

Appendix 1: Summary of Submissions

A. Referral Authorities

Sub. No.	Authority	Summary of submission	Officer response / recommendations
76	CFA	Acknowledges that the Draft Structure Plan contains strategies and policy direction that recognise the bushfire risk. Advises there are areas where this could be strengthened through the inclusion of content as suggested below.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key direction 10 – include wording to the effect of “including avoiding the hazard in the first instance”. 	Replace “reduce” with “avoid and minimise”.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.2 Snapshot – replace “high” bushfire risk with “extreme”. 	Accepted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.0 Vision and Principles – include consideration of bushfire, for example “strengthening community resilience to bushfire or creating safer communities”. 	Replace “Residents recognise and have successfully managed to balance bushfire risk with preservation of the natural environment” with “Residents recognise the extreme bushfire risk and have successfully adopted strategies to strengthen community resilience to bushfire and create safer communities”.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Natural Environment – Objective 1.1 include words to the effect of “while having regard to bushfire risk”. 	Not supported. The need to consider bushfire risk is addressed under Objective 1.2.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bushfire Management – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include recognition that the risk is extreme and one of the highest risk localities in Victoria recognise the benefits of a strategic approach to planning at a community wide level, for example avoid the risk in the first place by directing growth away from the hazard while local residents may be aware of the bushfire risk and well prepared, tourists have little or no awareness add “such as the Bushfire Management Overlay” on page 20 	Accepted Not supported – no growth is planned beyond the existing settlement boundaries, therefore this statement is not required. Accepted – include wording recognising this issue Accepted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – the strategies section should be more consistent with the SPPF which rather than “balance” bushfire protection and vegetation clearance, prioritises the protection of human life over other policy considerations. CFA recommends the inclusion of the following strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct development into locations of lower risk. Carefully consider development in locations where there is significant bushfire risk that cannot be avoided. Avoid development in locations of extreme risk. Avoid development in areas where planned bushfire protection measures may be incompatible with other environmental objectives. And the following actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic management of bushfire risk to the community as a whole, for example engaging with land managers, CFA and Council to manage public land surrounding the townships. 	Accepted in part. Replace the strategies with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the need for bushfire protection measures does not compromise the biodiversity and environmental objectives and preservation of the towns’ character. Avoid development in locations where the bushfire risk is assessed as extreme. Ensure development is directed into locations of lower bushfire risk and is sited, designed and constructed to mitigate the risks from bushfire. Add “including management of public land surrounding the townships” to the 5 th action.		

Sub. No.	Authority	Summary of submission	Officer response / recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Update the BMO mapping to accurately reflect the hazard and provide for appropriate mitigation measures for communities at risk. 	Add the following action: In consultation with DELWP and CFA update the BMO mapping to accurately reflect the hazard and provide for appropriate mitigation measures for communities at risk.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Urban Design Framework – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incorporate recognition of the bushfire risk in the Study Area section, including coverage of the BMO. ○ Strengthen the wording regarding landscaping around the NSP to ensure that additional planting will not compromise the conditions that allow it to be designated as a PLR. ○ Any landscaping should not increase the risk to existing or future residents. CFA encourages the use of non-flammable materials for landscaping. 	<p>Accepted in part. The commercial centres are currently not covered by the BMO. Accepted</p> <p>Accepted</p>
77	Corangamite CMA	<p>CCMA supports the following key directions of the structure plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● #1 – Contain the townships within existing boundaries to protect surrounding environmentally significant land ● #2 – Protect and enhance environmental assets ● #3 – Protect and enhance the coastal village character of the towns ● #10 – Apply appropriate mitigation/adaptation strategies to reduce the impact of environmental risks <p>Supports a greater emphasis on preserving and enhancing the natural environment as part of the Structure Plan. Suggests inserting a figure identifying the key waterways and natural assets.</p> <p>Advises the CCMA has prepared numerous strategic documents related to the area, including the Corangamite Waterway Strategy (2014-2022) and Corangamite Regional Catchment Strategy (RCS) (2013-2019).</p> <p>Highlights the importance of considering flood risks in the locality and advises that the Painkalac Creek is subject to flooding under various scenarios.</p> <p>Recommends the inclusion of the following actions in the structure plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support further studies to determine the nature of the flood risk to Aireys Inlet, Moggs Creek and Eastern View. (including flooding from catchment flows, river mouth closures, storm surge and sea level rise). 2. Manage development in flood prone areas according to best practice management principles and in a proactive manner. 3. Support initiatives to understand and better manage vulnerability to natural disasters and better integrate emergency management and response. 4. Support further studies into the effects of climate change on natural assets within the structure plan area. 5. Encourage developers to seek pre-application advice from the Corangamite CMA in relation to waterway and floodplain issues where relevant. 6. Upgrade existing drainage infrastructure over time to ensure the water quality from urban runoff is appropriately managed. 	<p>Support for the key directions noted.</p> <p>The Structure Plan's focus is on preserving and enhancing the natural environment and the plan encourages the planting of locally indigenous vegetation species (without increasing bushfire risk).</p> <p>Advice noted. These are useful background reports that should be considered as reference documents in the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Include additional wording under 4.1 Natural Environment – Environmental protection to acknowledge the flood risks.</p> <p>Most of the suggested strategies are valid, but are applicable more broadly across the municipality and therefore more suited as part of the Surf Coast Planning Scheme's MSS rather than the structure plan. It is recommended that the next review of the Planning Scheme considers these strategies and relevant aspects of the CCMA's strategic documents, such as the RCS, Waterway Strategy and new Regional Floodplain Management Strategy.</p> <p>It is recommended that the following strategies be included in the Structure Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continue to work with and support other land managers and volunteer conservation groups on environmental enhancement works, including revegetation, removal of environmental weeds, pest animal control and protection of native flora and

Sub. No.	Authority	Summary of submission	Officer response / recommendations
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design principles into public area upgrades and all new development. 8. In partnership with the Corangamite CMA support community groups with environmental enhancement works and consult on priority locations. 9. Enhance partnerships between Surf Coast Shire, community groups, Parks Victoria, Great Ocean Road Coast Committee, Corangamite CMA and Barwon Water to secure ongoing funding for environmental enhancement works on high value environmental assets. 10. Develop strategies to control/manage/eradicate environmental weeds with a focus on locations and species which will also provide benefit in terms of reducing bush fire fuel loads. 11. When new information becomes available, review relevant planning controls (e.g. Rural Conservation Zone, Environmental Significance and Vegetation protection Overlays) to ensure they remain relevant, accurate and useful in the appropriate preservation and enhancement of biodiversity values. <p>Suggest further strengthening of the second action under Objective 1.1 (natural environment) to consider developing and implementing a medium to long term strategy to control/manage/eradicate environmental weeds with a focus on locations and species which will also provide benefit in terms of reducing bush fire fuel loads, particularly in areas to the west of Paikalac Creek.</p> <p>Suggest adding an additional action that considers implementing a responsible pet ownership program to complement the focus on protecting native fauna as well as managing threatening pest plants.</p>	<p>fauna.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support further studies to determine the nature of risks associated with flooding, coastal acid sulfate soils and the effects of climate change within the area and develop appropriate responses to manage these risks, including consideration of planning scheme policies and overlays to control development in areas vulnerable to environmental hazards. <p>SCS already has programs in place for the removal of woody weeds.</p> <p>Not supported.</p>
84	VicRoads	<p>Provides the following comments on the structure plan and UDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency evacuation – VicRoads are working with Council and the CFA on the development of an emergency evacuation plan that takes into consideration the limitations of Aireys Inlet and the Great Ocean Rd. • Underground powerline relocation – Consent under the Road Management Act from VicRoads is required for works within the road reserve. Further details on the location of the powerlines will be required. • Signage – VicRoads supports Council undertaking a sign audit to remove and consolidate signs, subject to VicRoads consultation and approval. • Pedestrian refuge – Plans for improvements to car parking and pedestrian access were prepared in consultation with VicRoads. • Removal of mature cypress trees – It is VicRoads' understanding that these trees are protected as part of the Memorial Arch when the Great Ocean Rd was added to the National Heritage List. A permit is required to remove the trees. • UDF – Any vegetation to be planted needs to be low so as not to impact on sight lines. Any paths within the Great Ocean Rd reserve require approvals from VicRoads. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>

B. AIDA Submission

Structure Plan (Note: page numbers refer to the version of the structure plan appended to the Council minutes of 28/7/2015)

