

6 <u>THE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF A SUPERMARKET, SERVICE</u> <u>STATION AND VARIOUS USES AND DEVELOPMENTS, ASCOT PARK</u> <u>DRIVE PAKENHAM</u>

FILE REFERENCE INT1726537

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Andrew Paxton

AUTHOR Hugh Pierce

RECOMMENDATION

That a Refusal to Grant Planning Permit T160577 be issued for 'The use and development of a supermarket, service station, 7 food and drink premises, 3 convenience restaurants, 6 offices, development of buildings and works including 37 dwellings and 3 convenience shops, variation to car parking, access to a Road Zone, Category 1 and Advertising Signage at Ascot Park Drive, Pakenham be refused for reasons outlined in this report:

Attachments

1	Locality plan	1 Page
-	Loouncy plan	± i ugo

2 Development plan 25 Pages

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

APPLICATION NO.:	T160577
APPLICANT:	Montague Construction (Aust) Pty Ltd C/- Contour Consultants Aust Pty Ltd
LAND:	Ascot Park Drive, Pakenham VIC 3810
PROPOSAL:	The use and development of a supermarket, service station, 7 food and drink premises, 3 convenience restaurants, 6 offices, development of buildings and works including 37 dwellings and 3 convenience shops, variation to car parking, access to a Road Zone, Category 1 and Advertising Signage
PLANNING CONTROLS:	Clause 37.02, Comprehensive Development Zone, Schedule 2 Clause 44.04, Land Subject to Inundation Overlay Clause 45.06, Development Contributions Plan Overlay, Schedule 1
NOTIFICATION & OBJECTIONS:	Requested, but not yet undertaken
KEY PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:	Compliance with the Former Pakenham Racecourse Development Plan. Urban design Flood movement and hazards Car parking
RECOMMENDATION:	Refusal



BACKGROUND:

Planning permit T150133 for Staged multi-lot Subdivision (Stages 6 to 9), construction of single dwelling on a lot in the Comprehensive Development Zone, buildings and works within the Land Subject to Inundation and Special Building Overlay was issued on 3 July 2015. The was subsequently amended on 31 August 2015 and 29 January 2016.

SUBJECT SITE:

The subject site comprises two future lots adjacent to Racecourse Road and separated by Henry Street. The lot to the north is 11, 421 square metres whilst the lot to the south is 3, 507 square metres.

The site currently is vacant.

The main characteristics of the surrounding area are:

North:

- 65 Racecourse Road: Land subject to Heritage Overlay and comprises the Bourke House and Stables buildings along with multiple mature trees.
- Pakenham Creek

East:

- Vacant land subject to both the Comprehensive Development Zone – Schedule 3 and the Industrial Zone

South:

- Stages 6, 12 and 13 of the Former Pakenham Racecourse Site. Stage 6 will comprise of a wetland whilst 12 and 13 will be reserved for residential development.

West:

- Stage 8A and a significant extent of Stage 7 of the Former Pakenham Racecourse Site. Both stages still under construction but will comprise of residential development.

PROPOSAL:

The applicant is seeking planning approval for the use and development of a supermarket, service station, 7 food and drink premises, 3 convenience restaurants, 6 offices, development of buildings and works including 37 dwellings and 3 convenience shops, variation to car parking, access to a Road Zone, Category 1 and Advertising Signage.

The proposal is divided across the two lots as follows:

North lot

- 1 service station and associated advertising signage
- 7 food and drink premises
- 3 convenience restaurant
- 6 offices
- 37 dwellings
- Car park

South lot

- 1 supermarket



- 3 convenience shops
- Car Park

The proposed development does not require any vegetation removal.

CULTURAL HERITAGE:

In previous planning permit applications for the Ascot Estate, a due diligence report on the Aboriginal and Historic Cultural Heritage values of the site was provided. In summary the report states that the activity area is likely to have been subject to significant previous ground disturbance and hence under the conditions of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006*, a mandatory CHMP is not required. As a consequence of this and the subsequent fill applied to that land as a result of the previous subdivision, a CHMP is not required to be submitted.

PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS:

State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)

The relevant clauses of the SPPF are:

- Clause 11, Settlement
- Clause 11.06–2, Housing choice
- Clause 11.06-3, Integrated transport
- Clause 11.06-4, Place and identity
- Clause 13.02, Floodplains
- Clause 15.01-1 Urban design
- Clause 15.01-2, Urban design principles
- Clause 15.01-5, Cultural identity and neighbourhood character
- Clause 15.02, Sustainable development
- Clause 15.03-1, Heritage conservation
- Clause 15.03-2, Aboriginal cultural heritage
- Clause 16.01-1, Integrated housing
- Clause 16.01-2, Location of residential development
- Clause 16.01-3, Housing opportunity areas
- Clause 16.01-4, Housing diversity
- Clause 16.01-5, Housing affordability
- Clause 17.01, Commercial
- Clause 17.01-1 Business

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)

The relevant clauses of the LPPF are:

- Clause 21.01, Cardinia Shire Key Issues and Strategic Vision
- Clause 21.01-3, Key Issues
- Clause 21.02, Catchment and coastal management
- Clause 21.02-6, Post-contact heritage
- Clause 21.03-1, Housing
- Clause 21.04-1, Employment
- Clause 21.04-3. Activity centres
- Clause 21.06, Particular uses and development



Relevant Particular/ General Provisions and relevant incorporated or reference documents

The relevant provisions/ documents are:

- Clause 52.05, Advertising Signs
- Clause 52.06, Car Parking
- Clause 52.07, Loading and Unloading of Vehicles
- Clause 52.12, Service Station
- Clause 52.29, Land Adjacent to a Road Zone, Category 1, or a Public Acquisition Overlay for a Category 1 Road
- Clause 52.34, Bicycle Facilities
- Pakenham Structure Plan

Zone

The land is subject to Clause 37.02 – Comprehensive Development Zone, Schedule 2

Overlays

The land is subject to the following overlays:

- Clause 44.04, Land Subject to Inundation Overlay
- Clause 45.06, Development Contributions Plan Overlay, Schedule 1

PLANNING PERMIT TRIGGERS

The proposal for use and development of a supermarket, service station, 7 food and drink premises, 3 convenience restaurants, 6 offices, development of buildings and works including 37 dwellings and 3 convenience shops, variation to car parking, access to a Road Zone, Category 1 and Advertising Signage requires a planning permit under the following clauses of the Cardinia Planning Scheme:

• Pursuant to Clause 37.02 – Comprehensive Development Zone, Schedule 2 (CDZ2) a planning permit is required to use the land for a food and drink premises, shop (not including convenience shop) and office if not generally in accordance with the Comprehensive Development Plan. The use of the land as a service station requires a planning permit regardless.

A planning permit is required to construct a building or to construct or carry out works.

- Pursuant to Clause 44.04, Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) a planning permit is required to construct a building or to construct or carry out works.
- Pursuant to Clause 45.06, Development Contributions Plan Overlay, Schedule 1 (DCPO1) this overlay is not applicable to applications to construct a building or carry out works.
- Pursuant to Clause 52.05 Advertising Signs, a planning permit is required to erect business identification signage exceeding a combined area of 8 square meters.
- Pursuant to Clause 52.06, Car Parking, a planning permit required to vary the specified number of car spaces associated with the proposal.



• Pursuant to Clause 52.29, Land Adjacent to a Road Zone, Category 1, or a Public Acquisition Overlay for a Category 1 Road, a planning permit is required to create or alter access to a road in a Road Zone, Category 1.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

The applicant was notified that the application was to be advertised and sent notice on the 30 March 2017 requesting payment of the advertising fee so that letters and a sign could be produced for the formal advertising process to proceed. As of 18 April 2017 Council's records indicate the fee has not yet been paid and therefore advertising has not been undertaken.

Both the CDZ2 and LSIO include exemptions from public notification, however, the CDZ2 exemption is on the condition that the proposed use and/or development is generally in accordance with the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010)*. As it is not considered that the proposal is generally in accordance with this plan, the exemption does not apply. Further assessment of why the proposal is not considered to be generally in accordance with this plan will be provided in the 'Discussion' section of this report.

