



AGENDA APPENDIX
Council Meeting
Wednesday 25 September 2013

AGENDA ITEM FOR SEPARATE DISTRIBUTION TO COUNCILLORS AND EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP TEAM DUE TO DOCUMENT SIZE.

THE ITEM IS ACCESSIBLE VIA THE COUNCIL WEBSITE OR BY CONTACTING COUNCIL ON 03 5662 9200.

E.4•ADOPTION OF HOUSING AND SETTLEMENT STRATEGY

Appendix 2 – Summary of submissions

Appendix 2
Summary of submissions to draft HSS

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
Agencies	DTPLI: Support the HSS and no objection	(25)	Acknowledged.	No changes required
	Former DPCD - Suggested changes: 1) Update reference to the former DPCD; 2) Align settlement naming conventions with GRGP and supply brief explanation of the difference between 4 growth directions; 3) Request for more discussion of the protection of agricultural land, 4) SPPF (cl. 11.02, 11.05, 14.01) and Practice Note 37 in Part A; Request for mapping growth area in Leongatha; 5) Support the use of RO; 6) query about land in Kongwak site that has been included in the settlement boundary; 7) ID areas for implementation of new Residential Growth or Neighbourhood Residential Zones;	(30)	Support changes to a) reference to the former DPCD, b) discussion about SPPF, c) protection of farming land, d) Practice Note 37, and e) growth directions for settlements. Strategic settlement maps are not required to identify all growth areas, but accept that key growth areas in Leongatha and Korumburra are not be noted in settlement discussion in Part A. Land in Kongwak RLZ is currently undergoing a technical amendment for TZ rezoning to facilitate use of the land as car park for Sunday market. Identification of areas for implementation of new residential zones is not budgeted for in the HSS and will be pursued in a separate initiative.	Correct reference to the former DPCD; Discuss the need for protection of agricultural land, SPPF (cl. 11.02, 11.02-4, 11.05, 14.01) in Part A- Section 2.1 Policy context; Discuss practice Note 37 in Part C –RLZ; Reference the protection of agricultural land in RO section; Discuss the difference between the four growth directions in Part A.
	DEPI: Suggested changes to the executive summary and Section 2.2. in Part A - Discussions about Fauna, vegetation and Parks and Reserves.	(27)	Submission supported.	Modify executive summary and discussion in Part A as requested.
	WGCMA: Supports the following HSS directions: 1) growth in settlements with sewerage; 2) Managing demand for lifestyle residential development through LDRZ near larger settlements; 3) limitation of rezoning to RLZ, 4) careful management of coastal areas in accordance with the VCS.	(43)	Agree with suggested changes, with some modification to be made.	Part A: Give reference to the RCS in the Policy Context section; Discuss the PSA briefly under the Coastal Sea Level Rise and Flooding sub-section; Reference WGCMA in the glossary; Discuss the RCS and waterways under the sub-section of Water Catchment in Sec 2.2; Incorporate major water channels in settlement maps; Include discussion about each Landscape Priority Area in the appendix.
	Gippsland Water: Mirboo North: Future subdivision in "Potential Long Term urban Expansion investigation area" south-east corner of Mirboo North, recognized in the Planning Scheme, would require infrastructure upgrade - water tower. Submission also informs Council that any FZ to Urban zones rezoning on Baromi Road (currently in FZ and incorrectly recognized as existing urban zoned land in the PS) would require sewer infrastructure upgrade at developers cost.	(15)	Note the development constraints to be addressed in the permit process.	No changes required
	SGW: No objection to the draft HSS, subject to minor changes to discussions about infrastructure and key constraints in various	(45)	Agree with all the suggested changes.	Modify the HSS in relation to sewerage provisions and catchment issues in various settlements as requested.

