

Amendment C23 to Queenscliffe Planning Scheme - Summary of Submissions

| Submission No. | Submitter | Key Issues Raised Within Submission | Are Changes to Amendment Requested? | Officer Response |
|----------------|-------------|--|---|---|
| 1 | Carmel Bell | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sorrento does not provide parking within leasehold. Parking provision should be similar within both Queenscliff and Sorrento given their function as significant holiday destinations; Planning decisions should reflect yearly average demand as opposed to catering for peaks; Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses; Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010 (proposed Incorporated Document) requires further scrutiny regarding Item 9 (Passenger Terminal Building) and should be removed from Plan. | <p>Yes</p> <p>Requested change to Incorporated Document (Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010) as proposed to be Incorporated under Schedule to Clause 81.01.</p> <p>Submitter seeks deletion of 'Ferry Terminal Building' (Item 9) given lack of detail.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mornington Peninsula Shire provide 243 car parking spaces at Sorrento, which is significantly more than the current availability of approximately 155 car parking at Queenscliff (incl. 50 within Harbour car park); Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; As noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>"The amendment is required to facilitate upgrades to the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal to provide improved car parking, pedestrian access, vehicle access and circulation, passenger drop-off, signage, security, landscaping and amenity in the short-term and other development in the mid to long-term."</i></p> <p>Reject Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AECOM's Summary Report notes the following in respect to the Future Upgraded Passenger Terminal Building: <p><i>"The Ferry Terminal is a key gateway to Queenscliff and the Bellarine Peninsula. The existing passenger terminal building is ageing and inadequate for holiday season visitors. PST will seek to construct a new modern and sustainable building which would be an iconic landmark along this unique route to/from Queenscliff."</i></p> <p>Use and development of a Transport terminal would <u>not</u> require a subsequent Planning Permit, on Condition that:</p> <p><i>"Must be generally in accordance with Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010 and the Development Plans (to be prepared in stages)"</i></p> <p>Item 9 on the Implementation Plan shows an enlarged footprint (or 2-Dimensional 'Building Envelope') for the replacement Terminal Building (shown by a broken orange line on Plan). The table of descriptions forming part of the Implementation Plan sets out the following parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To meet the needs of ferry passengers.</i> <i>Potential to replace existing passenger terminal building with a modern and functional building, that provides views over Port Phillip Bay and which marks it as a gateway to the Bellarine Peninsula and Queenscliff.</i> <i>Passenger Terminal to be a maximum height of 8.5 metres above the ground level, inclusive of any changes to the ground level required to accommodate the projected sea level rise for 2060 (0.4 metres).</i> <i>Activities to include ticket sales, café, indoor/outdoor area, plus potential tourism information.</i> <i>The design of the passenger terminal building is to consider and respond to criteria for the use and development of coastal Crown Land and the siting and design guidelines relevant to Coastal Management Act consent.</i> <p>However, Part 4.0 of Schedule 3 to the Special Use Zone as drafted requires that:</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | | <p><i>Prior to the commencement of any buildings and works, a Development Plan must be prepared to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.</i></p> <p>Part 5.0 of Schedule 3 to the Special Use Zone then stipulates the following:</p> <p><i>The Development Plan must generally be in accordance with the Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010.</i></p> <p><i>The Development Plan may be prepared in stages and must be submitted to the responsible authority for approval and endorsement.</i></p> <p>The future 'built form' of any future Terminal will be guided by the following:</p> <p><i>The Development Plan or each stage of the Development Plan must include (but not be limited to) details on the following matters as appropriate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The location, height, dimensions, cross sections and floor area of all buildings and works.</i> <i>Elevations indicating the architectural theme, including preferred materials, colours and finishes for new buildings.</i> <i>Pedestrian, cyclist, watercraft and vehicular access ways, including parking areas, bus set-down areas, nominal loading bays, and any proposed off-site traffic management treatment.</i> <i>Location and linkages to public transport, including provision of passenger facilities.</i> <i>Adjacent areas of open space and public access to and along the foreshore.</i> <i>Security fencing.</i> <i>The stages, if any, in which the land is to be developed.</i> <i>A Traffic and Access Plan.</i> <i>A Landscape Plan.</i> <i>An Advertising Master Plan to provide for the orderly display of signage and signage in keeping with the character of the area.</i> <p>It is considered that Council (in assessing the 'Development Plan' for that part of the site containing any proposal to upgrade the Ferry terminal Building) will have sufficient control over matters such as the siting, floor area and elevations of any building proposed.</p> <p>It should be noted that the 'Development Plan' is <u>exempt</u> from third part notice and review (i.e. no ability to give <i>formal</i> notice to third parties). However, Council may see fit to undertake non-statutory notice to consider any comments from interested owners/occupiers before making a decision on the merits of any Development Plan or stage thereof.</p> |
| 2 | Queenscliff Music Festival Inc. | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal is a pivotal gateway to Queenscliff Music Festival; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 3 | Big 4 Beacon | SUPPORTS | No | No Action Required. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|---|
| | Resort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a major link in Victoria's transport network and their guests connectivity with Mornington Peninsula Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | | Support for Amendment noted. |