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response	
<p>1 p5-6 – <i>AIDA would expect that for every Key Direction there should be a Key Action and where possible vice versa. For example, Action 10 is really two Actions in one, with future tourism opportunities perhaps sitting under Direction 7 but the important community role of the Pub is not apparently based on any Direction. Also, Action 12 doesn't appear to be based on any of the Directions and Direction 4 doesn't appear to be followed through in any of the Actions. This part of the Executive Summary needs to be revisited to accommodate pairing of Directions and Actions, as the context and nature of any Action is not clear without it responding to a Direction.</i></p>	Disagree	The key directions and key actions in this section are not linked. They are a summary of the main directions and actions taken from the structure plan report. Page numbers have been included in brackets behind each action to refer to the sections in the report which provide the context for the actions.
<p>2 p5 Key Direction 6 – <i>What is meant by "adequate car parking"? Adequate in what season? Also, the Shire's 2011 Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines provided for at least some of the Bottom Shops parking being internal to the larger sites and not fronting the GOR.</i></p>	Disagree in part	<p>"Adequate car parking" has not been defined and it is thus not clear from the direction whether this refers to the adequate provision of car parking to accommodate peak season demand or normal conditions throughout the remainder of the year. The first strategy under Objective 3.1 seeks to ensure a reasonable balance is achieved between catering for peak demands and meeting the year round need of the local community. Adequate car parking needs to be seen in this context.</p> <p>The car parking recommendations of the <i>2011 Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines</i> are still valid and supported by the structure plan.</p>
<p>3 p5 Key Direction 5 – <i>AIDA would be concerned if the encouragement of housing diversity in this Direction was applied to the proposed Fraser Drive development, as there is no Action which picks up how this diversity should otherwise be achieved. Perhaps this Direction should be split into its components i.e. older persons housing and the rest or at least an additional Action for housing diversity added.</i></p>	Disagree in part	The provision of higher density housing for older persons is part of the strategy to increase housing diversity, as one of the identified key issues in Aireys Inlet is the lack of suitable housing to enable older persons to downsize due to the dominance of large, family sized dwellings in the area. Other options to achieve housing diversity are limited given the community's desire to retain Aireys Inlet's low density character.
<p>4 p5 Key Direction 7 – <i>This action must also recognise and incorporate that the peak summer visitor period is the period of our greatest bushfire risk.</i></p>	Agree	It is recommended that the additional wording be added to the direction.
<p>5a p6 Key Action 6, relating to dot point 2 on p32 of Walking – <i>It is not clear from this description where the "pathway from the Bottom Shops via the pedestrian laneway and River Reserve Road to Bambra Road" will be located. We believe that</i></p>	Agree in principle	The structure plan identifies the potential for several pathways to be provided or upgraded in response to community input. The exact location, alignment and construction details of the pathways will be

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response	
<p><i>the section from the Bottom Shops to Bambra Road should be along the shared River Reserve Road, and not through the grassy reserve beside the creek. Where is the path proposed to be located after reaching Bambra Road? Is this the path on the eastern side of the Painkalac Creek that has been in the budget for several years or is it along the alignment of Bambra Road?</i></p>		<p>determined through further investigation and consultation.</p>
<p>5b p6, Key Action 6, and dot point 1 on p32 under Walking. – <i>The continuous path along the GOR between the Top and Bottom Shops already exists in a functional form. The proposal in the Urban Design Framework is considered by AIDA to be a waste of money.</i></p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The intention of the proposed pathway upgrades is to enhance pedestrian connections and wayfinding between the Top and Bottom Shops, utilising existing routes. The exact works would need to be further scoped, costed and rated against other priorities.</p>
<p>6 p6 Key Action 8 – <i>What does the phrase “discourage any uses” mean? Are these uses over and above those controlled by the RCZ?</i></p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>The RCZ contains many uses that are allowed subject to a permit (e.g. group accommodation, restaurant, winery, rural industry). The structure plan seeks to provide policy direction to guide decision making when considering these uses and to discourage uses that would compromise the environmental values and increase bushfire risk. It is recommended that “uses” be replaced by “use and development”.</p>
<p>7 p6 Key Action 9 – <i>This Action should be implementing both the Urban Design Framework and the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines. There is little material incompatibility between the Urban Design Framework as proposed and the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines and AIDA would be opposed to any proposal which does not also incorporate its important and valuable principles, which have already been endorsed by Council.</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>It is recommended that implementation of the <i>2011 Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines</i> be added to the key action.</p>
<p>8 p6 Key Action 12 – <i>The SCS should be applying to VicRoads, not lobbying them. AIDA suggests that the speed reduction should be seasonal, not permanent – at least in the first instance. Thirdly, the 60 kph zone would be from the SLSC to the end of Eastern View, the current description appears to exclude Moggs Creek. AIDA believes that the speed limit should be kept at 80 kph in the very quiet off season – as a bad regulation will be ignored.</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>It is recommended that the action be redrafted as per AIDA's suggestion to apply seasonally only.</p>
<p>9 p14 Key Action 14 – <i>What will be monitored? It is worth being specific here so all will understand what is to happen, as there are diverse views as to what might need changing or might constitute an improvement.</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>It is recommended that the action be redrafted to refer to the monitoring of the “use, capacity and operation” of car parks.</p>
<p>10 <i>Is the use of a range of terms including “town, township and settlement” to describe Aireys Inlet, Fairhaven, Moggs Creek and Eastern View appropriate? In planning terms, are they synonymous? We note that in the 1993 structure plan, “settlement” and “township” were used.</i></p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>The terms are synonymous.</p>
<p>11 <i>“Fire” is used frequently throughout the draft document. We believe that in most if not all cases it should be “bushfire”, to remove any ambiguity with other types of fires such as structure fires.</i></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>It is recommended that the term “bushfire” be applied in lieu of “fire”.</p>

AIDA comment/recommendation		SCS Response	
12	p17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions dot point 6. – <i>The dot point should have this phrase inserted at the end ... incremental growth while adhering to the principles of the Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines.</i>	Disagree	It is not considered necessary to add reference to the urban design guidelines in the key direction. Application of the guidelines to guide built form outcomes in the commercial centres is listed as an action under Objective 4.1.
13	p 17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions dot point 7. <i>The dot point should have this phrase inserted at the end ...amenity impacts, recognizing the impact of peak summer periods and bushfire risk.</i>	Agree	It is recommended that the additional wording be added to the key direction.
14	p17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions. – <i>The second to last dot point talks about what the pedestrian and cycle paths link. Mentioned are commercial centres, community facilities, recreation and open space areas, and coastal and hinterland walking trails. Not mentioned but possibly most important for many would be the use of these paths to visit friends in nearby townships.</i>	Disagree	The direction considers pathways “throughout and between the townships”.
15	p19, 4.1 Natural Environment. 2nd sentence in Environmental Protection. The sentence ends with “heathlands and indigenous tree cover, all contributing to the district’s attractiveness”. – <i>We believe an important component of the vegetation is missing with this statement, namely the understorey vegetation. This is most evident at present with the understorey wattles in stunning bloom. A change such as the following would be appropriate “heathlands and indigenous tree cover and understorey all contributing...”</i>	Agree	It is recommended that “understorey vegetation” be added to the sentence.
16	p19, 4.1 Natural Environment, Objective 1.1, Actions dot point 1. – <i>Should the Environmental Overlay Schedule be introduced and called up here?</i>	Agree	It is recommended that an action be added regarding the application of the ESO to protect indigenous vegetation and biodiversity.
17	p20, Bushfire Management. – <i>Despite all the good work done by the CFA and SCS, we do not consider that “Most residents are well aware of and prepared to live with the risk.” It may be ill-advised to include such a statement in the absence of specific supporting evidence.</i>	Agree in principle	This statement should be further nuanced
18	p21 , – <i>Delete the last sentence in Bushfire Management. The sentence is “Consideration should be given ... surrounding hinterland.” The message of that sentence is contained in the strategies and action that follow immediately.</i>	Agree	It is recommended that the sentence be deleted.
19	p21, Objective 1.2, Action, dot point 4. – <i>We do not think that “Undertake periodical investigations into NSP-PLR and informal shelter options” is an adequate response. Rather the intent should be to provide a PLR or a shelter/refuge. The SCS has acknowledged how devastating a bushfire would be to this community. A more determined response is essential.</i>	Agree in principle	The issue of the lack of adequate and sufficient NSP-PLR’s and bushfire shelters/refuges in the district is recognised, however options to provide additional safe facilities have been investigated on several occasions in the past and have proven to be problematic due to a range of limiting factors (including proximity of classified vegetation and cost of required upgrades). Despite past findings, it is considered that investigations should continue to take place to identify suitable options for the provision of additional NSP-PLR’s and/or shelters/refuges given the area’s extreme bushfire risk rating.

