

## Strategic Assessment Guidelines Checklist

This checklist is a tool that provides a quick snapshot of the abovementioned information. It may be useful to use while preparing an amendment assessment.

**Note: In the 'Comment' field, you must click in the top left part of the field to enter any comments.**

Strategic Consideration	Yes	No	N/A	Comment
Why is an amendment required?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What does the amendment intend to do and what is its desired outcome?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment intends to create desirable design outcomes along the Mansfield Township Approaches.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does it intend to do it?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applying a new Design and Development Overlay schedule 3 to the township approaches and improving the existing Design and Development Overlay schedule 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it supported by or is it a result of any strategic study or report?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment is supported by the <i>Township Approaches Planning Controls and Guidelines Study, June 2018</i> .
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the planning policy, provision or control result in the desired planning outcome?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The planning provisions will ensure that new development and redevelopment adheres to the design requirements stipulated within the Guidelines Study.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the amendment have a net community benefit?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment will clarify expectations urban design and will improve the lived experience for the community by improving amenity, promoting urban greening and preserving views to the natural environment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the community benefit outweigh the cost of the new control?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The community benefits by having the character of Mansfield Township being protected and maintained. It was identified within the background study to the <i>Township Approaches Planning Controls and Guidelines Study, June 2018</i> , That this is something of great importance to the Mansfield Community. The amendment does not place excessive requirements on built forms and design but ensures that it is appropriate for the area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment repeat provisions already in the scheme?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed provisions do not currently exist within the Mansfield Planning scheme. Where design guidelines are present at a state level, they are not specific to the area of Mansfield township to which this amendment applies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the planning scheme the most appropriate means of controlling the issue or can other existing regulatory or process mechanisms deal with the issue?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Use of a 173 agreement was considered for sites of greater concern from the perspective of ensuring appropriate built form design. However, this is not appropriate, as the amendment considers a much broader area and is best implemented strategically through the Mansfield Planning Scheme.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the matter already dealt with under other regulations?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The matter is not dealt with under any other regulations.

Does the amendment implement the objectives of planning and any environmental, social and economic effects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment implement the objectives of planning in Victoria? (Refer to section 4 of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>)</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Yes, The amendment implements the objectives of planning in Victoria by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing for the fair, orderly, economic and sustainable use and development of land (section 4(1)(a) of the Act).</li> <li>Securing a pleasant, efficient and safe working, living and recreational environment for all Victorians and visitors to Victoria (section 4(1)(c) of the Act).</li> <li>Conserving and enhancing those buildings, areas or other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value (section 4(1)(d) of the Act).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment adequately address any environmental effects?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Environmental effects have been considered in the creation of this amendment. The amendment promotes larger landscaping areas and the planting of vegetation along the front and side boundaries of sites, including using vegetation to screen loading bays and provide shading for car parking. The amendment dictates that area should be left for the planting of significant vegetation also which will lead to a more environmentally sustainable outcome than the state standard requirement.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment adequately address any social effects?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The amendment is expected to result in positive social and economic effects with no negative impact on the environment. The Design and Development Overlays will lead to improve the attractiveness and physical condition of both immediate and surrounding areas by ensuring that development is designed to achieve high quality amenity by directing that any development proposals need to take a deliberative approach to the design of built form.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment adequately address any economic effects?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The new design guidelines will have positive economic effects by maintaining the character of Mansfield Township, which invites residents, visitors and tourists alike to the area as the town frames the natural environment and landscape where it is situated.</p>

