

STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PANEL SUBMISSION

GREATER GEELONG PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C375

BARWON HEADS STRUCTURE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Part B Submission to the Independent Panel

Panel: Con Tsotsoros (Chair), Elissa Bell

Date: Tuesday 21 August 2018

Presented by: Peter Schembri, Acting Coordinator & Stuart Thiele,
Acting Senior Strategic Planner on behalf of the City of
Greater Geelong

Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
KEY ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS	4
SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY	5
INCREASED HOUSING DIVERSITY AREA.....	9
RESIDENTIAL LAND SOUTH OF BRIDGE ROAD	10
THE NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE	14
MOVEMENT AND PARKING	14
VEGETATION PROTECTION.....	15
DRAFTING OF PLANNING CONTROLS.....	15
VILLAGE CHARACTER.....	16
RESPONSE TO EVIDENCE TABLED	17
BARWON HEADS LIFESTYLE GROUP (SUBMISSION #50)	17
TOWN PLANNING EVIDENCE	18
ECONOMICS EVIDENCE	20
FLOOD & STORMWATER EVIDENCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES EVIDENCE	21
ECOLOGY EVIDENCE	23
MID WEST GROUP (SUBMISSION #137).....	25
SAVE BARWON HEADS ALLIANCE (SUBMISSION #128)	28
STATUS OF STAGE 3 OF THE 13TH BEACH RESORT	29
WHAT IS THE ISSUE?	29
COUNCIL RESPONSE	29
STATUS OF BARWON HEADS ‘FURTHER WORK’ IN CLAUSE 21.14	33
WHAT IS THE ISSUE?	33
COUNCIL RESPONSE	33
STATUS OF THE BARWON HEADS TRAFFIC & PARKING STUDY WORK PROGRAM	34
WHAT IS THE ISSUE?	34
COUNCIL RESPONSE	34
CONCLUSION	35
APPENDICES	36

INTRODUCTION

1. Council's Part A submission was circulated to the Panel and the parties on 14 August 2018.
2. These submissions address the key issues raised in the submissions and evidence as well as any outstanding issues, particularly those highlighted under Direction #11 of the Panel's directions including:
 - A summary of the key issues raised in submissions
 - Response to evidence tabled
 - Status regarding Stage 3 of the 13th Beach Resort
 - Status of studies for Barwon Heads in 'further work' of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.
 - Details regarding the work program for the following council resolution on 26 June 2018:

That officers commit to and support at the Panel an updated traffic and parking study being undertaken that includes measurements conducted during both peak summer season and the non-winter period. Such study should be conducted to reflect the changing traffic conditions in Barwon Heads as a result of regional growth in surrounding areas, as well as the car dependency of residents and visitors through limited alternative transport options.

KEY ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

3. The key issues raised in submissions are categorised under the following themes:
 - Settlement boundary
 - Increased Housing Diversity Area
 - Warrenbeen Court
 - Residential land south of Bridge Road
 - The Neighbourhood Residential Zone
 - Movement and parking
 - Vegetation protection
 - Drafting (of the exhibited planning controls)
 - Village character
4. It is noted that in Council's Part A submission, Council not only identified the issues raised in the submissions but also put forward submissions in relation to those

issues. Below, we take the opportunity to further elaborate on the Council's position through further submissions.

Settlement Boundary

5. The Settlement Boundary for Barwon Heads was raised in nearly all submissions on Amendment C375.
6. The Amendment updates Clause 21.14 and includes a Barwon Heads Structure Plan map that delineates the Settlement Boundary. The Settlement Boundary along the western urban edge of the town is proposed to remain unchanged from that currently shown in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, except for the exclusion of two small rural lots that had previously been included erroneously.
7. In support of this position, it is relevant to observe that the overwhelming majority of submissions supported the position of the planning authority in relation to the settlement boundary. Of all of the submissions lodged, only a small handful of submissions supported a change to the settlement boundary.
8. The submissions calling for a move of the settlement boundary are noted. But Council does not support them. Neither does the overwhelming majority of the community support the change. It is sometimes difficult to consider something when it is a proposed change that is suggested as having no adverse impacts. However, helpfully, the material circulated by Best Hooper on behalf of its Barwon Heads Lifestyle Group provides the panel with a good understanding of just what such urban development might comprise.
9. As made clear and without ambiguity in the 2017 Barwon Heads Structure Plan, due to the lack of 'in-principle' support, Council did not undertake detailed feasibility assessments of the land outside the current settlement boundary.
10. Compelling advice from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning supported this approach.
11. The Barwon Heads Lifestyle Group (McAfee) expert evidence on infrastructure services, drainage and ecology is noted. But consistent with the direction given by the structure plan and the lack of the existence of any of these reports before the normal circulation period prior to a panel hearing, these reports have not been peer reviewed by Council and neither has Council retained experts to peer review them and neither has any State Government Agency and Authority officers reviewed them. It is unclear exactly how these reports are to be used. It is clearly not within the

reach of the panel to direct that the settlement boundary be moved or that land be rezoned as such a change to the amendment would be of very significant consequence and represent a clear transformation of the amendment.

12. In any event, there is no understanding of what planning controls are sought and what other controls would be required in respect, of for example, infrastructure provision. Furthermore, while there are separate submitters, it is clear that the cumulative impact of their individual submissions would be to result in a very substantial increase in the size of the Barwon Heads township in a manner that has never been contemplated. The areas involved in the three large lots west of the existing town boundary are approximately 43% the size of the existing Barwon Heads township (see **Appendix 1**).
13. There are also, more than likely, to be approvals required under the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act and potentially under the *Environmental Effects Act* which are simply not contemplated.
14. It should not be surprising then that Council's position is negative towards the changes sought by those submitters.
15. Every state and local strategy and policy which exists in relation to Barwon Heads has reiterated the current location of the settlement boundary. Every state and local strategy and policy undertaken has directed spatial urban growth to other locations. No strategy has ever identified this land for residential zoning and development.
16. Furthermore, the national and state coastal policy frameworks continue to shift in support of the position of the planning authority.
17. The 2017 Barwon Heads Structure Plan accommodates a modest level of growth within the settlement boundary while protecting the village character of Barwon Heads. Council submits that this is appropriate and that is all that is being considered in the context of this structure plan review and its implementation through the Amendment.
18. Of the 942¹ submissions that were lodged, 840² directly supported the Council's position on the settlement boundary.

¹ There were 940 submissions received during the exhibition period + 2 late submissions that were accepted.