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	towns.			
Emergency Management	Support the HSS and request for more elaborated discussions about the relevant adopted documents and the fire related issue throughout the HSS.	(48)	Support most suggested changes, as per earlier meeting with the submitter. Approve all the changes requested except for the discussion about the BMO and CIG for Koonwarra under the UDF section where there is currently no BMO coverage. The anticipated BMO amendment is discussed earlier in Part A and the CIG is also mentioned in Part A.	Modify discussion in Part A and B as requested.
Arawata	Surprised and disappointed to hear that Council intends to sell the former school site, citing former letter from Tim Tamlin stating future rezoning of the site to PPRZ to protect its public use in a general amendment in 2011. (The rezoning never took place)	(71)	Clarified with the submitter about the planned update to the draft HSS. The update is based on the internal advice that, given the Council asset realisation project, further discussion about the site will still be required before a final decision can be made about the site.	Include an action in Arawata UDF: "Engage with the Arawata community in determining the future use of the former school site"
Bena, Darlimurla,	No objection (some requires clarification over the phone)	(03), (06)	Acknowledged.	No changes required
Buffalo	Asserts that the UDF for Buffalo wouldn't allow for the organic growth of the township as the proposed settlement boundary doesn't include area formerly recognized in the "township plan" attached to the submission. The submission suggests that: 1) The "remainder of the former Township" should be rezoned as RLZ/RAZ if Council is determined to adopt "such a restrictive TZ"; 2) FZ does not reflect its current nor future usage.	(29)	Requirements listed in the State Government Practice Note 37 on Rural Residential Development would be difficult to achieve in Buffalo. While the old township plan supplied in the submission may have suggested the area 3, 6, and 7 (as per the plan) could be developed as part of the township, this was not recognized by the previous Council and not reflected in the current Scheme, hence the land has remained in FZ. The former Shire and the Planning Scheme recognise the development constraints of the township due to servicing difficulties. In addition to that, Council's policy position of "no sewer, no growth", endorsed in the Overall Settlement Plan and also the draft HSS, is still relevant as an overarching strategy and is expressed through the UDF directions for smaller settlements like Buffalo.	No changes required
Fish Creek	The submission proposes for RLZ investigation for the land with building envelopes and revegetation envelopes in place. The submission acknowledges the native veg with high conversational values and erosion on site due to grazing, but argues that with mandatory envelopes and revegetation a bio links can be established and produces a positive environmental outcome. The submission also argues that: 1)the RLZ would reduce rural living in FZ and impact negatively on farming activities. 2)The rural living potential provided by the RLUS cannot be fully realised	(40)	The general direction for the land was already established in the RLUS (2011) and it's not appropriate for the HSS to deviate given no fundamental change to the nature of the area or tourism market. The application of RLZ to this area would have to pass the test of Practice Note 37 and is not considered by the HSS.	No changes required

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	<p>due to Tarwin Catchment issue.</p> <p>The farming zoned land on the edge of Fish Creek (26 ha+ 42 ha not mentioned in submission) should be investigated for future RLZ for the following reason: 1) the Draft HSS direction for Fish Creek is to "support growth" , 2) his client's land is "of restricted potential for agricultural activities"; 3) Rural living close to townships are different from the RLUS opportunities and is popular; 3) Catchment issue is hampering the opportunities created by RLUS, so relying on RLUS is short-sighted; 4) proximity to the commercial centre (1.2 km) and close to some TZ land, 5) future expansion of township is not restricted by this proposed linear development; 6) acknowledge there are waterways but think it could be rehabilitated; 7) acknowledge it's within cultural heritage sensitivity area.</p>	(33)	<p>RLZ investigation is inappropriate given the following strategic and site specific issues:</p> <p>The reason that Rural Living close to town is popular does not necessarily outweigh the need for protection of farming land.</p> <p>The draft HSS promotes growth in Fish Creek within the settlement boundary subject to wastewater provisions.</p> <p>The application of RLZ to this area would have to pass the test of Practice Note 37 and is not considered by the HSS.</p> <p>Sewer provision is required in the township before any major growth could be considered.</p>	No changes required
Kongwak	<p>Oppose further development in Kongwak (RLZ), for it would change the look of Kongwak when there is no real requirement and demand for houses up for sale. More development would bring more car/noise and people what would drive people out of the area. There are enough houses and shops in Kongwak so it should be left alone.</p>	(34)	<p>The application of RLZ to this area would have to pass the test of Practice Note 37 and is not considered by the HSS.</p>	No changes required
	<p>Supports the draft HSS recommendation against RLZ Investigation in Kongwak.</p> <p>Questions about the population figure of Kongwak in Part A; Suggest Kongwak to be "downgraded" from a 'Village' to a 'hamlet'</p> <p>Question why the FZ land south of the main road is included into the settlement boundary when there is no discussion about the land.</p> <p>Concerned about the inaccuracy of the character statement in Kongwak UDF, and in discussion about effluent disposal issue in Kongwak and that it affects residential properties within the RLZ investigation section.</p> <p>Suggests the HSS should not pre-empt the outcome of the RLZ investigation area.</p>	(44)	<p>Agree with the suggested changes to the Character Statement in Kongwak UDF and delete reference to the affected residential properties in the context of existing effluent areas (RLZ discussion)</p> <p>Agree that Kongwak should be downgraded to hamlet given the infrastructure provisions relative to other settlements of similar size.</p> <p>The FZ land within the settlement boundary south of the main road is subject to a technical amendment to be rezoned to TZ given the use of the land as a car park for the Sunday market.</p> <p>Not support deletion of reference to LDRZ and TZ in the discussion about possible sewerage solution for Kongwak, as this gives indication about (not to determine) the possible outcomes.</p>	<p>As requested, accept all changes to the character statement and delete reference to the affected residential properties in the context of existing effluent areas. Downgrade" Kongwak from Village to hamlet in township hierarchy and township discussion (Part A).</p> <p>UDF text - Identify market land in FZ to be rezoned to TZ.</p>

