



Minutes

Hearing of Submissions Committee
Tuesday, 12 July 2016

Held in the
Council Chambers
1 Merrijig Drive, Torquay
Commencing at 4.00pm

Council:

Cr Rose Hodge (Mayor)
Cr David Bell
Cr Eve Fisher
Cr Clive Goldsworthy
Cr Carol McGregor
Cr Brian McKiterick
Cr Margot Smith
Cr Heather Wellington

MINUTES FOR THE HEARING OF SUBMISSIONS MEETING OF SURF COAST SHIRE COUNCIL
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 1 MERRIJIG DRIVE, TORQUAY
ON TUESDAY 12 JULY 2016 COMMENCING AT 4.00PM

PRESENT:

Cr Rose Hodge (Mayor)
Cr David Bell
Cr Eve Fisher
Cr Clive Goldsworthy
Cr Carol McGregor
Cr Brian McKiterick
Cr Heather Wellington

In Attendance:

Chief Executive Officer – Keith Baillie
Acting General Manager Environment & Development – Rowena Frost
Manager Planning & Development – Bill Cathcart
Acting Statutory Planning Co-ordinator – Karen Hose
Senior Strategic Planner – Jorgen Peeters
32 members of the public

APOLOGIES:

Cr Margot Smith

Committee Resolution

MOVED Cr Clive Goldsworthy, Seconded Cr Brian McKiterick

That an apology be received from Cr Margot Smith.

CARRIED 7:0

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Nil

SUBMITTERS HEARD

1. John Walker
2. John Jacoby
3. Peter Raines
4. Cindy Jacobs
5. Don Lawrie
6. Bill Welsh
7. Brian & Jill Pocklington
8. Grant Norris
9. Don Welsh (Parklea)
10. Anthony Jansen (AMEX)
11. Dale Tepper
12. Nicola Smith (Niche Planning Studio)
13. Alison McAdam
14. John Foss (Surfrider Foundation)

BUSINESS:

1. ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT 4
1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan..... 4

1. ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

Author's Title: Senior Strategic Planner

General Manager: Kate Sullivan

Department: Planning & Development

File No: F16/734

Division: Environment & Development

Trim No: IC16/708

Appendix:

1. Submitters who have registered to speak (D16/58238)
2. Summary of submissions (D16/60855)

Officer Direct or Indirect Conflict of Interest:

Status:

In accordance with Local Government Act 1989 –
Section 80C:

Information classified confidential in accordance with
Local Government Act 1989 – Section 77(2)(c):

Yes

No

Yes

No

Reason: Nil

Reason: Nil

Purpose

To hear from submitters in relation to Amendment C114.

Summary

Planning Scheme Amendment C114 seeks to implement the Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan.

The amendment was placed on public exhibition from 26 May 2016 to 27 June 2016. A total of 79 submissions were received. Key issues raised in submissions include rural-urban interface impacts, the level of development, signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road, impacts on the natural environment, biodiversity and wildlife, queries about the future development of the balance of the Spring Creek valley, and concerns about technical aspects of the PSP (e.g. open space, stormwater management, traffic infrastructure, lot sizes and density, native vegetation removal/retention).

The issues raised in the submissions will be further considered in a report to be presented to the 23 August 2016 Council meeting.

Recommendation

That Council receive and note submissions to Amendment C114.

Committee Resolution

MOVED Cr Carol McGregor, Seconded Cr Eve Fisher

That Council receive and note submissions to Amendment C114.

CARRIED 7:0

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

Report

Background

Planning Scheme Amendment C114 seeks to implement the Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan (PSP). The PSP was prepared by Council with assistance from the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) and in consultation with government agencies, service authorities and key stakeholders. It provides the strategic framework for the future development of the Spring Creek urban growth area west of Duffields Road.