² Of the 942 submissions, 840 directly supported retaining the existing settlement boundary location, 14 requested the boundary be shifted and the balance of submissions were silent on the settlement boundary issue.

19. Of the submissions received, 772, online google App pro-forma individually lodged submissions specifically supported the Settlement Boundary as proposed by the Amendment.
20. Many of the remaining submissions on the Amendment either specifically supported the Settlement Boundary as proposed by the Amendment or expressed general support for the Amendment's proposals. Along with local residents, supporting submissions were received from organisations/agencies such as the Barwon Heads Association (#13), Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (#31), Geelong Environment Council (#65), Geelong Field Naturalist Club (#66), Save Barwon Heads Alliance (#128) and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (#167).
21. While Council does not submit that planning is to be reduced to some form of ballot, it is of some relevance to note, albeit in a slightly different context that section 60(1) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* provides that:

Before deciding on an application, the responsible authority must consider:

- (f) any significant social effects and economic effects which the responsible authority considers the use or development may have.

22. Then at section 60(1B) it states that:

For the purposes of subsection (1)(f), the responsible authority must (where appropriate) have regard to the number of objectors in considering whether the use or development may have a significant social effect.

23. We do not argue the important point that the above provision relates to the role of the council as responsible authority rather than a planning authority. However, it would be a curious position indeed if it was relevant to consider the issue of township expansion in a permit application but not a rezoning context. Indeed, we submit that the Amendment C159 Panel that last considered this issue was very cognisant of this, albeit in a different context. In that report the panel observed: (at page 44)

Barwon Heads has not been identified as a location for growth, and retaining the current settlement boundary is a legitimate option. The situation would be different in a settlement that had been identified for growth and where there was a local or regional imperative to provide for that growth.

This is not the case in Barwon Heads and because of that, it is not the role of the Panel to dictate that Barwon Heads should accommodate further growth. This is an

issue that should be determined by Council and the Barwon Heads Community. The panel is satisfied that there is substantial community opposition to nay development of the Macafee land and this is not something that the Panel can dismiss.

24. It is worth observing that in that panel hearing, and in the context of that amendment there were 377 submissions of which 367 supported the settlement boundary. In the current amendment, as noted earlier, of the 942 submissions that were lodged, 840 directly supported the Council's position on the settlement boundary. The community appears to becoming more motivated to protect what it values.
25. The Panel should not lightly dismiss this weight of community opinion in considering the social effects of the amendment as the panel is required to do under the strategic assessment guidelines.
26. It is noted that in relation to the evidence that has been called by those calling for a shift in the property boundary, no evidence from a social planner has been called. This is not surprising to Council. Council submits that had such expert evidence been called it would have detected and commented on the strong community sentiment in relation to the issue of the settlement boundary and it would have elaborated upon how the township would have been impacted adversely by such a significant growth of the town. We say significant because it is apparent from any map that the available hectarage between the current settlement boundary and the environmental assets to the west could easily result in the growth of the township by over 43% in terms of land mass. Clearly this would have significant ramifications.
27. It is also noted that while the proponents of such a change have called experts in relation to drainage and the like no proponent has considered what the broader infrastructure impacts would be on the township in terms of the normal development infrastructure and community infrastructure implications. It would be likely in our opinion, that careful consideration would need to be given to the preparation of a development contributions plan to address what we think would be significant infrastructure funding issues.
28. We have also touched on the transformative effect of acceding to the submissions which call for such monumental change to the settlement boundary. We wish to be clear that if this were to be an outcome in the context of the current amendment, in Council's submission, the amendment would be transformed in a very significant manner from a structure plan update into a significant settlement amendment that would obviously raise issues of inconsistency with a broad range of policies both local, regional and state.

29. We also wish to note that the environmental wetlands that exists to the west of the current settlement boundary are a state sanctioned game reserve. In this location, shooting and hunting is permitted in season. No consideration has been given to the impacts of gun shots and the like on dwellings that would be located in closer proximity to the wetlands.
30. Accordingly, the panel should not be attracted to and nor should it get distracted by the submissions made by those handful of submitters that for many years have endeavoured to have their land made available for urban development as part of a larger Barwon Heads Township.

Increased Housing Diversity Area

31. The Increased Housing Diversity Area (IHDA) is an important policy area within the Barwon Heads township. As explained in the Part A submission, it is a policy area that had its genesis in the 2008 Housing Diversity Strategy which has since been progressed into Council's Municipal Strategic Statement and the G21 Regional Growth Plan for Barwon Heads [refer paragraph 194 of Part A submission].
32. The Housing Diversity Strategy recognised that further work would be required to manage change within the Barwon Heads IHDA.
33. Preparation of the 2017 BHSP was, in part, informed by the Barwon Heads Residential & Landscape Character Assessment (Hansen March 2017).
34. The Character Assessment formed the view that (p. 38):

'Increased diversity of housing stock is still encouraged but at a lower intensity commensurate with the scale of the township, associated availability of services and facilities, as well as the preferred character'.
35. The Character Assessment was also cognisant of the Flinders heritage precinct that applies to part of the IHDA, saying (p. 42):

'...given the mixed built form character in the area, this area continues to have potential for infill development, provided that development is respectful of the heritage qualities of the area, as well as the neighbourhood character of Barwon Heads. The Heritage Overlay will continue to ensure that new development is respectful of its heritage context'.
36. The Amendment achieves a balance between infill development, heritage and township character by:

- reducing the extent of the IHDA - by removing the land south of bridge Road and west of Golf links Road;
 - rezoning the revised IHDA to the General Residential Zone Schedule 1; and
 - applying a Design and Development Overlay Schedule 42 to the IHDA (excluding the Commercial 1 and Mixed Uses zones).
37. Council submits that this approach is strategically sound and reflective of Council's approach to implementing the new residential zones in 2014 via Amendment C300.
38. The Panel that considered Amendment C300, in discussing the extent of the IHDA and implications of the Heritage Overlay and existing character in Geelong West and Newtown said (p. 32):
- '...the Panel agrees with Council that the GRZ is a suitable zone for the precinct based HOs in this area. The GRZ will provide opportunities for redevelopment, while being respectful of character and heritage considerations'.
39. With regard to submissions that seek the IHDA be rezoned to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, similar submissions were received to Amendment C300. Here, the C300 Panel formed the view that (p. 32):
- 'As a matter of principle, applying the NRZ throughout an IHDA would be problematic given that the zone places significant emphasis on retaining existing character and limiting increased residential development, outcomes that are difficult to reconcile with the role of the IHDA'.

