

AMENDMENT C114 – SPRING CREEK PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN – RESPONSE TO PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
The Precinct Structure Plan generally			
1	Update the PSP to reflect the Panel's suggested changes detailed throughout this report and listed in Appendix E.		Make required changes as appropriate
2	Council review the wording of its regulations and guidelines where applicable to ensure that the terms 'must' and 'should' are appropriately placed.	Accepted	Make required changes as appropriate
Western Growth Boundary			
3	Council include 'urban growth potential' for the balance of Spring Creek with appropriate community engagement as part of its Rural Hinterland Futures Project.	This recommendation goes beyond the scope of the amendment. Urban growth further to the west is not contemplated by Council's strategic planning policies, including the SFP2040 and Clause 21.08 Torquay Jan Juc Framework Plan, and was not entertained by the former Minister for Planning upon rezoning of Spring Creek to UGZ. Land between Bellbrae and the western town boundary is designated as a green break.	Not supported
4	Provide a notation on the PSP showing the area south-west of the PSP boundary as a 'Strategic Investigation Area.	As above	Not supported
Road Network			
5	VicRoads and Council review the decision to delete the signalisation of the Great Ocean Road/Strathmore Drive East/connector street intersection as proposed in the exhibited PSP in favour of un-signalised staggered T-intersections.	Upon further discussions with Council, VicRoads has confirmed its preference for an un-signalised T-intersection. VicRoads is confident that such an arrangement would work satisfactorily in combination with a pedestrian crossing.	Confirm the decision to replace the signalised intersection at Great Ocean Road/Strathmore Drive East with an un-signalised left in/left out intersection.
6	Should the review confirm the decision to replace the signalisation of the intersection with un-signalised staggered T-intersections, the PSP Plan 7 (Road Network, Public Transport and Trail) be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) show a re-aligned north south access street to create a T-intersection with the Great Ocean Road approximately midway between Strathmore Drive East and Torquay Boulevard b) change the designation of the north south access street from Connector Street to Local Access Street – Level 2 c) include an additional connection from the north south access street to Duffields Road south of Ocean View Crescent subject to resolution of the environmental and sight distance issues raised by Council. 	Accepted	Amend PSP Plan 7 as per Panel recommendation

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
7	<p>Should the review confirm the decision to replace the signalisation of the intersection with un-signalised staggered T-intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a pedestrian refuge should be constructed as part of the T-intersection as an interim measure b) VicRoads and Council should monitor pedestrian and cyclist numbers crossing the Great Ocean Road and traffic volumes with the view to installing pedestrian activated traffic signals when warranted 	Accepted	Include the provision of a pedestrian crossing in the PSP and investigate whether it could be included as a DCP item.
8	As development occurs in the Spring Creek precinct, Council should monitor the increase in traffic volumes on Ocean View Crescent to determine whether the installation of traffic calming measures to discourage through traffic is warranted.	Accepted	Monitoring to occur at the appropriate time
Stormwater and drainage			
9	<p>Redraft the PSP section 3.6.1 Integrated water cycle management, the annotation to Plan 8 Integrated Water Management as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) make it clear and explicit that the PSP requirements with respect to the water management system and the location of drainage infrastructure are indicative only and can be amended at the subdivision approval stage b) provide clarity and future guidance for the assessment by the responsible authority of development proposals. c) Amend R55 to state: Final methodology, design and boundary of waterway and drainage reserves and infrastructure, including retarding basins, stormwater quality treatment infrastructure and associated paths, boardwalks, bridges and planting is to be agreed at the time of making an application for subdivision to the satisfaction of the responsible authority and the catchment management authority where required. 	Accepted. Consistent with Council's recommendation to the Panel.	Redraft relevant PSP sections
10	<p>Amend PSP Plan 8 Integrated Water Management as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) delete WL15 and WL21 b) provide a conceptual layout in place of these deleted water bodies to show water management infrastructure at a downstream location. 	Further work is required to consider the appropriateness of deleting these waterbodies.	Review appropriateness of deleting waterbodies
11	Council give further consideration in consultation with affected landholders to mechanisms to provide for the equalisation of contributions to shared water management infrastructure.	Accepted	Investigate equalisation mechanisms
12	<p>Add the following sentence at the end of R70 to state: ...unless the liability arises pursuant to an agreement under section 173 of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>, in which case Council is obliged to satisfy the liability in accordance with the agreement.</p>	Accepted	Redraft R70