REFERRALS

Melbourne Water

The application was referred to Melbourne Water as a statutory referral. Melbourne Water objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The proposed development is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to drainage and floodplain management.
- The proposed development is subject to inappropriate and unacceptable flood risk, where the safety of land users may be affected and potential for flood damage is excessive.
- The proposed development is contrary to Melbourne Water's 'Guidelines for Development in Flood Prone Areas' (Freeboard requirement).

VicRoads

The application was referred to VicRoads as a statutory referral. Despite Vic Roads having been referred the application on 24 February 2017, well in excess of the 28 day period provided for VicRoads to respond as prescribed within the *Planning and Environment Regulations 2015,* no formal response has been provided notwithstanding multiple requests.

DISCUSSION

Land use

The Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010) incorporated within the CDZ2 establishes the intended uses for the wider former Pakenham Racecourse and their respective locations. The land is divided into two precincts (Precinct 1 and Precinct 2) divided by Henry Street.

Precinct 1 should accommodate a mixture of uses such as high density residential, retail, commercial and community and institutional uses. This to be focussed within the western third of the precinct, where the retail hub of the entire former Pakenham Racecourse site is to the located, given its proximity to the Pakenham Train Station and established Pakenham commercial centre. The remaining land is a combination of residential and commercial use. The residential area is



located centrally within the precinct, whilst commercial area skirts around the edges of the precinct along the south and east boundaries.

Precinct 2 should comprise predominantly of residential development with a high density residential focused around parks and key junctions. It features a small section notated for commercial use at the corner of Henry Street and Racecourse Road, but this is only located on the corner and does not extend to the north boundary. Excluding this small section of commercial, the remainder of this precinct is reserved for residential use.

The subject site is located across both precincts with the north lot located in Precinct 2 and the south lot located in Precinct 1. The southern half of the north lot is within the commercial area whilst the majority, if not all of the south lot is also within this commercial area.

The service station, 6 offices and 2 convenience restaurants are located outside of the commercial area and therefore are sited inappropriately, within the land reserved for residential development as established by the Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010).

Pursuant to the CDZ2, a supermarket must be generally in accordance with the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010)*. Whilst the supermarket is located within Precinct 2 and within a defined commercial area along the intersection of Racecourse Road and Henry Street, it sits outside of the core retail hub in the western third of the precinct. It is considered that to locate a significant use such as a supermarket outside of the core retail hub would fragment the overall layout of uses and detract from the overall intention of not only Precinct 2 but the entirety of the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010)*.

Within *Fabcot Pty Ltd vs Whittlesea CC*, VCAT reviewed a case involving a proposed supermarket and whether it was 'generally in accordance with a relevant Comprehensive Development Plan. The supermarket was not within the 'core retail centre' as noted within the applicable Comprehensive Development Plan and VCAT therefore found that the purpose of the applicable Comprehensive Development Plan would be 'frustrated and potentially thwarted', as a supermarket is a key anchor store generating high customer numbers encouraging pedestrian flow which supports speciality shops within close proximity.

Taking the findings of *Fabcot Pty Ltd vs Whittlesea CC* into consideration, the overall spread of uses across both sites within the proposal fragments the wider former Pakenham Racecourse site in a manner that will dilute the functionality of the 'core retail hub' by drawing significant customers away from its intended location as dictated by the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010).*

Urban Design

Both the CDZ2 and Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010), establish a key objective for design within the former Pakenham Racecourse to achieve excellence in architecture and urban design. Likewise, both State and Local Planning Policies highlight objectives and strategies promoting urban environments that are safe, functional with a sense of place and cultural identity. Council's Urban Designer has reviewed the proposal and advised of several significant urban design issues.