Residential land south of Bridge Road

40. The Amendment proposes to remove that part of the current Barwon Heads IHDA south of Bridge Road from the IHDA and to rezone it from RGZ 3 to a new Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 6 (NRZ 6), and to apply a new Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 (DDO 41).
41. The removal of this area from the IHDA is based on the recommendations of the *Residential and Landscape Character Assessment 2017* undertaken by Hansen Partnership for Council. As was noted in paragraph 245 of the Part A submission the application of the IHDA to the areas so designated at the time was relatively broad brush at a municipal level and consequently was not based on a detailed review of the existing character of individual settlements.
42. We also refer the panel to the balance of the Part A submission on this aspect from paragraph 245 onwards.

43. In relation to this area (South of Bridge Road) Mr Glossop has expressed a reservation not on account of the merits of removing this area itself, but rather on account of the non-inclusion of areas further north of the remaining IHDA within the IHDA. Council submits that it is essential to deal with both areas separately. If the area south of Bridge Road ought, on its merits, be removed from the IHDA, then it should be removed from the IHDA whether or not an offset area is identified. Council does not agree with the conflating of the issue of the removal of the area south of Bridge Road with the issue of inclusion of the area to the north of the existing IHDA area.
44. Accordingly, Council submits that the clearly notified adjustments to the IHDA boundary and the proposed rezoning of the land within the IHDA is appropriate. The addition of the area north of the existing IHDA, which has not been the subject of any notification or proposal, is inappropriate in the context of the current amendment.

Warrenbeen Court

45. Further to the submissions made in the Part A submission, we wish to make the following submissions.
46. It is noted that lots in Warrenbeen Court are the subject of a restrictive covenant. The form of the covenant varies between lots although the covenant is the same for most of the lots and different in respect of one of the lots.
47. The covenants seem to have been drafted poorly and while each of them contain the covenant as no doubt set out in the contract of sale, the form of the drafting on one view has failed to give effect to the time restriction of the covenant which seems to have been intended to cease to have effect in 2020. Save for the case of Certificate of Title Volume `0546 Folio 035, most of the covenants appear to have not been drafted properly with the time restriction set out in the operative covenant itself. This is not a matter for consideration here.
48. What is a matter for Council is to consider whether the area, by nature of its significant vegetation coverage, and the clearly established character of the area in large part because of the covenant, ought to be allowed to be significantly changed through the stated intentions of the current registered proprietors assuming that they

do wish to subdivide and develop or sell on the basis that a subsequent purchaser is able to do this.

49. There are many examples in Melbourne where the character of a residential area has been strongly influenced by private restrictions in the form of restrictive covenants. While the restriction remains in place, there is no need for the public law in the form of the planning scheme to intervene. However where the private restriction is removed, it is perfectly legitimate for the public law in the form of the planning scheme to step in to maintain the status quo.
50. Obviously, the subdivision of land would have a very significant effect on the character of the Warrenbeen court area. It would slowly but surely erode the character of the area through the loss of vegetation and the increase in the appearance of built form. The issue for Council is not whether the private contracts between landowners expire or not. That is a private matter. The issue for Council is whether the area with its characteristics should be the subject of controls which give public protection to the recognised character of the area and the extent of significant vegetation in this area?
51. In Council's submission the answer is an unequivocal yes.
52. Council also submits that the strategy now being implemented has been contemplated for some time. As was noted in the Part A submission, the MSS has for some time now contemplated(at clause 21.14-3) that a landscape assessment study is required for the Warrenbeen Court area with the intention to apply an overlay to protect the existing character and vegetation. This action has been in the scheme since 2010 and it was also proposed in the 2007 structure plan.
53. It is submitted that the panel should consider the proposed overlays on its merits based on the vegetation assessment and not on the financial plans of existing registered proprietors. The objectives of planning in Victoria include the objective which is to balance the present and future interests of all Victorians not just the existing proprietors.
54. The *Barwon Heads Residential and Landscape Character Assessment* undertook an assessment of the area and other areas and made recommendations on the appropriate planning controls and overlays. It is submitted that the proposed controls are consistent with what was recommended. Furthermore the *Significant Residential Tree Assessment* of Warrenbeen Court by Ecology & Heritage Partners is an important expert report in relation to the vegetation qualities of the land.

55. Council also notes the evidence of Mr Glossop on the issue of the character of this area. Council does not share the same opinion as Mr Glossop on the use of the 4000 metre minimum lot size and particularly his reservations about it noting that a permit cannot be granted for a lot which is less than 4000. The Landscape Character Assessment report identified that another zone option would have been the Low Density Residential Zone. That zone would have provided for a 4000 sq metre minimum lot size and that would have had the same mandatory effect as is proposed for the NRZ Schedule. We respectfully submit that if the minimum lot size for Warrenbeen Court is allowed to be discretionary, there will be very uncertain outcomes for this area resulting in a potentially substantial change to the character of the area.
56. The character of Warrenbeen Court is consistent and the vegetation which has been allowed to flourish in the area is significant based on environmental assessment.
57. The issue of mandatory provisions in planning schemes has been the subject of much commentary. The Departmental practice note relevant to mandatory provisions [practice note 59] advises as follows:
- Mandatory provisions in the VPP are the exception. The VPP process is primarily based on the principle that there should be discretion for most developments and that applications are to be tested against objectives and performance outcomes rather than merely prescriptive mandatory requirements.
- Nevertheless, there will be circumstances where a mandatory provision will provide certainty and ensure a preferable and efficient outcome. Although these circumstances cannot be common practice, they may include areas of high heritage value, **strong and consistent character themes**, or **sensitive environmental locations** such as along the coast.
58. It is submitted that noting the very limited extent of the application of the minimum lot size, there is a very strong and consistent character theme that exists in this court bowl location. Furthermore, Warrenbeen Court is clearly a sensitive environmental location. Both of these issues are not really contested by any party.
59. Council respectfully submits therefore, that these factors suggest that the use of a mandatory provision is appropriate in this instance.

The Neighbourhood Residential Zone

60. Nearly all of the residential area of Barwon Heads outside of the IHDA (the majority of the town) is proposed to be rezoned from General Residential Zone 2 to Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 6. The Amendment also proposes to apply Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 (Barwon Heads Incremental Change Residential Area) to this area, except for the newer estates.
61. We note there is widespread local community agreement for the introduction of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone. We consider that the purpose of this zone, together with its mandatory maximum height limit of 9 metres and 2 storeys, will support modest, incremental housing growth consistent with the preferred low-scale coastal design character of Barwon Heads.
62. However, Council does not support calls by the Barwon Heads Association (Submission #13) and others for the Schedule to apply a minimum lot size of 400 square metres. The *Barwon Heads Residential & Landscape Character Assessment* did not recommend such a control nor has any submitter produced any expert evidence to support this position. We submit that proposed DDO41 is the appropriate planning tool in this instance.