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
Biodiversity			
13	Amend the wording of R23 of the PSP to allow for a permit application to remove native vegetation identified for protection in the NVPP.	Accepted	Redraft R23
14	Council consider using the best part of GW5 as a net gain native vegetation offset, with consideration of appropriate public access that manages identified threats and protects the values of the biodiversity asset.	Council's position at the Panel was that it opposed acceptance of the site as an offset site given the ongoing management responsibilities that would be placed on Council and restrictions on public access.	Investigate the advantages and disadvantages of accepting the patch as an offset site to inform a final position
15	Remove SRW1 from the PSP and NVPP as vegetation proposed for retention in a conservation reserve.	To date Council has not been able to produce evidence that public funding was used for the planting of trees within this vegetation patch.	Continue investigations into possible public funding
16	Review the status of native vegetation at 160 and 195 Grossmans Road, and amend the Biodiversity Assessment and NVPP accordingly.	Accepted	Undertake further review of vegetation on these properties
Open space			
17	Council should prepare a detailed assessment of how active open space needs of Spring Creek residents will be met, and review the requirement for passive open space contribution accordingly, to achieve a passive and active open space contribution of no more than 10 percent, and in line with the Open Space Strategy and Community Infrastructure Assessment.	Recommendation is contrary to aim of providing a natural open space system based around waterways and conservation reserves.	Undertake further work to justify the proposed open space provision and identify unconstrained areas for active use
18	Review waterway buffer widths and amend these in association with the review of open space provision, in response to site specific considerations and constraints such as amenity, topography and the need for open space linkages.	Recommendation is contrary to aim of providing generous creek buffers that protect waterways, remnant vegetation and aboriginal cultural heritage and provide for wildlife corridors and recreational use (walking/cycling trails).	Review site specific technical information to establish the width and alignment of buffers
19	Review the distribution of local and neighbourhood parks to ensure that provision within 400 metres of at least 95 percent all dwellings is achieved.	Recommendation is contrary to aim of providing a natural open space system based around waterways and conservation reserves.	Undertake further work to justify the proposed open space provision
20	If part of GW5 is secured as a net gain offset and Council is not able to manage this asset, then a suitable alternative land manager be secured.	It is unlikely that there is a land manager other than Council that would be willing to adopt management responsibility of the reserve.	Developer's responsibility to pursue alternate land manager
21	Amend the native vegetation patch identified as GW5 on 200-220 Great Ocean Road as follows: a) re-shape to minimise the boundary to area ratio b) include credited open space in the south western patch that has a degraded understorey and sparse trees, c) develop this south western patch as a Bellarine Yellow Gum reserve that is sensitively designed and managed for passive open space that protects and respects the environmental values of this area.	If the patch is to be developed and managed as a Bellarine Yellow Gum reserve then it should be designated as a conservation reserve rather than credited public open space. The degraded understorey would be able to regenerate if it was fenced and managed for conservation purposes.	Review the configuration and use options of vegetation patch GW5 at 200-220 Great Ocean Road, in relation to public access and use of the south-western degraded portion as credited open space

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
22	Relocate OS-08 local park to incorporate trees 41 – 47.	Accepted. Consistent with Council's recommendation.	Amend PSP
23	Review the size and configuration of OS-01, OS-02 and OS-13, and resize based on strategic justification for environmental or open space purposes.	Review as necessary and include in the review of open space across the precinct.	As per response to Recommendation 17
24	Council should determine a suitable treatment for the southern boundary of 231 Grossmans Road to ensure open space continuity, for example public open space along the waterway with fence to the northern side of the creek.	Accepted in principle	Review options
Density			
25	Amend O5 to read: Provide for a range of residential densities that reduce along Spring Creek and Grossmans Road, near rural land, and increase to allow the creation of lots of less than 600 square metres within a reasonable walking distance of the neighbourhood activity centre and the school.	Accepted	Amend PSP
26	Add G18 to state: Greater housing diversity is encouraged within a reasonable walking distance of the neighbourhood activity centre and the school.	Accepted	Amend PSP
27	Amend the land budget and associated mapping highlighting density accordingly, with a view to increasing densities to at least 12-13 dwellings per hectare.	Accepted in principle for smaller lots around the Neighbourhood Activity Centre (NAC) and school site.	Investigate options to expand the area of 500-600m ² lots around the NAC / school and consider pockets of medium density housing immediately adjacent to the NAC
Activity Centres & Community Facilities			
28	Amend the UGZ Schedule to ensure that early delivery of the NAC can be considered through a planning permit application with supporting evidence.	Accepted	Amend UGZ1
29	Reinstate the asterix on Map 1 of the UGZ and Plan 5 of the PSP denoting a Local Convenience Centre in the northern precinct.	Accepted	Amend Map 1 of UGZ and Map 5 of PSP
30	Add the following guideline in relation to Community Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where the responsible authority is satisfied that land shown as a local community facility on Plan 3 is unlikely to be used for that purpose, that land may be used for an alternative purpose which is generally consistent with the surrounding land uses and the provisions of the applied zone. 	Accepted	Amend PSP
Drafting issues			
31	Delete G17.	Accepted	Amend PSP
32	Insert the following preamble above Table 2 of the Residential Design Control to state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This table constitutes the residential design controls contemplated by Clause 4.7 of Schedule 1 to the Urban Growth Zone. These controls should inform the Memorandum of Common Provisions required by Clause 4.7 of Urban Growth 	Not accepted. Drafting in the manner proposed by the Panel would result in the application of the RDC's being optional to the discretion of the relevant developer. There will be no guarantee that a developer will apply the RDC's or a developer	Not supported. Maintain the RDC's as mandatory provisions.