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	hence reference to future LDRZ or the TZ is inappropriate.			
	Details the development of the draft HSS, the planning policies and controls that apply on the western investigation area. However there is no request in the submission for any changes to the draft HSS.	(35)	No changes are needed and the current recommendation in the draft HSS is appropriate. We anticipate the land owner to make proposal to Council relating to his land in accordance with the HSS following its adoption.	No changes required
	<p>Support HSS's recommendation against RLZ investigation of Area B in Kongwak, citing risk of flood, bushfire, land slip, contamination of Foster Creek, and loss of dairy productivity.</p> <p>Also raised are visual impact and non-conformance with "Applying the Rural Zones" practice note. It also reveals a recent permit for dwelling on the subject land, for which the proponent contends to VCAT that the land was to be used for farming. The submission argues that the proposal for RLZ rezoning is contrary to this stated intent.</p> <p>Opposing the TZ rezoning alongside the road north of Investigation Area B, the submission states risk of similar issues, issue of easement and traffic hazard at access point.</p>	(18)	<p>The draft HSS recognizes many of the issues raised in this submission, e.g. bushfire risk, flood risk, risk of erosion. The high level investigation has considered high level advice from relevant authorities on other issues.</p> <p>Apart from a minor technical amendment involving TZ rezoning on the land surrounding an existing dwelling, no TZ rezoning to the western end of settlement is supported by the HSS.</p>	No changes required
	<p>The submitter acknowledges his RLZ proposal is not supported in the draft HSS. He seeks Council's view on his TZ rezoning proposal, which he believed is not addressed in the draft HSS. He is interested in 1) TZ rezoning to accommodate 6 TZ lots (i.e. Extension of TZ along the road); 2) deepening of existing TZ area, or 3) Two lot subdivision to split the current TZ/FZ lot.</p>	(19)	<p>The draft HSS supports neither the RLZ investigation nor the extension of the TZ to the east. The rezoning would be inappropriate due to slope, fire risk, and lack of strategic reasoning to do so. The 2 lot subdivision to split the property along the existing FZ/TZ boundary could be considered by in a planning permit application.</p>	No changes required.
Koonwarra	<p>As a land owner in Koonwarra, the submitter advocates for rezoning of the RAZ land in Koonwarra to TZ, providing a map showing the extent of map he proposes to be rezoned. It's suggested that rezoning would provide more housing choices and increase the prosperity of local businesses and community groups. No other supporting material is provided.</p>	(02)	<p>The existing RAZ area in the drawing submitted is 42 hectare in size, but it also includes an existing LDRZ area of 26.3 hectares. There is no strong merit for large scale rezoning given the service level of Koonwarra, which is unlikely to change in short to medium term. Other issues are the Tarwin Catchment issue, environmental risk, bushfire risk and services/institutional employment opportunities in Leongatha. Embankment on both sides of the main street may also have made it difficult for further development in the TZ area.</p>	No changes required.

