

# Minutes

Special Council Meeting  
for Hearing Submissions  
Tuesday 11 March 2025

Video Conference

Zoom

Commenced at 6:00pm

**Council:**

Cr Mike Bodsworth (Mayor)  
Cr Paul Barker  
Cr Rebecca Bourke  
Cr Joel Grist  
Cr Liz Pattison  
Cr Tony Phelps  
Cr Adrian Schonfelder  
Cr Libby Stapleton  
Cr Leon Walker

## Order of Business

<b>1 Procedural Matters</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.1 Present.....	3
1.2 Opening.....	3
1.3 Pledge .....	3
1.4 Apologies .....	3
1.5 Conflicts of Interest .....	4
<b>2 Reports</b> .....	<b>5</b>
2.1 Urban Futures Strategy.....	5
<b>3 Close of Meeting</b> .....	<b>30</b>

# 1 Procedural Matters

## 1.1 Present

Cr Mike Bodsworth (Mayor)  
Cr Paul Barker\*  
Cr Rebecca Bourke  
Cr Joel Grist  
Cr Tony Phelps  
Cr Adrian Schonfelder

\*Cr Barker joined the meeting at 6:26pm.

Chief Executive Officer - Robyn Seymour  
General Manager Placemaking and Environment - Chris Pike  
General Manager Community Life - Damian Waight  
General Manager Strategy and Effectiveness - Gail Gatt  
Manager Integrity and Governance - Jake Brown  
Coordinator Governance and Council Business - Liberty Nash  
Senior Governance Officer - Sharon Busuttil

## Speakers

John Tebbutt  
Michael Tucker  
Michael Walmsley  
Cameron Gray  
Chris McNeill  
Ian Laging  
Greg Bursill  
Penny Hawe  
Dale Young  
Gareth Bellchambers, Simon Keyte and Brian Haritsis

## 1.2 Opening

**Mayor Cr Bodsworth opened the meeting.**

I would like to acknowledge that we meet on Wadawurrung Country and that the Surf Coast municipality also includes the traditional Country of the Gadubunud and Gulidjan people of the Eastern Maar Nation. I pay my respects to their Elders, past, present and emerging.

Surf Coast Shire Council is committed to walking with Traditional Owners on a reconciliation journey that recognises and celebrates culture and the unique land, sea and waterway Country of the Surf Coast.

I would also like to acknowledge any Aboriginal People attending or viewing this meeting tonight.

### 1.3 Pledge

**Mayor Cr Bodsworth recited the pledge.**

As Councillors we carry out our responsibilities with diligence and integrity and make fair decisions of lasting value for the wellbeing of our community and environment.

### 1.4 Apologies

#### **Council Resolution**

**Moved Cr Schonfelder, Seconded Cr Phelps**

That an apology be received from Cr Liz Pattison, Cr Libby Stapleton and Cr Leon Walker.

CARRIED 5|0

#### **For**

Cr Bodsworth  
Cr Bourke  
Cr Grist  
Cr Phelps  
Cr Schonfelder

#### **Against**

Nil

#### **Abstained**

Nil

### 1.5 Conflicts of Interest

Nil.

Cr Barker joined the meeting at 6:26pm.

## 2 Reports

### 2.1 Urban Futures Strategy

<b>Council Plan</b>	<b>Theme Four - Sustainable Growth</b>
<b>Author's Title:</b>	Strategy 11 - Protect heritage and township character.
<b>General Manager:</b>	Principal Strategic Planner
<b>Division:</b>	Chris Pike, General Manager Placemaking and Environment
<b>Department:</b>	Placemaking and Environment
<b>Attachments:</b>	Integrated Planning
	1. Key Themes Raised in Submissions [2.1.1 - 21 pages]

**Officer Conflict of Interest:** No officer declared a conflict of interest under the *Local Government Act 2020* in the preparation of this report.

**Status:** This report and attachments contain no confidential information under section 66(2) of the *Local Government Act 2020*.

#### Purpose

- The purpose of the Special Council Meeting for Hearing Submissions is to hear submissions received by Council following the exhibition of the Draft Urban Futures Strategy (the draft Strategy).

#### Recommendation

That Council:

- Receives and notes the submissions relating to the draft Urban Futures Strategy.
- Considers the submissions in a report regarding the final version of the Urban Futures Strategy at a future Council meeting.

#### Council Resolution

**Moved Cr Schonfelder, Seconded Cr Barker**

That Council:

- Receives and notes the submissions relating to the draft Urban Futures Strategy.
- Considers the submissions in a report regarding the final version of the Urban Futures Strategy at a future Council meeting.

CARRIED 6|0

For	Against	Abstained
Cr Barker	Nil	Nil
Cr Bodsworth		
Cr Bourke		
Cr Grist		
Cr Phelps		
Cr Schonfelder		