Movement and parking

63. The Amendment does not include any specific measures to address the traffic and parking concerns raised in 51 submissions. The 2017 BHSP discusses this issue on pages 15-16, though we note that the Council resolved on 26 June 2018 to undertaking a new traffic and parking study for Barwon Heads. Appropriate text changes to the Barwon Heads Structure Plan will be made to reflect commitment to a study.
64. Management of the broader transport network is the responsibility of Transport for Victoria and VicRoads. A submission to the Amendment by the Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR) indicated that these agencies are aware of community concerns regarding traffic and congestion in Barwon Heads. The submission advised that VicRoads is monitoring the issue but has not developed any proposals at this stage.
65. It was also submitted by DEDJTR that the Barwon Heads Structure Plan identify shared path connections to the broader path network including the Thirteenth Beach coastal path extension to the path between Blackgate Road and Breamlea Road. No change to the Amendment is required, however the text of the Structure Plan will be

revised to refer to that path connecting to the off-road path between Blackgate Road and Breamlea Road.

Vegetation Protection

66. 24 submissions highlighted the important contribution that vegetation provides to the Barwon Heads township.
67. Many of these submissions request that the Amendment apply vegetation controls to private land, similar to the proposed Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 6 (ESO6) to Warrenbeen Court. This request is not supported.
68. We agree that vegetation is a significant contributor to the established character of Barwon Heads. This was recognised in the *Barwon Heads Residential & Landscape Character Assessment* on page 40:

'Landscaping and vegetation make a very important contribution to the character of Barwon Heads'.

69. The Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41, and to a lesser extent the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 42, seek to ensure that new residential development provides sufficient space for landscaping, particularly in front yards.
70. We note that, in addition to the proposed ESO6, there are existing vegetation controls in Barwon Heads; being SLO8 (Barwon Heads Semi-Bush Significant Landscape Area), SLO9 (Barwon River Environs) and VPO1 (Part of Barwon Terrace, Sheepwash Road and River Parade).

Drafting of planning controls

71. Council's Part A Submission highlights the changes to the exhibited Amendment documents at Appendix 4. The changes are a consequence of the consideration of submissions that sought or recommended drafting improvements, as well as further review by Officers.
72. We are yet to properly consider the implications of Amendment VC148 in relation to the Ministerial Direction on the *Form and Content of Planning Schemes*.
73. We now address the proposed Amendment document changes with the Panel through verbal submissions.

Village character

74. Common to all the above themes is the overarching concept of 'coastal character' or 'village character'. Many objecting submissions make mention of this concept, often critical or dismissive of the Structure Plan's ability to protect the established character of the town.
75. We refer the Panel to paragraphs 300-308 of the Part A submission for a response to these community concerns.
76. We maintain that the new zone and overlay controls, together with retaining the settlement boundary location, ensures Amendment C375 strategically responds to the challenges of accommodating a 'modest' level of growth while protecting the 'village' character of Barwon Heads.

RESPONSE TO EVIDENCE TABLED

Barwon Heads Lifestyle Group (Submission #50)

77. The submissions concentrate on the settlement boundary issue.
78. In addition to the expert witness statements, a concept master plan, staging plan and traffic advice prepared by GTA Consultants was submitted. None of this information has any formal status nor is it within the scope of the Amendment. However, the concept plan helps to illustrate the type of development that may transpire if the settlement boundary is moved.
79. It must be said that the plan illustrates the concern of Council in a fairly cogent way. At the moment, by reference to aerial photography it can be seen that the environmental assets comprising the drainage line and the lagoon are a very distinct environmental feature and part of the Barwon Heads coastal landscape. Importantly, these environmental assets have a rural setting. They have large areas of rural land both to their east and west with the settlement boundary being a very clear and distinct line hundreds of metres to the east.
80. The concept plan demonstrates clearly that these assets which are currently read and appreciated in a rural context would be transformed into an urban setting
81. While the evidence of Mr Milner although relating to the area to the north, is critical of the hard edge boundary of the township, Council would regard this as a key clear, and straight forward delineation of the township boundary. While it could be argued that the waterbodies to the west would also be a logical township boundary, it is important to recognise that having a clear township boundary is only one part of the equation. The maintenance of the environmental assets in their rural setting is just as important. We submit that the concept plan shows that this objective will be entirely lost.
82. We respectfully submit that there is fundamental disagreement between the proponents and Council, and we would envisage between the proponents and the community, that the outcome demonstrated in the concept plan is an acceptable outcome. We would entirely reject that assertion.

Town Planning Evidence

83. The town planning evidence statement of Ms Horsfield provides an overview of the site and policy context. It also includes an appendix that critiques the proposed residential zone changes.
84. The summary of opinions at paragraph 5 states: ‘there are policy grounds to warrant further consideration of the settlement boundary’, ‘there is potential for an expansion of the settlement boundary’ and ‘benefits could be generated for the township through a modest expansion of the settlement boundary’ (emphasis added).
85. The summary at paragraph 5 also evidence states:
- Implementing the Barwon Heads Structure Plan via changes to the planning scheme is premature until such time as the Greater Geelong Settlement Strategy has been resolved, and the proposed ‘logical inclusions’ process for enshrining permanent settlement boundaries around all townships has been conducted.
86. The evidence advocates for the panel to put the Amendment on hold pending the Settlement Strategy. We reject that proposition. Essentially this approach would be holding the Structure Plan to ransom as it were simply on account of a disagreement on one part of the Structure Plan, namely the settlement boundary. In fact, there are various facets to the Structure Plan which are not interdependent on each other. The issue of the Settlement boundary, for instance, is different to the issue in relation to Warrenbeen Court and the IHDA. The approach of the evidence highlights the difficulty facing the submission which on the one hand at paragraph 47 accepts that further work would be required in order to resolve the specific location of the boundary (assuming that Council were to accept that the boundary should be moved) but on the other hand seeks to stall the current process of the implementation of the Structure Plan.
87. We submit that it would be a poor reflection on the processes of planning to stall the implementation of a plan such as a Structure Plan simply because one element of it was the subject of dispute. The fact is, if the Structure Plan stalls, the current boundary stays in place. With the new Structure Plan, the current boundary also stays in place. On that basis, there can be no prejudice in allowing the current Structure Plan to be implemented.
88. To be perfectly blunt about the issue of the settlement boundary, unless and until the Council as planning authority forms a view in principle that a boundary shift should

be considered, then there is no prospect of it changing. The previous panel that considered the last structure plan was perfectly aware and alive to this very point.