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
	Zone Schedule 1, and may be adopted in full or part as either mandatory or discretionary provisions, in conjunction with an application for subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. These controls may also be varied at the discretion of the Responsible Authority.	may cherry pick the elements that suit a particular development.	
33	Amend the following controls within Table 2 of the Residential Design Control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDC-3: minimum front setbacks to 4.0 metres and 3.0 metres for side setbacks across all columns. • RDC-5: The area of a lot covered by buildings should not exceed 35 per cent • RDC-6: At least 40 per cent of a lot must be available for the planting of vegetation and provision of permeable surfaces (excludes driveways and tennis courts of all surface types) 	Reduction in front setback to 4m not supported for 600-900m ² and 1500-2000m ² lots. Should be kept at 6m. Consider reducing to 5m for 500-600m ² lots. Replaces 'must' with 'should' Reduces permeable area from 50% to 40%	Undertake further work to justify the application of the design controls.
34	At section 3.2, in the first paragraph delete the words "co-located with" and replace them with "and".	Accepted	Amend PSP
35	Delete R8 and redraft as a Guideline. As a guideline, amend the following dot points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third: Provide staging (if relevant) and indicative timing of the development • Fourth: If appropriate, incorporate public transport services into the design of the centre • Eighth: Address interim management of the land required for longer term expansion (if relevant having regard to any staging and timing of development) so that the land is not kept in an unattractive or neglected state for long periods. 	Redrafting as a guideline is not supported, as the requirement for a Concept Plan for the NAC should be a mandatory requirement. The drafting changes to the dot points are accepted.	Retain requirement for a Concept Plan as a requirement
36	Redraft R10 and after the words "as illustrated on Plan 5", insert the words "or by reference to an approved Concept Plan pursuant to Clause 2.6 of UGZ1".	Accepted	Amend PSP
37	Delete R12.	Accepted (to be replaced as a guideline under G18A)	Amend PSP
38	Delete the words "car parking and" from G18.	Accepted	Amend PSP
39	Insert the following new Guidelines: G18A Buildings within the neighbourhood centre must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary vehicle access from the connector street • Positive and active building frontages addressed towards to the adjoining street network • Service and loading areas that manage amenity impacts the surrounding residential area. 	Accepted (redrafts the requirements of R12 as a guideline)	Amend PSP
40	Insert G18B: Address the Activity Centre Design Guidelines as appropriate having regard to the context, scale and topography of the neighbourhood centre.	Not accepted. Retain as a requirement under R8.	
41	Insert G18C: Demonstrate how the neighbourhood centre provides for a range of compatible commercial, residential and community uses.	Not accepted. Retain as a requirement under R8.	
42	Insert G18D: Provide appropriate opportunities for higher density housing or	Not accepted. Retain as a requirement under R8.	

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
	specialised accommodation such as serviced apartments, aged care or retirement living.		
43	Insert G18E: Locate and design car parking areas to manage negative amenity impacts.	Not accepted. Retain as a requirement under R8.	
44	Insert G18F: Locate and design service areas for deliveries and waste disposal including access for larger vehicles with measures that manage impacts on adjoining areas.	Not accepted. Retain as a requirement under R8.	
Urban Growth Zone Schedule			
45	Amend Schedule 1 to the UGZ as outlined in Appendix D and make any consequential changes as a result of amendments to the PSP.	Accepted in principle, unless where otherwise recommended in this report.	Review drafting changes recommended by Panel
Further recommendations			
46	Council should work with DELWP to review and refine the NVPP, to include a rationale for native vegetation proposed for retention and removal, and respond to the specific matters raised by DELWP, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimisation strategy • Review of the NVPP to minimise specific offsets • Roadside vegetation inclusion • Biodiversity Impact and Offset Requirements (BIOR) report • Clearly explain vegetation for practical retention • Rewording tree protection zone requirements • Information that explains the difference between specific and general offsets, and the offset requirements of landholders. 	Accepted	Work with DELWP to refine and update the NVPP
47	The impact of climate change should be modelled for stormwater for the precinct, and to ensure that design detail for each stage of the development demonstrates a response to this modelling.	Advice provided previously by Council's consultants on the impact of climate change confirmed that the proposed stormwater management approach, combined with the natural topography of the site, has enough built in conservativeness to cater for events outside of those modelled in the Study such as the possible effect of climate change.	Update the stormwater modelling report to include reference to the likely impact of climate change

