

**Sandown Racecourse Advisory Committee
Stage 1: Initial Assessment Report**

3 April 2024

Planning and Environment Act 1987
Stage 1: Initial Assessment Report
Sandown Racecourse Advisory Committee

3 April 2024



Kathy Mitchell AM, Chair



William O'Neil, Deputy Chair



Geoff Underwood, Deputy Chair



Rob Adams AM



Noelene Duff PSM



Peter Edwards

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Project Overview	4
1.2 Initial Assessment	4
1.3 General Declaration	4
2 Sandown Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan.....	5
2.1 Currency of background reports.....	5
2.2 Planning	5
2.3 Built form, urban design and yield.....	6
2.4 Traffic and Access	6
2.5 Drainage.....	6
2.6 Hydrology and Environmental Management.....	7
2.7 Community facilities and Retail	8
2.8 Open Space	8
3 Development Contributions Plan.....	8
4 Draft Amendment Documentation.....	9
4.1 Schedule 3 to Clause 37.02 Comprehensive Development Zone	9
4.2 Clause 22.13	9

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

Draft Greater Dandenong Planning Scheme Amendment C229gdan (the draft Amendment) proposes to facilitate the redevelopment of the Sandown Racecourse, Springvale by introducing a new planning framework for the site which will allow approximately 7,500 new dwellings, 20,000 square metres of retail and commercial space and over 20 hectares public space including open space, school and community facilities. This is how the draft Amendment is described in the Explanatory Report that was initially referred to the Committee by the Minister for Planning for the purposes of this Initial Assessment.

The initially referred Planning Report prepared by Urbis dated December 2020 describes the vision:

Sandown Racecourse will become a major new urban renewal precinct with a master planned design that focuses on liveability. A true 20min neighbourhood, it will provide diversity of housing, recreation opportunities, services and transport modes that support the future community, and, integrate with surrounding neighbourhoods.

The Minister for Planning appointed the Sandown Racecourse Advisory Committee (the Committee) on 2 March 2024 to consider the draft Amendment.

1.2 Initial Assessment

Clause 15 of the Sandown Racecourse Advisory Committee Terms of Reference requires the Committee to undertake an initial assessment of the Project:

The Committee is to undertake an initial assessment and provide written comments on the material that has been prepared by the Proponent including the proposed Sandown Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan, Development Contributions Plan and associated draft Amendment documentation.

This report has been prepared in response to this requirement.

1.3 General Declaration

This Initial Assessment outlines matters the Sandown Racecourse Advisory Committee (the Committee) has identified that may warrant further consideration by the Melbourne Racing Club (the Proponent) during the course of the Committee process. It is provided on a without prejudice basis to the final considerations and recommendations of the Committee.

This Initial Assessment is provided by the Committee without regard to the responses to the Directions issued by the Committee on 19 March 2024 following the Inception meeting for agencies to advise what further information they required about the Project and for the Proponent to advise its response.

The Proponent and other stakeholders should not assume that the issues raised in this Initial Assessment are the only issues of interest to the Committee, nor that the Committee has concerns about these issues.

The Committee reserves the right to seek further information as necessary throughout the course of the Committee process.

2 Sandown Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan

2.1 Currency of background reports

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Undertake a review of background documents and the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) to ensure that they contain relevant and up to date data and appropriately respond to current state planning policy initiatives, including but not limited to those relating to:
 - a) Victoria's Housing Statement
 - b) Interface of railway stations and Activity Centres
 - c) Affordable Housing
 - d) Provision of community facilities and education facilities including Kinders on School Sites (KOSS).