89. In so far as the panel may find some attraction to delaying the implementation of the Structure Plan, and we submit that it should not, nevertheless, it is to be noted that Council's Part A Submission refers to the draft Settlement Strategy and shows that it includes a framework plan that (also) limits Barwon Heads to its current settlement boundary. The Settlement Strategy is not proposing an expansion of the township.
90. While the Settlement Strategy provides for a 'logical inclusions' process, this process does not apply to smaller towns. The process of logical inclusions will only apply to the Bellarine Peninsula district towns of Ocean Grove, Drysdale/Clifton Springs and Leopold which are the peninsula's recognised and planned growth townships. The logical inclusions process is normally recognised with areas that are intended to have growth not non-growth areas. Accordingly, there is nothing to be gained in waiting for the Settlement Strategy. It is important to note that not only does the Settlement Strategy not propose to deal with the boundaries of the small towns, but as we have said consistently, there is not even an in principle decision to consider an extension of the settlement boundary at Barwon Heads. Accordingly, there is no Council proposal to consider the extension of settlement boundaries in this location.
91. The Barwon Heads Structure Plan is essentially maintaining the status quo as far as the settlement boundary and township growth is concerned. Therefore, the Structure Plan does not need to be preceded by the Settlement Strategy.
92. While accepting that the balance of the evidence identifies a number of prongs to the argument that the structure plan should consider the modification of the settlement boundary, the evidence fails to give adequate any weight to the community sentiment against further outward growth and the relevance of this, and the lack of any resolve by Council as the planning authority to consider that as an option. It may be the case that in the future a different Council may be of a different view. However the view of the current Council is, for the reasons set out in the Structure Plan, not of a mind to provide for further greenfield growth of this township.

Economics Evidence

93. Mr McNeil's evidence addresses matters of residential land supply and demand in Barwon Heads, demographic trends in Barwon Heads and their implications in the context of constraints on land supply.
94. Without having had independent review of this evidence, we do not take issue with most of Mr McNeil's analysis. However, Council does not think that his analysis or conclusion provide any sufficient reason to reconsider Council's position on Barwon Heads' Settlement Boundary.
95. We offer the following response to some of the matters raised in Mr McNeil's evidence.
96. First, in relation to paragraph 3.9, Council does not agree that there is any ambiguity in State policy in relation to the consideration of land supply at a municipal level. The evidence states that there is ambiguity as to how to interpret the adequacy of land supply at a local level against the needs of the municipality as a whole (paragraph 3.9). The panel should expressly reject this proposition and that which follows. The sentence in clause 11.02 of the SPPF that "residential land supply will be considered on a municipal basis, rather than a town by town basis" is a very clear sentence that has a very clear meaning. Policy cannot be unwritten or its otherwise clear interpretation changed simply because one takes issue with the proposition in the policy. There are towns around Victoria that have been designated as no growth towns. Barwon Heads is one of them. That ought to be the end of the policy debate.
97. The balance of the evidence sets up the scenario of what is likely to happen as the community ages, which it no doubt will. However, the report adopts a far too narrow approach to resolving the issues that arise. Barwon Heads is not an isolated rural Victorian town which has a tightly held settlement boundary. It is a small Victorian town which is closely located to other areas which are designated as growth areas. Ocean Grove is a stone's throw away and Armstrong Creek is a relatively short drive. One can expect and indeed will find not only existing community facilities but also a capacity to provide for more community facilities if there is a need.
98. Accordingly, the premise highlighted as an "urgency" in Mr McNeil's evidence is respectfully rejected. It is based on an ambiguity in policy which does not exist and in any event, adopts a far too narrow approach to the way that the issues can be satisfied if and when they arise.
99. None of the scenarios presented in Paragraph 6.18 of the evidence, should they in fact eventuate, are considered to justify an extension to the Settlement Boundary.

Flood & Stormwater Evidence and Infrastructure Services Evidence

100. In the limited time available, Council's Senior Planning Engineer has provided the following advice:

Introduction

- a. The following comments primarily focus on the document *City of Greater Geelong Planning Scheme Amendment C375 Expert Witness Statement Flood and Stormwater* (Venant Solutions, 14 August 2018).
- b. Expert evidence in the form of a *Servicing Report* (Peter Berry and Associates, 6 August 2018) has also been provided for review. This document incorporates advice from relevant Service Authorities that 1900 Barwon Heads Road can be supplied with water, sewer, electricity, gas and telecommunications infrastructure in the event residential development were permitted, subject to extension and augmentation of existing assets.
- c. The Venant Solutions document is presented as a feasibility study for *one* particular development scenario of 1900 Barwon Heads Road, incorporating conventional residential subdivision, a retirement village, an aged care facility, child care centre and playing fields.
- d. It is understood the relevant landowner's submission to the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 *sought only to extend the township boundary* so that a future rezoning/development proposal may be considered
- e. At this early stage, the key consideration should be to fully understand the physical characteristics of the land to inform suitable type and scale of any future development (ie. land capability analysis). This may include study of topography, geology, geomorphology, flooding and surface water, groundwater conditions, vegetation and biodiversity, historic land uses, etc.
- f. Key features of the subject land include:
 - Bounded to the west and south by wetlands forming part of the *Port Phillip Bay (Western Shoreline) and Bellarine Peninsula RAMSAR* site
 - Nominally protected from riverine flooding by a levee (Plummer Bank) to the north
 - Gently undulating with elevations at or below 5m AHD
 - Lower lying land appears to be periodically inundated
 - Scattered mature trees are present
 - An excavated water body is located toward the north-west corner
 - Historic land management practices are unclear – there does not appear to be intensive agricultural activity (grazing, cropping), however the land is managed.
- g. There is no analysis of the performance of existing infiltration and stormwater harvesting systems, particularly those in Barwon Heads. For example, the stormwater management system employed by the adjoining Seabank Estate relies in part on reuse by the Barwon Heads Golf Club. There have been problems with saline groundwater intrusion into the pump infrastructure, resulting in discharge of stormwater that is not fit-for-purpose.
- h. Cumulative impacts have not been considered in the event land north of Barwon Heads Road is included in an expanded town boundary

Levee

- i. Plummer Bank is an earthen levee located north-west of the Barwon Heads township on Council owned land and Crown Reserve. The 1700m long solid earth embankment was constructed primarily to prevent floodwaters from entering the town from the north during Barwon River flood events.
- j. Remediation works were undertaken in 1997-98, raising the crest height to 4.25m AHD (estimated 0.1% AEP flood level), following a flood event in 1995.
- k. The levee crosses the north-south wetland/channel forming part of the RAMSAR complex. Low flows are facilitated by a culvert through the levee, manually controlled by a check valve which is kept open as part of day-to-day operation.
- l. It cannot be assumed that the levee provides ultimate protection to the level of freeboard suggested in the report. The levee has an embedded structure with control to manage flow from one site to the other. The operation and maintenance of this structure is uncertain and could be a point of failure for the levee. An assessment of this as an ongoing strategy would need to be assessed.