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	<p>One submission raised the following: 1) no more growth in Koonwarra till sewerage provisions, 2) Koonwarra Store septic is emitting odour on busy weekends; 3) fuel along rail trail needs to be burnt; 4) Nirvana Park is an eye-sore.</p> <p>Another submission points out some errors in the UF map.</p>	(08) (32)	<p>Phone discussion followed by an email to submitter on 7 June. He is relieved to hear about our plan to correct the mapping errors in the UDF, which currently indicates rezoning of LDRZ to TZ.</p> <p>Action regarding Nirvana Park is to be reworded. Council has no plan to sell off the land.</p> <p>The submitter has been in liaison with Council about the wastewater issue from the commercial area so no action is required in the HSS though his concern about development expansion in the absence of sewer is noted and reflected in the UDF.</p>	<p>Correct mapping errors in UDF map affecting the reserve and the LDRZ precinct;</p> <p>Urban Design action regarding Nirvana Park is to be reworded to say "<i>Liaise with Koonwarra community over the future opportunities for Nirvana Park</i>"; Correction to indicate reticulated water supply; These errors will be rectified after the exhibition.</p>
Leongatha	<p>The two submissions for the same group of landowners contend that the future residential living discussion in Leongatha in the draft HSS does not address the issues presented in their earlier submission. The submission reiterates that not fully including the entire parcels affected in the subject land for RLZ investigation would make the land useless/impractical as a development site. The submission also argues it won't be financially viable without all the land rezoned given the existing overlays.</p>	(41)(42)	<p>Leongatha investigation area, west of Bass Highway, Southern Leongatha: Part of the land was identified in the draft HSS as a suitable site for rezoning to Low Density Residential Zone. There is little strategic merit to revise the identified rural expansion area as requested by the landowners due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Split zoning issue raised by the landowners can be addressed by boundary realignment and other means. ii. Safety and access issue from the land to the highway. iii. The increased yield of the land under the LDRZ required as the land is within a special water supply catchment and must be connected to reticulated sewer. iv. Council's decision to realign Simons Lane and, as a result, the creation of better highway access to the future Low Density Residential Zone precinct east of Bass Highway. 	<p>Indicate the area already identified in the Leongatha Framework Plan as suitable investigation area for rural living in LDRZ.</p>
Meeniyan	<p>Meeniyan should be ranked with Foster & Mirboo North as a "District Town" rather than a Small Town.</p>	(17)	<p>While it is agreed that Meeniyan provides some services to a catchment of smaller settlements, and that it will continue to grow in its contribution to the Shire, it does not play the same level of regional role as the "District Towns", i.e. Foster and Mirboo North which provide higher order services such as secondary education and aged care. The naming of the settlements are also influenced and guided by the State government's Gippsland Regional Growth Plan.</p> <p>Where settlements function, growth patterns and or/key features change in the life of this Strategy, particular settlement conditions and hierarchy in the HSS can be reviewed, subject to Council's project priority.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>
Nerrena	<p>Submitter is under the impression that the HSS is to override the directions in the RLUS about development in FZ and will limit FZ development. He advocates Council look at modern housing effluent management system.</p>	(04)	<p>Officer rang the submitter to seek his clarification of his concern. His land is not within the RO area. He was under the impression that the "Settlement Boundary" in Nerrena UDF would indicate changes of planning controls to FZ land outside the boundary. Officer clarified that the scope of the HSS does not include changing controls of the area outside settlement and the boundary is to define urban development for the settlement.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
Nyora RLZ	<p>2 submissions (49,50) oppose the revised RLZ precinct, siting amenity, road access and roadway issue.</p> <p>Submissions (23,52) from a land owner disagree with the RLZ recommendation in Nyora, citing poor access for emergency services, poor road structure, undulation leading to potential run off, and difficulty to establish infrastructure. Submission raised his land, closer to South Gippsland Highway (west of township) as better alternative for RLZ.</p> <p>One submission (53) is in support of the proposed revision of the Investigation Area. Her land has now been included for RLZ investigation.</p> <p>One submitter (54) is disappointed with the change of Council's position to include land on Berrys Road for RLZ investigation, citing concern with rural outlook, absence of requirement on landscaping, impact to traffic and access, as well as perceived increase to rate.</p> <p>Submission (70) supports the RLZ rezoning in Nyora, as an adjoining neighbour to a subject site, so long as no financial contribution is required of them to the upgrade of roads as a result of the rezoning.</p>	(21,23, 36,38, 46,49,50, 52,53,54, 70)	<p>(49,50): Submitters are satisfied with Council's explanation about the rationale of the changes. The precinct base approach allows for better coordination of resource, contribution to road upgrade, and better layout to the subdivision. As adjoining neighbours, they will be notified prior to any Amendment that affects the Investigation Areas. No changes required.</p> <p>(23,52): Land west of Nyora has been identified for future residential growth. Investigation of land further west from the township without knowing the clear extent of urban residential growth will compromise Nyora's growth opportunity. The land owned by the submitter is not free of constraints and will require careful consideration. The RLZ precinct identified in the HSS, together with the urban growth areas, should be sufficient for Nyora within the life cycle of the HSS.</p> <p>(53): Submission acknowledged.</p> <p>(54): The IDM will address the relevant issues. If warranted, landscaping and road upgrade offsite could take place subject to development contribution. Refer her to Rate for question about Rate change.</p> <p>(70): Officer informed the submitter that upgrade of road as a direct result of the development would be paid for by the developers or in some instances developers and Council, not residents. I also noted that they would be formally notified prior to any rezoning on the adjoining land.</p>	Extension of the Nyora RLZ Investigation areas to a wider precinct