Key features of the plan are:

- a permanent town boundary along the precinct's western boundary by having no roads along the boundary and larger residential lots with 20 metre building setbacks at this end of the precinct
- more than 57ha of open space and conservation reserves, including a 75 metre setback either side of the 10-year flood level along Spring Creek and wildlife corridors along all waterways
- protection of as many stands of Bellarine Yellow Gum and individual trees as possible, while vegetation offset requirements are identified for any trees removed as part of future development
- retention of existing roadside vegetation along Duffields Road, Grossmans Road and the Great Ocean Road
- a variety of lot sizes and housing options to suit a range of prospective residents
- residential design controls that mandate minimum setbacks, maximum site coverage, minimum area available for planting, fences and the use of retaining walls. The controls also specify a preferred maximum building height of 7.5 metres.
- local services including a neighbourhood shopping centre and a community building to reduce the need for car travel
- a comprehensive network of pedestrian and bicycle paths, including on both sides of Spring Creek, linking open space areas within the precinct and beyond towards Torquay's CBD
- connector road access points at the intersections of Messmate Road, Beach Road, Ocean View Crescent and Strathmore Drive East and West to provide safe and efficient connections between the precinct and surrounding areas
- retention of the green break between Torquay and Bellbrae

The PSP is based on recommendations from a Community Panel Council convened in 2015 as well as a series of technical reports and submissions on an interim Draft Framework Plan.

The Planning Scheme Amendment proposes to incorporate the Spring Creek PSP into the Surf Coast Planning Scheme. The amendment also updates the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 1 (UGZ1) to facilitate the development of the land; rezones part of the Christian College site to UGZ1; applies the Development Contributions Plan Overlay Schedule 3 (DCPO3) to all land zoned; incorporates the Spring Creek Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP); and makes a number of other changes to the Surf Coast Planning Scheme.

Discussion

The amendment was publicly exhibited from 26 May 2016 to 27 June 2016. A total of 79 submissions were received by the closing date. Submissions were received from government agencies, service authorities, Spring Creek landowners/developers, adjoining landowners, community groups and residents.

A summary of submissions is provided at Appendix 2. The hearing of submissions meeting allows an opportunity for submitters to present their views and concerns to Council.

The key issues raised in submissions are:

- Rural-urban interface issues along the western precinct boundary, including loss of rural atmosphere/lifestyle/amenity, impact on farming activities and livestock (horses) from possible incursion by new residents and dogs, complaints from future urban residents. Submitters request a proper vegetation buffer and larger lots (4,000m²) along the western boundary.
- Objection to signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West, with requests for roundabouts, staggered intersections or no access at all.
- Objection to the level of development and requests for less and larger lots (up to 4,000m²).
- Impacts on the natural environment, biodiversity and wildlife.

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

- Queries about what the future will be for the balance of the Spring Creek valley between 1km west and Bellbrae; and requests for land up to Ashmore Drive to be rezoned to Low Density Residential to permit 4,000m² allotments similar to Ocean Acres.
- Support for the Community Vision for the Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan prepared by various local community groups.
- Comprehensive submissions from Spring Creek landowners/developers raising issues about technical aspects of the plan, including the Neighbourhood Activity Centre, lot sizes and density, residential design controls (e.g. setbacks, site coverage, building height), transport infrastructure, stormwater management, vegetation retention/removal and public open space requirements.

The issues raised in the submissions will be considered in a report to be presented to the 23 August Council meeting.

Financial Implications

The cost of preparation of the precinct structure plan is being funded by 5 landowners within the precinct, who will in return receive a credit for their portion in the development contributions plan. Community engagement activities have been funded by Council through the allocation in the strategic planning budget for this item.

Council Plan

Theme 5 Development and Growth

Objective 5.2 Encourage sustainable economic development and growth

Objective 5.4 Transparent and responsive land use and strategic planning

Strategy 5.4.2 Utilise structure plans and planning processes to encourage a diversity of housing stock across the Shire.

Theme 1 Environment

Objective 1.1 Preserve and enhance the natural environment

Strategy 1.1.3 Protect and enhance biodiversity in Nature Reserves

Theme 3 Communities

Objective 3.3 Preservation of peaceful, safe and healthy environments

Strategy 3.3.6 Maintain, enhance and develop community and recreational facilities to improve community wellbeing.

Theme 4 Infrastructure

Objective 4.3 Enhance key rural and coastal roads and transport options

Objective 4.1 Allocation of infrastructure according to need

Strategy 4.1.1. Perform an infrastructure needs assessment to provide clarity to the community on how a fair distribution of infrastructure will be achieved.

Policy/Legal Implications

The precinct structure plan has been prepared consistent with Council policy and the objectives and strategies in the Surf Coast Planning Scheme. The planning scheme amendment has been prepared and exhibited in accordance with the legislative requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any conflicts of interest.