Murnaghurt Swamp/Lagoon

- m. The report assumes water levels within the Murnaghurt Lagoon complex are exclusively dependant on surface flows. Water cycle interactions of Murnaghurt are complex and uncertain, including surface flows, groundwater, overflow from golf course storage and urban catchments.
- n. The report does not present a quantifiable measure to assess the analysed expected water levels within both the channel, lagoon and Barwon river floodplain.
- o. Tail-water conditions and drawdown time of Murnaghurt Lagoon are unclear and could be tidally influenced.
- p. Frequency of inundation could become an issue for management in seasonally wet years.
- q. It is expected any development of the site would include significant buffers to the RAMSAR listed wetlands. Additionally, interaction between a 'developed' system and the natural wetland may need to be isolated.
- r. It is inevitable any development adjoining Murnaghurt will affect the current flow regime into the system. Potential impacts on the fresh/salt water balance, particularly at outfalls and interfaces, and whether impacts are considered detrimental requires a broader focus than simply the volume of runoff and meeting BPEM targets.
- s. Whilst the impacts of climate change on inundation as a result of sea level rise have been considered, the most recent study does not appear to have been referenced (Our Coast). Additionally, the interaction between sea level and groundwater in climate change scenarios are not well understood and could have serious implications for the site.

Development scenario

- t. The modelled development scenario relies on a combination of lot-scale stormwater harvesting (i.e. mandated rainwater tanks) and an end of line wetland/pond to manage stormwater runoff. The concept is similar to that presented in evidence to the C159 panel.
- u. Given the uncertainty around surface water and groundwater interaction, it may be difficult to achieve onsite retardation and treatment without potentially impacting the surrounding environmentally sensitive areas. The report does not address uncertainty in the land capability in managing onsite stormwater within acceptable standards.

- v. At approximately 5ha, the wetland would occupy 10% of the development site. This is unusually large in comparison to Council’s existing asset base, and would require ‘non-standard’ management procedures given the complexities around its proximity to environmentally sensitive receiving waters and interactions with potentially saline groundwater. Development at higher densities than those modelled will likely result in a larger wetland with increased ongoing maintenance liabilities.
- w. There is a lack of clarity regarding the practical land development assumptions in the modelling to demonstrate capability of a site based stormwater solution. Modelling assumes comparatively small houses on large lots, which is at odds with current housing trends in the municipality and particularly Barwon Heads.
- x. Council is apprehensive about allowing development that relies heavily on mandated stormwater reuse as an intrinsic part of a broader strategy. Modelling must be conservative to allow for variations in permanent occupancy rates. There is a need for agreements with landowners and surveillance through the Building Permit system to ensure the functionality is available in perpetuity.
- y. MUSIC modelling cannot be thoroughly interrogated as parameters and a schematic has not been provided
- z. Any development is likely to require an EES and/or EPBC referral.
- aa. Given the low elevations and saltmarsh nature of the area, constructability may be affected, and the usable life of assets handed over to Council may be shorter than expected.

Ecology Evidence

101. In the limited time available, Council’s Environment Unit has provided the following advice:

Wetlands

Delivery of “Biodiversity 2037” will rely on a best practice legislative and regulatory framework. The land use planning framework, for example, provides a good opportunity to ensure that biodiversity is integrated early in decision-making processes.

Port Phillip Bay (Western Shoreline) & Bellarine Peninsula Ramsar Site Mgt Plan (DELWP 2018)

The proposal will result in the following identified threats:

- Stormwater discharges, altering both water regimes and salinity,
- Direct habitat removal and loss of buffer is the highest priority for the Lake Connearre wetland complex.
- Cats predated on waterbirds

Corangamite Catchment Strategy 2014 – 2019: lists Lake Connearre (including Murtnaghurt Lagoon and the link) as an important (Ramsar) wetland and commits to improving its quality relative to 2009 benchmark data, enhance their ecological value.

Any proposed development or use must provide a demonstrable net environmental benefit for the Murtnaghurt Lagoon and the Connearre link. The current submission is not considered to provide a demonstrable net environmental benefit. Essential to this will be careful consideration of appropriate buffer between the Ramsar site and adjacent activities and land uses.

Adequate space is required to allow transition zones between wetland/terrestrial habitat to enable wetlands to respond naturally to climate change, coastal inundation, rising sea levels (i.e. wetland expansion/ retreat/migration). For example, to facilitate landward migration it would be important to maintain or create linkages between wetland and terrestrial habitats.

In the 2018 Ramsar Site Management Plan, DELWP have committed to developing “Wetland Buffer Guidelines” (currently in preparation). The proposal applies a 50m development setback from the Ramsar boundary, and another 50m buffer for the construction of stormwater retention assets.

An appropriate development set-back or buffer must be informed by current scientific literature considering (at a minimum):

- Appropriate distances from urban noise/use that does not impact breeding behaviour or habitat of migratory birds.
- Appropriate transition zones between wetland/terrestrial habitat to enable wetlands to respond naturally to climate change (expansion/migration).
- Maximum distance domestic cats roam from urban areas - Council is unable to undertake cat control compliance (literature suggests approx. >350m).
- Inclusion of land to manage fire risk (i.e. in addition to land required for biodiversity conservation).
- Greater buffers adjoining the Connewarre link where urban/residential risks are magnified due to the narrow width of the wetland (50-80m) and increased susceptibility to edge effects.

Native Vegetation

The Victorian Government inextricably links impacts to biodiversity through the removal of native vegetation:

“Native vegetation helps maintain Victoria’s biodiversity as it forms the basis of Victoria’s ecological communities”. Guidelines (DELWP, 2017).