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	<p>Landowner of one of the subject sites considered for investigation in the draft HSS (21) requests the land to be included for future RLZ assessment. The submission sites previous correspondence about his land and a report by a building consultant on bushfire risk which assesses against clause 52.47 of the Planning Scheme and contends that less than 10 lots would be an achievable subdivision outcome.</p>		<p>(21): The submission has resulted in extension of the investigation area to cover the subject site. The submitter has been made aware of this and is satisfied of the outcome.</p>	
	<p>Submissions (36,38) request for extension of the investigation area to cover the entire property on 135 Henrys Road, and is in support of the draft HSS which includes the site on 100 Lang-Lang Poowond Road (Henrys Road precinct) for future RLZ investigation.</p>		<p>(36,38): Requested extension to the RLZ is supported following internal discussion, as it is consistent with the Panel recommendation. Further investigation of the RLZ on a wider precinct-based approach is now preferred.</p>	
	<p>Submission (46) contends that planning merits for the Yannathan Road precincts are strong for RLZ investigation, and should be considered in the HSS.</p>		<p>The investigation does not include a proposal to rezone land at 675 Yannathan Road, Nyora to RLZ. Council resolved on 15 July 2012 not to include this land as an investigation area in the <i>Nyora Structure Plan</i>. This decision was supported by the Amendment C72 Panel Report. The Panel concluded that the inclusion of this property in the Structure Plan was <i>'not strategically justified'</i> (p. 55).</p>	
Port Welshpool	<p>Points out omissions about infrastructure in the Port Welshpool discussion in the draft HSS; Suggest review of new buildings and planning permits since last census and investigate the new demographic related to a tourist area.</p>	(47)	<p>Submission supported.</p>	<p>Make the following inclusion to the discussion of Port Welshpool in Part A: <i>'Existing Physical Infrastructure: Sewerage connected to town', 'Existing Community Infrastructure: Tennis Courts, boat ramps and fishing Jetty, Heritage Listed "Long Jetty"'</i></p>
Stony Creek	<p>Explains history of Stony Creek Reserve and the carbon sink area subject to Restructure. The submitter is the caretaker of both areas.</p>	(09)	<p>Submission is supported and is consistent with the restructure overlay for the reserve, which will strengthen the protection of the area from development.</p>	<p>No changes required</p>