Does the amendment address relevant bushfire risk?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment meet the objective and give effect to the strategies to address the risk to life as a priority, property, community infrastructure and the natural environment from bushfire in the Planning Policy Framework (Clause 13.02 of the planning scheme)?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment will not result in any increase to the prioritisation of human life as a direction. The land where the amendment applies is within the established Mansfield Township with reticulated water supply and urban fire-fighting services. The amendment has been considered against Clause 13.02 of the Mansfield Planning Scheme and is considered to meet the strategies of this clause. The amendment does not propose to change the location of development but improve the standard of the existing and future built environment.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the view of the relevant fire authority been sought in formulating the amendment?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Country Fire Authority was consulted previously when this amendment was exhibited as amendment C48MANS. No objections were received from the fire authority. They will however be engaged again with the exhibition of this amendment C56MANS.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the planning scheme includes a Local Planning Policy Framework at Clause 20, is the amendment consistent with the Local Planning Policy Framework objectives and strategies that apply to bushfire risk?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	The Mansfield Planning Scheme has been updated to the new PPF format.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is local policy for bushfire risk management required to support the amendment?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
Does the amendment comply with all the relevant Minister's Directions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment comply with the requirements of the Ministerial Direction - The Form and Content of Planning Schemes?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment is in accordance with the ministerial direction regarding the form and content of planning schemes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do any other Minister's Directions apply to the amendment? If so, have they been complied with?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Ministerial Direction – The Form and Content of Planning Schemes</u>  The amendment complies with the Ministerial Direction on the form and content of Planning Schemes.  <u>Ministerial Direction No. 11 Strategic Assessment of Amendments</u>  The amendment has been prepared in accordance with Ministerial Direction No. 11 – Strategic Assessment of Amendments. This explanatory report addresses requirements listed under Ministerial Direction No. 11.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the amendment accompanied by all of the information required by a Minister's Direction?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p>Does the amendment support or implement the PPF?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment support or give effect to the PPF?</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The amendment is consistent with, and gives effect to the Planning Policy Framework (PPF), in particular:</p> <p><u>Clause 15.01-1L (Urban design in Mansfield Township CBD)</u></p> <p>This policy encourages development to engage with both High and Highett street Mansfield, respond to the existing built form character of the town centre and provide for pedestrian amenity as part of commercial development. It also seeks to design access parking to minimise impacts on active frontages and be preferably provided via side streets or similar areas.</p> <p>The proposed amendment strengthens this policy by providing more clarity surrounding desired built form design outcomes and applying them more particularly to the township approaches of Mansfield Township. The amendment will assist Mansfield Shire Council make planning decisions by having clear, prescriptive planning policy. This will also make design standards clear for any persons applying for planning permits in the area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any competing PPF objectives and how are they balanced?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment support or give effect to any relevant adopted state policy?</li> </ul> <p>If the planning scheme includes a Municipal Planning Strategy (MPS) at Clause 02 and the amendment seeks to introduce or amend a local planning policy in the PPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the new or amended local planning policy:</li> </ul>	<p>X</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Clause 15.01-1S (Urban Design)</u> This policy recognises the need for high quality development that contributes to the cultural identity and context of an area including its surrounding landscape and natural features. It denotes that layout designs should be of a high standard to create a safe environment for users and that any development, including signs, minimise detrimental impacts on amenity, the natural and built environment and the safety and efficiency of roads.</p> <p>The amendment supports these objectives by encouraging high quality development and urban design that is sensitive to the context of the four township approaches to the Mansfield township. The amendment is required in addition to this policy to provide clearer and detailed design guidelines currently not present in the Mansfield Planning Scheme.</p> <p><u>Clause 15.01-2S (Building Design)</u> This policy encourages development to retain existing vegetation, provides landscaping that suits its context, and supports cooling and greening of urban areas. It also seeks to protect and enhance valued landmarks, views, and vistas.</p> <p>The amendment seeks to preserve existing vegetation and allow for the planting of significant trees whilst also preserving the valued views to the surrounding natural landscape including Mt Buller, Mt Stirling, Mt Battery and the broader Alpine National Park area.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>respond to a demonstrated need?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implement a strategic direction in the MPS?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>relate to a specific discretion or group of discretions in the planning scheme?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>assist the responsible authority to make a decision?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(assist any other person to understand whether a proposal is likely to be supported?)</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment affect any existing local planning policy or tool?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is a local planning policy necessary OR is the issue adequately covered by another planning tool or decision guideline?</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>X</p>	

<p>Does the amendment support or implement the LPPF?</p> <p>*This strategic consideration only applies if the planning scheme includes an LPPF at Clause 20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment implement or support the MSS?           <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> </ul>	<p>This strategic directions at Clause 2.03 contain statements relevant to the amendment. Clause 02.03-5 (Built environment and heritage) encourages development that respects the unique character and location of each settlement and projects areas of natural, environmental, and architectural character. It also supports development (including advertising signage) that is sensitive to the role of the Alpine approaches as gateways to Mansfield Township and the Alps.</p> <p>The amendment supports these directions by ensuring development within the township approaches and Alpine gateways are designed to preserve the unique and valued character of Mansfield Township.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment seek to change the objectives or strategies of the MSS? If so, what is the change?           <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <span>X</span> </div> </li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What effect will any change to the MSS have on the rest of the MSS:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the amendment consistent/inconsistent with strategic directions elsewhere in the MSS?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> <li>Has the cumulative effect of this amendment on the strategic directions in the MSS been considered?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <span>X</span> </div> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the new or amended local planning policy:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>respond to a demonstrated need?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> <li>implement an objective or strategy in the MSS?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> <li>relate to a specific discretion or group of discretions in the scheme?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> <li>assist the responsible authority to make a decision?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> <li>assist any other person to understand whether a proposal is likely to be supported?               <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the amendment affect any existing local planning policy or tool?           <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> </ul>		<p>The amendment will amend the existing Design and Development Overlay Schedule 1 to make it more clear and provide additional guidance.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is a local planning policy necessary OR is the issue covered by another planning tool or decision guideline?           <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> <span>X</span> <input type="checkbox"/> </div> </li> </ul>		