## **Summary**

2. The Urban Futures Strategy (UFS) project commenced in November 2022. A key driver for the project was the change to the Torquay growth area framework brought about by gazettal of the Distinctive Areas and Landscapes - Statement of Planning Policy (SPP). The SPP introduces protected settlement boundaries for all settlements within the declared area including Torquay-Jan Juc. The SPP will effectively halt the outward growth of Torquay-Jan Juc's urban area and guide growth within the town.
3. The purpose of the draft Strategy is to:
  - 3.1 Understand landscape level opportunities and constraints to determine where forecast growth can and should occur.
  - 3.2 Establish a clear policy framework defining the future role of towns within the Surf Coast Shire to guide land use planning at the township and precinct level.
  - 3.3 Consider forecast population growth to determine future housing and employment needs.
4. The draft Strategy considers population and housing growth to a planning horizon of 2051 and responds to the State Planning Policy Framework requirement to plan for projected population growth over a 15-year period at a municipal basis.
5. The draft Strategy responds to the key findings and recommendations of the technical assessments that were undertaken to inform the UFS including:
  - 5.1 Growth Projections for the Urban Futures Strategy, April 2024 (Spatial Economics)
  - 5.2 Residential Land Supply and Demand Assessment – Surf Coast Shire, June 2024 (Spatial Economics)
  - 5.3 Industrial Land Supply and Demand Assessment – Surf Coast Shire, June 2024 (Spatial Economics)
  - 5.4 Surf Coast Shire Strategic Bushfire Assessment, July 2023 (Kevin Hazell Bushfire Planning).
6. It also considers existing and emerging planning policy, the key drivers that influence the strategy and important outcomes to be achieved in planning for growth.
7. The draft Strategy provides an updated growth framework for the shire with directions regarding the spatial distribution of urban growth and identification of appropriate locations for future growth, as well as place-specific principles and directions for growth in Winchelsea, Torquay- Jan Juc, the coastal towns and rural towns.
8. The draft Strategy is structured in three main sections:
  - 8.1 Part one: Introduction.
  - 8.2 Part two: Key drivers and Outcomes:
    - 8.2.1 Managing Bushfire Risks.
    - 8.2.2 Protecting Surf Coast's Unique and Natural Environment, Landscapes, Biodiversity and Built Heritage.
    - 8.2.3 Providing for Diverse and Changing Housing Needs.
    - 8.2.4 Developing Sustainable Communities.

2.1 Urban Futures Strategy

- 8.2.5 Current State of Residential Land Supply.
  - 8.2.6 Changing Locations for Future Growth.
  - 8.2.7 Planning for the Possibility of Changes in Future Growth Rates.
  - 8.2.8 Planning for Employment Needs (Industrial Land Demand and Supply).
- 8.3 Part Three: Our Places (Winchelsea, Torquay, Other Coastal Towns and Rural Townships).
9. A draft UFS and supporting documents were presented to Council on 25 June 2024, seeking Council's endorsement for the purpose of public consultation [25 June 2024 Council Meeting Minutes](#).
10. The draft Strategy was put out to consultation for a period of 8 weeks, concluding on 26 August 2024. The draft Strategy was advertised in local newspapers and via targeted social media posts to increase awareness of the project, and to invite attendance to 2 community information sessions in Torquay and Winchelsea (where the majority of growth is planned). The draft UFS and key technical documents were provided on Council's website which included an online submission portal to enable feedback to be provided. Three targeted information sessions with community groups in Aireys Inlet (capturing the coastal towns groups), Winchelsea and Torquay were also held during July 2024.
11. Information sessions were held with both internal and external stakeholders and feedback on the draft UFS was invited.
12. The Winchelsea community drop-in session was well attended with 40-50 people dropping in during the two-hour session and showing an interest in the project.
13. A total of 53 submissions were received including six from external agencies; Barwon Water, Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA), Department of Energy Environment and Climate Action (DEECA), City of Greater Geelong, Golden Plains Shire and the Department of Education. Seven of these submissions were from community groups, these being Growing Winchelsea (including sub-committees), Aireys Inlet and District Association (AIDA), Friends of Lorne, 3228RA, Anglesea's Housing Challenge, Moriac Community Network and the Surf Coast Energy Group.
14. A significant proportion of submitters (19 of 34 individual submitters) were residents and landowners in Winchelsea (or those with an interest in the township). Seven submissions were from residents or landowners in Torquay-Jan Juc, three from Anglesea and one each from Aireys Inlet, Fairhaven and Deans Marsh. Five submissions were also on behalf of the local development industry relating to Winchelsea, Torquay and a new settlement in the locality of Buckley.

**Summary of Submissions:**

15. Seven submissions provide general support for the draft UFS including the principles and directions and offer other positive feedback in relation to the structure, format and presentation of the document.

2.1 Urban Futures Strategy

16. Two submissions have raised overall concerns about the draft UFS and cite that this is a lost opportunity to develop a well-planned strategy for the shire and in particular for Torquay.
17. Submissions (including those that are generally supportive of the document) also raise concerns about specific elements of the draft Strategy. The submissions make suggestions and recommendations to amend both the general and township principles and directions, or in some cases for the inclusion of new principles and directions.
18. Key matters raised in submissions are grouped and summarised based on the key sections of the draft Strategy (as stated above). Details of the submissions are provided in **(Attachment 1)**.
19. The submissions relate to the following key matters:
  - 19.1 Cultural heritage.
  - 19.2 Bushfire risks.
  - 19.3 Protection of the environment and biodiversity assets including waterways.
  - 19.4 Housing density and diversity.
  - 19.5 Housing affordability and availability (including key worker housing).
  - 19.6 Provision and timing of infrastructure to support growth.
  - 19.7 Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) principles.
  - 19.8 Active and sustainable transport modes including public transport.
  - 19.9 Current land supply issues.
  - 19.10 Population and housing projections including State Government housing
  - 19.11 targets (which have now been finalised as an additional 8,000 dwellings in Surf Coast Shire by 2051).
  - 19.12 Industrial and employment land supply.
  - 19.13 Locations for growth including:
    - 19.13.1 The growth of Winchelsea (including important considerations and outcomes for growth).
    - 19.13.2 The continuing growth of Torquay.
    - 19.13.3 Additional locations for growth including new settlements.
  - 19.14 Implementation and timing of future strategic work projects.
20. The submissions have been carefully considered by officers and will be addressed in a future report to Council. A revised UFS will be presented at a future Council meeting and will be supported by a report identifying the refinements made to the Strategy in response to the matters raised.



Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
<b>Part 1 - Introduction</b>	
<b>Traditional Owners</b>	One submission considers that Traditional Owner custodianship should also be embedded as a guiding principle.
<b>Part 2 – Key Drivers and Outcomes</b>	
<b>Managing Bushfire Risks</b>	<p>Three submissions provide specific support for the principles relating to bushfire.</p> <p>Three submissions raise the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The direction relating to bushfire risk should be strengthened to <i>prohibit</i> changes to the settlement boundaries of towns in areas of high or extreme bushfire risk (rather than avoid).</li> <li>• Jan Juc should be included as being in the same risk category as the coastal towns to the west and it should be acknowledged that Torquay - Jan Juc, Bellbrae and Bells Beach are not immune to the threat of bushfires.</li> <li>• A review of township boundaries is encouraged based on up-to-date bushfire data.</li> </ul>
<b>Protecting Surf Coast’s Unique and Valued Natural Environment, Landscapes and Built Heritage.</b>	<p>Five submissions specifically support the protection of environmental and landscape assets as a priority in determining the suitability of future urban development.</p> <p>Three submissions identify the need to strengthen the UFS in respect of protecting the environment. Specifically, the following is raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stand-alone principle is needed relating to protecting the environment.</li> <li>• Protection of the environmental, social, cultural and economic values of the rivers, creeks and streams is a serious omission in the key directions of the UFS.</li> <li>• Waterways should be specifically mentioned and documented.</li> <li>• An additional principle needs to be added that focuses on the integration of best practice Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) to protect waterways.</li> <li>• Council should address the environmental impact of spending choices, and ensure its public budget is aligned with its climate and environmental objective.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning for Diverse and Changing Housing Needs</b> (Housing diversity and affordability)	Four submissions generally support the principles and directions relating to housing diversity.

