

**Table VicRoads: Drysdale Bypass
Response to Formal Submissions – Planning Scheme Amendment C369**

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submission is generally supportive of the Drysdale Bypass. ▶ The submitter references an agreement between VicRoads which will enable the resident of 86 Whitcombes Rd, Drysdale to remain at their residence. ▶ If the measures agreed upon in the letter from Mr Tim Price (dated 8 May 2017) are carried out, no objections or changes to the exhibited Planning Scheme Amendment are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Note that the measures included in letter dated 8 May include an agreement to reduce the PAO. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts the submission. Agrees to change the amendment to reduce the extent of PAO.
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the condition of both Basin and Gillies Road. ▶ The submitter believes the design of the Drysdale Bypass will create increased traffic volumes along both Basin and Gillies Road and encourage school traffic to use these roads as a 'rat run' to access the back of the school. ▶ The submission makes reference to the Unmade Road Development Policy (2014) in describing both Basin and Gillies Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes regarding the Drysdale Bypass are sought but raises concern regarding traffic volumes and flows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter provides an assessment against Council's Unmade Road Development Policy and proposes that a review of both Basin and Gillies Road should be undertaken (it is noted that this submission is not a request for sealing). 		
3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlington/Grubb Road intersection. ▶ The submitter is opposed to VicRoads decision to close Jetty Road and believes that the closure will increase travel times for residents in new housing estates such as Curlewis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ That Jetty Road should be left intact for the whole of its length. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter raises a number of concerns regarding Amendment C369. Primarily, if any part of the submitters land is to be acquired, the amendment will not be supported. Other issues include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 3.5 meter wall proposed to be built along the properties boundary. 2. The lack of footpaths in the immediate area. 	<p>The submitter requests a number of changes including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To install sound proof windows (at VicRoads expense) instead of constructing a 3.5 metre wall along the properties boundary for noise attenuation purposes. ▶ To provide an appropriate area to perform a u-turn if 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Partly a matter for land acquisition. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<p>3. A lack of car parking in the school district.</p> <p>4. No right hand turn from Lake Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is not supportive of VicRoads decision to close Jetty Road. ▶ The submitter does not support an overpass at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<p>no right turn is allowed from Lake Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To construct more footpaths within the local community. ▶ To increase parking facilities and provide two lanes to accommodate future traffic in the School District. ▶ To consider Justin Zahra for any design/landscaping aspects of the bypass. 	
5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission
7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the proposed underpass at Peninsula Drive and Andersons Road. Specifically, the submitter is concerned the 'at grade' underpass will be susceptible to flooding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought within the submission however a number of questions are asked including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where is the entry point for St Thomas Primary School? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes minimal thought has gone into the underpass and school precinct due to the projected growth of St Ignatius College. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Have turning lanes been included for Peninsula Dr to access all three schools safely? 3. Is there any car parking spaces allocated on this road to replace the parking Andersons Rd? 	
8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) supports the proposed amendment C369 as exhibited (subject to minor variations which it indicated have been captured in the Incorporated document). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is not supportive of the proposed ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. ▶ The submitter believes the current design of the Bypass has the potential to negatively impact upon environmental values between Murradoc Road to Whitcombes Road. 	<p>The following recommendations are made by the submitter including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To discontinue with the proposal to construct the Bypass beyond Murradoc Road. ▶ Ensure that adequate measures are put in place to protect the ecological values of the study area. ▶ Further investigate the Growling Grass Frog habitat in the study area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the proposed elevation on Drakes Road of 4 – 6 metres will reduce the amenity by allowing road users to look onto the submitter's property. ▶ The submitter is also concerned with the potential increased run off which may cause flooding, erosion, mud and bog. ▶ The submitter also raises concerns regarding a natural pond which is currently in his property believing he has a Growling Grass Frog population. ▶ The submitter disagrees with VicRoads noise modelling assessment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are recommended in the submission. <p>A number of answers are sought regarding the treatment runoff such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ How will run off be slowed in both velocity and volume? ▶ Will water purity be maintained over the years? ▶ Who ensures water purity in the years to come? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Agrees to amend the Incorporated Document to ensure that hydrological and ecological impacts are addressed via EMP and designed design. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is generally supportive of the Drysdale Bypass Project. <p>The submitter raises a number of concerns in relation to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Indigenous vegetation ▶ Noxious plants, environmental weeds and pest animals. ▶ Increased usage of Gilles Road. ▶ The environmental value of Lake Lorne. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Where possible, netting wire should be considered along roadsides to prevent noxious plants, environmental weeds and pest animals. ▶ The submitter would like an audit undertaken of all indigenous vegetation which may be removed. ▶ The submitter also requests specifications for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Agrees to amend the Incorporated Document to ensure that ecological impacts are addressed via EMP and designed design. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			landscaping of the bypass.	