2.2 Planning

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Clarify the time frame for the overall development of the site.
2. Clarify the timing and co-ordination of the various Precinct Plans required by the CDP, Development Contributions Plan (DCP) and the Schedule to the Comprehensive Development Zone (CDZ).
3. Clarify the sequencing, coordination and responsibility for whole of site features including Mile Creek, the racing track, the grandstand and future Precinct Planning.
4. Elaborate why the CDZ has been selected as the most appropriate zone to advance the development of the site.
5. Review the appropriateness of commencing development in the north of the site and providing the primary activity node and multi modal interchange toward the end of the development sequence.
6. Review the appropriateness of deferring planning for community facilities such as early learning, primary school and multi-purpose for future Precinct Plans.
7. Commission independent expert peer review of the proposed planning framework for the Public Hearing, including a review of the adequacy of the proposed planning controls to ensure that the reliance on the preparation of future Precinct Plans will not have unintended consequences in terms of delivery of the site vision.

The Committee requires that the Proponent:

1. Confirm through independent legal advice, including advice from Counsel if necessary, that the proposed Schedule to the CDZ accords with the Ministerial Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes, that the CDP is suitable as an Incorporated Document, and that the planning documents as a package are fit for purpose to guide and direct

development. Alternatively, the advice may recommend changes to the planning documents to achieve the purposes.

2.3 Built form, urban design and yield

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Review the proposed dwelling density, site constraints, and proposed built form controls to determine if there is an opportunity to increase development yield without compromising amenity and liveability.
2. Consider if there are additional built form opportunities for perimeter development (possibly with central courtyards) that have potential to deliver higher density, and high amenity housing at affordable prices.
3. Consider if there are additional opportunities for terrace housing fed by laneways with secondary dwellings and parking off these lanes, to further increase the density and provide opportunities for key workers and improve affordability.
4. Clarify what is considered 'high density' as the definition is not consistent throughout various reports which reference anything from 4 – 12 storeys.
5. Commission independent expert peer review of urban design and built form for the Public Hearing.

2.4 Traffic and Access

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Update traffic surveys and traffic modelling.
2. Prepare updated assessments of the likely traffic impacts onto the surrounding road network, and in particular, the local road network (i.e. Sandown Street, Virginia Street, Corrigan Road).
3. Provide updated maps showing existing and future traffic volumes onto the surrounding (and internal) road network (daily and peak hour) with an explanation if environmental capacity is exceeded and/or remedial works are required.
4. Document in a tabulated format, the performance of each intersection with reference to the six different traffic scenarios tested.
5. Explain why Corrigan Road is not proposed to be upgraded to a divided carriageway.
6. Confirm the timeline anticipated for the construction of the multi modal interchange at Sandown Park Station and the funding source, and the party responsible for delivery.
7. Commission independent expert peer review of traffic for the Public Hearing.

2.5 Drainage

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Undertake further assessment of the Sandown Drainage Strategy (prepared by Cardno and dated August 2020) to ensure the directions referenced are codified in the CDP and the planning controls.

2. Clarify if the 'Greenfield' waterway guidelines in the Cardno drainage strategy are appropriate and adaptable for the subject site.
3. Confirm that Mile Creek is appropriate as the principal focus of the drainage strategy and that appropriate opportunities exist to:
 - a) reengineer the flow path
 - b) reengineer the three existing water bodies
 - c) construct appropriate crossing points to avoid segregation of uses east and west of the alignment.
4. Clarify the following potentially conflicting findings:
 - a) The Cardno report concludes "The land set aside in the current masterplan for the Sandown site provides enough space for management of flooding through the site, with no impact on upstream and downstream landholders.
 - b) The ARUP Sustainability report states "Existing Melbourne Water infrastructure and lake system causes water to build up in certain flood events resulting in flooding upstream of the site".
5. Commission independent expert peer review of drainage for the Public Hearing.