AIDA comment/recommendation		SCS Response	
			It is recommended that the action be redrafted as "Investigate options for the provision of additional NSP-PLR's and/or shelters/refuges".
20	p22/23, Residential Development and Housing, first sentence in the last paragraph on p23 ends with "and / or social housing". <i>Delete this phrase. See reason for deletion below in item 21.</i>	Agree	It is recommended that the words "and / or social housing" be deleted from the sentence.
21	p24, Objective 2.1, Actions dot point 2. – <i>The Action should become "Progress investigations into the options for higher density housing for older persons on the Council owned site at 2 Fraser Drive, Aireys Inlet". AIDA has been told in discussions with the Shire and the Office of Housing that social housing is better provided in the larger towns of Torquay and Winchelsea, and that it is unsuited to areas of low community service levels and poor public transport like Aireys Inlet to Eastern View.</i>	Agree	It is recommended that the words "for older persons" be added to the action.
22	p24-26, Infrastructure. – <i>At various places in this section what the community has said it wants (Neighbourhood Character Study 2004, Citizen Juries, AIDA Community Survey 2015, etc) clashes with the policies of SCS Infrastructure. The majority of the community has said that they want unsealed roads and paths. The hierarchy of paths in the Shire's Pathway Strategy applies Shire-wide and specifies what the surface of the path will be – regardless of community desires. Furthermore "informal appearance" seems to be interpreted by SCS Infrastructure to be the use of a washed exposed aggregate concrete path surface rather than standard trowelled concrete paths, whereas the community's understanding of "informal appearance", as documented in the Neighbourhood Character Study and in numerous surveys of local opinions, is informal unsealed gravel roads and paths. In view of this clash, how does the community get what it wants? Could the community's desire for the surface type for roads and paths be specified in the structure plan? How can we ensure that roads and footpaths are designed and constructed to achieve an appropriate informal appearance, with an emphasis on retaining vegetation within road verges and alternatives to concrete kerbing?</i>	Agree in part	<p>The Structure Plan recognises that a key aspect of the local character is the informal appearance of infrastructure. It defines this as the unsealed roads, lack of concrete kerb and channel, limited paved pathways and roadside footpaths, gravel car parks and limited street lighting. The starting point of the Structure Plan is to preserve the informal appearance by retaining the unsealed roads and paths wherever possible. Where a decision is made to seal certain roads or provide footpaths, then it is important to consider alternative treatment options over standard bitumen and concrete to achieve a natural and informal appearance as much as possible. This may include use of coloured or exposed aggregate bitumen/concrete, maintaining soft road edges and open swale drains in lieu of concrete kerb and channel, and retaining roadside vegetation. Each proposal should be considered on its individual merits and have regard to specific circumstances. The structure plan also notes that some people do prefer sealed roads over gravel roads to reduce dust, mud, noise and maintenance requirements. One of the strategies is to ensure that engagement with the community occurs prior to design work being undertaken to ensure the community has the opportunity to contribute to the design of proposed infrastructure.</p> <p>It is recommended that the 1st strategy under Objective 2.2 be replaced with the following three strategies to give greater clarity around the expected construction standards of roads and paths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve the informal appearance of roads and paths by retaining gravel surfaces wherever practicable.

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that where roads are to be sealed, this occurs in a manner that retains their informal appearance as closely as possible, e.g. by using alternative pavement treatments (e.g. coloured or exposed aggregate bitumen in lieu of standard bitumen), maintaining soft road edges and open swales in lieu of concrete kerb are channel, minimising carriageway widths and retaining roadside vegetation. • Ensure footpaths are constructed in materials that are appropriate for the setting, purpose, character of the town and the local community.
<p>23 p28, Objective 3.1, Strategies, dot point 2 – <i>AIDA strongly encourages that the Community Hall/Recreation Reserve be seen and used as a community hub and encourage integration with the Primary School. In two other communities in Victoria, the school has been constructed or modified to allow it to be used as a community refuge from bushfires. This outcome in Aireys Inlet would be a most appropriate development.</i></p>	Agree in part	Refer Item 19.
<p>24 p34, Objective 3.4 “Lobby VicRoads to consider introducing a permanent 50 km/h speed limit on the Great Ocean Road...”. – <i>Rather than “permanent” we suggest that consideration be given to a “seasonal” speed limit.</i></p>	Agree	It is recommended that the action be redrafted as per AIDA’s suggestion to apply seasonal speed limits only.
<p>25 p35, Commercial Activity. – <i>Was the floor area of the shops associated with the development nearing completion at 2/42 Great Ocean Rd (behind the general store) included in the floor space recorded here and used in the assessment of future need? And what about the floor space of the restaurant, art gallery, hotel, Willows Café and medical centre? Despite them not been located in designated commercial areas, they are commercial enterprises.</i></p>	Agree	The floor area of the recently completed development and of other commercial premises in Aireys Inlet has been taken into account in the commercial assessment undertaken by Tim Nott for the structure plan.
<p>26 p43, 5.2 Ongoing Actions and Advocacy. – <i>We do not consider advocacy for improved telecommunications services to be an adequate response. Until the telecommunications black spot problem is overcome, we feel that it would be appropriate for a temporary telecommunications facility to be obtained at least for each bushfire season. A notional costing should be included under item 5.1 of the Structure Plan.</i></p>	Agree in principle	It is recommended that an action be added at 5.1 regarding investigating the provision of a temporary telecommunications facility during bushfire seasons.
<p>27 <i>If certain of the above points are accepted, they will have implications for what has been included elsewhere in the Structure Plan document.</i></p>	Agree	The structure plan will be checked for consistency.
<p>28 <i>There are a number of references to acid sulphate soils in the district. However, while AIDA is aware that some acid sulphate soils exist in the Painkalac valley, we are unaware of these soils having been fully mapped. If they have not been mapped, we request that mapping be done and once mapped that an appropriate overlay be developed. These requests should be included as an objective in the Structure Plan.</i></p>	Agree	<p>It is recommended that the structure plan include the following actions under Objective 1.1 to manage the risk of environmental hazards, including acid sulphate soils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support further studies to determine the nature of risks associated with flooding, coastal acid sulfate soils and the effects of climate change within the area and develop appropriate

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response
	responses to manage these risks, including consideration of planning scheme policies and overlays to control development in areas vulnerable to environmental hazards.

Urban Design Framework (July 2015)

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response
<p>P3 last paragraph - The Top and Bottom Shops.....with emphasis on low rise buildings (2 stories, active frontages "to the creek and Great Ocean Road" and well defined pedestrian areas and connections. – <i>We suggest that this quoted phrase above be inserted.</i></p>	<p>Agree Recommendation: insert "to the creek and Great Ocean Road".</p>
<p>P5 Top Shops Existing Character – "... lack of a recognizable, cohesive and consistent theme." <i>Isn't that what we wanted and asked for and got in the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines? Why is it noted here?</i></p>	<p>Disagree The statement describes the current characteristics of the commercial centres. Despite the intentions of the 2011 UDGs, the commercial centres still suffer from the lack of a recognizable, cohesive and consistent theme, with the haphazard and ad-hoc nature of built form and poor quality public realm.</p>
<p>P5 New development of townhouses with offices behind the Store, "opposed by Surf Coast Shire and local residents", may be setting a precedent for more intensive development in the centre. <i>We suggest that this quoted phrase above be inserted.</i></p>	<p>Disagree Recommendation: rewrite as "...may be setting a precedent for more intensive development in the centre, which is not in line with the community's preferred low-key informal character".</p>
<p>P5 Signage is a mix of directional and commercial, which could benefit from consolidation; this is an opportunity for artistic elements to be introduced to enhance the image of the area. – <i>It is assumed that this suggestion relates to public signage only, rather than commercial signs. AIDA is opposed to the idea of introducing "artistic" signage to "enhance the image of the area". The proliferation of signage, particularly inessential, over-large or self-conscious signage, is strongly opposed in the local community. The local character objective is to retain a low key and informal appearance. The prevailing opinion would be that recessive, low scale signage enhances the image of the area.</i></p>	<p>Agree in part It is considered that the issue of signage and introduction of artistic elements should be separated. Commercial signage should be minimal and consistent with the low-key, informal character of the centre. Recommendation: delete "this is an opportunity for artistic elements to be introduced to enhance the image of the area".</p>
<p>P6 Potential Development Pattern - "... smaller residential units over commercial buildings; this would suit down-sizing retirees and also young families". – <i>Aren't these the very people who should not have to negotiate upper stories? Most – probably all – local commercial buildings have top floor access only via stairs.</i></p>	<p>Agree in part Residential units above commercial premises are supported, but should not necessarily be targeted to down-sizing retirees or young families. Recommendation: delete "this would suit down-sizing retirees and also young families".</p>
<p>P6 Potential Development Pattern – <i>What is a moderate amount of two-storey development? Has the need for additional office space been established?</i></p>	<p>Agree in part Delete "a moderate amount of". The commercial assessment undertaken by Tim Nott for the structure plan estimated that there is scope for an additional 300sqm of commercial office space.</p>

