boundaries respond adequately to stations outside the activity centre. – The existence of a train station alone outside the identified activity centre boundary should not be applied as criteria for measuring the catchment boundary. 	<p>consistent principles however amendments have been made to catchment boundaries to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre.</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			<p>Other considerations should inform the setting of the boundary.</p> <p>The walkable catchment boundary for each activity centre should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ensure that the average walker takes up to about 10 minutes to walk to the activity centre core – align along roads, rail, rivers or other easily discernible and consistent boundaries, including zone boundaries – avoid creating small pockets at the edge, where a more consistent edge could be created nearby – avoid aligning along rear or side boundaries between residential properties – avoid any area separated by built or topographic barriers such as divided arterial roads and steep topography with restrictive, hostile or unsafe connectivity. 	

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Broadmeadows Activity Centre (SAC Report 3)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Landscape setbacks	Please advise whether the designated locations in the <i>draft Broadmeadows Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> for landscape setbacks are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	The designated locations in the Activity Centre Plan for landscape setbacks are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	Supported.
2.	Sun access	Please advise whether retaining the designated locations in the <i>draft Broadmeadows Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> is suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	The designated locations in the Activity Centre Plan for sun access are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	Supported.
3.	Active frontages	Please advise whether modifying the designated locations in the <i>draft Broadmeadows Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> are suitable to achieve the intended purpose, specifically the removal of the internal roads to Hume Central.	The modified designated locations in the Activity Centre Plan (September 2024) are suitable to achieve the intended purpose. Removing the active frontage requirement from the internal roads of Hume Central is suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	Supported.
4.	Master plans	Please advise whether the designated locations in the <i>draft Broadmeadows Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> are suitable to achieve the intended purpose and whether identifying Kangan Institute, Banksia Gardens, Hume Central, and 16-22 Pearcedale Parade as sites for master planning is suitable to achieve the intended purpose.	The designated locations for master plans in the Activity Centre Plan are suitable to achieve the intended purpose. Modifying the designated locations to add Kangan Institute, Banksia Gardens, Hume Central, and 16-22 Pearcedale Parade is consistent with the intended purpose. Consistent with comments regarding master planning in the Referral 2 report, 16-22 Pearcedale Parade should be designated a Large Opportunity Site.	Supported in part. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amendments have been made to reduce the extent of masterplanning requirements applying to land in all centres.
5.	Spatial application of built form typologies	Please advise whether the proposed changes to the spatial application of built form typologies provide sufficient clear guidance for the responsible authority's decision-making:	Designating 16-22 Pearcedale Parade as a Large Opportunity Site would provide sufficient clear guidance for the	Supported.

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of the Large Opportunity Site typology to an additional site at 16-22 Pearcedale Parade. 	responsible authority's decision-making.	
6.	Building height	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the building height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for the responsible authority's decision-making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discretionary building height controls for managing airport Obstacle Limitation Surfaces (OLS) constraints. 	<p>The proposed discretionary building height controls for managing the airport OLS constraints provides sufficient clear guidance for the responsible authority's decision-making.</p> <p>Any proposal seeking to protrude into prescribed air space will be subject to a separate Federal referral process.</p>	Supported.
7.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the recommended change to the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Broadmeadows is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>The walkable catchment is inconsistent with the intended purpose and should be remeasured as recommended in the Referral 2 report.</p> <p>To achieve the intended purpose, the Broadmeadows walkable catchment boundary should be revised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - exclude [the area east of Dallas Drive] - include only those parts of [the proposed extension to the north and south] within a walkable catchment of the core of the Activity Centre, including allowance for time to cross over arterial roads and the rail line. 	<p>Supported in part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre. Land in the proposed extension to the north and south affected by the MAEO is identified as suitable catchment land for potential rezoning subject to MAEO changes. Area east of Dallas Drive excluded from catchment.



Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Camberwell Junction Activity Centre (SAC Report 4)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the recommended change to the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Camberwell Junction is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>The catchment boundary needs to be redrawn in accordance with the principles outlined by the Referral 2 Committee.</p> <p>Consistent with the findings of the Referral 1 Committee, the redefined catchment area should then be further refined to remove areas within the Heritage Overlay or a Neighbourhood Character Overlay.</p> <p>These refinements are likely to include removal of [a small area at the southern extent] from the walkable catchment. However, there are many other parts of the current catchment that will also need to be removed.</p> <p>Recommendation: Redraw the Camberwell Junction walkable catchment boundary so that it reflects an 800 metre 'real time' walkable distance from: a) the areas identified in the City of Centres Report as Heritage Main Street Core or Non-Heritage Main Street Core b) the entrances to Camberwell Train Station.</p> <p>Exclude the following from the area from which the 800 metre walkable distance is measured: a) fringe precincts b) residential areas (if any) c) any large opportunity sites and areas with limited sensitivities that do not serve the day to day needs of the local community d) open space areas on the periphery of the Activity Centre.</p>	<p>Supported in part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre. – The amendments to the planning provisions suitably address HO and NCO matters. – A small area at the southern extent has been removed from catchment.

			<p>Ensure the redefined boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) align along roads, rail or other easily discernible and consistent boundaries, including zone boundaries b) avoid aligning along rear or side boundaries between residential properties c) avoid creating small pockets at the edge, where a more consistent edge could be created nearby. <p>Exclude the following from the redefined walkable catchment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) areas in the Heritage Overlay or a Neighbourhood Character Overlay. 	
--	--	--	--	--

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Chadstone Activity Centre (SAC Report 5)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Landscape setbacks	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the <i>draft Chadstone Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> for landscape setbacks are suitable to achieve the intended purpose, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A 7.6 metre deemed to comply front landscaping setback as a local variation along Dandenong Road and whether this is appropriate to provide opportunity for large canopy tree planting and to contribute to an improved boulevard character. 	<p>Additional locations for landscaped setbacks will need to be designated in the Activity Centre Plan to achieve the intended purpose.</p> <p>The setback on the north side of Dandenong Road should be extended along the shopping centre site frontage.</p> <p>Landscape setbacks should be designated along the shopping centre site frontages on Chadstone Road, Castlebar Road and Capon Street. The Committee does not have sufficient information to advise how wide the setbacks need to be on Chadstone Road, Castlebar Road and Capon Street.</p> <p>The proposed 7.6 metre landscape setback along Dandenong Road is appropriate to provide an opportunity for large canopy tree planting and to contribute to an improved boulevard character along Dandenong Road.</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Landscape setbacks have been amended along Dandenong Road – Landscape setbacks within the shopping centre site are to be addressed through future amendments to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) Schedule 2 that applies to the site.
2.	Sun access	<p>Please advise whether modifying the designated locations in the <i>draft Chadstone Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> is suitable to achieve the intended purpose, specifically the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Removal of the ‘Boulevard’ classification as it relates to sun access and solar protection for the section of Dandenong Road between Chadstone Road and the intersection of Maroo Street / Dandenong Road to support 	<p>It is appropriate to remove the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘Boulevard’ designation along the section of Dandenong Road fronting the shopping centre site. - ‘key pedestrian/green streets’ designation on Chadstone Road. <p>These are not pedestrian friendly streets or places where people are likely to stop and rest and enjoy sun access.</p> <p>This may require further consideration if the Committee’s recommendation for a landscape</p>	<p>Supported.</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<p>the long-term strategic development of Chadstone Shopping Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Removal of the ‘Key pedestrian streets / green streets’ classification on Chadstone Road to support the long-term development opportunities in the south-west corner of Chadstone Shopping Centre. 	<p>setback to be designated along Chadstone Road is accepted.</p>	
3.	Active frontages	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the <i>draft Chadstone Activity Centre Plan (September 2024)</i> are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Application in the Mixed Use Zone area – Application to Chadstone Shopping Centre – The use of deemed to comply standards 	<p>Additional locations will need to be designated as active frontages if the intended purpose is to be achieved.</p> <p>The Committee does not have sufficient information to advise where additional active frontages should be designated. Areas to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - external edges of the shopping centre site - internal locations within the shopping centre site, depending on its future layout and activity nodes. <p>Active frontages for the shopping centre site should be considered as part of the master plan.</p>	<p>Application to the Mixed Use Zone - supported.</p> <p>Application to Chadstone Shopping Centre - supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The committee’s recommendations for the shopping centre site are subject to future work on the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) Schedule 2. <p>Use of deemed to comply, supported.</p>
4.	Master plans	<p>Please advise whether a site-specific approach to Chadstone Shopping Centre beyond what is proposed for the ‘Enclosed Shopping Centre typology’, including a master planning requirement.</p>	<p>It is essential that the shopping centre site be subject to master planning requirements.</p> <p>The Committee is not in a position to advise whether the master planning requirement should be located in the BFO schedule, or some other planning tool.</p>	<p>Supported in principle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site specific planning to be undertaken as part of future amendments to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) Schedule 2 that applies to the site.