<p>Does the amendment support or implement the MPS? *This strategic consideration only applies if the planning scheme includes an MPS at Clause 02</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How does the amendment seek to implement or support the MPS? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li>   <li>● Does the amendment seek to change the strategic directions of the MPS? If so, what is the change? <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>● What effect will any change to the MPS have on the rest of the MPS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Is the amendment consistent/inconsistent with strategic directions elsewhere in the MPS? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Is the amendment consistent/inconsistent with strategic directions elsewhere in the MPS? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– What is the cumulative effect of this amendment on the other directions in the MPS? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> </li> </ul>				<p>This strategic directions at Clause 2.03 contain statements relevant to the amendment. Clause 02.03-5 (Built environment and heritage) encourages development that respects the unique character and location of each settlement and projects areas of natural, environmental, and architectural character. It also supports development (including advertising signage) that is sensitive to the role of the Alpine approaches as gateways to Mansfield Township and the Alps.</p> <p>The amendment supports these directions by ensuring development within the township approaches and Alpine gateways are designed to preserve the unique and valued character of Mansfield Township.</p>
<p>Does the amendment make proper use of the VPP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does the amendment use the most appropriate VPP tool to achieve the strategic objective of the scheme? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li>   <li>● Does the amendment affect, conflict with or duplicate another existing provision in the planning scheme that deals with the same land, use or development? <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>● If so, have the provisions been reconciled? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>● Does the control capture matters that do not specifically relate to the purpose or objectives of the control or matters that should not be dealt with under planning? <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>● Does the amendment make any existing provision in the planning scheme redundant? <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>				<p>The amendment makes proper use of the Victoria Planning Provisions by using the Design and Development Overlay to encourage appropriate built form and design outcomes not currently present within the Mansfield Planning Scheme.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the amendment consistent with any relevant planning practice note?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The amendment has considered Planning Practice Note 59 – The role of mandatory provisions in planning scheme, applying mandatory controls for prescriptive matters relating to setbacks to buildings, building heights, and fence heights. In relation to the design of built form elements such as colour, material, façade design and similar elements discretionary provisions have been implemented to achieve a range of design responses that are in keeping with the character of the area but vary to provide visual interest and improve the overall amenity of the area. All prescriptive requirements have been strategically justified within the <i>Township Approaches Planning Controls and Guidelines Study, June 2018</i> prepared by Tract Consultants.
How does the amendment address the views of any relevant agency?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have the views of any relevant agency been addressed?</li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The relevant agencies have been consulted over the course of the development of this amendment with no submissions received other than the Department of Transport who requested that the Design and Development Overlay includes the following provision: “Vehicle access points to sites located on arterial roads should be minimised and be provided by side streets or via shared access ways, wherever possible”. This request has been included within the proposed Design and Development Overlays.
Does the amendment address the requirements of the <i>Transport Integration Act 2010</i> (TIA)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the amendment likely to have a significant impact on the transport system as defined by section 3 of the TIA?  If so, explain how the amendment addresses the transport system objectives and decision-making principles set out in Part 2, Divisions 2 and 3 of the TIA.</li> <li>Are there any applicable statements of policy principles prepared under section 22 of the TIA?  If so, assess how the amendment addresses any specified policy principles that apply to the proposal.</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	The requirements of the Transport Integration Act 2010 are not applicable to this amendment.
What impact will the new planning provisions have on the resource and administrative costs of the responsible authority?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the council considered the cost implications in implementing and administering the new planning provisions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– estimated increase in number of planning permit applications</li> <li>– planning staff resources</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It is not anticipated that the planning provisions proposed by the amendment will have any significant impact on the administrative costs of the responsible authority. The amendment provides policy guidance for built forms but does not trigger a planning permit in all instances where prescriptive provisions are adhered to.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- other miscellaneous costs including legal or other professional advice, for example, heritage advisers</li><li>- capacity to consider the new application within the prescribed time?</li></ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	