AIDA comment/recommendation		SCS Response	
P6	Community Plaza at the Top Shops– <i>AIDA does not support this development. It is an unnecessary urbanization.</i>	Disagree	This view is not supported by the broader community. The idea of an area where people can sit, meet or linger has support from part of the community. However, the detailed design of the “plaza” would require further investigation and consultation with the community and relevant stakeholders to ensure it reflects the preferred character for Aireys Inlet.
P7	Opportunity to improve links between the Pharmacy and the Medical Centre (currently on opposite sides of the Great Ocean Road) – provide better pedestrian crossing – <i>AIDA is not convinced of the need for this crossing, nor of the feasibility of implementation given the locations of the bus stops and the traffic constraints of moving the existing crossing nearer to Albert Avenue.</i>	Agree in part	Although a pedestrian crossing between the pharmacy and medical centre was desired by some people (as the existing crossing to the north of the shopping centre is not central and not within key desire lines), implementation of such is problematic in this location.
P7	Constraint: Existing car park with granitic sand finish, timber bollards & ropes. Opportunity: Consider using multi-tier raised edge kerb to work with traffic and drainage requirements. Coastal plants selection to provide softening to car park while maintaining view lines to shops and for safety. – <i>We do not know what a multi-tier raised edge kerb is and hence it is not possible to comment? Further consultation regarding this with the community is essential.</i>	Agree	Further design work and consultation with the community is required before any recommendation of the UDF can be implemented. This is noted on page 16 of the UDF (Community Engagement).
P7	Improve all abilities access to (northern) bus stop. – <i>Is this a V/Line responsibility?</i>	Disagree	Council has an annual budget for bus stop improvements, independent from PTV and V/Line.
P7	Potential to make this (the north verge of Great Ocean Road opposite) informal parking area formalised. – <i>AIDA considers this proposal to be dangerous and unnecessary but, if done, should accommodate parallel parking only, and then only seasonally.</i>	Agree	Further investigation is required to determine the feasibility and practicality of providing parking in this location. The UDF notes this parking to be for seasonal use.
P8	Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 2 – <i>The community does not see 89 GOR as a “landmark” development – quite the contrary. Please delete that descriptor. Also, surely the development of this commercial space has no place in the UDF.</i>	Disagree in part	Despite the community’s view of this building, it does define the edge of the centre and in an urban design sense is considered a “landmark”. Nevertheless, this descriptor could be deleted.
P8	Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 6. – <i>AIDA welcomes the suggestion for a GOR pedestrian crossing between the Bottom Shops and the Recreation Reserve. It is already listed on the Pathways Strategy as one of the four accepted proposals for Aireys Inlet and this might enable it to be implemented earlier.</i>	Agree	Comments noted.
P8	Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 7 – <i>AIDA welcomes the proposal to distinguish private land at 83 & 85 GOR from public land that includes both the lane (formerly Painkalac Lane) and the creek interface. We note the proposal to colour code the pedestrian pathway across and down Painkalac Lane. However we do not see the need for a wavy line being used here. Activation of the interface with the creek has long been an AIDA objective, as has distinguishing private from public land in this area. Both</i>	Agree in part	Comments noted.

AIDA comment/recommendation		SCS Response	
	<i>are strongly supported.</i>		
P8	<p>Planting/landscaping - Appropriate sculptural elements here could include: a surfer holding their board, people perched on a rock, a mermaid. –</p> <p><i>The preferred and approved character of Aireys Inlet is low-key and informal. In this suggestion there appear to have been no lessons learned from previous proposals, vigorously opposed by the community, for grandiose sculpture in key public places in Aireys Inlet. AIDA strongly recommends deleting this proposal.</i></p>	Agree	Recommendation: delete the paragraph.
P9	<p>Bottom Shops, Laneway – Bottom Shops, para 4 –</p> <p><i>AIDA supports the aim of making it clear that the lane is a public right of way. It would clarify this intention if this is qualified as a “pedestrian” public right of way.</i></p> <p><i>We suggest that the quoted word above be inserted here.</i></p> <p><i>AIDA believes that the tranquil natural view across the creek at this point, framed by trees on either side, is the strength of this location and therefore should be retained as the focus. A pavilion in this location would tend to block the view to the creek from along the laneway and is therefore not supported, but a simple BBQ area on the creek bank at the end of the laneway might act to draw people in, providing a nucleus for creek-side activity.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>The lane provides an important link between the bottom shops through to the pathway network which extends along Painkalac Creek. In addition to providing pedestrian access, the laneway is also a right of way for vehicle access for adjoining properties. The desire for pedestrianisation is understood, and strongly encouraged by the Structure Plan, UDF and Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines, however vehicle access cannot be excluded unless Council closes or discontinues the road through a formal process. The aim of the UDF is to better define and increase the attractiveness of the laneway for pedestrian use, whilst maintaining existing access rights (this may take to form of a shared zone with pedestrian pace speed limits).</p> <p>Recommendation: delete “or low-scale pavilion/bird hide” from the last sentence on page 9.</p>
P10	<p>Bottom Shops –</p> <p><i>The notation between the creek and the back of 89 and 85 GOR is “potential for activation facing river”. AIDA recommends that the remainder of the River Reserve Road frontage be also included in this recommendation. The whole frontage has great potential for activation.</i></p>	Agree	Recommendation: amend the notation to apply to activation of the entire creek side frontage.
P10	<p>Bottom Shops - Constraint: insufficient car parking near the landmark building. –</p> <p><i>89 Great Ocean Road should not be referred to as a landmark building. The demand for car parking in this specific location was created by a particular highly popular shop tenancy in the past, but there is no intrinsic need for additional parking in this location.</i></p> <p>Opportunity: provide linear parking for visitors along (the north side curve of) the Great Ocean Road. –</p> <p><i>Parking was once allowed in this location but was later disallowed by the SCS and VicRoads because of many near missed collisions it caused. AIDA believes that this is too hazardous to try again.</i></p>	Agree	Recommendation: delete the notation from the plan.
P10	<p>Bottom Shops - (At the entrance into Inlet Crescent West)</p> <p>Constraint: Left turn (from the Great Ocean Road, travelling west) into (Inlet Crescent West to access the Aireys Inlet Reserve) car park is narrow</p>	Agree in principle	Recommendation: delete the notation from the plan.

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response	
<p>Opportunity: Expand the roadway for left turn. Provide additional parking (as per the Traffic Management Plan). – <i>If the reference here is to the 2010 Morgan Traffic Management Plan, this was part of complex negotiated local traffic considerations at that time but was itself not adopted by Council. After substantial recent traffic improvements in this area, AIDA believes that the entrance to both Inlet Crescent West from the GOR and into the Aireys Inlet Reserve car park are perfectly adequate as they exist and there is no need for this proposal.</i></p>		
<p>P10 Bottom Shops - (Pointing to 77 Great Ocean Road, but possibly applying to the whole commercial zone) "Future re-development sites; opportunities for mixed use development with car parking." – <i>AIDA endorses this note on the basis that the Council-adopted 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines should be applied throughout this zone.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>The Introduction on page 2 of the UDF states "The scale and design of buildings within the two commercial centres will continue to be guided by the Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Design Guidelines (2011)". It is not necessary to include reference to the guidelines in the notation, however some of the principles could be included.</p> <p>Recommendation: amend the notation to read "...opportunities for mixed used development with internal car parking and active frontages to the creek and Great Ocean Road".</p>
<p>P10 Bottom Shops - Public parking (at rear of 83 to 87 Great Ocean Road) – to be retained. – <i>AIDA strongly opposes this proposal which is contrary to Council's 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines, which provide for the pedestrianisation of the creek-side land and the associated unmade River Reserve Road road reserve, except for emergency vehicles. The current vehicular usage pattern in this area establishes it as merely a car park and roadway for abutting properties and is incompatible with the creek-side Public Conservation and Resource Zone (PCRZ), the 2011 Commercial Areas Design Guidelines and also the Structure Plan's proposal for a pedestrian pathway running along the creek in this area.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>It is agreed that the parking area at the rear of 83 to 87 Great Ocean Road, which is partially situated within a formal road reserve and the Painkalac Creek reserve, should be made more attractive as part of activating the creek side area and pedestrianisation of the laneway, consistent with the intentions of the Structure Plan, UDF and 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines. It currently has the appearance of a privatised car park with little to no relationship with the creek environs. The laneway however is a right of way providing vehicle access for adjoining properties (designated as a road on title). Vehicle access can therefore not be excluded until such time Council formally closes or discontinues the road under the Local Government Act. Disallowing parking in this area would also increase car parking demand within the Bottom Shops car park, which is already at a premium in peak holiday periods.</p> <p>It is recommended that the notation "Public parking- to be retained" be deleted from the plan so as not to explicitly encourage parking in this area. Rather the aim for this area should be "Potential for activation facing river".</p>
<p>P10 Constraint: path not well defined – it is not clear that there is access to the riverbank and path. Opportunity: clear directional & interpretive signage to give indication of river pathway and nature area. –</p>	Agree	<p>All signage in the study area should remain low key. The pathway is to remain gravel. Request to be submitted to responsible Council unit for replacement</p>