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
5.	Building height	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the Building Height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority's decision-making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A 60m preferred building height for Chadstone Shopping Centre. 	<p>The building height standard for the shopping centre site (40 metres, proposed to be revised to 60 metres) does not provide sufficient clear guidance for decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Height limits on the shopping centre site should be graduated. While 60 metres may be appropriate for some parts of the site, it will not be appropriate as a blanket control across the whole site. Graduated heights within the shopping centre site should be addressed in the master plan. 	<p>Supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Site specific planning to be undertaken as part of future amendments to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) Schedule 2 that applies to the site.
6.	Street wall/podium height	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the Street wall / podium height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority's decision-making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A 15m / 4 storey deemed to comply 'Street wall / podium height'. 	<p>The proposed 15 metre (four storey) street wall height in the Fringe Precinct areas is appropriate.</p> <p>Street wall heights should be designated within the shopping centre site (internally and around its edges). If not already addressed under the IPO2, this should be addressed in the master plan.</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Activity centre plans have been updated to ensure correct references to street wall heights and podium heights, and to provide more detailed decision-making guidance. – Proposed 15 metre / four storey) street wall height updated to align with Front wall heights standards in Fringe Precinct (1:1 ratio of road width to front wall height or 21m whichever is lesser). – – Site specific planning for the shopping centre site is to be undertaken as part of future amendments to the Incorporated Plan Overlay (IPO) Schedule 2 that applies to the site.

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
7.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the recommended change to the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Chadstone is consistent with the intended purpose.	A catchment should not be applied to the Chadstone Activity Centre.	Supported in part <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre. – Catchment area to the south is reduced.. – Areas separated by significant physical barriers have been removed. – Remaining areas retained in catchment have reasonable access to Chadstone Shopping Centre.

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Epping Activity Centre (SAC Report 6)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Epping is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), the proposed catchment boundary for Epping is inconsistent with the intended purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To achieve the intended purpose, the 800-metre (10-minute) walkable catchment should be measured from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - entrances from the shopping centre building - in the area shown as ‘Enclosed Shopping Centre’ - the Costco building entrance the Epping Train Station entrance. 	<p>Supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre. – The area to the north has been removed from the catchment.

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Frankston Activity Centre (SAC Report 7)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the recommended change to the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Frankston is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>The recommended change to the walkable catchment boundary in that [the area north of Overton Road and the area east of the Frankston Freeway] are removed, and [the area west of the Frankston Freeway] is included, is acceptable.</p> <p>The Committee recommends: The area to the south of Williams Street should not be included in the walkable catchment area for the Frankston Activity Centre.</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre. – The area north of Overton Road and the area east of Frankston Freeway have been removed from the catchment. The area west of Frankston Freeway has been included. – The area south of Williams Road has high amenity and is within walking distance of the commercial centre. This area has been retained based on the methodology for defining the catchment and applying this consistently across centres.


Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Moorabbin Activity Centre (SAC Report 8)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Landscape setbacks	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the draft Moorabbin Activity Centre Plan (September 2024) for landscape setbacks are suitable to achieve the intended purpose, including if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extension of the 4m deemed to comply front landscaping setback is appropriate for the newly proposed sections of the Residential typology in Kingston (local variation) 	<p>The Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Extend the four metre landscape setback along the north side of South Road between Jasper Road and Gilmour Road – Include the four metre landscape setback in Redholme and Healey Streets to reflect the change to Residential typology. – Remove the four metre landscape setback on Horscroft Place. 	<p>Supported in part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not adopted along the north side of South Road between Jasper Road and Gilmour Road as not deemed suitable in line with typology applied in this location – Included four metre landscape setback on Redholme and Healey Streets – Landscape setback retained to Horscroft Place due to residential typology being applied
2.	Sun Access	<p>Please advise whether modifying the designated locations in the draft Moorabbin Activity Centre Plan (September 2024) is suitable to achieve the intended purpose, specifically if the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inclusion of the ‘Key pedestrian streets / green streets’ classification on Charming Street in Bayside is appropriate, to support a network of green streets connecting to the Activity Centre Core – inclusion of the ‘Key pedestrian streets / green streets’ classification on section of Healey Street between Central Avenue and Horscroft Place is appropriate, to support street greening and active transport 	<p>The Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include Charming Street in Bayside as a Key pedestrian street/green street. – Include Healey Street, between Central Avenue and Horscroft Place Pocket Park, as a Key pedestrian/green street. – Designate the whole of the Horscroft Place Pocket Park as Moderate protection and update its mapping accordingly. 	<p>Supported</p>

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<p>opportunities throughout the Activity Centre Core</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inclusion of the ‘Key pedestrian streets / green streets’ classification on section of Horscroft Place is appropriate, to support street greening and active transport opportunities throughout the Activity Centre Core 		
3.	Active frontages	<p>Please advise whether modifying the designated locations in the draft Moorabbin Activity Centre Plan (September 2024) is suitable to achieve the intended purpose, specifically if the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inclusion of ‘secondary active frontage’ on South Road, on south side in Bayside, is appropriate to support defining the Bayside entry to the Activity Centre Core and to avoid inactive edges – inclusion of ‘secondary active frontage’ on South Road between the Frankston railway line and South Avenue in Glen Eira is appropriate to foster walkability and a sense of sense in order to overall support a more amenable pedestrian environment – inclusion of ‘secondary active frontage’ on both sides of Taylor Street in Kingston is appropriate to foster walkability in the Activity Centre Core 	<p>The Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Include ‘secondary active frontage’ to South Road and Nepean Highway, between the Frankston railway line and South Avenue in Gen Eira. – Include ‘secondary active frontage’ to South Road in Bayside. – Include ‘secondary active frontage’ to both sides of Taylor Street in Kingston. 	Supported

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inclusion of 'primary active frontage' on Central Avenue to support activation of this key street as a focal point for the Activity Centre Core 		
4.	Master plans	<p>Please advise whether modifying the designated locations in the draft Moorabbin Activity Centre Plan (September 2024) is suitable to achieve the intended purpose, specifically if the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inclusion of identification for master planning for the Moorabbin West Precinct Large Opportunity Site, bounded by the Frankston railway line, Exley Drive and Nepean Highway, is appropriate given its size, shape and frontage to a major arterial road 	<p>The Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include and undertake master planning for the Moorabbin West Precinct Large Opportunity Site, bounded by the Frankston railway line, Exley Drive and Nepean Highway. 	<p>Supported in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments have been made to reduce the extent of masterplanning requirements applying to land in all centres.
5.	Building Height	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the Building Height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority's decision-making in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34m / 10 storey preferred building height for the Harvey Norman Large Opportunity Site, on South Road and Linton Street 	<p>The Committee recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase the preferred building height of the Harvey Norman Large Opportunity Site, on South Road and Linton Street to 34 metres/10 storey. 	<p>Supported</p>
6.	Street wall/podium height	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the Street wall / podium height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority's decision-making:</p>	<p>The Committee finds and recommends the proposed changes to street walls/podium heights will provide sufficient and clear guidance for responsible authority's decision making, subject to the following</p>	<p>Supported in part,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horscroft Place recommendation not supported due to associated typology applied