Other recommendations in the Panel report that are not included in the list of recommendations

No.	Panel Recommendation	Officer Response	Proposed Action
Biodiversity			
A	In relation to wildlife and kangaroos, the Panel supports DELWP's recommendations and Council's proposal to include Kangaroo Management Principles in the PSP and Construction Environmental Management Plans.	Support noted	Redraft PSP and UGZ1
B	Council should undertake further work to understand climate change impacts on native vegetation across the site, and determine suitable revegetation species.	Accepted in principle. Council could consider preparing a landscape planting list for Spring Creek.	Prepare a landscape planting list for Spring Creek.
Climate change and environmental sustainability			
C	More comprehensive application of Appendix F to achieve the goal of environmentally sustainable development across the precinct.	As currently drafted, the PSP only requires a response to Appendix F in Section 3.2 (activity centres). The Panel's recommendation is supported and it is recommended that the sustainability principles also apply to residential development across the precinct.	Amend the PSP to require all development to consider the sustainability principles at Appendix F.
Open Space			
D	The Applied Zone Provisions in the exhibited UGZ1 should be amended to remove the open space categories PCRZ and PPRZ, and that these areas be rezoned once vested in Council.	Accepted. The exact size and location of open space and conservation reserves will be determined through detailed design at the subdivision stage.	Amend the UGZ1 to delete the PCRZ and PPRZ from the applied zone provisions.
E	The buffer arrangements along the western boundary as proposed by Council are appropriate.	Support noted.	Insert requirement for buffer into PSP.
Urban Growth Zone Schedule 1			
F	At Clause 2.8 of the UGZ1, increase the maximum building height to 9 metres (or 10m where slope exceeds 2.5 degrees)	Not supported. The 7.5m maximum building height proposed by Council is not a mandatory requirement but a permit trigger. Heights above 7.5m can be considered subject to a planning permit. Increasing the height to 9m as of right is not consistent with the rest of Torquay-Jan Juc and other coastal townships.	Reject Panel recommendation

Response to the Panel's recommended drafting changes to the PSP (Appendix E of the Panel Report)

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
1.0	Amend final sentence to "through the construction of approximately 2,400 dwellings to accommodate more than 6,000 people".	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	If density increases as per response to Rec 27, then population and housing estimates will require updating accordingly.
	Update population figure to account for density suggestions.	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	As above
1.1	Delete 2 nd dot point: <i>Enables the transition of non-urban land to urban land.</i>	Not supported. This is one of the key purposes of a PSP and the UGZ.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Delete reference to Open Space Strategy 2016-2026.	Not supported. The strategy is not a reference document in the Planning Scheme, but is an adopted document that has informed the PSP.	Agree with Council.	Noted
Plan 3	Change "residential (lot size 500-600m sq)" to "medium density residential (townhouses and terraced housing)".	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Change "residential (lot size 600-900m sq)" to conventional density residential (minimum average lot size at least 500m sq)".	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Remove "residential (lot size 1500-2000m sq)" category.	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Remove the waterway and drainage reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Review the conservation reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Delete open space OS-01 (encumbered and unencumbered) and waterway corridor/drainage asset from Property 2 (165 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	See rec 23.	See response to Rec 23
	Extend road to PSP boundary (260 Great Ocean Road).	Council does not support any roads terminating at the western boundary.	See rec 4. (southern portion)	Not supported. See response to Rec 4.
	Change designation of 1500-2000sqm lots along south-west boundary to residential (lot size 600-900sqm).	Not supported.	See rec 26, 27	Maintain larger lots along western boundary

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	Pedestrian access over Spring Creek to be realigned.	Council accepts that the location of the pedestrian bridge may be reviewed subject to further detailed site investigations.	Agree with Council.	Noted
	Local access road to be relocated closer to creek (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Council does not support a reduction to the creek buffers.	See rec 18	See response to Rec 18
	Waterway to be removed (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 10	See response to Rec 10
	Dam within open space to be relocated (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 10	See response to Rec 10
	Open space allocation to be reduced (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 17	See response to Rec 17
	Area of vegetation to be slightly reduced (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 21	See response to Rec 21
	Dam within vegetation to be removed (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 10	See response to Rec 10
	Higher density residential land to be encouraged around the school site (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 26	See response to Rec 26
	Dog-leg to be re-oriented (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported. Road frontage to school site to be maintained.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Higher order uses (ie medical centre, childcare centre, café) (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Council not opposed to higher order uses in this location, but submits these do not need to be shown on Plan 3 as they can be considered pursuant to the underlying residential zone.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Development to be set back 30m from 1 in 10 year floodplain (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Council does not support a reduction to the creek buffers.	See rec 9, 10, 18	See response to Rec 9, 10, 18
	Drain within conservation area to be removed (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 9	See response to Rec 9
	Proposed nature play area (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Council not opposed to delivery of nature play area in a suitable location, but should not be shown on Plan 3.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Removal of vegetated tail (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Strongly opposed for the reasons set out in Council's submissions.	See rec 21	See response to Rec 21