12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the high frequency of traffic lights when travelling to or from Geelong via Jetty Road. ▶ The submitter believes the proposed signalised intersections in the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass would be an unfair imposition for a number of residents due to an increase in travel time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter proposes amendments to the design to make it possible to turn off Portarlinton Road at either end of Curlewis Golf Club and reach Jetty Road via Coriyule Road (only if sealed). ▶ If this cannot not be achieved, the submitter believes the left turn from Portarlinton Road to Jetty Road should be preserved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
13		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter comments that the safety of intersection at Portarlinton / Grubb Road affects all residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
14		<p>The submitter is not supportive of the proposed ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Primarily the submitter is not supportive of constructing the bypass beyond Murradoc Road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ High cost and extent of earthworks. 	<p>The submitter raises a number of questions in regards to the increase in water flow as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Who maintains these on an annual basis? ▶ What happens to the pollutants in a downpour event (as happened this year) and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Agrees to amend the Incorporated Document to ensure that ecological impacts are addressed via EMP and designed design. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Increases in the amount and rate of water flow. ▶ Impact negatively on existing flora and fauna. ▶ Destroy the existing amenity of the property. 	<p>hydrocarbons and tar are washed out of confinement and into our waterway populated by frogs , wading birds, ducks and bordered by the historically important remnant river red gums?</p>	
15		<p>The submitter is primarily concerned that the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass has overlooked the operation and functionality of the Motel accommodation that is offered at the property. The submitter has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The property no longer has a road frontage. ▶ Access to the Motel will no longer be 'easy'. ▶ The operation of the Motel will be severely interrupted with road works. ▶ The business name would need to be changed as it is no longer on Jetty Road. 	<p>The following is sought if the Drysdale Bypass is constructed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A new access off Portarlinton Road (including a new office house and driveway to units at this site). ▶ Compensation for new signs and costs associated to change the business name. ▶ Compensation for loss of business (if the business fails the submitter will be seeking compensation of 2 million dollars plus loss of income). <p>The submitter has stated that keeping open the existing entrance to Jetty Road as a one-way slip lane from Portarlinton Road will be beneficial to not only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Partly a matter for land acquisition. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			<p>themselves, but the broader community.</p>	
16		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is not supportive of the proposed ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Primarily, the submitter is concerned with the intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road. ▶ The submitter believes the intersection will be unsafe and appear like an outer Melbourne suburb. The submitter is also concerned that VicRoads have chosen the cheapest and easiest option. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter suggests that an overpass at the intersection between Grubb/Portarlinton Road with a system of roundabouts is the best outcome for the project. ▶ A hand drawn sketch of the proposed overpass and system of roundabouts is attached in the submission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
17		<p>The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter raises concerns regarding the rerouting of Jetty Road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A loss of amenity and rural lifestyle ▶ A loss of privacy ▶ Devaluing of property ▶ Access ▶ Noise impacts <p>The submitter also raises their disappointment that VicRoads did not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought but a number of concerns regarding the design have been raised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		purchase land along Jetty Road when there was opportunity.		