Risk Assessment

There are no risks to Council associated with considering submissions.

Social Considerations

The PSP takes into consideration the needs of the future population for community infrastructure. The plan shows a neighbourhood activity centre, local community facility and integrated open space and pathway network.

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

Community Engagement

The amendment was placed on public exhibition in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. Notice was given in the following manner:

- Notices were sent to all landowners within the Spring Creek urban growth area
- Notices were sent to abutting landowners
- Notices were sent to members of the Community Panel, submitters to the Draft Framework Plan and community groups
- A notice was placed in the Surf Coast Times, Echo and Government Gazette

In addition, meetings were held with key community groups (including Bellbrae Residents Association, 3228 RA and SANE) to brief them on the PSP and a display was erected in the foyer of the Council office for the duration of the exhibition period.

The amendment and supporting documents were available for viewing at the Council office, on Council's Surf Coast Conversations website and on the website of the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.

Environmental Implications

The PSP is informed by detailed biodiversity, arboricultural, aboriginal heritage and land capability assessments. The plan provides for 38 hectares of conservation and waterway/drainage reserves and seeks to retain as many Bellarine Yellow Gums as possible. The Native Vegetation Precinct Plan regulates which native vegetation can be removed and which must be retained. The PSP encourages environmentally sustainable development and includes kangaroo management principles to ensure the existing kangaroo population does not become landlocked by future development.

Two major developers (Amex and Parklea) have registered for the Urban Development Institute's EnviroDevelopment Programme, which is a nationally recognised independent technical assessment tool that encourages developers to exceed minimum sustainability standards.

Communication

Submitters will have the opportunity to address the Hearing of Submissions Committee and submitters will be advised of Council's decision on the amendment following the August Council meeting.

Conclusion

The submissions received in relation to Amendment C114 detail a number of matters that need to be considered and these are presented to Council via the Hearing of Submissions meeting.

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

APPENDIX 1 SUBMITTERS WHO HAVE REGISTERED TO SPEAK

Planning Scheme Amendment C114
Hearing of Submissions – Tuesday 12 July 2016

Submitters who have registered to speak:

	Name	Submission No	Visual presentation
1	Peter Raines	1	
2	John Jacoby	6	
3	Jennifer & John Walker	7	*
4	Bill Welsh	29	
5	Brian & Jill Pocklington	4	
6	Grant Norris	60	
7	Don Welsh (Parklea)	65	
8	Anthony Jansen (AMEX)	42	*
9	Dale Tepper	37	
10	Don Lawrie	56	
11	Nicola Smith (Niche Planning Studio)	43	*
12	Alison McAdam	13	
13	Cindy Jacobs	44	