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	Remove open space and conservation reserve from Property 3 (195 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	See rec 23	See response to Rec 23
	Move local access street to south or DCP fund to deliver (195 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Standard density lots along Grossmans Road.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Continue road to western boundary as per Rural Estates (260 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 3,4	See response to Rec 3, 4
	Standard density lots (along western precinct boundary) (260 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	Subject to other changes. Covered by rec 1	Maintain larger lots along western boundary
	Remove open space (along western precinct boundary) (260 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	See rec 22.	See response to Rec 22
	Reduce open space per overall reduction.	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	Consider as part of further investigations into open space provision
	Identify land for potential non-residential use (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Reduce size of open space / conservation area to facilitate lots fronting connector (200-220 Great Ocean Road).	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	Consider as part of further investigations into open space provision
	If connector straightened against school submissions, move open space to land between connector and school boundary.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Identify land around school for higher density residential.	Not supported.	See Rec 25, 26	See response to Rec 25, 26
	Increase the size of the neighbourhood centre to 3ha.	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Notation on map or additional shading to designate potential medium / high density housing in and around the NAC.	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	Consider as part of review of densities
2.1	Amend 3 rd paragraph as follows: A range of housing densities will respond to the topography and sensitive interfaces, including the Spring Creek riparian corridor and rural land to the west, which is currently rural but is recognised as having potential for future residential development and is required by the Planning Scheme to be the subject of a further strategic planning exercise to identify preferred land uses.	Strongly opposed. Land further to the west is <u>not</u> identified by Council or any strategic documents for future residential development.	See rec 4	See response to Rec 4

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	Amend 3 rd paragraph as follows: A range of housing densities will respond to the topography and sensitive interfaces, including the Spring Creek riparian corridor and rural land to the west , the proposed neighbourhood activity centre and the non-government school.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
2.2	Amend O5 "Provide for a range of residential densities and lot types, including medium density around the neighbourhood centre".	Not supported.	See rec 25	See response to Rec 25
	Amend O5 "Provide for a range of residential densities that reduce along Spring Creek and Grossmans Road, near rural land, and increase to allow the creation of lots of less than 600 square metres within a reasonable walking distance of the around the commercial centre neighbourhood activity centre and the non-government school."	Not supported.	See rec 25	See response to Rec 25
	Amend O5 "Provide for a range of residential densities that reduce along Spring Creek and Grossmans Road, near rural land north of Spring Creek, and increase around the commercial centre."	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Amend O11 "Deliver a permeable movement network of attractive streetscapes which connect residential, community and commercial uses and encourage walking and cycling and provide for future connection to land to the west."	Strongly opposed. Land further to the west is <u>not</u> identified by Council or any strategic documents for future residential development.	See rec 4	See response to Rec 4
Plan 4	Change "residential (lot size 500-600m sq)" to "medium density residential (townhouses and terraced housing)".	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Change "residential (lot size 600-900m sq)" to conventional density residential (minimum average lot size at least 500m sq)".	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Remove "residential (lot size 1500-2000m sq)" category.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
2.3	Amend third and fourth sentences to: "The land budget shows that the PSP will yield 2,398 lots with an average density of approximately 13 dwellings per net developable hectare. An average household size of 2.54 persons for conventional density housing (based on Victoria in Future 2015), is used to estimate the future population of the PSP area. On this basis, the future population of the PSP is estimated to be 6,091 residents."	Not supported.	Agree with Council	If density increases around the NAC and school, then population and housing estimates will require updating accordingly.

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	Update dwelling yield and densities.	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	As above
Table 1	Remove the waterway and drainage reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Review the conservation reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	Consider as part of further investigations into open space provision and review of vegetation along Grossmans Road.
	Remove the individual lot size categories and just use the net developable area to calculate the dwelling capacity at 13 dwellings per hectare, i.e.: NDA = 184.48 Dwell / NDHa = 13 Dwellings = 2,398	Not supported.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	If density increases around the NAC and school, then population and housing estimates will require updating accordingly.
	Update to reflect submissions in relation to reduced areas of waterways, conservation area, open space.	Not supported	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1.	Land use budget to be updated following changes to PSP.
Plan 5	Change “residential (lot size 500-600m sq)” to “medium density residential (townhouses and terraced housing)”.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Change “residential (lot size 600-900m sq)” to conventional density residential (minimum average lot size at least 500m sq)”.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Remove “residential (lot size 1500-2000m sq)” category.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Remove the local convenience centre and its catchment from Plan 5, and instead add a note in the legend “local convenience centre location to be determined”	Supported.	Agree with Council	Panel recommendation not consistent with Rec 29 to reinstate the asterix
	Inclusion of notation indicating that the location of a Local Convenience Centre is to be included on the landholding of 80 Duffields Road.	Not supported.	See rec 29	See response to Rec 29
R1	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported. Maintain as a requirement.	Agree with Council	Noted
R2	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported. Maintain as a requirement.	Agree with Council	Noted