AIDA comment/recommendation	SCS Response	
<p><i>This pathway is currently missing its original low key entry sign due to vandalism, but its replacement is all that is needed. The Aireys Inlet to Eastern View community is strongly opposed to the unnecessary proliferation of signage and it is important that where needed, signage remains low key. The GORCC signage along the cliff path is a good model for this. The path itself is, and should remain, an informal gravel surface, which is quite adequate.</i></p>		<p>of entry sign.</p>
<p>P12 The Connections <i>AIDA questions the value of the proposal to modify the existing path along Barton Court and also the service road as far as Kerrie Court. We see it as a waste of money that could be better spent elsewhere in our area.</i></p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>The intention of the proposed modifications is to enhance pedestrian connections and wayfinding between the Top and Bottom Shops, utilising existing routes. The exact works would need to be further scoped, costed and rated against other priorities.</p>
<p>P13 Bigger Ideas A theme that Aireys Inlet could adopt to brand itself and give the town and both shopping centres an individual yet consistent image is most likely to relate specifically to Aireys Inlet's beautiful natural setting where the bush meets the ocean. This would be a good topic for community workshops, involving all ages to develop a theme that can then translate into a consistent and planned approach for including artistic and characterful elements in; landscaping, street furniture, lighting, pavement material, signage, flag poles/banners, artwork, etc. – <i>The values and objectives underlying these suggestions are completely incompatible with the preferred local character and the underlying ethos of the Aireys Inlet to Eastern View community and therefore should be deleted from the document. These proposals appear to relate to the idea of "place management", prevalent in city suburbs, where establishing differentiation and identity between one suburb and the next is seen as important – but the unique natural environment and special visual character of Aireys Inlet to Eastern View, coupled with its relaxed and modest development style are what defines it, rather than any self-conscious local image management.</i></p>	<p>Agree in part</p>	<p>The 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines noted that while there are some unifying characteristics, generally the overall impression of the commercial areas is one of disjointed building forms, especially at the bottom shops. It was felt that a theme could guide development of the commercial centres, as currently, the haphazard and ad-hoc nature of the built form and poor quality public realm does not reflect the desired character. It is not the intention to enforce a theme that would be inconsistent with the preferred character or that would seem artificial just to create a certain image. On consideration however, given the 'Landscape' and 'Materials' sections of the UDF state that the natural coastal and bushland setting of Aireys Inlet can provide design cues for the selection of materials and landscaping, it is considered there is no need to devise a separate official theme. This approach would be consistent with the "unique natural environment and special visual character of Aireys Inlet to Eastern View, coupled with its relaxed and modest development style". It is recommended that page 13 be deleted.</p>

C. Public submissions

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
1	Ian & Jackie Carroll			See value in growth of caravan/campervan tourism sector to increase viability of businesses and employment opportunities for local residents. Requires options for short term parking.
2	Bob Edgar		Plan is too focussed on maintaining the status quo; stopping even modest development, in particular ability of large vegetated blocks to have some modest degree of more intensive use.	
3	Chris & Simone Matlock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge • Key action 6 – pathways • Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls • Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ • Key action 9 – UDF implementation • Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 14 – monitoring of beach car parks • Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd • Key action 10 – Aireys Pub tourist development opportunities • Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management • Key action 13 – public toilets at community hall • Key action 1 – older persons housing and community garden at 2 Fraser Dr • Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley • Key action 3 – Anderson Roadknight Reserve master plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge • Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd • Key action 6 – pathways <p>Traffic movement and volume is greatest health risk/safety.</p>
4	Helen Grutzner	<p>Top Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public toilets constructed at the Top Shops in the next 1-2 years • Informal plaza with planting and seating • Traffic directed away from pedestrians <p>Bottom Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer delineation of car and pedestrian access • Proper pedestrian path to separate cars and pedestrians 		Proper path between the Top and Bottom Shops. Better signage for cyclists.
5	Geoffrey & Gerardine Horgan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley • Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ 	Key action 6. No need for a pathway along Bambra Road. Wish to maintain rural feel.	For Aireys Inlet to retain its rural character. Do not wish to see a network of concrete footpaths.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		Support proposal for a pathway along Painkalac Creek, provided it is a bush track, not an over-engineered pathway such as the pathway and bridge to Fairhaven.		
6	Richard McDonald		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley Plan contains too little real actions – too much facilitate, investigate, work with, lobby, monitor, consider. 	Reverse action 2
7	Paul Shannon		Key actions 4, 12 appear to be strategies rather than actions, and need to be based on data/evidence that a difference would be made.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 6 – pathways
8	Margaret Lacey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed walking path Protection of open valley landscape of Painkalac Creek Older persons housing Pedestrian refuge at Bottom Shops 	Managing visitor demand at the Lighthouse needs to be sensitively done, i.e. retain vegetation. Toileting here is a problem.	Need toilets at top of Steppe Beach car park. Overall like the emphasis on preservation of the natural environment.
9	Chris & Brigitte Lloyd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance vegetated coastal village character Maintain natural environment in and around the town Stop any development beyond the urban zoned areas Not allow development of the Painkalac Creek valley 	Allowing further tourism development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement statutory planning controls to achieve the objectives. Apply a large tourism charge (e.g. \$100/person) for all tourists, especially those on buses coming to the Surf Coast. Limit tourists coming to the Surf Coast, especially buses. They are already damaging the environment and pay nothing. Consider with VicRoads an elevated footbridge instead of a tunnel at Fairhaven SLSC.
10	Peter McKeddie	Putting the powerlines from Moggs Creek to Eastern View underground. Power poles are dangerous, unsightly and out of keeping with a national heritage listed site.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd Key action 14 – monitoring of beach car parks
11	David Arnold			Lobby VicRoads to permanently reduce the speed limit from Beach Road to the Great Otway National Park picnic grounds on Bambra Road to 50 km/h.
12	David Ford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Containment of townships in existing boundaries Ensuring adequate car parking at Top and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Modest infill development" is vague / undefined. Needs to be defined. Pathway along Bambra Road and River 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A pathway in Aireys Street (dangerous due to rough and slippery gravel surface). Much more needed then along Bambra Road, which is level and paved.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bottom Shops (presently inadequate) Containment of commercial development in existing boundaries No recreation development in the Painkalac Valley Maintenance of open space and other community spaces Inclusion of private land within the Rural Conservation Zone Underground powerlines, but in township roads rather than Great Ocean Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reserve Road not needed, but do need a pathway between Top and Bottom Shops. Do not need a pedestrian refuge on the Great Ocean Road at the Bottom Shops (already one near Bambra Road). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Path from Top to Bottom Shops along the Great Ocean Road Bushfire mitigation. Need for alternative escape road. Did not need new pathway and bridge to Fairhaven. Delete all the vague words and be more specific as people will abuse the system.
13	LE & PE Arnott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley 	Increasing size of car parks	<p>Key actions 5, 11, 2.</p> <p>Any changes implemented to accommodate increase in tourism should not impact on the unique village character. Character should be retained, not only for people passing through but also for the local residents.</p> <p>The Shire should continue to consult with AIDA.</p>
14	Cath Morgan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 6 – pathways Key action 9 – UDF implementation Key action 10 – Aireys Pub tourist development opportunities Key action 13 – public toilets at community hall 	Key action 12 – impossible to maintain and keep to. Perhaps 70 km/h but not 60 km/h to Eastern View.	<p>Key actions 5 and 6, and not proceed with 12.</p> <p>Traffic is already slow with so many tourists. Need 2hr parking limit at shops to prevent all day parking by traders/workers.</p>
15	Virginia Browne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain townships within existing boundaries Powerlines underground along Great Ocean Road Maintain the low key informal coastal village character Continue to include private land outside the settlement boundaries in the Rural Conservation Zone 	Permanent speed reductions to 50/60 km/h.	Avoid more bitumen footpaths and reduce number of signs (consolidate not add to).
16	Mary Anne Boyd-Squires	<p>All key directions and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 6 – pathways Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ 		Improve walkways, lower traffic speed and contain development to protect Aireys Inlet from further development.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd Key action 14 – monitoring of beach car parks 		
17	Alasdair McAndrew	Supports majority of plan.		Need for pedestrian refuge on Great Ocean Road near Old Coach Road, Moggs Creek due to hazardous conditions.
18	James St John	Agree with almost all aspects of Structure Plan, including the proposal for a pathway along Bambra Road to Old Coach Road (provided no vegetation destroyed).	Disagree with proposal for pathways along Painkalac Creek due to the impact of pedestrians and dogs on kangaroo and water bird populations. Residents and visitors gain great pleasure from viewing native animals and birds in this area. This would be lost by allowing access to the creek.	
19	Natalie Lynch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley Key action 3 – Anderson Roadknight Reserve master plan Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 6 – pathways Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls Key action 9 – UDF implementation Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd 	Key action 12 – reduced speed limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not progress development in Painkalac Creek Valley – protect wildlife and birdlife. Pathway from Bottom Shops to Top Shops via continuous pathway that can be used by pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrian refuge on Great Ocean Road from Bottom Shops to playground and at SLSC. Investigation of an inland route to provide another road from Lorne to Anglesea during severe fire danger periods. The Great Ocean Road comes to a standstill in January.
20	Elizabeth & Colin Gomm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining the informal look of the area. Maintaining and enhancing the historical, environmental and cultural values of the area, particularly the Painkalac Creek Reserve. 	There need to be toilet facilities at the Top Shops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Painkalac Creek trails east and west should not allow for vehicular traffic as they will attract cars and trailers as currently seen on the Narani Way trail (fire track). Improve signage and make explicit that dogs must be on leads in the Painkalac Creek area. Allow for pedestrian access from Bimbadeen Drive up the Barwon Water track. This joins other tracks in the area and should allow for walkers.
21	Gary Incedon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 6 – Pathway Bottom Shops – Old Coach Road via River Reserve Road Continuous pathway between Top and Bottom 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathway from Bottom Shops to Old Coach Road via River Reserve Road Aireys Pub tourist opportunities