Supermarket and associated Convenience Shops

The Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010) establishes



the Racecourse Road and Henry Street intersection as a gateway location which should be anchored by key buildings. Council's Urban Designer notes that blank walls associated with supermarkets are conventionally and ideally sleeved behind speciality shops fronting the street, however, in this instance speciality shop fronts are located to front the car park resulting in blank walls fronting the both Henry Street and Racecourse Road. This is considered a poor urban design outcome given the significance of the gateway.

Food and Drink Premises and Offices fronting Henry Street

As previously noted, the Racecourse Road and Henry Street intersection is of considerable significance to the former Pakenham Racecourse. The floor plans and elevations of the commercial premises along Henry Street predominantly indicate primary access to these premises being from the internal car park. The implications of the primary entrances being from the internal car park as opposed to Henry Street will result in the development turning away from Henry Street, limiting the visual and social experience of the design interface between the building and pedestrian footpath along Henry Street.

Interface with 65 Racecourse Road

Adjoining 65 Racecourse Road is subject to Heritage Overlay – Schedule 108 'Bourke House and Stables' which is of particular significance to the former Pakenham Racecourse. The Pakenham Structure Plan highlights that an active interface should be achieved between the subject site and 65 Racecourse Road. The proposed development is setback a minimum of 1 metre from the common boundary between the two properties and only blank walls front 65 Racecourse Road. Council's Urban Designer has noted the proposal would significantly impact in a detrimental way on the heritage site, by degrading the landscape setting and curtilage of the heritage buildings. As a consequence, it is not considered that proposal appropriately respects the identified heritage significance of this adjoining site.

Shop top dwelling entrances

The proposed entrances to the shop top dwellings within the proposal are located to the rear of their respective buildings which front the car park as opposed to Henry Street. This layout results in an inefficient sense of address that will further detract from the movement of pedestrians along Henry Street and instead preference the rear car park.

Dwellings to the west

The proposed three storey dwellings to the west of the subject site predominantly feature a very limited setback and replicate a consistent design that will restrict the ability of each dwelling to achieve its own individual sense of address. Furthermore, the dwellings fronting the internal laneway are provided with limited open space that will provide for poor internal amenity.

Traffic

Pursuant to Clause 52.06 Car Parking the proposal requires 190 car parking spaces, however, only 157 car spaces are provided. Whilst the Traffic Impact Assessment, submitted as part of the applicants' proposal, notes that only 177 spaces are required to be provided it does not include the 13 dwellings that feature 2 bedrooms and a study, which requires 2 car spaces as opposed to 1 car space as provided within their assessment.

Council's Traffic Engineers have reviewed the proposal and provided the following concerns:



 Overall this development appears to be over developed and internal connections appear to not have been well considered with sections of the site isolated from each other, especially for pedestrian access from the residential component.

Advertising signs

The proposed signage is applicable to business identification signage associated with the service station above the entry and along the canopy. It is consistent with signage associated with service stations and would therefore have limited implications on the amenity of the area. Whilst a pole sign displaying petrol prices is shown on the site plans the applicant has advised it does not form part of this application.

Land Subject to Inundation

As previously discussed, Melbourne Water, as the relevant floodplain management authority, objected to the proposal. It is therefore considered that the proposal is not able to satisfy the purpose of the Land Subject to Inundation Overlay.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not considered to accord with the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010)* and therefore will undermine the intended layout and functionality of the former Pakenham Racecourse site. The overall design of the development fails to actively interact externally, fails to provide appropriate internal amenity to dwellings and establish individual senses of address or satisfactory car parking. Furthermore, Melbourne Water has also objected to the proposal.

It recommended that a Refusal to Grant Planning Permit T160577 be issued for 'The use and development of a supermarket, service station, 7 food and drink premises, 3 convenience restaurants, 6 offices, development of buildings and works including 37 dwellings and 3 convenience shops, variation to car parking, access to a Road Zone, Category 1 and Advertising Signage at Ascot Park Drive, Pakenham for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Development Zone, Schedule 2. Specifically, its failure to appropriately respond to the *Former Pakenham Racecourse Comprehensive Development Plan (February 2010)* due to the types of uses proposed, their extent, location and the inability to provide a suitable urban design outcome.
- 2. The proposal is inconsistent with the State and Local Planning Policy Framework of the Cardinia Planning Scheme, specifically the following:
 - Clause 11.06-4 Place and identity
 - Clause 13.02 Floodplains
 - Clause 15.01-1 Urban design
 - Clause 15.01-2 Urban design principles
 - Clause 15.03-1 Heritage conservation
 - Cause 16.01-4 Housing diversity
 - Clause 21.02.02 Catchment and coastal management
 - Clause 21.02-6 Post-contact heritage
 - Clause 21.03-1 Housing
 - Clause 21.06-1 Design and built form