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
Walkerville	<p>Submitter (01): Need new/better road in Walkerville south, proper car park in Walkerville, boat ramp at Walkerville north, bicycle and pedestrian pathway from caravan park to the north, reopen 5 Mile Track to Venus Bay Coastline, Spiral stair leading down to cliff to beach at Promviews Estate.</p> <p>Submitter (20): Strongly supports the directions set out in the HSS, particularly limiting growth to larger, sewerered towns, and enhancing small settlements. Submission expresses concern with the current lack of protection of landscape values at Walkerville (and other coastal villages) under current Planning Scheme zones and overlays. It appears to him that the HSS is the place to address this. It also offers some suggestions on corrections to be made in the document.</p> <p>Submitter (22): Some developments in coastal villages should be allowed. Enquire if her subdivision and bungalow development in Walkerville will be supported.</p> <p>Submission (24): Errors in the Walkerville. Expect Council explore opportunities to optimise the use of the Walkerville community Hall.</p> <p>Submission (39): Supports the Walkerville UDF and the Investigation Areas in Part C. Request a clean-up of campers set up on vacant block without toilet facilities. Also advocates for better infrastructure in Walkerville, e.g. walking track along the Walkerville-Fish Creek Road, Bayside drive and Walkerville North.</p>	(01,20, 22, 24,39)	<p>(01): Engineering input has been considered and no changes are supported. 5 Mile Track is managed by Parks Vic and requires a permit from them to use. Any new access through or along the foreshore would be up to the Committee of Management (CoM) and/or Parks Vic. The caravan park is not managed by SGSC, so it's will be determined by Parks Vic and the CoM. These matters shouldn't be specifically mentioned in Strategy.</p> <p>(20): In relation to the suggested addition in Section 6.16.1, the change is not necessary, as existing planning control such as the ESO3 & TZ already covers the area. Protection of coastal landscape is a consistent theme in the HSS, and Walkerville doesn't stand out from the other coastal towns in that regard and was not considered of sufficient quality to be included in the Significant Landscape Overlays placed into the scheme by C45. In relation to the existing planning controls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The TZ applied to Walkerville allows for a range of uses. Unless the land is returned to the crown as in the case for part of Ninety-Mile Beach, the zoning there is unlikely to change. The ESO-3 provides a trigger for a planning permit for new dwellings and some extensions. Within the ESO3, in addition to the siting, colour and design of buildings and works, the overlay also requires a number of environmental objectives (subclause 2.0) to be considered as well as a number of relevant decision guidelines. They provide some support for environmental protection from visually intrusive developments. SLO: In reviewing the Coastal Spaces Landscape Assessment Study 2006, which led to the application of the SLO. Walkerville was not identified as a Regionally Significant or State Significant landscape so was not placed into the scheme at that time. A new locally based overlay such as an SLO or similar provisions would be required to consider built form on landscape values. Appendix: The table are the indicative number of existing developments and development opportunities based on some simple factors, e.g. 4000m2 minimum lot size for septic disposal, as described in the headings. The number is for high level reference only and ultimately development would be determined by statutory planning team and wastewater team assessing on a case-by-case basis. Corrections to be made to the HSS but no strategic changes are required. <p>(22): The land is subject to the following planning controls: TZ, BMO, ESO3. Both the proposed 2 lot subdivision and development of an outbuilding (i.e. the bungalow) to an existing dwelling would be subject to a planning permit. The Housing and Settlement Strategy (HSS) is a strategic document and does not consider individual planning/building permit application.</p> <p>(24): Corrections will be made to the errors raised. The hall is on DSE land administered by the foreshore committee, Council does not have any management responsibilities for the site.</p> <p>(39): Support strengthening an action on access issue in the UDF.</p>	<p>All errors in the Walkerville UDF raised are to be corrected.</p> <p>Walkerville UDF: "<i>Investigate opportunities to improve existing access to and amenity of car parking areas in Walkerville North and South</i>" is to be amended to: "<i>Investigate opportunities to improve pedestrian and vehicle access to and amenity of existing car parking areas in Walkerville North and South</i>"</p> <p>Strengthen an existing action on access issue in the UDF</p> <p>Investigate a new locally based overlay such as an SLO or similar provisions to consider built form on landscape values.</p>