1.1 Amendment C114 - Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan

APPENDIX 2 SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

**Amendment C114 – Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan
Summary of Submissions**

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
1	Adjoining landowners	<p>Raise concerns relating to the western boundary interface with rural properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not show the setback of the internal road and how far from the fence line houses will be allowed to be constructed. Lots should be 4,000m² along the western boundary. Abutting landowners were not specifically consulted when the plan was drafted and were not allowed to join the Community Panel. Loss of rural atmosphere, loss of privacy, loss of views, noise and dust during construction and ongoing, major increase of traffic on Grossmans Road, impact on livestock from possible incursion by new neighbours, current kangaroo herds will migrate onto property during construction, property devaluation. There should be a significant “green wedge” between our east boundary and any housing or roads in the new development to provide a barrier. The group of large significant trees close to the western boundary should not be destroyed, but will not be able to be incorporated in the size of blocks currently shown on the plan. Objects to the routing of the main water supply line to the planned new development outside the precinct’s western boundary. This, and any other utilities, should be located within the development area.
2	Barwon Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to correspondence previously submitted to the Draft Framework Plan in relation to the provision of servicing infrastructure. This confirms that Barwon Water can provide water and sewerage to the Spring Creek precinct. The provision of Class A recycled water via a dual pipe system is not viable due to the high cost and limited demand. Does not object to the amendment provided references to the provision of recycled water via a dual pipe system are removed from the PSP.
3	Southern Rural Water	No objection
4	Adjoining landowners	Request that a 300 metre exclusion zone be applied around the egg farm to any housing opposite in Spring Creek to safeguard the operation of the farm.
5	Resident, Bellbrae	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the way the westward boundary is designed to minimise the likelihood of western expansion. Does not support two new sets of traffic lights at either end of Strathmore Drive. One set should be adequate. The plan does not provide for any new active play areas. No new public school planned. The education department planning has been in error before. Supports the building restrictions and varying block sizes. A small retail area (coffee shop/store) should be encouraged in the north area.
6	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Suggests use of roundabouts.
7	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to urban development of Spring Creek – loss of rural feel, traffic, noise, suburbia. Construction of a supermarket is unnecessary. Council should do whatever it can to minimise the impact of this development.
8	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the amendment.
9	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road, in particular at Strathmore Drive East. Development should be restricted to 1km west of Duffields Road, not 1.47km as proposed.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
10	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Would affect traffic flows and Strathmore Drive is not suitable for increased traffic due to current conditions.
11	Spring Creek landowner	Requests a trafficable culvert/bridge crossing over Spring Creek to provide improved internal connections, alleviate traffic on Duffields Road and provide a better alignment for a sewer main and the pedestrian link.
12	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Should consider T-intersections or roundabouts.
13	Resident, Jan Juc	Expresses concerns about the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road, in particular at Strathmore Drive East as would exacerbate existing traffic issues. Requests that this intersection be deleted from the PSP, with an intersection at Strathmore Drive West only.
14	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West as this would affect traffic flows and the amenity and attraction of the area as a tourist destination. Suggests a better alternative is parallel service roads and roundabouts.
15	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the Amendment for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed lots are too small Overdevelopment devaluing the coastal town feel, increasing population, traffic and congestion, affecting local environment and habitat The statement to 'protect as many stands of Bellarine Yellow Gum and individual trees as possible' should be replaced with 'protect ALL stands of Bellarine Yellow Gum and individual trees'.
16	Resident, Jan Juc	Questions the need for the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Council should consider roundabouts or only one set of traffic lights.
17	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Suggests the Great Ocean Road between Spring Creek and Bellbrae Roundabout should be dual lane divided highway. Vehicles travelling from Bellbrae could have access via left hand turn. Other access should be via Duffields Road.
18	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Council should consider other solutions, e.g. a staggered entrance to Spring Creek. Expresses disappointment with further development of the area. Severe planning restrictions should be in place to limit development.
19	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Council should consider free flowing traffic solutions like staggered intersections.
20	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West.
21	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West as they will affect traffic flows and cause people to avoid the area.
22	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West due to the impact on traffic flows, congestion and safety; and the effect on the aesthetics of the historic gateway and coastal environment.
23	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the size and location of the neighbourhood shopping centre. Supports the road connections to the Great Ocean Road, because Duffields Road and Great Ocean Views Estate should not have to bear the brunt of all future traffic from Spring Creek. Does not support 3228 RA's plan regarding access.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
24	Resident, Jan Juc	Questions the need for more traffic lights on the Great Ocean Road. Other options should be considered to assist traffic flows.
25	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes a right hand arrow is needed at Great Ocean Road/Duffields Road when turning right from Duffields Road (coming from Spring Creek). Questions the need for two more sets of traffic lights at Strathmore Drive. Other more free flowing traffic solutions should be considered, e.g. roundabouts, speed limits or other engineering options before adding more traffic lights.
26	Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR)	<p>Public Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed connector road network and associated cross sections provide opportunity for an effective bus service. The location of higher density residential development, community facilities and neighbourhood centre maximises public transport accessibility and facilitates existing bus services to service the south eastern portion of the precinct. Plan 7 of the PSP incorrectly shows an existing bus route along Strathmore Drive West. The provision of bus stop infrastructure should be included in the Developer Contributions Plan. <p>Arterial Roads and Intersections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The spacing and number of intersections proposed on the Great Ocean Road (GOR) will have an adverse impact on traffic flows along the GOR. This can be mitigated by consolidating the number of intersections. The location of the intersection on the GOR at the western precinct boundary is acceptable, but functional layout plans and a detailed traffic impact assessment are required to assess the operational and safety impacts on the GOR. For safety and operational reasons the proposed service road along the GOR must have a minimum 80m separation from the GOR at the connector road intersection at Strathmore Drive West. The following note should be added to Plan 7: "Access to the school and kindergarten must be provided via the internal road network before the connector road and intersection with the Great Ocean Road is created". The intersection of GOR and Strathmore Drive East must be removed. The intersection at Strathmore Drive West must be the primary connector road access point. The agreed interim access for Christian College from GOR is too close to the proposed intersection at Strathmore Drive West. Alternative access to the school should be considered. Measures should be implemented to discourage traffic from using Ocean View Crescent. <p>Active Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location of the potential regional bicycle path on the north side of GOR must be agreed with VicRoads. The off-road bicycle path on the south side of GOR must be removed as there is insufficient room for this to be safely accommodated within the road reserve. The off-road shared path network within the southern portion of the precinct should be extended to complete the link between the creek and GOR.
27	Spring Creek landowners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the proposed larger lot sizes on their property. Submit that 600-900m² should be applied as land can be fully serviced and should be developed to its full potential. Object to the area of public open space on their property.
28	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to development west of Duffields Road due to high wildfire risk and impact on natural environment (duty of care). Requests reconsideration of Torquay/Jan Juc as a growth node by State and local government.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the event the development is approved then the low growth option proposed by the Alternative Community Plan Group should be considered.
29	Resident, Grossmans Road	Raises issues about the current state of Grossmans Road with development at Ghazeeopore. Feels landowners on the south side between Messmate and Ashmore are disadvantaged and are caught between larger land holders and housing blocks. Requests that Council meet with the small landowners to discuss this issue.
30	Residents, Torquay	Express concern about the level of residential development proposed and strongly support the Community Vision Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan created by the Local Residents Association.
31	Resident, Anglesea	Supports the Community Vision for the Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan advocated by local community groups.
32	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West due to the impact on traffic flows and increased traffic volumes on Strathmore Drive. Supports the plan prepared by 3228 RA with traffic directed onto Duffields Road.
33	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to the proposed lot density and suggests there should be less lots and more larger lots - up to 4000m² - in the north and along the western boundary, similar and in keeping with lot sizes in Ocean Acres. Considers another shopping centre is unjustified. There should be no entry/exits to Great Ocean Road which would need to be signalised.
34	Resident, Torquay	Objects to the proposed signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road at Strathmore Drive East and West. Roundabouts would be a better solution.
35	Residents, Jan Juc	Supports the Community Vision for the Spring Creek Precinct Structure Plan.
36	Surf Coast Energy Group (SCEG)	Raises concerns about the effects of urban sprawl, climate change, species decline and sustainability. Submits there should be a minimum of 27% public open space as per the community groups' plan for Spring Creek to respond to biodiversity decline and to provide suitable wildlife habitat corridor, forming the basis for "corridor for life botanic gardens" and 21 st century sustainable growth.
37	Spring Creek landowners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointed in the Community Panel process. Concerned about the effects of development, including traffic problems and overcrowding. Requests deletion of internal service roads along Grossmans and Duffields Roads. One acre allotments should back onto these roads to protect and integrate with roadside trees. Wind breaking trees should not be removed. Possums that inhabit these trees should be relocated where trees are removed. The Kangaroo Management Plan is not reflective of the community's view of the need for a wildlife corridor through which wildlife could move freely. Roundabouts should be included on the Great Ocean Road instead of traffic lights. The process is being rushed and many people in the community are unaware of the scale of the development. The timing of the development should be delayed Traffic on Grossmans and Duffields Roads has increased in the past 12 months. New traffic surveys should be undertaken to inform proper planning of road infrastructure. Residents should be protected from dust once construction starts.
38	Adjoining landowners	Concerned about the effects of development in Spring Creek, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in traffic and need to upgrade roads Need for a primary school for local children Residents need more than only one convenience store to enable walking to shops and a sense of community