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
R3	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported. Maintain as a requirement.	Agree with Council	Noted
G4	Delete.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
G8	After the phrase "abutting open space areas", insert the words "other than retaining walls constructed to a boundary".	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
R4	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported. Maintain as a requirement.	Agree with Council	Noted
R5	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
R6	Add "(with the exception of lots fronting Grossmans Road)". This does not work in the current layout of large lots and open space in between the drainage line and Grossmans Road. Primary position is to delete open space. Secondary position is to remove this impracticable requirement.	Not supported. G43 provides discretion for alternative access to be considered.	Agree with Council	Noted
	(a) Insert the word "any" before the words "dwellings fronting open space"; (b) Insert the words "in order to provide a physical separation between the dwelling and the open space, conservation reserve or arterial road".	Not supported. Refer to wording previously provided by Council.	Agree with Council	Noted
R7	Inconsistent with R6.	Agree. Council has provided amended wording for R5, R6, R7.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Redraft as a guideline.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
G15	Modify to "Dwellings should must provide a positive address to abutting community centres and schools" and include as a requirement.	Council is not opposed to this change.	Retain as should	Panel recommendation accepted
G17	Delete.	Accepted.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Replace with "Lot sizes may be reviewed based on matters including design, orientation, topography, aspect and subdivision layout. Lot sizes may be provided both above and below the lot size ranges set out in Table 2 and Plan 3, provided that the average minimum lot size in a subdivision area does not fall below the minimum lot size provided for the relevant area."	Not supported. Council agreed to delete G17.	See rec 31	Accepted
	Add G18 – Greater housing diversity is encouraged within a reasonable walking distance of the neighbourhood activity centre and non-government school.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Panel recommendation not consistent with Rec 26

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
Table 2	Underneath the heading "Table 2 Residential design controls", insert the following words: <i>This table constitutes the residential design controls contemplated by Clause 4.7 of Schedule 1 to the Urban Growth Zone. These controls should inform the MCP required by Clause 4.7 of UGZ1, and may be adopted in full or part as either mandatory or discretionary provisions, in conjunction with an application for subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.</i>	Supported in part. Reword as follows: <i>This table constitutes the residential design controls contemplated by Clause 4.7 of Schedule 1 to the Urban Growth Zone. These controls must inform the MCP required by Clause 4.7 of UGZ1.</i>	See rec 32	See response to Rec 32
	Table 2 is unnecessarily prescriptive and should be deleted; these matters would be better covered at permit stage.	Not supported. Council prefers the use of MCPs to reduce planning permit requirements.	Agree with Council – see rec 32	Noted
RDC-1	Delete.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Change 500-600 sqm category to “medium density residential (townhouses and terraced housing) – no specific lot sizes”.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Change “residential (lot size 600-900m sq)” to conventional density residential (minimum average lot size at least 500m sq)”.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Remove “residential (lot size 1500-2000m sq)” category.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
RDC-3	Amend to be in accordance with ResCode, i.e. 4m façade setback to dwellings and 2m side setback when adjoining a road.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	(a) Change minimum front setbacks to 4.0 metres. (b) Change minimum side setbacks to 3.0 metres.	Not supported.	See rec 33	See response to Rec 33
RDC-4	Amend so that setbacks to rear boundaries are 3m not 20m and require landscaping along the boundary with land in the Farming Zone.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	(a) Delete the current additional requirements set out in relation to the 500-600sqm lots; (b) Replace the requirements with the following words: (i) A new wall should be located a minimum of 2.0 metres from a side boundary. (ii) A new wall should be located a minimum of 5.0 metres from a rear boundary to facilitate privacy between upper levels of adjoining lots.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
RDC-5	Amend to allow site coverage up to 60 percent on sites less than 500 sqm.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	(a) Amend site coverage from 35 percent to 50 percent; and (b) At the end of the sentence, insert the words "or 60 per cent including all impervious surfaces".	Not supported.	See rec 33	See response to Rec 33
RDC-6	Amend to "Front setbacks must be planted with a canopy tree or trees".	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	(a) Amend reference to 50 percent to 40 percent; and (b) After the phrase "planting of vegetation", insert the words "and provision of permeable surfaces".	Not supported.	See rec 33	See response to Rec 33
3.2	1 st paragraph: delete the words "co-located with" and replace them with "and".	Supported.	See rec 34	See response to Rec 34
	2 nd paragraph: replace the first sentence with: <i>The Spring Creek Neighbourhood Centre will provide important economic support for the local both in the early phases of residential development in the PSP area and the subsequent growth of the Spring Creek community.</i>	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
R8	1 st bullet point: redraft as a Guideline which refers to the Activity Centre Design Guidelines.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Recommendation not consistent with Rec 35, 40
	2 nd bullet point: redraft as a Guideline	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Recommendation not consistent with Rec 35, 41
	3 rd bullet point: after the words "provide staging", insert "(if relevant)"	Supported.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35
	4 th bullet point: insert the words "if appropriate" at the start of the point	Supported.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35
	5 th bullet point: redraft as a Guideline	Council suggests deleting this point.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35, 42
	6 th bullet point: redraft as a Guideline	Not supported.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35, 43
	7 th bullet point: redraft as a Guideline	Not supported.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35, 44
	8 th bullet point: after the words "longer term expansion", insert the words "(if relevant having regard to any staging and timing of development)"	Supported.	See rec 35	See response to Rec 35
R10	After the words "as illustrated on Plan 5", insert the words "or by reference to an approved Concept Plan pursuant to Clause 2.6 of UGZ1".	Not supported.	See rec 36	See response to Rec 36
R12	Redraft as a Guideline.	Not supported.	See rec 37	See response to Rec 37