18		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter strongly supports the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. ▶ The submitter draws on a Bike Safe Roundabout Research Report and states that lights are significantly safer for cyclists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission
19 (No - 1)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. ▶ Specifically, the submitter strongly believes that well designed roundabouts are safer than signalized intersections. ▶ The submitter is also concerned that VicRoads have not supplied sufficient data to the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout. Other minor detailed design amendments are sought. ▶ The submitter has provided a hand drawn sketch of the proposed roundabout design which they believe is a much better option than VicRoads proposal (Option 6B). ▶ The submitter also requests the following information in relation to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission.. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			<p>the two intersection options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Safety - Predicted number of injury crashes over a nominated time period. 2) Travel Times - Predicted travel times for all the major routes at: - Peak AM and the number of vehicles affected Peak PM and the number of vehicles affected Off Peak periods and the number of vehicles affected. 	
19 (No .2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that safety has not been assigned adequate priority at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. The submitter has provided an alternative option (option 6A) that they believe address the safety criteria much better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout. Other minor detailed design amendments are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes that the preferred option is more consistent with the Victorian Governments "Towards Zero Vision" and provides a safer outcome. ▶ The submitter is concerned that there are an unnecessary and excessive number of vehicle-to-pedestrian conflict points in the ultimate design of the Bypass. 		
19 (No .3)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the proposed ingress/egress to the service station is unsafe. ▶ The submitter states that the proposal requires vehicles entering the service station from Drysdale or exiting towards the Bypass to execute a U-turn and/or lane crossing maneuver which is an unsafe process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter proposes an alternative entry into the existing service station which can be viewed on the hand drawn sketch (option 6). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
19 (No .5)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter raises concern regarding the environmental impact associated with vehicles waiting at red lights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Through an environmental analysis, the submitter contends that a roundabout option will give win-win benefits to the "community, country and planet". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is concerned that VicRoads have not determined the cost of fuel usage, the carbon footprint and the volumes of harmful emissions associated with vehicles waiting at red lights. ▶ The submitter is also concerned that VicRoads have not supplied sufficient data to the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter has requested data on travel times and travel volumes on major routes within the Drysdale Bypass from VicRoads. 	
19 (No .6)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter raises concern regarding the proposed pedestrian underpass at Peninsula Drive. ▶ The submitter is concerned that the proposed underpass is too narrow and will create a dark and unsafe environment for school children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter recommends VicRoads redesign the underpass to be much wider and provide two way cycling and pedestrian paths. <p>The submitter also recommends that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A plan is drawn up for active transport and scenic trails for Drysdale/Clifton Springs/Curlewis areas. 2. A plan is drawn up for traffic and active transport ingress/egress, parking and student drop off for the education precinct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
19 (No .7)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the bypass may not be adequately compatible with the active transport requirements of the community. ▶ This is the case as the submitter believes the Drysdale Bypass will deposit a large volume of traffic around the school precinct. 	<p>The submitter once again recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A plan is drawn up for active transport and scenic trails for Drysdale/Clifton Springs/Curlewis areas. ▶ A plan is drawn up for traffic and active transport ingress/egress, parking and student drop off for the education precinct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ The planning authority has also sought further advice from City of Greater Geelong regarding the Active Transport Strategy. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
19 (No .8)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the proposed roundabout designs are larger than necessary according to Ausroads recommendations in "Guide to Road Design Part 4B Roundabouts". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout in line with the Ausroads Guide to Road Design Part 4B Roundabouts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
19 (No .9)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the proposed signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Jetty Road intersection will significantly spoil the ambience of Lake Lorne 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout to prevent the ambience of Lake Lorne. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		Reserve and the entrance to Drysdale.		
19 (No .10)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the proposed signalised intersection at Portarlington/Jetty Road intersection is not consistent with local preferences as determined by VicRoads community consultation conducted in 2015. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlington/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout to demonstrate community preference. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. Refer the submission to the panel.
19 (No .11)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the construction of the Bypass will entail a considerable amount of distribution and congestion around the education precinct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To construct a road connection from Belchers Road through to the education precinct before commencing construction on the Drysdale Bypass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. Refer the submission to the panel.
