

[REDACTED]

This email provides the Department's response to further questions taken on notice in the 30 April hearing.

In relation to the requests for Ministerial approval documents for the VC and GC amendments and infrastructure modelling, I am instructed that Government cannot respond to the request for these documents within the Committee's timeframes.

CRG Membership Information

How were the CRG reps selected?

- CRG members were selected through an expression of interest (EOI) process promoted on the Victorian Planning Authority (VPA) Activity Centre projects websites.
- 188 EOIs were received, 20 for Broadmeadows, 24 for Camberwell, 24 for Chadstone, 7 for Epping, 13 for Frankston, 24 for Moorabbin, 19 for Niddrie and North Essendon, 34 for Preston, 23 for Ringwood.
- EOIs came from individual community members, built environment professionals, local businesses, local organisations, community groups, schools, academia.
- The vast majority of EOIs were from individuals who live, work or study in the relevant areas. Many of them listed multiple clubs and community organisations that they are members of.
- All CRG applicants were required to read and sign the Terms of Reference and a Conflict of Interest form for their Activity Centre Community Reference Group prior to the first meeting of the group.
- DTP also directly approached community groups and local stakeholders recommended by local councils.
- Local stakeholders approached included those belonging to community centres, schools, sports clubs, local associations, and landowners.
- Invitations were also sent to councils asking them to promote the opportunity to join the CRG as widely as possible.
- Councils were also asked to suggest local community representatives they would recommend DTP approach to seek their interest in joining the CRG.

Were any members of Parliament invited to participate?

- The chairing of CRG meetings was predominantly by local MPs.

Heritage Modelling

Overlay Precinct Considerations:

- The model did not assess and model each Heritage Overlay schedule individually. The model applied assumptions to account for limited development potential in these areas.
- Sites within a Heritage Overlay were classified as having a medium development constraint, and their theoretical capacity was reduced by 50% compared to similar sites not affected by a Heritage Overlay.
 - HCTZ2 Area - Around 60% of parcels are covered by a Heritage Overlay. For these sites, capacity was first estimated based on the proposed built form controls and development assumptions for HCTZ2, and then reduced by 50% to reflect heritage-related constraints.
 - Unchanged Area - Around 32% of parcels are covered by a Heritage Overlay. For these sites, capacity was based on a BAU scenario using the existing zoning, and then similarly reduced by 50%.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Department of Transport and Planning

Level 21 / 1 Spring Street
Melbourne VIC 3000

[REDACTED]