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
Yanakie	<p>Submitter (07): Is under the impression that sewerage is to be introduced to Yanakie. He finds the information vague and hard to understand.</p> <p>Submitter (13): Oppose RLZ rezoning of the Yanakie site due to noise impact from the motor cycle club. Urge Council to resist pressure from developers; Rezoning land to RLZ should only be approved for infill developments. It's paramount to protect the farming activities in farm areas.</p> <p>Submitter (14): Oppose to RLZ investigation for Yanakie site. It is farming land and should be kept that way. Also raise concern about land use tension given the proximity to the motor bike track. Rezoning the land would reduce supply of farming land for farmers.</p> <p>Submitter (37): Commends Council of the works done for the UDF and the draft HSS. Requests for improvement of infrastructure in Yanakie, and rezoning of 64 Shellcott Road in Yanakie (from FZ). The submitter contends that the area with a beautiful landscape and beach front would attract local and foreign projects investors and contribute to the socio-economic environment of Yanakie community.</p>	(07, 13, 14, 37)	<p>(07): There is no reference to reticulated sewerage in Yanakie in the HSS. The submitter was referred to the specific pages of the HSS and the draft Municipal Domestic Wastewater Management Plan 2012 for further information.</p> <p>(13): Submission supported by the HSS. RLZ investigation is supported only where anomaly exists or is strategically justified.</p> <p>(14): Submission supported by the HSS.</p> <p>(37): Part A of the draft HSS has addressed the infrastructure investment issue and the direction to focus on larger settlements are in line with the factors discussed. Yanakie is away from major settlements which make it very difficult to get the required level of infrastructure/services for any new residents beyond the settlement boundary. Recommendation to include the subject land for RLZ rezoning is not supported.</p>	No changes required.
Others	<p>Submission (11): Concern about hobby farmers complaining his farming operations. He also wants to pursue Council policy to relax control on second dwelling in farms for farming community.</p> <p>Anonymous submitter (26): asks for permits to be issued for dwelling development in small acre blocks.</p> <p>Submission (51): The district is unique in its settlement pattern, with a dispersed settlement associated with clusters of towns that are almost self-sufficient for most services; The distribution 1/3 1/3 1/3 remains close with the potential allotments are all developed; The population can grow to around 52,000; There is an over emphasis on hierarchy of major towns in the report; Service costs are not greater for infill in smaller towns in fact are less than</p>	(11, 26, 51)	<p>(11): The request is beyond the scope of the project. The project does not look into policy changes on Farming Zoned land.</p> <p>(26): RLU already sets strategic directions in general Farming Zone land.</p> <p>(51): Overall the HSS needs to consider the massive irreversible impact of spread-out rural living development to agricultural land the RLU provided clear direction in this regard allowing nearly 2000 vacant lots under 4.1ha to be developed across the shire. The HSS focuses on township hierarchy and settlements. Due to servicing constraints, the HSS does not aim to transform the rural land in FZ to satellite towns beyond that already allowed by the RLU. Smaller settlements are celebrated in the HSS.</p> <p>As stated clearly in Practice Note 37, rural residential development can have environmental, social and economic costs that are significantly higher than those of standard residential development. Land use conflicts between agricultural activities and the amenity expectations of rural residential dwellers should be minimised. Significant impacts to primary production or to the environmental or cultural values of a rural area should also be avoided. Finite and valuable natural resources present on the land should not be lost. This is reflected in the guiding principles of the HSS and led to the current recommendations.</p>	No changes required.

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	Greenfields sites; Service costs for rural dispersed housing is less than infill in some cases and not significant according to the Rural Councils report.			
Sandy Point	Support the HSS in that the submitter recognises the issue with development in un-serviced areas and the changing lifestyles and living locations of different age groups. Suggests Council takes actions on liaising with agencies and ultimately providing infrastructures needed by general public and visitors coming to Sandy Point. Disagree with HSS's recommendation against Sandy Point RLZ investigation, in particular Aqua Court decision based on site specific reasons: 1) cluster in existence; 2) Lots varied in size; 3) housing diversity (lot size compared to TZ lots). Support rezoning subject to owners' agreement; 4) only 1 or 2 large blocks will be resulted from this implying negative impact would be minimal.	(16)	Acknowledge the submitter's support with the HSS component. Suggestions regarding public infrastructure will require consideration in the capital works program. On the issue of Sandy Point RLZ, the draft HSS recommendation is based on higher level consideration. We acknowledge that the 2 sites meet some site specific conditions (e.g. existing rubbish collection services) but fail to meet most of the criteria in our strategic consideration including the likely placement of BMO & LSIO in the area, and the predicted impacts of coastal climate change on the settlement. The application of RLZ to this area would have to pass the test of Practice Note 37.	No changes required
Restructure Plans	Hedley RO: Under the impression that Council will take away their land or destroy the township of 'Henerson'.	(05)	Submitter now understands the process and her options.	No changes required
	Hodde RO: The submission argues that the 3 titles proposed in the Restructure Plan for them are inequitable and only a solution of 5 titles with planning permits will be equitable in their view. It contends that the current amenity of the area is small rural house blocks and the RO aims to "preserve and enhance" this, suggesting that the 5 titles would help achieving that outcome.	(28)	All relevant points in this submission have been discussed previously with the submitter. The primary goal of the Restructure Overlay is to discourage development in these former Crown Townships that are no longer considered suitable locations for development. The 3 consolidated blocks as proposed are considered a reasonable compromise in comparison to land holdings of other owners in the precinct.	No changes required
	Jeetho RO: Support the proposed Jeetho Restructure Plan. Have query about subdivision process.	(12)	Responded to query about subdivision process and acknowledge his submission.	No changes required
	Jumbunna RO: Owner of land forming the proposed restructure lots 14-16. Eager to build on this land which has been restructured as per the proposed Restructure Plan.	(10)	Lot 14-16 should be removed from the Restructure Plan.	Remove RO lot 14-16 in Jumbunna restructure plan.
	Port Franklin RO: The submission states that the concern with the oversights in the plan	(31)	The principle of single dwelling per lot consolidated as per the Restructure Plan would	A revised Restructure Plan that addresses some of her concern and include additional land for restructure to achieve