20		<p>The submitter raises a number of concerns regarding the detailed design of the Drysdale Bypass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter is concerned that insufficient access has been provided to the school precinct. The submitter is concerned with the location of both the 	<p>The submitter notes a number of changes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To relocate the intersection at Reserve/Jetty Road to the existing intersection between Railway Crescent and Jetty Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<p>Reserve/Portarlinton Road and Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes that roundabouts should be considered at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection as they provide a safer option. ▶ The submitter has noted that VicRoads could improve communications and project updates to the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To relocate the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection to the intersection at Portarlinton/Hermsley Road. ▶ To redesign the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection to consist of a combination of roundabout design with the incorporation of a traffic light system. It is noted the traffic light system would predominately be used during "peak hour" traffic, and for the majority of the time would just flash amber to indicate normal roundabout caution to be exercised. The lights would control "peak hour" situations and allow Pedestrian / Cyclists access also. This would enable safe & good flow of all traffic at all times. 	
21		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter raises a number of concerns regarding the detailed design of the Drysdale Bypass and believes the project is a 'waste of money'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes a 40km/h zone should be implemented along the new bypass road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the Drysdale Bypass will cut off a vital hub of Drysdale. ▶ The submitter believes the pedestrian underpass is not a good option and that Peninsula Drive should be extended to connect to Belchers Road. ▶ The submitter is also concerned with the increased traffic volumes on Reserve Road. 		
22		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter raises a number of concerns regarding the detailed design of the Drysdale Bypass. Primarily, the submitter believes it is not logical to construct the bypass beyond Murradoc Road as it will result in a loss of amenity and an unnecessary amount of cut and fill. ▶ The submitter is also concerned that the Bypass will not have an effect on peak traffic times. ▶ The submitter believes the intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road should be simplified. 	<p>The key recommendations made by the submitter include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To discontinue with the proposal to construct the Bypass beyond Murradoc Road. ▶ Include road upgrades to Coriyule and Hermsley Road. ▶ Construct an overpass for through traffic at Grubb Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
23		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The EPA raise no issues with the proposed Amendment C369. Recommends guidance that can be used for the EMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
24		<p>The submitter raises a number of concerns with Amendment C369.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes there is an issue with storm water drainage in the vicinity of the sports precinct and school. ▶ The submitter is concerned that little thought has gone into the road design of the school precinct. ▶ The submitter believes insufficient space has been provided for safe drop off points for school children. ▶ The submitter requests detailed design for vehicles entering/exiting the existing Caltex Service Station. ▶ The submitter believes a lack of information has been provided regarding lighting of public spaces. ▶ The submitter believes the noise readings were insufficient and inadequate. ▶ The submitter is concerned the Drysdale Bypass will act as a barrier between the school precinct and the Town Centre. 	<p>The following recommendations are made by the submitter including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To improve drainage in the vicinity of the rail trail and sporting precinct. ▶ To connect Peninsula Drive with Belchers Road to the south to improve traffic movement around the school precinct. ▶ To relocate a U-turn point which services the Caltex Station. ▶ To provide noise mapping which indicate road chainages at locations tested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
25		<p>The submitter raises a number of concerns with Amendment C369 including:</p>	<p>The following recommendations are made by the submitter including:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is opposed to VicRoads decision to close Jetty Road and believes that the closure will increase travel times for residents in new housing estates such as Curlewis. ▶ The submitter believes that a signalized intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection is 'perplexing' and believes a 2 lane roundabout is more appropriate. ▶ The submitter believes the proposed roundabout at Grubb Road which serves the school precinct would be better served as a signalized intersection. ▶ The submitter is concerned with the consistency in speed limits from Portarlinton to Leopold. ▶ The submitter is concerned that the increased noise will impact on the value of his property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To not remove any part of Jetty Road. ▶ To amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the signalised intersection at Portarlinton/Grubb Road and replacing it with a roundabout. ▶ To construct a signalised intersection at the Grubb Road roundabout which services the school precinct. ▶ To change the speed limit to 80 km/h for the entire section of road between Portarlinton and Leopold. ▶ To inform the submitter on noise attenuation strategies. 	