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 11m / 3 storey deemed to comply ‘Street wall / podium height’ for all Large Opportunity Sites and Limited Sensitivities in Kingston that don’t front to South Road or Nepean Highway 	<p>changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide that the podium height for all Horscroft Place be 11 metres (three storeys). – Properly map the deemed to control street wall/podium requirement. – Include ‘podium’ in the reference to ‘street wall’ in the Built Form Zone Schedule and associated mapping. – Change the areas identified as “Large Opportunity Sites” and “Limited Sensitivities” in Kingston that do not front South Road or Nepean Highway as mapped in referred material Attachment F Moorabbin Draft Activity Centre Plan, VPA, September 2024 to 11 metres/3 storey deemed to comply ‘Street wall/podium height’. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Plans/referencing updated accordingly
7.	Spatial application of built form typologies	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the spatial application of built form typologies provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority’s decision-making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Residential typology to the section in Kingston bounded by Redholme Street and Healey Street – Residential typology to either side of Horscroft Place – Non-Heritage Main Street Core typology to South Road between Jasper Road and Railway Crescent 	<p>The Committee finds and recommends: The spatial application of built form typologies is appropriate, subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Change the built form typology to the area bounded by Redholme Street and Healy Street to the Residential typology. – Change the built form typology on both sides of Horscroft Place to the Residential typology. – Retain the Limited Sensitivities built form typology for South Road between Jasper Road and Railway Crescent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the built form typology to Station Street between South Road 	Supported




#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LOPS typology to Station Street between South Road and Central Avenue – LIMS typology to 2-4 Highbury Avenue, Hampton East 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and Central Avenue to the Large Opportunity Sites typology. – Change the built form typology to 2-4 Highbury Avenue, Hampton East to the Limited Sensitivities typology. 	
8.	Catchment Boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the extent of the proposed catchment boundary in Moorabbin is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>The Committee finds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The extent of the proposed Moorabbin Catchment Boundary is appropriate and is consistent with its intended purpose. 	Supported

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon Activity Centres (SAC Report 9)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Landscape setbacks	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the draft Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon Activity Centre Plans for landscape setbacks are suitable to achieve the intended purpose, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1.5m front landscaping setback to street frontages zoned Commercial 2 Zone (C2Z). – 2.5m front landscaping setback along Limited Sensitivity typology on Mt Alexander Road. – 4m front landscaping along sections of Queen Street for Fringe typology. 	<p>The proposed landscape setback local variations for both Activity Centres will achieve their intended purpose.</p> <p>Recommendation: Extend the four metre landscape setback local variation to the properties at 22, 24 and 26 Queen Street, North Essendon</p>	Supported.
2.	Sun access	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the draft Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon Activity Centre Plans are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.</p>	<p>The designated locations for solar access protection in the draft Niddrie (Keilor Road) & North Essendon Activity Centre Plans are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.</p> <p>That said, the Boulevard standard's reference to "maintain sun access to opposite central median" is unclear and would benefit from drafting improvements.</p>	Supported.
3.	Active frontages	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the draft Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon Activity Centre Plans are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.</p>	<p>Findings: The designated primary and secondary active frontage locations are appropriate to achieve their intended purpose.</p> <p>That said they should be extended to apply to a few additional locations to provide for more integrated outcomes for the two Activity Centres.</p>	Supported.


#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Extend the primary active frontage to both sides of Wallis Mall between Keilor Road and Hotham Street, Niddrie.</p> <p>Extend the secondary active frontage across the northern edge of the retail pocket facing Woodlands Park to the east of Carnarvon Road, North Essendon.</p>	
4.	Master plans	<p>Please advise whether the designated locations in the draft Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon Activity Centre Plans are suitable to achieve the intended purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The site at 1144-1146 Mt Alexander Road. 	The identification of 1144-1146 Mt Alexander Road as a Master plan site in the North Essendon Activity Centre Plan is appropriate.	Supported.
5.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the extent of the proposed catchment boundary in Niddrie (Keilor Road) and North Essendon is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>Finding:</p> <p>The walkable catchment of both Activity Centres is excessive and should be reduced consistent with the findings of the Referral 2 Committee.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Amend the Niddrie (Keilor Road) 800 metre walkable catchment to be measured from the edge of the Commercial 1 Zone rather than including land in the Commercial 2 Zone.</p> <p>Amend the North Essendon 800 metre walkable catchment to be measured from the edge of the Commercial 1 Zone (except those fringe areas already intensely used for residential activity) rather than including land in the Residential Growth Zone or the LT Thomphson, Woodlands Park, Lincoln Park and the Cliff Ellison Reserve.</p>	<p>Supported in part.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the committee and the local context of each centre</p> <p>The North Essendon catchment has been refined to exclude parks from the catchment measurement.</p>