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
R13	Redraft to read as follows: <i>A local convenience centre must be:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provided for within the landholding of 80 Duffields Road, with the ultimate location to be approved by the Responsible Authority; and • located on and positively address the adjoining street. 	Not supported.	See rec 29	See response to Rec 29
G18	Delete the words "car parking and".	Not supported.	See rec 38	See response to Rec 38
	Insert G18B-F	Not supported	See rec 39-44	See response to Rec 35, 39-44
Plan 6	Remove the waterway and drainage reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	See rec 9	See response to Rec 9
	Review the conservation reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Consider as part of further investigations into open space provision and review of vegetation along Grossmans Road.
	Remove OS-08 away from western boundary.	Council has suggested OS-08 could be relocated to cover tree 41-47 as suggested in DELWP submission.	See rec 22	See response to Rec 22
R15	Reduce public open space contribution to 4 percent passive public open space.	Strongly opposed. Council maintains a 10 percent POS contribution should be required consistent with other areas in Torquay.	See rec 17	See response to Rec 17
	Reduce public open space contribution to 5 percent.	As above.	See rec 17	See response to Rec 17
G25	"may vary so long as it is not less than one hectare" does not make sense having regard to areas of in particular OS-02 but also OS-01.	Council already suggested the deletion of these words.	See rec 23	Deletion of wording accepted
G30	Modify to "School sites should must be provided with three street frontages, where practicable " and include as a requirement.	Not supported. Council prefers this to remain as a guideline.	Agree with Council	Noted
G31	Modify to "Childcare, medical or similar facilities should be located proximate within the neighbourhood centre or in the potential non residential use location at the corner of Strathmore Drive and the Great Ocean Road".	Not supported. The underlying residential zone will enable these types of uses to be considered.	Agree with Council	Noted

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
R23	Native vegetation must be retained as described in the NVPP unless a permit is granted for its removal.	Accepted.	See rec 13	See response to Rec 13
R23	Delete.	Council accepts the submission that the requirement is contrary to the operation of the NVPP and Clause 52.16, however prefers wording suggested above by S43.	Agree with Council	As above
R25	Reduce buffer zone along Spring Creek to 30m.	Strongly opposed.	See rec 17, 18	See response to Rec 18
	Reduce buffer zone along Spring Creek to 50m.	Strongly opposed.	See rec 17, 18	See response to Rec 18
G36	Reduce buffer zone along northern tributaries to 10m.	Strongly opposed.	Agree with Council	See response to Rec 18
	Modify to refer to reduced buffer of 0m – 10m.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	See response to Rec 18
Plan 7	Reinstate the road connection from Grossmans Road to Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Amend the “local access street – level 1” adjacent to Grossmans Road to “local access place”.	Supported	Agree with Council	Noted
	Offset the two potential bus routes that connect to Strathmore Drive to avoid the need to install signalised intersections on the Great Ocean Road.	Council supports removal of signalised intersection at Strathmore Drive East.	See rec 5,6,7	See response to Rec 5, 6, 7
	Deletion of service road along Grossmans Road. Instead, propose a limit on the number of driveways able to have direct access to Grossmans Road.	Not supported. G43 provides discretion for alternative access to be considered.	Agree with Council	Noted
	(a) Delete signalised intersection on the Great Ocean Road, to be replaced with an unsignalised T-intersection; (b) Insert a secondary vehicular entry point to the proposed NAC along Duffields Road	Supported in principle.	See rec 5,6,7	See response to Rec 5, 6, 7
R31	Modify to allow lots that provide good amenity to the waterways and open space to not require a frontage road to open space.	Council proposed the addition of the words “paper roads” to provide flexibility for a range of interface options to be considered.	Agree with Council	Noted