26		<p>The submitter is generally supportive of the construction of the Drysdale Bypass. The submitter has however raised the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is concerned with the impact of noise and lights from the Bypass when the vegetation at their property is removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought however some concerns are raised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ That their property value will decrease. ▶ Impacts from construction such as dust and noise. ▶ The submitter is concerned that the area they live in will no longer be a green rural area. 		
27		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
28		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the ultimate design of the Drysdale Bypass. Specifically the submitter believes the proposed intersection at Reserve/Portarlinton Road will severely impact there amenity. ▶ The submitter believes that little consideration was given to their property in the design of the Drysdale Bypass. ▶ The submitter is concerned that the projected noise levels have not taken into consideration the removal of vegetation which acts as a natural buffer and increased traffic flow. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Partly a matter for land acquisition and the implementation of VicRoads noise policy. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes VicRoads have provided little information as to how the consequences of the Bypass will be ameliorated to retain the properties rural living zone amenity. 		
29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ DELWP recommends a number of principles be considered for inclusion in an environmental management plan. 	<p>DEWLP recommends the following principles be listed in Clause 5.2 of the incorporated document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Before work starts, the contractor must advise all persons undertaking the vegetation removal or works on the site of all relevant principals and associated statutory requirements or approvals. ▶ Before the vegetation removal starts, the boundaries of all native vegetation to be removed and retained must be clearly marked on the ground. ▶ Any pruning/lopping/trimming that is required to be done to the canopy of any tree to be retained must be done by a qualified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Does not agree to include that level of detail in the Incorporated Document, but agrees to provide some further guidance regarding the EMP. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			<p>arborist in accordance with Australian Standard 4373-2007 – Pruning of Amenity Trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Tree protection zones (TPZs) need to be taken into consideration when planning works. TPZs prevent the indirect loss of vegetation due to encroaching construction/development in the area. Where impacts exceed 10% of the TPZ the tree should be considered lost and offset accordingly. ▶ Identification of site compound locations where native vegetation will not be impacted. There must be no temporary or permanent storage of any materials, vehicles, equipment or plant within areas of native vegetation identified to be retained. Such sites must not be located on or near erodible surfaces, surface water runoff areas or areas infested with weeds. 	

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			<p>▶ Incorporating weed control measures to prevent the spread and introduction of new weeds into the site. This includes implementing wash down areas to avoid transporting plant material or soil, as well as post works weed monitoring and controls as required. Noxious weeds listed under the <i>Catchment and Land Protection Act 1994</i> that were identified as part of the weed assessment for this project must be appropriately controlled throughout the study area to minimise their spread and impacts on ecological values.</p> <p>DELWP also recommends that the incorporated document be amended to require an Offset Management Plan to be prepared in consultation with DELWP.</p>	
30		The COGG are generally supportive of the Amendment C369.	▶ The COGG has identified a number of areas where further design work and	▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission, particularly as it relates to the integration of strategic

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		<p>COGG also makes reference to the strategic planning and the sports and school precinct.</p> <p>In its submission COGG indicates that a works in kind agreement could be negotiated to allow VicRoads to upgrade Belchers Road, COGG encourages the delivery of these works in the short term.</p> <p>COGG has also indicated that it intends to make further submissions in relation to drainage.</p> <p>COGG have asked for a further assessment of the hydrological impact of the project on the stand of red gums at Drakes Road,</p>	<p>negotiation will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The COGG recommended a number of changes to the Incorporated Document. 	<p>planning around the schools / sport precinct. .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Agree to update the Incorporated Document to reflect Council's suggestions. ▶ Planning authority agrees that VicRoads and COGG need to work collaboratively in relation to a number of aspects of the project. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel
31		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Transport for Victoria (TFV) support the proposed Amendment as exhibited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change are sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
32		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes the proposed ultimate design for the Drysdale Bypass is a 'waste of time and money' and that an overpass would provide the best outcome for the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter disagrees with the ultimate design of the Bypass and suggests that an overpass at the intersection between Grubb/Portarlington Road is the best outcome for the project. ▶ A hand drawn sketch of the proposed overpass is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			attached in the submission.	