#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
6.	Building heights	<p>Please advise whether the proposed changes to the Building Height standard provide sufficient clear guidance for responsible authority's decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing deemed to comply height of 203-211 Keilor Rd from 10 storeys to 8 storeys due to the conflict with Essendon Fields Airport's operation. 	<p>Findings:</p> <p>Reducing the deemed to comply height of 203-211 Keilor Road from ten storeys to eight storeys is generally supported.</p> <p>That said further discussions with Essendon Fields Airport and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority should be undertaken to establish that an eight storey height limit for 203-211 Keilor Road, Niddrie will not impact Essendon Fields Airport operations or aircraft safety.</p>	<p>Supported in principle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site at 203-211 Keilor Rd has been identified as a Large Opportunity Site typology and building height standards will be discretionary.

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Preston (High Street) Activity Centre (SAC Report 10)


#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1.	Catchment boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Preston is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>Redraw the Preston (High Street) walkable catchment boundary so that it reflects an 800 metre / 10 minute 'real time' walkable distance from the core of the Activity Centre. The core should generally relate to the area defined as Heritage Main Street Core and Non Heritage Main Street Core and also include Preston Market and the supermarket on Murray Road.</p> <p>Exclude the following from the commercial core:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – fringe precinct- residential areas – large opportunity sites not including the existing supermarket on Murray Road or Preston Market- open space areas on the periphery of the Activity Centre. <p>Ensure the redefined boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – align along roads, rail or other easily discernible and consistent boundaries, including zone boundaries – avoid aligning along rear or side boundaries between residential properties and in mid block locations. – avoid creating small pockets at the edge, where a more consistent edge could be created nearby. <p>Exclude the following from the redefined walkable catchment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – any areas in the Heritage Overlay or a Neighbourhood Character Overlay- any areas within the Mixed Use Zone 	<p>Supported in part.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to catchment boundaries and proposed planning provisions (zones) to respond to the findings of the Committee and the local context of each centre.</p> <p>Areas amended based on the methodology for defining the catchment and applying this consistently across centres.</p> <p>Changes to the catchment zone provisions, including building heights, respond to the local context in Preston in line with the Committee's findings.</p>



#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – any areas within non-residential zones such as the Priority Development Zone. 	

Standing Advisory Committee Report recommendations – Ringwood Activity Centre (SAC Report 11)

#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
1	Catchment Boundary	Having regard to the advice sought on the catchment boundary in the common matters (Referral 2), please advise if the recommended change to the extent of the proposed catchment boundary for Ringwood is consistent with the intended purpose.	<p>Findings:</p> <p>The changes to the catchment boundary for Ringwood are broadly consistent with the intended purpose.</p> <p>The [area west of Heatherdale Road in the City of Whitehorse] should be excluded from the walkable catchment and areas [at the southern, eastern and north-eastern extents] be further amended.</p> <p>The walkable catchment should be redrawn to ensure it extends up to 800 metres from the core commercial precincts of the Ringwood Activity Centre and the Ringwood Train Station, consistent with the findings of the Referral 2 Committee. It should also be mapped to account for pedestrian crossing timeframes over the Ringwood Bypass and the primary Eastland pedestrian entries.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>The Ringwood walkable catchment be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – exclude [the area west of Heatherdale Road in the City of Whitehorse] – include only that part of the area between Oliver Street and Rupert Street (excluding Prospect Court) – include only that part of [the area east of Ringwood Lake Reserve, Hill Street and Great Ryrie Street, and south of Ringwood Bypass] within 800 metres of Precincts 4 and 6 of the Ringwood Activity Centre Framework Plan – include only that part of [the small area in the south of the catchment to the east of Jubilee Park] within 800 metres of 	<p>Supported in part.</p> <p>The Committee's recommendations have been adopted in part with exception of one area's retention proposed by the committee which was contradictory to aligning with street blocks (and not mid-blocks).</p>



#	Matter	Advice sought	Key findings	Action
			Precincts 2 and 6 of the Ringwood Activity Centre Framework Plan	