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
G43	<p>Modify to refer to Grossmans Road, east of Messmate Road, Or Exempt low density allotments (1500sqm – 2000sqm) fronting Grossmans Road from this requirement and allow them to be accessible without additional road reserve widths by using direct crossovers.</p>	Not supported. G43 provides discretion for alternative access to be considered.	Agree with Council	Noted
G43	Vehicle access to lots fronting Grossmans Road should be provided from existing crossings or service road, local internal loop road or rear lane, or a combination of the two, to the satisfaction of the coordinating roads authority.	Not supported. G43 provides discretion for alternative access to be considered. Where land is not subdivided, existing dwellings will be allowed to maintain existing driveways.	Agree with Council	Noted
R51	Replace “as an integral part of” with “to interface with the”.	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
Plan 8	Remove the waterway corridor from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	See response to Rec 9
3.6.1	<p>Under the heading "Integrated water cycle management", insert the following words:</p> <p><i>Further to the requirements and guidelines set out below, a landowner may design an alternative stormwater management system to what is currently set out in Plans 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and Table 5 of this PSP and Map 1 set out in UGZ1. In the event that a landowner proposes an alternative stormwater management system to what is proposed in this PSP and the UGZ1, it is the intent of this PSP and the UGZ1 that Surf Coast Shire Council and the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (where relevant) are capable of considering and assessing the alternative stormwater management system proposed, and approve the alternative stormwater management system. Where an alternative stormwater management system is approved by the Surf Coast Shire Council and Corangamite Catchment Management Authority, the alternative stormwater management system is to be considered to be generally in accordance with this PSP (including Plans 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 and Table 5) and Map 1 of UGZ1.</i></p> <p><i>To the extent that an approved alternative stormwater management system encumbers part of the land identified in Table 1 and Appendix A to this PSP as credited open space, the amount specified in Table 1 and Appendix A to this PSP must be adjusted to reflect the extent of unencumbered credited open space resulting from the construction of the approved alternative stormwater management system.</i></p>	Not supported. Council has provided additional wording to the note on Plan 7.	See rec 9	See response to Rec 9

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
R52	The stormwater management system must be designed in accordance with depicted in Plan 8 is indicative only. The stormwater management system must be unless otherwise approved by the responsible authority.	Not supported. Council has provided additional wording to the note on Plan 7.	See Rec 9	See response to Rec 9
R55	After the word "final", insert the word "methodology".	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	After the words "drainage reserves", insert the words "and infrastructure, including".	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Delete the words "must be" and replace them with "is to be agreed at the time of making an application for subdivision".	Not supported.	Agree with Council See Rec 9	See response to Rec 9
Table 5	Remove the waterway from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	See response to Rec 9
	Remove WL21.	Not supported.	See rec 10	See response to Rec 10
	Amend note <i>The areas and corridor widths identified in this table are indicative only and are subject to refinement alteration during detailed design to the satisfaction of the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority and the responsible authority.</i>	Supported as is generally consistent with suggested wording provided by Council.	Agree with Council	Noted
R63	Rationalisation of words "except where it is included in the DCP or outlined as the responsibility of an agency".	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
R69	Delete last dot point.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
R70	At the end of the paragraph, insert the following words: <i>unless the liability arises pursuant to an agreement under section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, in which case Council is obliged to satisfy the liability in accordance with the agreement.</i>	Not supported.	See rec 12	See response to Rec 12
	Accepts amended Parklea wording to account for Section 173 agreements.		See rec 12	See response to Rec 12
3.7.3	At the end of the fourth bullet point, insert the words "if applicable".	Supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
Table 6	Add local access road to the south of the drainage line.	No supported. Local access roads are not part of DCPs.	Agree with Council	Noted
App. A	Remove the waterway and drainage reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	See response to Rec 9
	Review the conservation reserve from Property 1 (225 Grossmans Road).	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Consider as part of further investigations into open space provision and vegetation along Grossmans Road.

Section	Change requested by submitters at the Panel hearing	Council submission to the Panel	Panel Recommendation	Council response to Panel recommendation
	For Property 4, remove the 0.7 hectares from the “Arterial Road – Widening and Intersection Flaring” column.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Noted
	Update to reflect submissions in relation to reduced areas of waterways, conservation area, open space.	Not supported.	Agree with Council	Panel recommendation not consistent with recommendations in relation to biodiversity and open space. Land use budget to be updated following any changes to PSP.
App. B	Remove the cells setting out "Guidelines" next to each "Principle".	Council in principle supports culling of number of guidelines.	Subject to other changes, covered by rec 1	Accepted