- 3. The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site having regard to the extent of use and development and its failure to comply with Clause 52.06 Car Parking.
- 4. The proposal is inappropriate having regard to its context, and design response and would result in a poor planning outcome contrary to Clause 65 of the Cardinia Planning Scheme.

Melbourne Water

- 5. The proposed development is inconsistent with State and Local Planning Policy relating to drainage and floodplain management.
- 6. The proposed development is subject to inappropriate and unacceptable flood risk, where the safety of land users may be affected and potential for flood damage is excessive.
- 7. The proposed development is contrary to Melbourne Water's 'Guidelines for Development in Flood Prone Areas' (Freeboard requirement).



PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AT RACECOURSE ROAD, PAKENHAM

TP00	COVER PAGE
TP01	SITE ANALYSIS
TP02	EXISTING CONDITIONS SITE PLAN
TP03	PROPOSED SITE LOCALITY PLAN
TPQ4	PROFOSED SERVICE STATION, CONVENIENCE
	RESTAURANTS AND OFFICES FLOOR FLAN
TP05	PROFOSED SERVICE STATION, CONVENIENCE
	RESTAURANTS AND OFFICES ELEVATIONS
TPOG	FROFOSED CONVENIENCE RESTAURANT \$
	FLOOR PLAN & ELEVATIONS
TP07	FROFOSED SUPERMARKET AND TENANCY
	FLOOR PLANS
TP08	FROFOSED SUPERMARKET AND TENANCY
	ELEVATIONS
TP09	PROPOSED FOOD & DRINK 1 - 5 FLOOR PLAN
TP10	FROFOSED FOOD & DRINK 1 - 5 ELEVATIONS
TP11	PROPOSED APARTMENTS & MIXED USE
	CENTRE GROUND & LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLANS
TP11.1	PROPOSED APARTMENTS LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN
TP12	FROFOSED APARTMENTS & MIXED USE
	CENTRE ELEVATIONS
TP13	PROPOSED APARTMENTS FLOOR PLANS
TP13.1	FROFOSED APARTMENTS TYPICAL FLOOR PLANS
TP14	FROFOSED APARTMENTS TYPICAL ELEVATIONS
TP15	FROFOSED ROOF PLAN, SHEET 1
TP16	FROFOSED ROOF PLAN. SHEET 2
TP17	FROFOSED SHADOW PLANS AND SECTIONS
TP18	FROFOSED APARTMENTS OVERLOCKING
	FLAN



	AND REAL PROPERTY AND REAL PROPERTY.	840	THOTHE
۵	64KGPBA SHIBE COURSELISSEE	蜿	10206/16
٨	1117-010 1919 1919 200	PQ:	20/12/16
	Representation and and	10.0	26/36/05



concept + design + interiors + project management

Install, 1976-1938 Valent: Road Kalman, Halina, 2004 Analaka Tarda Salkes 2000, Pri-19 Salkes 2019 The Road Occupation Loc Admitted Color Part Cole Reprise Broad Salkes 201

	WHERE ON STREASE IN GRADEL DOWNWOOD ON LY 2
NUT STALL	
DESCRIPTION OF	
	T TEMPENTESS. HE INTERPENTED AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN
	C+COUNTRIET 2008 to
CONTRACTO	the particular Sectors reactives its democratic or the
	ENANT BORIES IN RECYCLED FOR ART REPRODUCTION

PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

RACECOURSE RCAD

PAKENHAM

VIC 3810

OREANA PROPERTY GROUP

1	
	B

Not for construction

۲



PHODINA	DISTINCT
PRODUCTION TEMPORTON TO T	1494
PE SYNNE PATE	1007/4
95. RMBSINE PERMANASE ISSN	3.91
similarity occurrent portion	9.64
INSCRIMENT GONDOL INVERIOUSLE	7.0%
PRINTING OFFICE STREET, STREET	5.64
PREVIOUS PLACE INCOMING BUTTLE	2/81
Preznanti Merena Gentes	8.62
C4P9-0252345	5.654
SPECIAL INTERNATION COLORED	1111
CARDINE WAY PREMILING	0.650
RUSPEPER D.P. 125, 126, 107, 105, 129	0.5623



Rec	AND DAMEST OF THE S	99	TIGHT
•	EVERYOR SHEEL COURSELSER	49,	1896N
٨	General Associations	82	169616
в	PERSENT REVISION	85	1896/12
r:	PENERAL REVISIONE	90	101003-005



concept + design + interiors + project management

Insel11, 1996-1998 Valuert Road Materix, Victoria, 3968, Anatola Instal 30849/8900 Pri-61 2064530 House Sciclas 2007

PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

RACECOURSE RCAD

PAKENHAM VIC DISOFULTES STE ANALYSIS 3810

SINT OREANA PROPERTY OROUP

urva JUL	NE 116	NA NA	NGRIH	_
NA.	51	JB	$\left + \right $	\rightarrow
		ANNING		_
PR0 151		TP01	C	SHEET Cloft8

PRELIMINARY Not for construction





10 20/12/15



concept + design + interiors + project management

lexell, 1996-1998 Nation Road Raborn, Actors, 3968 Australia Turon Sciencesco, Purest www.5p.gu/s.com The Fielded Oceanities (all in 195 (59 197 19 REPAIRS REALISING

PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

RACECOURSE RCAD

PAKENHAM

VIC DEPENDENCE EXISTING CONDITIONS SITE PLAN 3810

SEE OREANA PROPERTY GROUP

JUNE 116	1.503	NGREE	
AAJNA JB		1 A)
	LANNING		٢
PROJECT HS.	DRS/PEEDS.	REMOVEMENT	SHIET
15155	TP02	A	(2of18











PRELIMINARY

Not for construction

















concept + design + interiors + project management

leselli, 1996-1999 Kaleeri Roya Kabara, Victoria, 2004 Anatolia Turch 2004/2000 Pur-61 2004/201 The Finduat Once printy Do: Altri US COMPTUS O REPAIRS READING

PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT

PRAFE ADRESS RACECOURSE RCAD

PAKENHAM

VIC ENVIRENTER PROPOSED APARTIVENTS LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN 3810

OREANA PROPERTY GROUP







el ane	h.	[
76.6	1000	[
676.0	1990°	(#	annan sinti ann ann ann ann	195	1000
200 S	int of	[#	STATEMENT PROPERTY AND	55	1000
		12.0	ANG/O/ER TOSTALIS	27	0.05



concept + design + Interfors + project management

leelit tee kisikka STREET, BOOK



FROPOSED SIMED USE DEVELOPMENT

PRESIDENCE BRACECOURSE BOAD

PAKENHAM 3810

VIC PROPOSED APARTMENTS & PROPOSED APARTMENTS & INVESTIGATION AND LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLANS

CIEF

ora June 116	2018649 1:3099	100000 	
AASIA	inene JB		
TRACT	ARINI NG		7
PROPERTY.	TP11	A	Here and







61265 11 1 1

ALLET -

00 LEVEL 1 FLCOR PLAN



2010







R0 16/10/16

A TYPE O'LON BRITERING BED







RACECOURSE RCAD

PAKENHAM

VIC PROPOSED APARTIVENTS TYP CAL FLOOR FLANS 3810

OREANA PROPERTY GROUP



PRELIMINARY Not for construction







DE LEVEL 1 FLOOR PLAN





DEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN

Attachment 2 - Development plan

Attachment 2



















KEY PLAN