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<p>Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 3 – Plan for Anderson Roadknight Reserve • Key action 9 – Increase attractiveness of Top and Bottom Shops • Key action 10 – Aireys Pub tourist opportunities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous pathway between Top and Bottom Shops
22	R Davitt	Key action 7 – Minimum lot sizes are important in maintaining character of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 – This should be an underpass. A refuge will disrupt traffic flow and cause congestion. • Key action 12 – This is unnecessary and would create traffic build up. Traffic volumes and pedestrian traffic are low during most of the year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls • Key action 10 – Aireys Pub tourist development opportunities • Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management
23	Nick Harding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intention not to proceed with a sports precinct in the Painkalac Creek Valley • Pathway along the river side of Bambra Road to Old Coach Rod and along the creek bank 		
24	Peter McArdle		Would like to see a cycle or cycle/pedestrian path connecting Moggs Creek-Fairhaven-Aireys Inlet.	Need for gathering/refuge place in case of fires.
25	Sally Sainsbury	The emphasis on maintaining the natural environmental assets of the area and not allowing development to expand into the buffers to the Great Otway National Park.	<p>Concerns with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 1 – how will higher density housing look, be aesthetically pleasing and practical for older people? • Key action 4 – what shape/form will this take? • Key action 5 – does this mean denuding the area of its vegetation? • Key action 9 – do not want a suburban shopping centre 	Key actions 7, 8, 11 and 5 are all important, but too often see examples where the intention is to improve resources for expanding numbers of visitors to the detriment of the historical/natural beauty of the area. Should not interfere with natural beauty too much or becomes ugly urban environment.
26	C Hanley	<p>Particularly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley • Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls • Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd • Key action 13 – public toilets at community hall • Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge
27	Bev Shaw	Would like to see plans for the redevelopment of 2 Fraser Drive and whether this fits in with key action 7. Also whether the members of the community garden would all be able to have their plots and where residents would park.	Key action 13 – parking could be an issue due to school and community hall usage. Also it is not in the vicinity of the Top and Bottom Shops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is imperative in relation to speed limits (key action 12) that LED flashing lights be installed for the safety of school children. • There is no RV dump site and parking in Aireys Inlet. The economic benefits of RV

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
				travellers have been overlooked. Free camping should also be considered.
28	P & C Giles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 1 – older persons housing and community garden at 2 Fraser Dr • Key action 3 – Anderson Roadknight Reserve master plan • Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge (not on bend) • Key action 6 – pathways • Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls • Key action 10 – Aireys Pub tourist development opportunities • Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley • Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management • Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ • Key action 9 – UDF implementation • Key action 11 – underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd • Key action 14 – monitoring of beach car parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key actions 5, 6, 7. • The installation of a safety barrier along the Great Ocean Road between Painkalac bridge and corner shops. • A levee bank along Bambra Road to the Great Ocean Road to allow creek to drain naturally.
29	John Beaumont, Inlet Medical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beautification of Top Shops • Enhanced pedestrian access and car parking 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beautification of Top Shops • Enhanced pedestrian access and car parking • Public toilets at community hall
30	Don & Elizabeth Allen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 – pedestrian refuge at bottom shops • Key action 9 – car parking at both Bottom and Top Shops needs to increase (difficult) and be short term • Key action 11 – powerlines underground. Existing poles are an eyesore and dangerous. • Key action 12 – 50 km/h could start halfway between Boundary Rd and Hopkins St. Support 60 km/h at Eastern View, but should also apply at Moggs Creek starting at Old Coach Rd. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see reduced speed limit to 30 km/h in Bellbird Drive, Robyn Rd and Noel Rd, Moggs Creek. Speeding traffic causes damage to the unsealed roads. • The frangible on the corner of Bellbird Drive and Robyn Rd is damaged and needs replacing.
31	Joanna Cook	Love the new walking track. Great use of the area.		
32	J & M McMahon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 – Construct a pedestrian refuge on the Great Ocean Rd between Bottom and Top Shops • Key action 6 – Construct a pathway from Top to Bottom Shops • Key action 7 – Continue to protect the character of the towns • Key action 10 – Aireys Pub, tourist orientated uses 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 7 – Continue to restrict development and protect the character of the towns. • Key action 10 – Importance of Aireys Pub, social focal point, additional uses. • Key action 13 – Public toilets at the Community Hall

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 13 – Public toilets at the community hall Key action 2 – Investigate the enhancement of the primary school 		
33	Sharyn McNeill	The Structure Plan and UDF provide a balanced way forward for the area. Particularly agrees with the key directions regarding protection of environmental assets and the small scale, non-suburban village character of the towns.	More detail is required regarding the development of the Bottom Shops, perhaps including examples of the nature of commercial operators sought or otherwise not preferred (e.g. supermarkets, large scale chain commercial operators). Further detail is also required regarding tourist options for the pub. Preference should be given to temporary installations rather than longer term options that become permanent (e.g. accommodation).	
34	Robert Putland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd 		Area between Bottom Shops and Skate Park should be a 50 km/h zone to improve safety.
35	Pam & Harry Hill	Broadly ok.	Key action 12 – Lower speed limits. Eastern View is the only area between Lorne and Anglesea where it is legal to overtake. As slow moving tourist traffic is a hazard, the existing 80 km/h is already limiting for following vehicles to overtake. The 60 km/h proposal makes a bad situation worse.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – Underground powerlines Key action 7 – Protect the character and separation of the settlements Key action 2 – Protect the Painkalac Creek Valley
36	Judy & Jack Lawlor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining settlement boundaries Speed limit at 50 km/h on Great Ocean Rd Retain block sizes Develop more walk/cycle tracks – creek area 	Footpath on Bambra Rd not required. Very little traffic and speeding. Suggest lower speed limit to 50 or 40 km/h.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Extend Surf Coast Walk to Lorne via coast, beach or inland. Extend walking track Merran Reserve, Fairhaven to Yandanah Rd (stops 20m short). Benches for sitting on foreshore between Fairhaven and Eastern View, overlooking the beach.
37	Peter & Dorothy Sutherland	All of it		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian access and safety Preservation of natural assets Fire prevention and safety <p>Challenges inherent in the plan but it should be do-able. Trust the financial and human resources will be put in place to ensure it happens.</p>
38	Sarah Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cessation of development of Painkalac Creek Valley Potential underground powerlines along Great Ocean Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making Aireys Pub more commercial Continuous pathway link between Bottom and Top Shops being along Bambra Rd 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Appearing rustic and non-urbanised. Pathway along Bambra Rd to be on riverside and surfaced with gravel, not concrete. At all costs avoid turning Aireys into an