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	<p>and its failure to adequately address the owner's (i.e. submitter's) circumstances. The submission notes the following: 1) the long history of the family ownership of the land and 2) the ongoing adverse procession, 3) the dwelling permit in 1997 which resulted in a consolidation of 6 lots, 4) queried why the land is still subject to the "general lump" of lot 3 in the Restructure Plan; 5) The roadways in the plan have been practically used as part of the farming activities; 6) the larger parcel to the east being excluded from the Restructure plan. The submitter queries whether future dwellings under the Restructure Plan will be an as-of-right of subject to usual rules application.</p>		<p>be supported.</p> <p>Subject to discussion with engineering department about each consolidation, any current road reserve within the Plan may be closed, likely without a financial burden.</p>	<p>a better environmental outcome. It allows the potential of one additional dwelling in the precinct subject to permit process.</p> <p>Specific changes are: 1) include all internal road reserve and some land in PCRZ that is privately owned (blue in map) into the Restructure plan, 2) include a big parcel to the east and 3) exclude the consolidated block on the south east corner. (all noted)</p>
<p>Online survey response to questions</p>	<p>(55,61): Disagree with the principle on restricting dwellings in FZ. The submitter challenges the direction to provide additional community services in larger townships, citing impacts to community development in smaller communities.</p> <p>(56): Submits that more consultation is required with residence over the UDFs and promotion of LDRZ. Concerned with the prospect of smaller settlements losing out with no funding left.</p>	<p>(55-69)</p>	<p>(55, 61): The draft HSS celebrates the smaller communities and their existing facilities. Further developments in the FZ beyond RLUS and identified in the RLZ investigation will risk encroachment into valuable farming land.</p> <p>(56): Maintenance of existing infrastructure and facilities will continue, with occasional government grants to boost some items with tourism and investment potential (e.g. long jetty, Sandy Point community hall).</p>	<p>No changes required</p>
	<p>(57,60,62,63,64,67,68,69): Support all the principles expressed in the HSS, in particular the focus of growth in larger township as it balances environmental social and economic values for the long term. Support emphasis on the need for sewer in Nyora. Services can't be provided in all towns given the small rate base. Old crown townships and areas with fire risk should be discouraged from growth. Suggest that developers of rural living should provide funding to services. Agree with the approach to RLZ and RO as well. Satisfied with sewerage and reticulated water supply.</p> <p>(59): Agree with consolidate developments in larger townships and other principles expressed in the HSS, e.g. Restructure plans, as they would avoid increase in demand for services in areas without such</p>		<p>(57,59,60,62,63,64,65,67,68,69): Acknowledge the support to the HSS.</p>	

Issues	Details	Ref. No	Response	Recommendation
	<p>facilities and the consequent costs associated with this. The RLZ investigation was a reasonable compromise. Tourism related projects (e.g. Great Southern Rail Trail) should be fast-tracked.</p> <p>(65): Support the principles in the HSS. Support the settlement boundary for Dumbalk to be made official. Agree with the approach to RLZ and RO as well.</p>			
	<p>(58): Suggests the land in cape Liptrap to be rezoned to RAZ to allow some tourism developments.</p>		<p>(58): RAZ rezoning is beyond the scope of the HSS.</p>	
	<p>(66): Does not believe the smaller communities have been listened to, and is concerned that the sustainability of these small towns would be compromised by inadequate funding.</p>		<p>(66): The HSS does not suggest funding cut to existing services. However, the investment priority to infrastructure must be rational. Protection of farming land around smaller settlements is consistent with the state and council policies.</p>	