33		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes that the ultimate design should consist of roundabouts instead of signalised intersections. ▶ The submitter believes roundabouts provide faster travel times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ It is sought to amend the ultimate design of the Bypass by removing the two sets of signalised intersections at Reserve/Portarlington Road and Portarlington/Grubb Road and replacing them with roundabouts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
34		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the condition of Basin Road and believes the road is not suitable to carry increased traffic volumes. ▶ The submitter believes road side vegetation and the Basin Reserve will also be impacted through an increase in traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The construction of speed signs along Basin Road is sought. ▶ The construction of a shared path along Basin Road to allow people to ride/walk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
35		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlington/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
36		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlington/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
37		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes that the ultimate design of the Bypass would be better if Peninsula Drive connected to Grubb Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
38		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is supportive of the proposed signalised intersection at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No change sought. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Accepts submission.
39		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the two sets of traffic lights within the ultimate design of the Bypass. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter objects to the two sets of traffic lights in the ultimate design of the Bypass and suggests that roundabouts would provide a better alternative. ▶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
40		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is concerned that the Drysdale Bypass will increase traffic flow on both Basin and Gillies Road and create an unsafe environment for road users and residents. ▶ The submitter is also concerned that the Drysdale Bypass will cut off access for people and horses to safely navigate to the Pony Club. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes sought but is concerned about the traffic flows and volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
41		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the closure of Jetty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter believes the Drysdale Bypass should be elevated over Grubb 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
		Road will create a bottle neck effect on Railway Crescent.	Road as per an attached sketch.	▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
42		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the design of the Drysdale Bypass will increase traffic volume along both Basin and Gillis Road. ▶ The submitter believes Basin Road is not suitable for heavy traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes sought but is concerned about the traffic flows and volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
43		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the design of the Bypass will increase traffic volumes on Whitcombes Road. ▶ The submitter contends that Whitcombes Road will rapidly deteriorate if traffic volumes increase. ▶ The submitter is supportive of implementing traffic lights at the Portarlinton/Grubb Road intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A request to asphalt the unmade section of road between Whitcombes and Martins Road. ▶ If the above request cannot be delivered, the submitter requests speed restrictions and more regular maintenance of the road be implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
44		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that Jetty Road will be impacted from the future Curlewis population. ▶ The submitter also raises concerns over the 'irregular' intersection at Whitcombes Road and Bayshore Avenue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ To alleviate vehicle movements to and from Curlewis estates on to Jetty Road, the following has been proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Seal Coryule Road (between 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
			<p>Jetty and Hermsley Road)</p> <p>2) Relocate the western entrance signalised intersection further west to the intersection of Hermsley and Curlewis Road.</p>	
45		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the design of the Bypass will increase traffic volumes along Murradoc Road. ▶ Particularly, the submitter believes the Bypass design will create an unsafe entry/egress point when entering/exiting their property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes sought but is concerned about the traffic flows and volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
46		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned that the design of the Drysdale Bypass will force them to travel on gravel roads to access their property. Which will in turn worsen access for emergency vehicles. ▶ The submitter also raises concerns that their walking group will now face a number of dead-end roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes sought but is concerned about the traffic flows and volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.

#	Submitter	Nature of Submission	Any specific changes sought to the PSA	Planning Authority's Response
47		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is generally supportive of Amendment C369. ▶ The submitter is however concerned that the closure of Drakes Road will increase traffic flow along Whitcombes Road for vehicles travelling towards Portarlinton. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No specific changes sought but is concerned about the traffic flows and volumes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.
48		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter is primarily concerned with the school precinct. ▶ Specifically, the submitter is concerned that the Bypass will reduce student amenity when in the school playground. ▶ Moreover, the submitter believes the idea of an underpass at Peninsula Drive is not ideal for school children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The submitter recommends a 'drop off zone' at the bottom of Peninsula Drive in order to help alleviate traffic congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Notes the submission. Proponent will need to review the submission. ▶ Refer the submission to the panel.