2.6 Hydrology and Environmental Management

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Clarify how the Integrated Water Management Strategy concepts and solutions (prepared by CJ Arms and dated September 2019) are codified in the CDP and the proposed planning controls.
2. Consider if further iterative flood modelling should be undertaken.
3. Provide further detail on the necessary upgrades and new systems that will be provided to overcome issues associated with there being insufficient capacity in the sewage and water system to meet demand from the urban structure proposed by the CDP, on a whole of catchment basis, and on a more localised precinct basis.
4. Provide further information on Melbourne Water's views on the timing, sequencing and appropriateness of proposed works and proposed funding mechanisms for drainage works that will affect Melbourne Water owned assets.
5. Provide confirmation where Melbourne Water is the asset owner, that they are supportive of the technical solutions on drainage and mechanisms proposed to protect their assets.
6. Provide further information regarding the clean-up of two former 5,000 litre underground fuel storage tanks and one decommissioned tank site mentioned in the Environmental Desktop Study (prepared by Douglas Partners and dated July 2018).
7. Provide clarification on whether the additional works to investigate soil and groundwater contamination at the site, and remove known potential sources of contamination, as recommended by the Consultant have been conducted and/or advise on timing of when the work is scheduled under the CDP.

8. Commission independent expert peer review of hydrology and environmental management for the Public Hearing.

2.7 Community facilities and Retail

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Consider adopting Kinders on School Sites (KOSS) as a preferable option within the proposed school sites and confirm if the 3.5 hectare site area for the school allows for this.
2. Consider the utilisation of more efficient community facility models, for instance those that use two or three level development and shared open spaces wherever possible, in order to improve the utilisation of this infrastructure, and incorporating it closely with the primary activity centre.
3. Undertake a further review of community facilities to:
 - a) evaluate if it would be appropriate to locate the school/community facilities with the open space opposite the grandstand in order to concentrate activity in the early stages of the development.
 - b) determine if there is a need for a secondary activity node within the proposed site.
4. Commission independent expert peer review for the Public Hearing of the Retail and Economic Report (prepared by Deep End Services and dated September 2019) to assess the anticipated demand for additional retail supermarkets and basic services for residents of the redeveloped site.

2.8 Open Space

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Clarify the proposed Open Space Contribution including how much is being provided and where, the amount of unencumbered and encumbered land, including as a proportion of Net Developable Area.
2. Commission independent expert peer review for the Public Hearing of the appropriate provision of open space, including the specifics of the amount to be nominated in *Schedule to Clause 53.01 Public Open Space Contribution and Subdivision*.

3 Development Contributions Plan

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Consider preparing a review of all costs in the DCP, and updating the Development Contributions Plan Overlay (DCPO) accordingly
2. Undertake a review of DCP triggers for delivery of infrastructure projects to ensure they are responsive to timing of development across the whole site.
3. Commission independent expert peer review for the public hearing of the DCP and proposed Schedule 4 to the DCPO.

4 Draft Amendment Documentation

4.1 Schedule 3 to Clause 37.02 Comprehensive Development Zone

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Undertake a review of the proposed Schedule to the CDZ to identify opportunities to simplify it in respect to the following matters that are addressed at both Clause 3.0 *Subdivision* and Clause 4.0 *Buildings and Works*:
 - a) *Requirements*
 - b) *Precinct Plan*
 - c) *Affordable Housing*
 - d) *Mile Creek and Police Road Drain Concept Master Plan*
 - e) *Mile Creek and Police Road Concept Master Plan Agreement*
 - f) *Application Requirements*
 - g) *Exemption from Notice and Review*
 - h) *Decision Guidelines*
2. Clarify why the proposed Schedule to the CDZ includes an iteration of the Framework Plan that excludes the four proposed 'Intersection Upgrades' and the 'Local Street Connections' that are shown in the CDP Version of the Framework Plan.
3. Review if 14 days is sufficient time for public notice and receipt of submissions in relation to future Precinct Plans under the proposed Schedule to the CDZ.

4.2 Clause 22.13

Based on the preliminary review of the Committee, the Proponent should:

1. Consider replacing the map within the Draft Policy at *Clause 22.13 – Sandown Racecourse* with the map contained in the CDP Version of the Framework Plan.