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade of services required • Poor provision of public transport • Increase in vermin and pest animals. Displacement of kangaroos. Threat of wandering cats and dogs onto adjoining rural land. • Loss of key vistas and vantage points • Soil runoff issues with small house blocks • Amenity impacts from suburban development
39	Rural Estates	Detailed submission which submits that Council should have taken a broader view of the Spring Creek Valley and implemented the recommendations of the C66 Panel which suggested key links be provided to the area west of the UGZ boundary. Submits that the UGZ western boundary should not be the final town boundary and criticises the community panel process and Council's regard to politics rather than planning.
40	Department of Environment, Water, Land and Planning (DELWP)	Supports the key conservation strategies identified, including the retention of the large area of Bellarine Yellow Gum woodland south of Spring Creek and the protective buffer around Spring Creek. The Department is willing to provide a submission to Panel. Submits that more work is required on the rationale behind native vegetation proposed for retention or removal and that more detailed investigation on vegetation loss is required. DELWP does not object to the 'practical retention' category but recommends more work on the detail of application. The submission also makes further detailed recommendations on kangaroo management, threatened species and overlays to promote biodiversity outcomes.
41	Reeds Consulting representing Mondous	Comprehensive submission criticising: larger lot sizes, specific plot ratios, drainage reserves, conservation reserves, removal of road connection to Grossmans Road, density and retention of significant vegetation on private land and makes detailed suggested changes to the PSP. Criticises lack of information on the DCP and requirements for subdivision.
42	AMEX Corporation	Comprehensive submission disagreeing with the low prescribed average density, over-prescription of built form controls and subsequent diversity of housing, the included street cross sections and the stormwater management plan. Submits that greater clarity is required in the NVPP and DCP. Makes specific suggestions for alterations to the UGZ Schedule for lots less than 300m ² , local convenience centres, buildings above 7.5m permit trigger and restrictions on title for the residential design controls. Provides detailed list of suggested changes to the PSP.
43	Niche Planning Studio representing Mack Property Development	Comprehensive submission criticising a number of elements, in particular the biodiversity outcomes, Native Vegetation Precinct Plan and conservation reserve on 200 and 220 Great Ocean Road. Also disagrees with the large buffer to Spring Creek, the low density targets and the lack of diversity of housing. Recommends lot sizes of 500-600 square metres within walking distance of the community facility and shopping centre. Submits that the conservation reserve for Bellarine Yellow Gums should be included as part of their unencumbered 10% public open space contribution. Submits that consultant reports on biodiversity, traffic management, road network and design, and stormwater reach different conclusions to Council's consultant reports and PSP.
44	Adjoining landowner	Raises concerns relating to the western boundary interface with rural properties and requests the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 15m wide green break between rural and residential properties and secure dog-proof fencing to protect existing farming activities (incl. horses) and privacy. • Minimum 4,000m² lots along the western boundary with a minimum 20m building setback. • Retention of existing fire emergency exit onto adjoining property • Provision of suitable habitat for wildlife to avoid relocation of kangaroos onto rural land.
45	Resident	Objects to the signalised intersections at Strathmore Drive East and West. Submits