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>Other submissions raise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrating only on Torquay as the only growth area has resulted in a housing crisis and we are now decades behind the housing needs of the community.</li> <li>• The language in the UFS should be strengthened to <i>require</i> housing diversity, including a minimum 30% affordable housing in all new large developments (subdivisions greater than 30 lots and apartments greater than 10 units).</li> <li>• An increase in density must only occur where it is meeting essential housing needs rather than short-term rental or holiday houses.</li> <li>• Language around exploring social and affordable housing opportunities on suitable sites should be strengthened. Council should be more proactive identifying sites that are suitable for social and affordable housing and seek interest from the government and social and affordable housing sector to provide such housing. Council should work with landowners of large sites, such as land owned by religious organisations or land currently being used for non-residential uses where housing is seen as a more appropriate use of the site</li> <li>• All housing types (including small second dwellings) should comply with all local planning scheme overlays.</li> <li>• Lack of explanation or description of some terms including density done well and key worker housing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Developing Sustainable Communities</b></p>	<p>Four submissions generally support the principles relating to sustainable communities.</p> <p>Issues raised in other submissions include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries around the terminology ‘sustainable development’ and ‘sustainable’; how can a Strategy be based on an undefined word/s and can growth be sustainable?</li> <li>• The intent (in the UFS) for people to move around without heavy reliance on private transport is unrealistic. Cars are inevitable part of society, particularly for rural communities.</li> <li>• Language around improvements to active transport modes and public transport needs to be stronger.</li> <li>• Appropriateness of adopting a long-term precautionary approach to employment land; some employment land may be more appropriate for other uses such as mixed use.</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The circular economy should be included as a key driver.</li> <li>• The draft UFS is reactive rather than proactive in its approach to ensuring infrastructure is provided; infrastructure needs must be met as early as possible.</li> <li>• Lack of definition and explanation relating to ESD.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Current State of Residential Land Supply</b> (Land Supply and Demand)</p>	<p>One submission highlights the need for clarification of some of the terms used in the <i>Residential Land Supply and Demand Assessment</i> undertaken by Spatial Economics.</p> <p>Specific elements of the methodology used in the Assessment are queried in a submission on behalf of the Messmate Road Landowner Group (based on findings of an independent Land Supply Assessment that has not been provided to Council).</p> <p>The Messmate Road Land Owner Group submission highlights that the draft Strategy acknowledges the immediate need to rezone land for housing. However the principles do not reflect this level of urgency. Specifically, it cites that the UFS is a strategic plan to guide growth up to 2051, yet it is absent in setting out proactive principles and directions to ensure an immediate response is implemented. The submission strongly encourages that the directions relating to Torquay-Jan Juc, and more broadly throughout the draft UFS, are updated to demonstrate a level of endeavour and commitment by Council to support this cause.</p> <p>A submission (on behalf of a residential property developer in Winchelsea) highlights that the existing supply of land does not satisfy Council’s obligations under State Planning policy to provide sufficient land to accommodate projected population growth over at least a 15-year period. By not identifying any new supply of residential land and leaving identification to future strategic work the draft UFS significantly exacerbates the undesirable consequences of under supply. The submission requests that the implementation section of the UFS be updated to ensure Council clearly articulate the specific actions (and associated timeframes) that Council needs to undertake to ensure that sufficient land is available to accommodate projected population growth over at least a 15-year period. It also requests that Council commit to working with and utilising the best-available State Government resources to bring additional supply land online.</p> <p>Other submissions reference ‘dispersed infill’ including the meaning of the term and concerns about the impact of over-density on amenity and town character; the Strategy does not address how this will be controlled.</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
	It is also suggested that available land supply should not be in excess of what is required by the State Government (in future assessments).
<b>Planning for the Possibility of Changes in Future Growth Rates</b> (Population and dwelling projections)	<p>Submissions raise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the UFS be updated to reflect population growth since 2021?</li> <li>• Historic strategic documents that are referenced should be updated.</li> <li>• Queries regarding varying dates and figures for growth in the region (stated in different documents).</li> <li>• Queries regarding methodology used in calculating the projections.</li> <li>• The UFS should acknowledge measures being undertaken by the State Government including the Housing Statement and the emerging Plan Victoria and associated housing targets.</li> <li>• Queries regarding whether Council will be revising its strategy in line with the new State Government housing targets? Surf Coast Shire has been given a draft target of 7800 new dwellings to accommodate by 2051 and it is noted that dwelling projection scenarios in the UFS are in excess of this figure.</li> </ul>
<b>Planning for Future Employment Needs (Industrial Land Supply)</b>	<p>One submission on behalf of landowner within the Messmate Road Future Urban Area provides a review (undertaken by consultants Ethos Urban) of the Industrial Land Supply and Demand Assessment by Spatial Economics.</p> <p>The review provides a critique of the need for industrial land in Torquay, particularly by challenging the demand estimates used in the assessment.</p>
<b>Changing Locations for Growth</b>	<p><b>Growth of Winchelsea</b></p> <p>Three submitters support and welcome the direction promoting Winchelsea as the focus for the majority of long-term future growth (and away from Torquay-Jan Juc). Directing most investment and growth to Winchelsea is considered to be of better medium to long-term benefit to the shire. An opportunity to create a desirable location to live in and attract new buyers to the area was cited.</p>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>Seven additional submitters either support the growth of Winchelsea or recognise that it is unavoidable and necessary; or understand the need for additional dwellings and growth. A total of 17 submissions (including all of the submitters who have expressed support or acknowledge the need for growth) raise concerns about the impact of the scale of growth proposed and/or have identified important outcomes or caveats for future growth. This is discussed in detail below.</p> <p>One submission highlights a lack of vision provided in the UFS with a suggestion that the Strategy should identify what Winchelsea might look like at 18,000 people. Mock up imaging of possible futuristic views of Winchelsea to facilitate the community's understanding should be obtained.</p> <p>Six submissions have raised concerns about recent growth and development in the township including the impact on the heritage and village character of the township and the Barwon River, loss of trees, lack of parks and greens spaces in new residential areas, lack of connectivity, a busy truck route through the town and a lack of infrastructure and services.</p> <p><b>Continuing Growth of Torquay</b></p> <p>Five submissions oppose the continuing growth of Torquay, considering it unsustainable and query why Torquay continues to be a focus for growth alongside Winchelsea when there are restrictions on land that is available (due to the DAL). The following points are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The town and its facilities are overcrowded; Torquay and Jan Juc cannot sustain the residential growth which has occurred in the last five years.</li> <li>• Infill is not supported; the Torquay and Jan Juc communities have expressed this on many occasions (including through the DAL process) but continue to be ignored.</li> <li>• The towns of Anglesea to Lorne have a principle that there will be limited future housing growth and employment within the existing settlement boundaries that is consistent with town character. Torquay and Jan Juc are not afforded this principle.</li> <li>• A population effects report or impact study is required to consider capacity of the beach, car parking, water etc. and impacts of a growing population and from increasing numbers of visitors (from growth areas to the north of Torquay) on the environment.</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>One submission indicates support for the continued growth of Torquay (subject to changes proposed to some of the principles and directions relating to how Torquay will grow).</p> <p><b>Moriac</b></p> <p>Two submissions suggest that Moriac should also be considered as a potential location for growth (to ease the extent of growth proposed for Winchelsea).</p> <p>One submission demonstrates support for the directions in the UFS which provide for limited LDRZ growth in Moriac to maintain its unique character (in line with the adopted Moriac Structure Plan).</p> <p><b>Deans Marsh</b></p> <p>One submission suggests that Deans Marsh could have a role to play in solving the housing crisis, contrary to the directions in the Strategy.</p> <p>The submission cites that the township is in Landscape Level 2, meaning it can be suitable for development, and is not affected by a BMO.</p> <p>Deans Marsh is considered an opportunity to provide seasonal worker accommodation to support Lorne. Providing low-cost housing would support Deans Marsh services and longer-term the township could expand and be sewerred.</p> <p><b>New Township/Secondary Growth Front</b></p> <p>One submission indicates that consideration should be given to a new town along the railway line between Winchelsea and Moriac (after utilising the land around the station in Winchelsea).</p> <p>Two submissions cite that Winchelsea cannot accommodate all of the growth within the shire and that a secondary growth front should be identified.</p> <p>One of the submissions from Ample Investments puts forward the concept of a second growth front in the locality of Buckley and requests that a 'Future Investigation Area' is identified in the UFS that can pave the way for further engagement and strategic planning. The submission is supported by a detailed planning report and analysis prepared by Macroplan planning consultants.</p>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>The Ample submission identifies the risks for the shire of only having one growth front at Winchelsea. The analysis questions the potential for Winchelsea to accommodate the level of population growth proposed in the UFS and that it should not be the single long-term growth front for the entire shire. The submission highlights the UFS as a key strategic opportunity for the shire’s community to consider the creation of a second growth front to play a part in meeting the need for diverse and affordable housing supply, in what is otherwise a very constrained housing market. It is cited that the shire must consider a long-term planning strategy that protects the historic village character of Winchelsea, reduces economic risk to the wider community, and takes meaningful and genuine steps to create housing affordability and diversity.</p> <p>The Ample submission considers that the identification of a Future Investigation Area will provide a solid strategic basis to undertake community engagement, consult with relevant stakeholders and to ensure ‘Buckley Village’ can deliver the aspirations set for a new master planned community. The creation of ‘Buckley Village’ is proposed to be delivered via a not-for-profit (‘NFP’) model, with 100 per cent of project proceeds dedicated to addressing housing affordability (10% of stock for social housing), key worker housing (30% of stock), subsidised renewable energy, environmentally friendly built-form, provision of social infrastructure, the rejuvenation of Lake Modewarre, and many other outcomes that directly benefit the community.</p>
<b>Part 3 – Our Places</b>	
<b>Winchelsea</b>	
<b>Future Growth Concerns &amp; Important Growth Outcomes</b>	<p>Seventeen submitters have expressed concerns about the impact of the proposed scale of growth in Winchelsea and/or highlighted important caveats and outcomes for growth in the township. It is acknowledged that some issues have already been captured in the Winchelsea Community Plan.</p> <p>The submissions raised the following :</p> <p><b>Township and Landscape character</b></p> <p>Eleven submissions have referenced the importance of township and landscape character and have made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural charm, country feel and spacious blocks are key attributes of the town which are integral to the lifestyle and identity of the community.</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High density development with no vegetation or connectivity will ruin existing country character, landscape and outlook of township.</li> <li>• Future growth should avoid turning the town into Armstrong Creek (no trees and gardens and small lots) or outer suburb of Geelong.</li> <li>• Urban design that is established in inner city and suburban areas are not suitable for Winchelsea. Wide roads, vegetated nature strips, street trees and connectivity to the river are required.</li> <li>• Loss of open spaces and the rural setting is a concern; large public spaces should be considered a priority to maintain country feel.</li> <li>• Winchelsea is not conducive to town houses and units; no more two storey developments.</li> <li>• Lot sizes need to be more varied and increased as in similar towns. There should be a minimum lot size and larger lots maintained.</li> <li>• The existing landscape should be honoured in new development areas and any mature existing trees protected, specifically the eucalypts that can be found in the south-east short term growth area (between Barwon Terrace &amp; Austin St).</li> <li>• Loss of habitat for local wildlife is a concern; ensuring all new development include street trees, and additional street plantings is integral.</li> <li>• Principle 7b should explicitly seek to retain existing tree cover and incorporate these into the urban design.</li> <li>• A greater emphasis on the environmental aspects of the town that need protecting is required including the Barwon River.</li> <li>• A denser population could lead to noise, congestion, and a decline in the overall appeal of the area, making it less attractive to potential buyers (and impact property values).</li> </ul> <p><b>Education/School Provision</b></p> <p>Six submissions (including one from the Winchelsea School Council President) raise concerns about the poor state of the current primary school and identify the need for a new larger school or an additional primary school and a secondary school (or a P-12 school). Other schools such as Moriac and Deans Marsh are currently being considered by families as alternative options.</p> <p>The School Council of Winchelsea Primary School have identified that the school on its current site is insufficient for its future needs. It is considered that the school should be relocated (away from the main road) to a site that could cater</p>



Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>for all ages, provide sporting and extra-curricular activities and car parking.</p> <p>It is outlined that families will consider moving to Winchelsea if the education facilities are provided and a new site and facilities would also assist in keeping children in Winchelsea for their secondary education instead of travelling to Geelong, Lorne or Colac.</p> <p>The submission emphasises disappointment that the shire have not consulted with the families in the community or indicated that it would work with the Department of Education and the School Council to discuss a new school.</p> <p>It is highlighted that the previously identified ‘possible education precinct’ on Barwon Terrace is a location that will benefit the community and could provide education from nursery care needs through to secondary school. The UFS does not address the need for updating the facilities now and working to make this site located become a reality until a much later date.</p> <p>It is requested that the UFS direction should advocate for the acquisition of land within an area identified as the Education Precinct and ensure that this precinct provides adequate access to sporting grounds and facilities for the school and local community.</p> <p><b>Employment/Industry</b></p> <p>Three submissions reference the lack of local employment opportunities in the township and highlight the importance of increasing the capacity for employment and businesses to locate, through provision of industrial land and commercial precincts. One submission considers that the UFS should strengthen creative industries.</p> <p>One submission on behalf of the landowner at 3010 Princes Highway identifies this land (20 hectares) as a potential to be rezoned for industrial purposes as an extension to the industrial estate (and included in the settlement boundary). The submission puts forward a development proposal including a plan outlining a potential subdivision, and expressions of interest from seven businesses including two currently located in Winchelsea wishing to relocate.</p> <p>One submission highlights that recommendations from the existing <i>Growing Winchelsea Strategy</i> involving commercial and industrial land were never actioned.</p>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p><b>Railway Station Precinct</b></p> <p>Three submissions cite the railway station precinct as a potential development opportunity that should be a priority and indicate that the provision of medium density housing around the station should be considered. The historic station building could be better utilised.</p> <p><b>Social and Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>One submission highlights the need for greater oversight over any social housing provided.</p> <p><b>Services and Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Six submissions identify concerns relating to a lack of services and infrastructure in the township and emphasise the importance that infrastructure must be provided to support increased population and growth.</p> <p>The following concerns are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft UFS appears to have little focus on improving existing infrastructure to entice people to move to Winchelsea. It overlooks that infrastructure is needed to assist in promoting people to move to the area.</li> <li>• Council do not take pride in the infrastructure it provides.</li> <li>• Only one childcare centre and one kindergarten which are both at capacity in their current state.</li> <li>• Only one public sports stadium, one hall and one football oval.</li> <li>• Need for more spaces and places which support young families and their diverse needs.</li> <li>• More focus is needed on development and opportunities for the young.</li> <li>• Health precinct should be established.</li> <li>• Need to increase entertainment areas to ensure public participation such as a modern community centre or space to provide a wide variety of program/services to a multitude of users.</li> <li>• Roads, water supply, and waste management systems could be placed under considerable strain leading to potential service disruptions and increased costs for residents.</li> <li>• Economic growth may not be seen if there is a delay by the government and Council to provide the infrastructure needed.</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Water, Road, Power and Employment group should be established.</li> </ul> <p><b>Retail</b></p> <p>Three submissions reference the lack of retail and shopping opportunities in the township. Other issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More retail diversity is a key requirement.</li> <li>• Only one supermarket with high prices.</li> <li>• An alternative shopping complex to service Winchelsea and surrounds should be supported by Council.</li> <li>• Improved parking which is safer than the current options is also required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Active Transport Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Three submissions raise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved accessibility and active transport connections are cited as important requirements including walking tracks and footpaths on streets.</li> <li>• Public access to the river and surrounding vegetated area is currently limited.</li> <li>• Other facilities such as bike tracks, public seating and fitness parks are identified as an important need.</li> </ul> <p><b>Public Transport</b></p> <p>Seven submissions identify improved public transport as an essential requirement for the town. Specifically, the submissions highlight the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing train service has limited times and is very unreliable; there are very few services residents can use) and there is no public bus system.</li> <li>• A strong focus on public transport will encourage people to move to the area and support young people to stay in the town.</li> <li>• A timetable should suit workers and students enabling employment and social opportunities in Geelong and Melbourne.</li> <li>• Improvements to the rail service from Colac to Geelong (and Melbourne) is considered essential prior to growth (and is required in the immediate future to meet the needs of current residents)</li> <li>• A local bus network is essential as the population grows.</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p><b>Roads, Parking and Traffic</b></p> <p>Concerns relating to the existing traffic through the town, roads and parking have been raised in six submissions. Trucks are considered a particular problem with noise and pollution spoiling the amenity of the town. The expected population growth is considered untenable with the current situation of traffic bisecting the town.</p> <p>The submissions consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic audits should be undertaken.</li> <li>• Slip lanes should be maintained to current and future business and services.</li> <li>• Roads need to be wider to retain the integrity of the town’s country feel and enable off street parking.</li> <li>• Increased traffic could also pose safety risks, particularly on roads not designed for heavy use.</li> <li>• Council should advocate to the State Government for a bypass which will allow for growth of the town whilst maintaining the country feel. A possible bypass route is put forward by one submitter.</li> <li>• The train track should be expanded to twin track (to at least Colac) to enable freight movement which would reduce the numerous trucks on the road.</li> </ul> <p><b>Circular Economy</b></p> <p>One submission references the need for a futuristic view to the circular economy leading to self-sufficiency.</p> <p><b>Stormwater</b></p> <p>Two submissions have highlighted the importance of stormwater run-off not impacting receiving waters and that this should be a key principle. There is some concern regarding storm water run-off on the health of the river due to nearby development.</p> <p><b>Community Consultation/Involvement</b></p> <p>Two submissions reference the importance of community consultation. The need for true community consultation and joint work is identified, which has happened with other projects. Ensuring the community are fully involved and engaged in township planning as a key priority is supported; however this needs to happen in practice (as is not currently the case).</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
	<p><b>Cultural Values</b></p> <p>One submission supports the need for a Cultural Values Assessment that includes intangible spaces.</p>
<p><b>Short Term Growth Area in South-East of Winchelsea</b></p>	<p>Two major landowners in the south-east growth area support the recommendation in the draft UFS relating to the direction to support a planning scheme amendment to rezone land in this area (which reiterates an existing policy direction in the Planning Scheme).</p> <p>The submission highlights the issues surrounding the gap between taking a policy position and delivering on the desired outcomes; a policy alone has no effect on housing supply, affordability, or diversity without actual delivery. A rezoning application is likely to not lead to additional dwellings for about 6 years and issues around affordability, supply and diversity will be exacerbated. Enacting an immediate rezoning proposal is therefore considered critical by the landowners. It is requested that the implementation programme specified in the UFS should more robustly support the immediate rezoning of the land given the current land supply issues and that changes are made to the Strategic Framework Plan to identify this.</p> <p>There is an additional submission from a landowner in the precinct who consider rezoning the area as sensible and logical, indicating willingness to work with other landowners in the development of a rezoning application. There are queries regarding pedestrian access from the precinct to the river loop and pedestrian river bridge.</p> <p>One landowner in this area does not support a rezoning of their land to residential use and wishes to retain its rural use and zoning.</p> <p>Another submitter does not support the rezoning of land in this area that is covered by the Significant Landscape Overlay (SLO) and considers the precinct on either side of the railway station should be the priority.</p>
<p><b>Torquay</b></p>	
<p><b>Town Character</b></p>	<p>Four submissions reference the lack of concern and consideration for the character of Torquay; retaining Torquay's unique township character has passed and catch-up planning rather than growth planning is now required.</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
	<p>There is particular concern relating to the impact of densification on the town character of Old Torquay.</p> <p>Submitters consider that Council needs to undertake a comprehensive coastal character/land study for the township with the community fully involved. The study would establish Neighbourhood Character Zones, appropriate zoning, and suitably located commercial and industrial precincts. This study should be incorporated into the Strategy and would prove that the community are being listened to.</p>
<b>Social Infrastructure</b>	<p>One submission highlights that a community facility that has a 50m indoor pool, spa, sauna and adequate space for group fitness activities is required.</p>
<b>Commercial/Employment</b>	<p>One submission refers to the direction in the draft UFS to revisit the Torquay Retail and Employment Land Strategy (RELS) which will now cost additional time and money. The submission highlights that previous suggestions by community members to delay the RELS until the DAL process was finalised were previously ignored by Council.</p> <p>One submission indicates that more areas within the existing town (including North Torquay), need to be zoned as areas suitable for restaurants, pubs etc. A plan should be applied to guide the future development of land in the Torquay North precinct.</p>
<b>Stormwater</b>	<p>Two submissions are supportive of principles of stormwater diversions not impacting the Karaaf Wetlands and minimising impacts on other receiving waters in the Torquay - Jan Juc areas.</p>
<b>Infill</b>	<p>Two submissions support the need for infill development in Torquay. However greater guidance should be provided in the UFS on appropriate infill (this should be affordable, sustainable, meeting local housing needs, small and low-scale).</p>
<b>Mixed Use Precincts</b>	<p>One submission welcomes the direction to plan for diverse employment and mixed-use development; mixed use planning across activity centres is key to meeting housing needs and better utilising land.</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
<b>Public Transport</b>	<p>One submission considers the direction relating to public transport should be strengthened to advocate for a significant improvement in services (including the provision of rapid bus services, a direct link to Waurm Ponds/Deakin/Epworth, a summer timetable with higher frequencies and longer operating hours, and provision of space for bikes and luggage on board)</p> <p>The UFS should also advocate for a rail spur line from Marshall to Armstrong Creek Town Centre.</p>
<b>Messmate Road Future Urban Area (MRFUA)</b>	<p>Two submissions oppose the development of the MRFUA. One submission considers that this area should only be developed for housing after development in activity centres, infill and existing greenfield areas.</p> <p>One submission representing the Messmate Road Landowner Group (4 landowners in the precinct) is generally supportive of the draft UFS in terms of its role and function and provides general support for the principles, directions and key outcomes relating to the MRFUA.</p> <p>The Landowner Group submission highlights that there is an immediate need to increase the supply of zoned land for urban residential use, and that there is a declining capacity for developable land in Torquay-Jan Juc.</p> <p>The submission considers that the UFS directions should encourage the fast-track planning and development of the MRFUA to meet housing targets and address the housing crisis. The removal of the need for a strategic plan to be prepared as a direction in the UFS is requested.</p> <p>Three other submissions reference the MRFUA and cite the following (and suggest changes to relevant directions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure should be provided at the earliest opportunity.</li> <li>• Provision of public housing, key worker housing and a minimum 30% social and affordable housing should be referenced and required in the UFS.</li> <li>• The precinct should preserve significant access by wildlife to and from Grass Tree Park Nature Reserve. (additional direction should be added to the UFS).</li> <li>• Precinct should showcase highest level of ESD principles in planning and design (additional direction should be added to the UFS).</li> </ul>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There must be significant improvements in public and active transport in the precinct as part of any initial stages of development.</li> <li>• Potential contamination from poison residue evidenced by dieback of old trees adjacent to the flower farm.</li> </ul>
<b>Baines Crescent</b>	<p>Two submissions support provision of residential components as part of land use mix in Baines Crescent. Recreational and environmental green spaces with trees are also considered essential in the area.</p> <p>One submission queries whether vacant land will be diverted to housing (which would be contradictory to the need for more commercial land) or housing provided above commercial premises.</p> <p>It is suggested that the precinct plan for Baines Crescent proposed in the UFS should extend to the other side of Surf Coast Highway from Bristol to Darian Roads (or a separate one be prepared).</p>
<b>Torquay Town Centre</b>	<p>Two submissions refer to the direction in the UFS to revisit the Torquay Town Centre Urban Design Framework (UDF) and review building heights in the town centre. The submissions highlight that much of the UDF is yet to be implemented (and cite no valid reason for the delay) and a review must determine how to ensure the implementation of the framework. It is highlighted that the UDF provides for a maximum height of 3 storeys which is being ignored (in other planning documents including the DAL).</p> <p>Other submissions raise the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwellings constructed in the town centre should not be made available for holiday use.</li> <li>• A review of building heights should only be considered if sites are to be used for meeting essential housing needs such as social and affordable long term rental housing or affordable homes for purchase. An increase in heights to provide for the short stay tourism market should be prohibited.</li> <li>• Any changes to Torquay town centre should ensure that streets including Gilbert Street retain winter sunlight and tree cover, and do not restrict solar access to homes.</li> </ul>