The Brett Lane and Associates report (August 2018) recorded the following native vegetation within the property:

- 3 x habitat zones of Coastal Saltmarsh (EVC 9, Habitat Zone B,C and D. No habitat score or species list provided for B and C).
- 1 x habitat zones of Coastal Alkaline Scrub (EVC 858, Habitat Zone A, No habitat score or species list provided).

The proposal will require an application to remove native vegetation in accordance with Clause 52.17. The application would be assessed under the “detailed assessment pathway” due to the removal of more than 0.5 hectares of native vegetation. A “detailed assessment pathway” means the removal could impact endangered EVC, sensitive wetlands or significantly impact habitat for rare/threatened species.

Comments and Recommendations:

- Review of historical aerial photography (Nearmap) shows Habitat Zone D may have been present >10 years ago, and therefore the “regrowth” exemption may not apply. This is supported by the presence of the DELWP mapped wetlands layer in the same area. Wetlands can be difficult to identify and accurately assess at the site level as they respond quickly to changes in environmental condition, especially rainfall. After a period of no or low rainfall they may appear degraded or not be evident.

Council recommend that this area is given the same level of consideration and protection as Habitat Zones A-C (i.e. the purpose and intent of the DELWP mapped wetland layer). This area of mapped wetland must be avoided, this outcome would also remove the requirement for a permit to remove native vegetation, and to source offsets for Prickly Arrowgrass (currently unavailable).

- The likelihood of retaining native vegetation within future open space area is low (i.e. mature Moonah /Coastal Alkaline Scrub in Habitat Zone A may be considered unsafe for retention in public open space/drainage reserve). Retention of native vegetation in conservation reserves/conservation zoned land is the preferred outcome.

Why is key information regarding Habitat Zones A, B and C missing from the report (i.e. habitat scores, species lists)? Even those these areas are to be “retained” in the proposal, this information is crucial to understanding species use/policy implications from indirect impacts.

Mid West Group (Submission #137)

102. This submission concentrates on the settlement boundary issue.

103. An expert evidence report was prepared by Robert Milner for Mid West Group (Barwon Heads), a consortium of landowners of 135 Taits Road, 137 Taits Road and 1941-1949 Barwon Heads Road. A submission on Amendment C375 on behalf of these owners had argued that there are shortcomings in the Amendment and Structure Plan.

104. In the conclusions of Mr Milner’s evidence, it is recommended that the Panel not endorse Council’s view that there should be no change to the Settlement Boundary; however, the evidence makes no recommendation as to the particular location for any variation to the extent of urban development or of a revised Settlement Boundary.

105. Council rejects this conclusion and continue to support the Settlement Boundary as shown on the Barwon Heads Structure Plan Map in the exhibited Amendment C375. We submit that extension of the Settlement Boundary is not supported by the planning policy framework and that no compelling case has been made to justify a change to planning policy to support such an extension.

106. Paragraph 22 of the evidence refers to “hard edged, suburban” interface that terminates “without seeming rationale or reference to topography, road or other physical feature”. This interface is based on cadastral boundaries, even if, due to the historical subdivision pattern, not on road boundaries. This is not an unusual situation (for example, in the City of Greater Geelong, the eastern Settlement Boundary for Leopold; the easternmost part of the Settlement Boundary for Portarlington; and the eastern Settlement Boundary for Ocean Grove, south of Shell Road) and it is not a justification for a change to a Settlement Boundary.

107. Paragraph 22 of the evidence also refers to the land being poorly used and maintained, low-lying and partly subject to inundation and of limited agricultural value

and potential for productive use. Council submits that there are a wide range of possible uses under the Farming Zone. To argue that the land has limited agricultural value is inadequate justification for its inclusion in the Settlement Boundary. Council will address this matter further in response to Paragraphs 52 and 53 of the evidence.

108. Paragraph 25 of the evidence argues that an appropriate balance must be struck between cited competing planning policy considerations. We would argue that the Barwon Heads Structure Plan and Amendment C375 have appropriately balanced these planning policy considerations. Economic development and tourism does not require a change to the Settlement Boundary or the zoning of land outside the Settlement Boundary. Protection of productive agricultural land is not furthered by expanding the Settlement Boundary.

109. Paragraph 52 and 53 of the evidence refer to the 2007 Rural Land Use Strategy. Council submits that there is no validity to the argument that the classification of the land as having the lowest agricultural land quality class (Class 5) in the 2007 Rural Land Use Strategy somehow warrants or justifies its removal from the Farming Zone. On the contrary, much similar land has the same zoning and subdivision controls.

110. The Schedule to the Farming Zone (Clause 35.07) in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme has operated in the Scheme with its current subdivision controls since 2010 – these were inserted in the Scheme by Amendment C129(Pt 1), which gave effect to recommendations of the Rural Land Use Strategy. That Amendment set a 30 ha minimum lot size for any subdivision of Farming Zoned land on the Bellarine Peninsula. This zone and subdivision control apply to large areas of the Bellarine Peninsula identified in the Rural Land Use Strategy with the same Class 5 agricultural land quality class. No further subdivision of any of the lots in the “Western option” is permissible under the Farming Zone controls.

111. Productive agricultural capacity is not necessarily the same as agricultural land quality, a Paragraph made clear in the section of the Rural Land Use Strategy from which the Map (Figure 8 in Mr Milner’s evidence) is taken:

It is important to consider that the quality of land is a key, but not a singular factor in understanding the locational dynamics of agricultural activity. Shed-based agricultural activities are largely reliant on factors such as land availability, infrastructure, buffers and labour force access. Also in Geelong, the structure of agricultural activity in many locations is part of a mixed economy that benefits from linkages to urban employment.

As a planning tool, land capability does offer effective indication of the importance of land resources for agriculture in specific areas. From a land use policy perspective, land capability should not be considered as offering predictive results, but rather as a layer of information to be considered along with urban and rural settlement dynamics, infrastructure and natural resource circumstances; and all within a context of planning policy and community expectations of economic development and landscape values.

For Greater Geelong this means that while some land can be considered of high value as an existing and potential agricultural resource, other factors such as the scope for growth in agricultural activity less reliant on land quality (such as shed-based activities) and the need to recognise the value of rural and agricultural land as having important landscape values should also be considered in strategic land use planning.

112. The Structure Plan does not suggest that productive agricultural capacity is the sole basis for applying the Farming Zone to land. Moreover, it should also be noted that the Farming Zone now allows a wide range of uses, many of which will not require high agricultural quality class land.