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
		staggered intersections or roundabouts would be a better option.
46	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the signalised intersections at Strathmore Drive East and West.
47	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the signalised intersections at Strathmore Drive. Submits roundabouts would be a better solution.
48	Resident, Torquay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased traffic and noise on Ocean View Crescent and Duffields road. Loss of beautiful rural tree view and loss of vegetation and space for wildlife. High density lots (less than one acre) and shops creating much more traffic.
49	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is opposed to the rezoning of the land west of Duffields Road for residential purposes against the wishes of the majority of the people. This is a golden opportunity for the Council to be responsible for our environment and our current amenity. Objects to expansion of the boundary to 1.47km from Duffields Road instead of 1km. Objects to traffic lights at Strathmore Drive. There should be no new entry points onto the Great Ocean Road from Spring Creek. Traffic generated by the subdivision should be directed to Duffields Road. A service road could be used on the north side of the Great Ocean Road between Duffields Road and Strathmore Drive west which would feed towards Duffields Road. Alternatively, if traffic is to enter the Great Ocean Road from Spring Creek, it would be better to have left hand turns only, or if all that fails, roundabouts. Supports the Residents 3228 plan for the area.
50	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the signalised intersections at Strathmore Drive East and West. Suggests staggered intersections or roundabouts.
51	Resident, Torquay	Objects to traffic lights at Strathmore Drive.
52	Resident, Bells Beach	Is of the understanding that the development was to extend 1km west of Duffields Road, not the 1.47km that the plan seems to encompass. Is opposed to any development further than 1km west of Duffields Road.
53	Resident, Jan Juc	Objects to the signalised intersections at Strathmore Drive East and West. Suggests staggered intersections.
54	Resident, Torquay	Objects to the amendment.
55	Resident, Torquay	Objects to number of traffic lights. Development needs to be capped. Surf Coast is losing its uniqueness and becoming just another Geelong suburb.
56	Adjoining landowners	<p>Raises concerns relating to the western boundary interface with rural properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on rural amenity/lifestyle and equestrian activities Adjoining landowners were not adequately consulted and were not allowed to join the community panel Need for a proper vegetation buffer, larger lots and dog-proof fencing along western boundary The proposed Torquay West Feeder Main along the western boundary should be located within the PSP area, not on adjoining rural land Existing fire emergency exit onto adjoining property should be retained Bend on Grossmans Road should be realigned and speed limit reduced to 60km/h to increase safety to cope with increased traffic Plan should provide for water and gas connection to 231 and 235 Grossmans Road Staging of development should commence along Duffields Road Provision should be made for kangaroos to live within the precinct rather than being diverted onto adjacent rural land Questions what effect will be on council rates and property values Likelihood of complaints from urban residents As land will become less viable for farming in a few years time, it should be rezoned to low density residential, together with land up to Ashmore Drive