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public toilets at community hall 		Anglesea or Lorne, with too much planning, upgrading or commercial expansion.
39	Dennis Baker	Keeping the village aspect of the towns.	Not to progress the active recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key actions are not much different to the 1993 plan. Build a bypass road around the towns to stop congestion. Push for natural gas to be piped to all residents.
40	Michael Lynch		<p>Questions why ratepayers should pay for underground powerlines at Moggs Creek only. Still need an oval for football and cricket. Has been buried in the too hard basket for years.</p> <p>Council should not be promoting individual business such as the Aireys Hotel. There is a perceived conflict of interest, as a councillor (or relatives) is understood to be a shareholder.</p>	
41	Amanda George		<p>Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children.</p> <p>Toilets should be near the shops or more signs provided directing people to existing toilets near the Bottom Shops.</p>	
42	Jo Lawson		<p>Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall. There are existing toilets at the hall and school when open. Should increase signage to existing toilets at the skate park, surf club and below the lighthouse.</p>	
43	Neil Liddell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Containing townships, protect and enhance environmental assets, natural beauty and vegetated coastal village feel. Contain commercial developments within existing boundaries. Integrate network of accessible pedestrian pathways. 	<p>Reduced speed limit to 50 km/h unnecessary. At most could be considered for summer peak and from school to Bottom Shops only.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider pathway along Sandy Gully to Sandy Gully beach. Master plan for Anderson Roadknight Reserve should ensure natural bush area to north side of community hall and school is retained. Retain character to towns where possible with unsealed roads.
44	Eliza Feely		<p>Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children.</p> <p>There are existing toilets at the hall and school when open. Toilets should be near the shops or more signs provided directing people to existing toilets near the Bottom Shops.</p>	
45	Rod Crellin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 5 – Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge 	Implementation of all key actions would be costly and would see very little getting up under special	Key actions 12, 2, 8, 6.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 6 – pathways • Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls • Key action 8 – retain private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ • Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd • Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley, particularly improving/enlarging primary school oval for general school use and football club, possible soccer use, and sharing with Lorne, Anglesea, Bellbrae and Torquay. Challenge how to make the oval larger. 	charge schemes. Well budgeted modest improvements might get through. Many proposed improvements would alter the character of the town/area.	Does not like to see Melbourne bay suburb type landscaping in the area (expensive and would change the character). The use of granitic sand in car parks is problematic, as high wind forces cause health issues (eyes).
46	Michelle Vernieux		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school and tennis. It would encourage travellers to camp overnight in the car park. Toilets are available near the Bottom Shops.	
47	Community Garden 3231	Acknowledgement of the community garden as a valuable community asset and social hub; recognition of the health and wellbeing benefits of the garden; support for its current location and integration with housing for older persons.		
48	Doug Humann			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of bicycle parking and safe bike lanes on the Great Ocean Rd. 2. Reduced speed limits on the Great Ocean Rd for the benefit of cyclists and pedestrians. 3. Reinforcement of Great Ocean Rd and parking areas where being undercut by high tides. 4. More should be made of the natural features of the area (marine and terrestrial parks and reserves). 5. Providing connection with and through the national parks and reserves with Parks Vic. 6. High summer visitation coinciding with high fire risk periods. More focus required on additional refuge and evacuation points.
49	Roger & Nola Ganly	Support all aspects of the draft structure plan.	Structure plan does not specifically mention the lack of toilet facilities at the Memorial Arch. Believe there should not be a blanket ban on the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce speed permanently to 50 km/h and 60 km/h (action 12) 2. Construct a pathway in the valley (action 6)

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
			sealing of roads.	3. Continue to apply minimum lot sizes and include private land outside the settlement boundaries within the RCZ (actions 7 and 8)
50	Clint Hinch	All except key actions 2, 6, 12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley Key action 6 – pathways Key action 12 – reduced speed limits on Great Ocean Rd 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a recreation reserve (not at the school) Implement recommendations of UDF
51	Diana Trewenack	Agrees with all key actions, but particularly importance should be given to lobbying VicRoads to reduce the speed limit at the Archway in Eastern View.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impose a levy on bus companies using the Great Ocean Rd. Inform bus companies to stop at available toilets for sufficient time. Provide more signage to existing toilets rather than provide new toilets at the community hall. Bus companies should provide information to overseas tourists on how to use toilets and should pay for toilet cleaning.
52	Rebecca Smits		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school, tennis and other activities at the hall. A facility would also be detrimental to the amenity of the immediate surrounds. Visitors should be directed to the toilets at the skate park.	
53	Davin Hopper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining minimum lot sizes for development within the towns Pedestrian link between the Top and Bottom Shops, and community centre Pedestrian link along Sandy Gully, connecting Aireys St to Gully beach Pedestrian path around the Painkalac Creek Developing the school oval rather than building in the Painkalac valley Road crossing between Bottom Shops and existing toilets/parkland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing parking on the Great Ocean Rd beyond the Bottom Shops – would impact on views. Provision of public toilets at community hall not required. Additional parking at Top Shops. There is more than enough parking for a large majority of the year, adding more would be obsolete over most of the year and detract from the village atmosphere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining village feel, particularly low level building regulations that restrict housing within the treeline, and minimum lot sizes. Pedestrian link between Aireys St and Gully Beach. Pedestrian link between top and bottom shops. <p>Underground powerlines beyond Moggs Creek a great initiative, however presumably this would be funded in part by the residences that would benefit from improved views and higher resale values.</p>
54	Catherine & James Bell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressing the ill-defined pedestrian access across the carpark in front of the Bottom Shops More landscaping along the river edge behind the Bottom Shops Clearly defining the lane way between the bottom shops and the river as public right of 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making Aireys Inlet a 'walking town' that in particular makes more use of the river and its surrounds. Increase seasonal parking at the Top Shops.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> way Linking the Bottom Shops with Bambra Road, Old Coach Road and Painkalac Creek with a walking trail. Could be made a circular walk that returns via the Painkalac Creek bridge. 		
55	Lois & Bill Jackman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 6 – pathway along Bambra Rd to Old Coach Rd and beside Painkalac Creek Key action 1 – housing for older people Key action 13 – public toilets 	Key action 12 – 60 km/h is sufficient	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 6 – pathways Key action 7 – maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley <p>Require a right hand turn into the Bottom Shops and widening of the curved section of the Great Ocean Rd (especially for bikes).</p>
56	Jan Pitt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian refuge at Bottom Shops Footpath between Top and Bottom Shops Toilet at the Top Shops Footpath along Bambra Rd, returning along Painkalac Creek The removal of one entry/exit point at the Bottom Shops and extra car parking A careful review of signage to limit number of signs 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian refuge between Bottom Shops and skate park Footpath linking Top and Bottom Shops Footpath from Bottom Shops along Bambra Rd, returning along Painkalac Creek A mirror on the Great Ocean Rd at Flax Lily Lane
57	Matthew & Cathie Hoath			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of speed limit along Great Ocean Rd Moving powerlines underground Continue to implement development controls (minimum lot sizes)
58	Tim Northeast	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance low key village Enhance pedestrian and cycle paths Reduce speed limit from before Boundary Rd 	Underground powerlines – money could be better spent elsewhere.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce speed limits Improve pedestrian facilities Improve car parking and pedestrian access at Top and Bottom Shops <p>Great Ocean Rd is hard to cross in summer. Consider a pedestrian tunnel or permanent crossing.</p>
59	Wendy Stanley		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school, tennis and other activities. Toilets should be near the shops or more signs provided directing visitors to existing toilets at playground.	

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
60	Tony Hughes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergrounding of powerlines from Moggs Creek to Eastern View Improving Top and Bottom Shops, especially parking 	Aireys Pub should not get special treatment over other shops.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – Underground powerlines Key action 9 – Improve parking and access at shops Key action 14 – Car parks <p>The powerlines have a negative impact on the coastal views. Their removal would make Moggs Creek a world class hang gliding site and enhance the tourism potential.</p>
61	Bohdan Philippa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergrounding powerlines Not having a sports oval in the valley Aim to reduce bushfire risk Walking paths Beautification of Top and Bottom Shops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50 km/h speed limit A sporting facility/oval is unnecessary for such a small community when suitable facilities are close by 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Underground powerlines from Spions Kopp to Devils Elbow Reduction of bushfire risk Improvement of the aesthetics and functionality of the Top and Bottom Shops <p>The relocation of powerlines should be prioritised as it has been of concern for decades. It is a world heritage listed area/road. There should be federal government funding available to assist with the investment.</p>
62	Aireys Inlet Traders and Tourism Association (AITTA)	Recognises all key directions and the 14 key actions as relevant strategies and UDF improvements for the area.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Underground powerlines from Spions Kopp to Devils Elbow Pedestrian refuge on Great Ocean Rd at Bottom Shops Master plan for Anderson Roadknight Reserve/ Community Hall, including public toilets and artistic signage at the entrance. <p>Strongly support beautification of Top and Bottom Shops including car parking. Increased litter pick up along the Great Ocean Rd.</p>
63	AIDA	AIDA is generally supportive of the draft structure plan. The submission includes a detailed list of comments/suggestions for improvement.	AIDA has a number of concerns about the UDF and provides a detailed list of comments/suggestions for improvement.	
64	Coulter Roache Lawyers on behalf of Adrienne Clarke			Does not object to the proposed Painkalac Creek trail provided it is situated on public land on the east side of the creek and does not encroach onto the clients private land on the west side.
65	Krystina & Dominic Morris		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall, given the vicinity of the school, parking congestion in the car park, and the availability of toilets at the skate park.	