113. With respect to the reference to tourism facilities in Paragraph 69 of the evidence, there are tourism uses possible within the Farming Zone – it is not necessary for the Settlement Boundary to be relocated to allow an appropriate, environmentally sensitive tourism use.

114. Paragraphs 74 to 84 of the evidence, seem to be being argued that extension of the Settlement Boundary would significantly address housing affordability. Council does not agree with this argument. The likelihood of additional greenfield residential land being marketed and sold as affordable housing is strongly doubted. With respect to land supply and affordability, Barwon Heads should not be considered in isolation but, not only at a municipal level, but also in the context of Ocean Grove (a designated growth town, just across the Barwon River) and Armstrong Creek (the state's largest regional urban growth area, less than 10 km to the west). With respect to housing diversity, it is clear from the Housing Diversity Strategy that the best place to provide for this is close to an activity centre, not by greenfield expansion on the edge of a town.

Save Barwon Heads Alliance (Submission #128)

115. Ecology evidence prepared by Dr Andrew McMahon of Ecology Australia supports the submissions of the Save Barwon Heads Alliance Inc.
116. Our Environment Unit has provided a response to the evidence of Brett Lane, and this has been included in our Part B Panel submission.
117. Although that response does not specifically respond to the expert evidence of Andrew McMahon, it provides an indication of the relevant environmental issues to be addressed in any detailed consideration of a change to the Settlement Boundary.

123. The Thirteenth Beach Resort Comprehensive Development Plan does not show any proposed development on the Stage C land. The land contains the following notation on the Comprehensive Development Plan:

LAND EAST OF LINGS ROAD:
NO DEVELOPMENT OR BUILDING TO BE USED AS
ACCOMMODATION OR COMMERCIAL PURPOSE

124. Prior to any substantial new development proposal, that plan (which is an incorporated plan under the Scheme) would need to be changed and an Amendment made to the Planning Scheme to incorporate the updated plan.

125. Council previously proposed to rezone the Stage C land from the Comprehensive Development Zone Schedule 1 to the Rural Conservation Zone, as part of Amendment C159, which implemented the previous 2007 Barwon Heads Structure Plan. The Amendment C159 Panel Report considered that proposal but recommended that the CDZ1 zoning be retained.

126. The Panel noted that it was conceivable that some form of golf-related development, based around a third 18 hole golf course, could be accommodate in a manner that addresses the various relevant issues. The Panel considered that potentially suitable development proposals would need to:

- be principally focussed on an 18 hole golf course;
- have a strong link with the existing Resort;
- provide a demonstrable net environmental benefit for the Murtnaghurt Lagoon and the channel;
- avoid any de-facto residential development; and
- maintain the non-urban appearance along the frontage to Barwon Heads Road

127. The Panel noted that CDZ1 zoning would not necessarily be retained in perpetuity if not acted upon.

128. The Stage C land, along with the now existing golf course and associated residential estate, is zoned Comprehensive Development Zone Schedule 1 (CDZ1) under the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 and Amendment C375

129. The 2017 Structure Plan (Part A, section 3.3.1, pages 11 and 12) states that the land should remain zoned CDZ for the following reasons:

- the development provides an opportunity to deliver net environmental benefits for the community;

- economic conditions that would have allowed for the development in a short timeframe have changed;
- this is a nationally recognised golf course that is identified in the Tourism Greater Geelong and the Bellarine Tourism Development Strategy as a key tourism facility for the City;
- the Farming Zone has changed since 2010 and allows for a wider range of land uses;
- a golf course of this nature can provide a high level of amenity; and
- there was limited support for the change by the community through engagement.

130. The Structure Plan noted it is imperative that conditions for development imposed as part of the 2010 Structure Plan are retained, with a key requirement being that no residential development should occur on the site.

131. The Structure Plan (page 12) contains the following Direction:

- is principally focused on an 18 hole golf course (or similar);
- has a strong link with the existing resort;
- provides a demonstrable net environmental benefit for the Murtnaghurt Lagoon and channel;
- excludes residential development; and
- maintains the non-urban appearance along the frontage to Barwon Heads Road.

132. Amendment C375 proposes no change to the zoning of the Stage C land.

133. The Amendment proposes the following reworded objective in Clause 21.14:

- Support the appropriate development of Stage 3 of the 13th Beach Resort as a focus for golf that excludes residential development and provides demonstrable net environmental benefits.

134. The Amendment proposes to include a Barwon Heads Structure Plan map in Clause 21.14 with the following notation on the Stage C land:

- Retain the comprehensive development zone for Stage C 13th Beach Resort.

Current status

135. The subject land is vacant farmland. There are no current development proposals for the land.

136. The Incorporated Document: *Thirteenth Beach Golf Resort Barwon Heads, Comprehensive Development Plan*, at the Schedule to Clause 72.04 Documents Incorporated in this Planning Scheme, continues to apply as shown below.

STATUS OF BARWON HEADS ‘FURTHER WORK’ IN CLAUSE 21.14

What is the issue?

137. The Panel has sought the status of studies identified for Barwon Heads in ‘further work’ of Clause 21.14 of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

138. The ‘further work’ is to:

Undertake a study to identify significant vegetation and biodiversity values of public areas and roadsides within Barwon Heads.

Undertake a detailed study of Murtnaghurt Lagoon to establish whether the boundaries of the existing Environmental Significance Overlay require review.

Council response

139. Council’s Environment Unit advised that mapping work of public areas and roadsides has commenced.

140. No detailed study has occurred for Murtnaghurt Lagoon and ESO review. This project is not within the Planning Strategy Unit 2019 financial year planning, and it has not been activated by the Environment Unit.

STATUS OF THE BARWON HEADS TRAFFIC & PARKING STUDY WORK PROGRAM

What is the issue?

141. The Panel has requested details regarding the work program for the following council resolution on 26 June 2018:

That officers commit to and support at the Panel an updated traffic and parking study being undertaken that includes measurements conducted during both peak summer season and the non-winter period. Such study should be conducted to reflect the changing traffic conditions in Barwon Heads as a result of regional growth in surrounding areas, as well as the car dependency of residents and visitors through limited alternative transport options.

Council response

142. Council officers will commit to submit a funding bid for Council consideration to fund a traffic and parking study to be undertaken for the Barwon Heads Township. The study would include undertaking traffic measurements during both peak summer and non-peak winter periods to identify traffic improvements for all road users.

143. At its earliest, the submission would be for the next financial year budget bid process.

CONCLUSION

144. This completes the Part B submissions of Council.

.....

For City of Greater Geelong