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
57	Christian College	<p>Supports the PSP as presented - in principle - with the following suggested improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of a third street frontage on the western school boundary. • The "off-road shared path" shown on "Plan 7" should continue to the school. • A secondary vehicular access across the creek would enable a safer and more convenient access for families on the northern side of the valley to access the school. • 10 dwellings per net developable hectare is very low and will make the Spring Creek valley an extremely 'land-hungry' development - contrary to sustainability objective "O1". Part of the original planning rationale behind the smaller lot sizes (500-600m²) on Parklea's land on Duffields Rd was because it was surrounding a possible school (now not going ahead) - and so the same, sensible planning rationale for smaller lot sizes should apply around this school that is going ahead. • A 75m setback from either side of the 10-year flood level along the creek ("R25") is excessive - it is a mostly dry drainage line this far up the valley. • "R15" provides for the responsible authority to alter the distribution of public open space. This should probably reflect that this can be initiated by the land owner.
58	Resident, Torquay	Submits that the vegetation, flora and land needs to be protected not developed.
59	Resident, Grossmans Road	Objects to the proposed lot sizes on the western boundary and requests lots of 0.4 to 1ha to provide a suitable transition between urban and rural land.
60	Resident, Torquay	Seeks a balance between development and conservation of environment and wildlife and is concerned about overdevelopment of Torquay.
61	Resident, Jan Juc	Concerned about traffic impacts on Strathmore Drive.
62	Spring Creek landowner	<p>Generally supports the PSP, but seeks resolution of a number of issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of land required for conservation, open space and waterway reserves, drainage assets and vegetation retention • Location of local access road and connector road • Supports 1,500-2,000m² lots provided direct access from Grossmans Rd is permitted • Whether larger lots can be exempt from connecting to reticulated sewer
63	Resident, Torquay	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The density is inappropriate for the area. Lots along the western boundary should be 4,000m² to provide suitable transition to rural land. Land between the western boundary and Ashmore Road should be rezoned to LDZR. • The plan provides insufficient provision for wildlife management, in particular kangaroos.
64	Resident, Jan Juc	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density too high. More larger lots required (up to 4,000m²) • No need for another shopping centre • There should be no entry/exits onto Great Ocean Road • The PSP gives insufficient regard to climate change, loss of biodiversity and the accommodation of kangaroos • Consultation has been poor and information hard to access or understand • 7.5m height limit should not be discretionary • The alternative community plan for Spring Creek has been ignored in the PSP
65	Parklea Developments	<p>Comprehensive submission regarding the Neighbourhood Activity Centre, dwelling density, site coverage and lot controls, building height and transport and movement. Submits that due to the slope of the land and other factors the NAC will require approximately 3 hectares of land rather than the 2.1 ha shown on the PSP. Contends that medium or high density housing should be permitted around the shopping centre and smaller lots within a walkable catchment of the centre.</p>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
		Believes site coverage controls should vary according to allotment size, and does not support the large front, side and rear setback controls proposed. Makes specific recommended changes to road cross section, traffic management and intersection treatments.
66	3228 Residents Association	Does not support the exhibited plan for Spring Creek but supports the alternative community plan. Submits that much of the state planning work and guidelines for PSPs relate to Melbourne and not a regional town. Does not support the lot sizes in the PSP and believes the minimum lot size should be .4 ha. Submits that Torquay has sufficient lot supply for housing for the next 14 years and therefore lower density development can be planned in Spring Creek. To reduce visual impact, requests that Council rezones the majority of land to Low Density Residential with a target of 2.5 lots per hectare. The submission also criticises the community panel process, and provides commentary on Torquay/Jan Juc 2040. Does not support access to the Great Ocean Road, the level of open space or the removal of any existing native flora or fauna. They support the location of the commercial area and pedestrian and bike paths but suggest improvements to specific matters or further investigation.
67	Adjoining landowners	Object on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on habitat and vegetation • Removal of windbreak trees will cause wind tunnel and loss of possums • Other (flatter) areas of Torquay are more suitable for development • Plan does not provide clear details of exact roads, paths and amenities
68	Resident	Does not support the PSP in its current form as it would damage valuable environmental assets and provide for unsustainable development. Supports the Community Vision for Spring Creek.
69	Resident	Submits there should be a fire exit/access on the north east side of Fernbach Drive for 231 Grossmans Road. Queries the future of land west of the Spring Creek UGZ and supports Low Density Residential Zone for that area.
70	Resident, Jan Juc	Submits that Council should negotiate more than 10% open space in the precinct to protect native flora and fauna, and all Torquay/Jan Juc should have mandatory planting of indigenous plants. Allotments should be orientated towards the north for free energy. Has concerns with the amount of increased traffic down Strathmore/Domain Road, especially during summer months and holidays.
71	Adjoining landowner	Raises concerns relating to the western boundary interface with rural properties.
72	Surfrider Foundation Surf Coast	Does not support development west of Duffields Road. Supports the alternative community plan for Spring Creek due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The larger lot sizes • Permanent western boundary • No road connection to the Great Ocean Road • Protection of coastal vistas and Great Ocean Road • Protection of Spring Creek including 100m buffer on the south side and 75m on the north side • Protection of Bellarine Yellow Gums and use of them as street trees • Development of the area will put families at risk of bushfire. Clearing will lead to species decline.
73	Resident, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not support any development west of Duffields Road and is concerned about the impacts on the environment and wildlife. • Does not support two new sets of traffic signals on Great Ocean Road or another shopping centre. • Concerns with road cross sections and lack of stormwater treatment swales. • Supports the alternative community plan for the site and lower density.
74	Resident, Grossmans Road	Queries what the future will be for the balance of the Spring Creek valley. Objects to 231 Grossmans Road not having access from Fernbach Lane and queries the water main.