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
66	Marian Bayley		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school, tennis and other activities. Toilets are better situated at the shopping centres, a lookout area near Fairhaven and Eastern View, and at the Archway.	
67	Kelly Turner		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school.	
68	Marijke Tweedie		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall as would be unsafe for children who attend school. Toilets should be provided where tourists stop, e.g. Step car park near the lighthouse.	
69	Richard Shelton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – Underground powerlines Key action 2 – Not progress development of a recreation space in the Painkalac Creek Valley 	Key action 12 – reducing speed limit to 50 km/h and 60 km/h. Existing speed limits are appropriate.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Underground powerlines (fire risk) Additional measures to reduce fire risk Do not spoil valley with recreation spaces
70	Carl Watson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground powerlines 		Suggests improvement/beautification of the barren area overlooking the inlet to the south-east of Lialeeta Rd.
71	Leeanne Mead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting the natural beauty and environment Protecting the quiet village atmosphere Providing more walking and cycling paths Limiting commercial development Meeting the community needs as well as the tourist industry 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Create better pedestrian access to shops and between shops, and aim to decrease the number of cars parking at the Top and Bottom Shops. That community needs and amenity are more important than attracting greater numbers of tourists. Maintaining the natural environment.
72	Stephanie & Dean Lewis		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the community hall. The precinct is heavily used by the community for tennis, school, market, mobile library, hall activities etc. Toilets for tourists and passing traffic would be incompatible. Suggest Council purchase the vacant lot opposite the Top Shops and provide parking, toilets and a pedestrian crossing.	
73	Lois Kesselring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support majority of key actions, notably 3 and 11. 	Key action 12 – reduced speed limits only relevant for peak season.	Key action 11 – Undergrounding of powerlines long overdue. Is a key recommendation of the Royal Commission on bushfires, a safety issue for hang-gliders, detrimental to the natural beauty of one of Australia's greatest tourist attractions and would reduce power outages in the area.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
74	Peter Stacey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for key directions 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian refuge near Bottom Shops Continuing to apply minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls Pathway from Top to Bottom Shops <p>Also important to create a safe environment for children given the heavy traffic on the Great Ocean Rd.</p>
75	Diana Shelton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – Underground powerlines Key action 2 – Not progress development of a recreation space in the valley 		Underground powerlines (fire risk).
78	Julie Fink	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 – no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley Key action 6 – pathways Key action 7 – minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls Key action 8 – private land outside the settlement boundary within the RCZ 	Key action 12 – 60 km/h at Eastern View	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 7 Key action 2 Key action 8 <p>Keeping the area a low key coastal area. Maintaining the unmade roads to enhance the natural beauty of the area.</p>
79	Tosca Looby & Hayden Stephens			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathway along Sandy Gully between Anderson St and Sandy Gully beach. Commitment to maintain unpaved roads to retain the area's character and beauty. Now allowing larger commercial developments.
80	Michael Healy	Protect open valley – no oval or any development in the Painkalac Creek Valley.	Remove timber bollards, ropes and vegetation at Top Shops to increase visibility of traffic.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect valley Remove bollards at Top Shops Be able to subdivide large vegetated lots
81	Michael Mackie	Support all.		Future planning should address the difficulty for businesses to remain viable due to the seasonality of visitation. Suggests that koalas could be housed in the forest surrounding the Moggs Creek picnic ground to attract greater visitation.
82	David Quin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground powerlines between Spion Kopp and Devil's Elbow 	Public toilets at community hall not worthwhile. Better situated at Top Shops.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lobby V/Line for a bus stop at Moggs Creek. Underground powerlines between Spion Kopp and Devil's Elbow. Would increase visual amenity of a prominent stretch of coastline (heritage listed Great Ocean Rd, iconic archway), reduce fire risk, increase safety for traffic and hang/paragliders, improve power supply reliability and enhance liveability.
83	Meg Parker, Assistant		Opposed to the provision of public toilets at the	

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
	Principal Donna Groves, President Parents and Friends Leah Sterritt, Parents and Friends Paul Weight, Vice President School Council		community hall, given the vicinity of the school and use of the precinct for multiple community activities, parking congestion in the car park, and the availability of toilets at the skate park which could be improved. Also consider improved signage and toilets at the Memorial Arch.	
85	Daryl Stubbings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathway along Bambra Rd, provided it is located on the creek side of the road and constructed of gravel not concrete. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the open valley landscape is retained (no active recreation facility) Improve parking and access to the Top and Bottom Shops Continue minimum lot sizes Improve access points to the creek for swimming, canoes, SUP's, etc
86	Grant Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment of 2 Fraser Dr for older persons housing Improve car parking at Top and Bottom Shops Monitor coastal/beach car parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly disagree with shelving an oval for Aireys Inlet Strongly disagree that all large vegetated allotments remain so. Some rezoning required to satisfy future demand. The Aireys Hotel is no longer the social focal point. Reduction of speed limit at Eastern View does not consider the many residents who travel to and from work along the Great Ocean Rd. 	Seems that some of the actions proposed are based on the suggestions of a minority and not a majority of ratepayers.
87	Anna Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 11 – underground powerlines 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any measure to reduce fire risk Powerlines underground Maintain character of Aireys by restricting development
88		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Powerlines underground Master plan for Anderson Roadknight Reserve Contain commercial development to Top/ Bottom Shops Walking track along Bottom Shops and Old Coach Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of speed limits Construction of pedestrian refuge Continue to apply minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain character of towns Powerlines underground Reduce fire risk
89	Rebecca	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Powerlines underground 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean up trees and shrubs Reduce risk of fires
90	Leanne Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 1 – Development of 2 Fraser Dr Key action 5 – Pedestrian refuge at Bottom Shops Key action 14 – monitoring of beach car parks, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 2 (no recreation space in Painkalac Creek Valley) – the current oval is too small Key action 6 (pathways) – unless the Bambra Rd pathway is on the valley side of the road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key action 1 (older persons housing and community garden at 2 Fraser Dr) – so elderly members can remain in community To relieve traffic congestion at Bottom Shops

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
		<p>but believe this is already being done</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 13 – public toilets at community hall • Key action 4 – Archway, Eastern View visitor management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 9 (UDF implementation) – is adequate as is, no need to waste more money • Key action 10 (Aireys Pub tourist development opportunities) – disagree hotel is of high value to the community, the community hall and surf club are more suitable • Key action 7 (maintain minimum lot sizes and restrictive development controls) – each landowner should have the right of consideration within the existing confines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 5 (Bottom Shops pedestrian refuge) – it is becoming increasingly dangerous for pedestrians to cross the Great Ocean Rd in summer months <p>Agrees with pathway along Bambra Rd as long as it is on the valley side of the road so it does not cross driveways.</p> <p>Would like the option of subdivision along Bambra Rd between Aireys St and Old Coach Rd to provide a fire buffer to the CBD of Aireys Inlet.</p> <p>Believes the hotel is not a community hub. The Top Shops, surf club and community hall/school are more valuable to the general community.</p>
91	Vicki Hutchins			<p>Suggests that screening be grown or erected to screen the car park at 89 Great Ocean Rd as it currently detracts from the scenic creek environment.</p>
92	Catherine & Geoffrey McNaughton	<p>Support the main directions of the plan in maintaining the current pattern of small scale development in existing townships in a bushy landscaped setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key action 12 – 50km/h speed limit from Boundary Rd to Fairhaven SLSC. Also suggest 30km/h in local streets to increase pedestrian safety. • Top Shops plaza (attractive area to sit, reduce dominance of road space). • Walking/cycling path along creek to National Park. • Walking/cycling path from pub to Bottom Shops. • Pedestrian refuge at Bottom Shops. • Retention of unsealed roads. • Underground powerlines. • Improved accessibility of bus stop at Top Shops. • Protection of night sky. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal parking area opposite the Top Shops that would remove vegetation. • No separate footpath required along River Reserve Rd. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request a continuous footpath wide enough for two people along the top shops (currently too narrow and interference from cars). • Prevent cars driving along footpath and parking in front of caravan park by planting nature strip with feature avenue of indigenous trees (central area of Aireys Inlet is very bare, compared to forested roadsides at northern entry). • Properly connect creek path to Great Ocean Rd path near Bottom Shops. • Improve the bicycle path from Mad Max house to surf club (gravel slopes too steep). Would encourage more families to ride to the beach rather than use car. • Install bike parking at surf club. • Protect wildflower vegetation along Aireys St between Pearse Rd and Gilbert St. • Consider 30km/h speed limit in Aireys St to Sandy Gully and a traffic island on Great Ocean Rd for safe pedestrian crossing. • Provide a path from the bend of Panorama Dr to Bambra Rd.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Like / agree with	Dislike / disagree with	Priorities for implementation / Other comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate former path adjacent caravan park between Pearse Rd and Top Shops. • Remove the gate across Werona Rd on bicycle circuit from Distillery Creek picnic ground to Moggs Creek picnic ground via the dam. • Install drinking taps at key points along the main paths. • Install traffic islands for safe crossing at the end of Pearse Rd, Aireys St and Fairhaven end of bridge. • Plans for the Top Shops should include more than just one tree. • Replace trees that were lost with construction of Pearse Rd. • Progressively remove pine trees along riverbank and replace with indigenous trees. • Prevent cars parking on grassy verge of riverbank. • Address erosion on hillside of farm at end of Eastern View. • Promote bicycle tourism.
93	Sandra Chambers		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action list should have been presented with appropriate costings and budget, otherwise is all pie in the sky. • Despite all previous consultation between Council and the traders association about public toilets, the Structure Plan recommends further investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not one actual action listed in the key actions.
94	Fiona Dann	Supports pathway along Bambra Rd (plus some attractively designed speed deterrents), as would increase safety for pedestrians.		