<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
<b>Spring Creek Land - 140 Duffields Road</b>	<p>One submission (on behalf of the landowner) highlights the potential opportunities for land at 140 Duffields Road in the existing UGZ (Spring Creek land that will be rezoned by the State Government). It emphasises that whilst the future use of the site may not be for urban residential purposes as originally envisaged, this gateway site has far more to offer the Surf Coast community than purely rural land uses such as agriculture or grazing. It is considered that the Special Use Zone (SUZ) is considered a more appropriate and versatile alternate zoning to a rural zone to allow future uses including eco-tourism accommodation and community facilities.</p> <p>It is requested that Council consider identifying the subject site for further investigation as a gateway site as part of the UFS.</p>
<b>Coastal Towns</b>	
<b>Principles &amp; Directions</b>	Three submissions specifically indicate general support for the principles and directions relating to the coastal towns (albeit with some changes cited below).
<b>Housing Affordability and Availability</b>	<p>The following matters are raised in submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus should be placed on use of existing homes and housing stock given high vacancy rates. Council should take the initiative to reduce short term rentals and investigate and support other options such as shared equity schemes for purchase of existing homes, and for stamp duty relief for homebuyers who are key and essential workers.</li> <li>• A further direction is needed to encourage the transfer of existing short-term holiday rental properties and holiday homes to the long-term rental market.</li> <li>• Priority must be for new housing that meets local needs such as key workers and long-term rental; it should not provide for expansion of the holiday rental and holiday home market</li> <li>• Opportunities should be available for residents to move into smaller dwellings as their housing needs change (although question whether the existing larger houses do not meet the future needs of smaller households as these needs can vary greatly in the coastal townships depending upon the season and individual family circumstances).</li> </ul>
<b>Anglesea and the Former Alcoa Land</b>	Two submissions cite the demand for more affordable housing in Anglesea. It is highlighted that there are currently a large proportion of holiday houses and an increasing trend for