Sub. No.	Submitter	Issues Raised
75	Resident	Queries what the future will be for the balance of the Spring Creek valley between 1km and Bellbrae.
76	Resident	Recommends more thought for fire escape plans and access for emergency vehicles.
77	Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA)	Note that they have had involvement in the Integrated Water Cycle Management Plan for Spring Creek and the Stormwater Modelling Report. Has no objection and do not seek to make a submission to the Panel Hearing.
78	PJC Co	Comprehensive submission raising the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stormwater strategy is ill conceived and not suitable for the site. • The extent of allocated open space is a significant burden on the property. Seek clarification as to how the credited open space areas were determined and why they do not include encumbered land that is suitable for open space. • The proposed building design controls will create an onerous building environment with forced second storeys. • The proposed prohibition of second dwellings will prevent any granny flats, units or dual occupancies, which is inconsistent with housing diversity policies. If the residential character objectives can be achieved then the number of dwellings on a lot is irrelevant.
79	Residents, Jan Juc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The advertised distance along the Great Ocean Road as 1km is wrong; the distance is just over 1.5km. • Object to road connections to the great Ocean Road and traffic signals at Strathmore Drive. Past subdivisions have been designed without consideration of bus requirements with the width of all roads insufficient to accommodate large buses or extra traffic. A safer alternative would be directing traffic via existing and more direct routes of Duffields Road and not the highly populated streets of Strathmore Drive east and west. • The subdivision will destroy the wildlife and vegetation.

Close: There being no further items of business the meeting closed at 5.45pm.