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
	<p>investors to purchase large houses for tourist accommodation, which should be discouraged.</p> <p>Three submissions refer to the former Alcoa land in Anglesea. The submissions query whether this land has been considered for housing in the draft UFS. The land around Camp Road and around the Anglesea Primary School is highlighted in the submissions as a potential for rezoning from SUZ to residential. It is highlighted that small block sizes could be provided where low scale houses would be well located near the town services.</p> <p>The Strategic Bushfire Assessment and its conclusions pertaining to the Anglesea Futures Land Use Framework Plan (AFLUF) which covers the former Alcoa land is referenced. This noted the potential use of land in Area 10 for housing confirming that it is a high-risk location. The submission notes that it is unlikely that this land would receive Council support although concerted community and shire input at State level may succeed.</p> <p>A review of existing town boundaries to alleviate some of the housing challenges facing Anglesea due to increased knowledge of bushfire risk is suggested (changes to directions are requested to enable this).</p>
<b>Active and Public Transport</b>	<p>One submission proposes that an additional direction is required in the draft UFS relating to investing in improvements to active transport and advocating for increased public transport services. This includes a local bus network linking Anglesea to Torquay and an increase in frequency of coach services, including a summer/school holiday timetable.</p>
<b>Population</b>	<p>Submissions note a lack of detail on population of coastal towns where there are the largest ageing populations and a lack of specifics around key worker accommodation and diversity in housing to accommodate an ageing population.</p>
<b>Rural Townships</b>	
<b>Principles and Directions</b>	<p>Two submissions generally support the principles to maintain the unique character of the shires hinterland towns.</p>
<b>Active &amp; Public Transport</b>	<p>One submission considers that an additional direction is needed in the UFS relating to investing in improvements to active transport and advocating for increased public transport services. This includes a local bus network linking Moriac with Winchelsea and Waurm Ponds, as well as advocating for the reopening of the Moriac railway station.</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
<b>Other Issues</b>	
<b>Implementation</b>	Submissions raise concerns relating to a lack of detail regarding implementation or interpretation of the Strategy.
<b>External Agency Submissions</b>	
City of Greater Geelong (COGG)	<p>The draft UFS is considered to align with the City’s planning objectives in several key areas.</p> <p>Armstrong Creek to Torquay Rail Corridor: COGG recommend that Surf Coast Shire reconsider the role of the transport corridor through Armstrong Creek as a potential extension of the public transport link to Torquay. At a minimum, it is recommended that this extension of rail corridor to Torquay is identified as a future option to be further investigated so that it remains a potential option under the shire’s strategic planning framework.</p>
Golden Plains Shire Council	Supportive of the UFS and consider it establishes a clear framework to guide future land use planning within Surf Coast Shire.
Barwon Water (BW)	<p>Generally supportive of the draft UFS and the potential opportunities it will bring to the region.</p> <p>A carbon and nature positive approach to new growth areas that ensures biodiversity values are protected and enhanced in all future urban design is encouraged.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that BW are making significant investment to boost the region’s water resources and provide infrastructure to cater for growth.</p> <p>The submission cites the unprecedented growth of Winchelsea and notes that to ensure that BW is in a position to service this magnitude of growth, significant investment will be required. Therefore, there is a need to understand where this growth is proposed to take place within Winchelsea and the timescale it will occur over.</p> <p>Ensuring that strategic infrastructure planning and investment is in line with the future growth targets is considered integral to allowing BW to deliver water and sewerage services in an efficient, cost effective and environmentally responsible manner.</p>

Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)	Summary of Matters Raised
	<p>The submission indicates that a detailed investigation will be required in order to understand the implications of this growth on BW's networks. BW welcome the opportunity to continue to collaborate with Council to ensure appropriate infrastructure planning and investment in Winchelsea.</p>
<p>Department of Energy, Environment &amp; Climate Action (DEECA)</p>	<p>Supportive of the direction to limit settlement growth and development within and adjacent to important areas of biodiversity and landscape significance. It is recommended Council ensure biodiversity information is utilised (either through existing information or new assessments) to support progression of the UFS and ensure feasibility of its implementation in accordance with strategic biodiversity policy.</p> <p>Endorses the identification of waterways and waterbodies as important environmental features within the shire, and its recognition of stormwater as a potential threat and challenge to be managed. Suggested change to Principle 4 to list a specific stormwater / integrated water management direction.</p> <p>Suggested changes to Direction relating to Messmate Road to reference that stormwater is managed to meet the quantitative performance objectives for urban stormwater outlined in the EPA's <i>Urban Stormwater Management Guidance</i>.</p>
<p>Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA)</p>	<p>Supportive of the concept of developing the draft UFS. However, it is considered that the strategy has not adequately considered the climate change hazards associated with coastal inundation and sea level rise.</p> <p>Some concerns with regard to the New Long Term Strategic (Place) Plan for Winchelsea. The preferred direction of growth and the acceptable directions for growth do not give enough of an indication of the actual extent for these areas. The location and extent of these areas will play a key role in storm water management, hydrological regime change and other potential land use change implications.</p>
<p>Department of Education (DE)</p>	<p>DE have no concerns with the draft UFS identifying a 'possible school precinct'. However, DE clarify that this designated area may accommodate either future non-government or government school provision, and that this designation does not indicate a specific type of school provision need.</p> <p>The current analysis of population forecasts and the capacity of existing schools to accommodate growth indicates that schools within the broader Winchelsea and Surf Coast area</p>

<b>Key Themes Raised in Submissions (Based on the structure of the Urban Futures Strategy document)</b>	<b>Summary of Matters Raised</b>
	<p>have the capacity to meet anticipated enrolments, and there are no plans to fund the construction of a new school in this area.</p> <p>Nonetheless, DE will continue to review this information annually as part of its statewide planning for school. DE looks forward to working with Council on the Strategic Place Plan for Winchelsea.</p>

### **3 Close of Meeting**

The Special Council Meeting for Hearing Submissions Urban Futures Strategy - 11 March 2025 closed at 7.39pm.