| 4 | Peppers Moonah Links Resort / Peppers Torquay Sands Resort | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 5 | Ashcombe Maze & Lavender Gardens | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 6 | Carmel Murphy | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 7 | Queenscliff Lonsdale Business & Tourism Association Inc. | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure, specifically inadequate car parking. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors; Need to support proposals which stimulate economic growth in town to increase visitation. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 8 | The Bellarine Railway | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ferry is a key driver of regional growth, local tourism and economic development; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 9 | John Bowman | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of vegetation and vegetated public open space; Inappropriate to cater for 100% of peak car parking demand; Sufficient car parking along Harbour near Swan Bay; Restricts and endangers pedestrian access between bridge and the pier; Improved public transport required to move away from car dependence. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSE support the principle of 'Improvement Gain' to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent 'vegetation compensation area'. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; Implementation Plan provides for upgrading of pedestrian paths linking Terminal to adjacent Foreshore and Harbour. This approach is consistent with broader path strategy linking Terminal to Pier; Implementation Plan seeks to provide improved set down and pick up areas for all vehicles, including public transport (bus) and taxis. |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| 10 | Peter Scott | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 11 | Paula Scott | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 12 | Robert & Shirley Hurley | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposal to create improved traffic flow, car parking and pedestrian safety; Notes key issues as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-separation of vehicular/pedestrian traffic; Condition of paths; Car parking layout currently poorly planned and maintained; Provision of bus stop is unsatisfactory; Parking within dune should never have been permitted. Protection of dunes either not considered or failure; Suggested changes to Landscape Development Plan (and by inference to both Implementation Plan and Traffic Development Plan. | <p>Yes</p> <p>Requested change to Layout. By inference this will affect the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010; Traffic and Access Plan; and Landscape Plan. <p>Submitter suggests a number of changes to layout, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No building/car park on primary dune; Relocate egress NE and preclude car spaces exiting directly onto this road; Staff car parking within 'Sterile Area'; Provide sealed pedestrian pathway along southern perimeter extending into Harbour; Pedestrian coastal trail not be approved; Pedestrian path adjacent Maritime Museum be improved; Approve Bus/Taxi drop off; Relocate shelter, plantings and car parking having regard to Item 1. (above). | <p>Reject Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes suggested within the submission would result in wholesale changes to the Implementation Plan, and proposed Development Plan layouts for both Traffic and Access and Landscaping; The layout has been prepared having regard to safety and surveillance as well as improving both vehicle and pedestrian circulation throughout the Terminal; The suggested changes would also require expansion of the lease boundary beyond that now proposed with additional implications for native vegetation removal and offset implications. It is likely that the relocated car parking spaces would require an additional access lane for circulation; The pedestrian coastal trail does not form part of Amendment C23. |
| 13 | Sue & Roel Wasterval | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Borough should be guarding beaches and vegetated areas; Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval; Car park is not at capacity – why destroy open space for peak demand. Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; Employee parking should be provided off site; Improved public transport required to move away from car dependence; Vegetation Offset will result in long term reduction in area available for vegetation; Offset area between ferry and pier is public land that should not be managed by ferry operator. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suitable areas within reasonable walking distance of Terminal given needs of elderly and family groups; Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation. Notwithstanding this, the NVPP has included the area of previously removed vegetation in assessing offset requirement to be undertaken within Native Vegetation Compensation Area; Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; Employee parking (4 spaces) are to be provided in addition to the 129 spaces available to the public; Implementation Plan seeks to provide improved set down and pick up areas for all vehicles, including public transport (bus) and taxis; DSE support the principle of 'Improvement Gain' to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent 'vegetation compensation area'. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); Under the VOMP, agreed revegetation works will be costed and a direct payment made by the ferry operator to Parks Victoria who will undertake such works in their capacity as Committee of Management |

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|---|----|---|
| | | | | under the Crown Land (Reserves) Act 1978. |
| 14 | Bellarine Tourism | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bellarine Tourism represents approx. 200 tourism businesses across the Bellarine Peninsula (including accommodation, restaurants, cafes, retailers, attractions and transportation facilities) working in partnership with Geelong Otway Tourism (Submission No. 15) to promote visitation to the Bellarine; Bellarine Peninsula's economy interlinked with tourism; Terminal is a pivotal gateway to Geelong Otway and broader Great Ocean Road regions; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 15 | Geelong Otway Tourism Inc. | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terminal is a pivotal gateway to Geelong Otway and broader Great Ocean Road regions; Tourism industry is critical to social and economic well being of Queenscliff and the region; Terminal currently lacks infrastructure. Supports proposal to create improved infrastructure for locals, tourists and visitors. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 16 | Bellarine Catchment Network | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portion of Crown Land zoned Public Conservation and Resource Zone (PCRZ) and covered by an Environmental Significance Overlay should not be rezoned to provide for car parking for a private operator; Alternatives should be explored; Siting and Design Guidelines for Structures on the Victorian Coast includes policy requiring alternatives or minimisation of car parks and roads in sensitive coastal environments; Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval; Ferry operator not complying with Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010; Only one EVC (879 Coastal Dune Grassland) has been identified as being present within Native Vegetation Precinct Plan 2010, failing to recognise existence of EVC 160 (Coastal Dune Scrub); How has consultant derived a Gain Target (Habitat Hectare) offset score for EVC879 in the Otway Plain Bioregion when no EVC benchmark has yet been published by DSE?; No confidence in Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) being either accurate or reliable given above; Need for DSE / Ecologist (familiar with indigenous flora on Bellarine) to determine whether certain Acacias are designated as weed species. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suitable areas within reasonable walking distance of Terminal given needs of elderly and family groups; Siting and Design Guidelines for Structures on the Victorian Coast (Section 3.1.2) considers appropriateness of development, noting that examples of development for which a coastal siting are appropriate include facilities such as: boat launching facilities, boat moorings etc. Support uses such as car parking which underpin selected primary uses are also considered appropriate; Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation. Notwithstanding this, the NVPP has included the area of previously removed vegetation in assessing offset requirements to be undertaken within Native Vegetation Compensation Area; The Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010 has not yet been approved. It forms part of C23 and is proposed to become an Incorporated Document; The NVPP is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Queenscliff Ferry terminal Flora and Fauna Assessment report (14 Jan 2009); Updated Habitat Hectare and Net Gain Assessment - Supplementary report (25 Aug 2010). Vegetation Offset Management Plan (1 September 2010) <p>The Updated Report (section 4.1, p. 4) notes:</p> <p>"To determine which component EVC to use (and discuss offset options with a Parks Victoria representative) a site visit was conducted on the 12 of August 2010. During this site visit the vegetation subject to removal was determined to be consistent with EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland. Some vegetation characteristic of EVC 160: Coastal Dune Scrub was also present within the general area but this vegetation generally formed behind the primary dune whilst EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland formed in the foredunes and at the beach margin." Additionally, the VOMP requires revegetation (Section 5.0) consisting of species taken from both EVC 160 (Coastal Dune Scrub) and EVC 879 (Coastal Dune Grassland).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Gain Target (Habitat Hectare) score has been derived by using published EVC Benchmarks. Refer to Submission No. 33 (DSE) for suggested Change to Section 5.0 of VOMP; |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Opportunity for correct classification of Acacias when Draft Documents are updated to Final status prior to endorsement. |
| 17 | Mr D. Connoley | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking issues were explored by Panel during Amendment C16 (Harbour Redevelopment) and nothing of significance has changed to warrant further expansion; Concerned about custodianship and management of the nearby foreshore and vegetation area; Enforcement of planting and vegetation requirements under previous applications by ferry operator required. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation. |
| 18 | Queenscliffe Environment Forum Inc. | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of foreshore land to private operator; Why the need for a distinct Special Use Zone for Ferry?; Threats posed by dynamic coastal processes and climate change not considered; Lack of community consultation; Sufficient car parking in area. Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; No landscaping or revegetation within existing Terminal; Proposals for new road and footpaths will result in environmental destruction; No confidence in Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) being either accurate or reliable; Proposal contrary to Queenscliffe Planning Scheme and State Policies pertaining to Coastal Planning; Little community benefit. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of land forming part of the Amendment is currently located within a Special Use Zone - Schedule 1 (<i>Queenscliff Harbour</i>). Objectives and decision guidelines primarily relate to the Harbour Precinct and do not sufficiently provide for use and development specific to the operations of the Ferry Terminal Precinct. During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Summary Report (AECOM) outlines and responds to Coastal Policies, and includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (AECOM 3 Sept 2010) which assessed the implications of projected sea level rise, the adequacy of the sea wall (up until 2060) and outlines adaptation strategies including: monitoring and maintenance, future requirement for detailed coastal vulnerability assessment and potential need for modifications to the structure. DSE (Submission No. 33) notes: <p><i>“The Department is satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner that is appropriate for an amendment.”;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibition of C23 enables community input to be considered; Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|----|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation; Works and impacts associated with the construction of the road and paths will be appropriately offset; Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; The Summary Report (AECOM) outlines and responds to Coastal Policies, and includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (AECOM 3 Sept 2010) which assessed the implications of projected sea level rise, the adequacy of the sea wall (up until 2060) and outlines adaptation strategies including: monitoring and maintenance, future requirement for detailed coastal vulnerability assessment and potential need for modifications to the structure. DSE (Submission No. 33) notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“The Department is satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner that is appropriate for an amendment.”;</i> The proposed development is located in a significant activity area and is considered that it will result in a community benefit through improved access to the ferry and the foreshore. Enhanced walking and cycling connections will be provided linking with the Harbour and Ferry to Pier path network. |
| 19 | Joan Kenwood | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exemptions should be provided for infrastructure / works; Lack of community consultation; Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses; Ample parking available within Weeroona Parade. Need for disabled car parks and drop off areas closer to Terminal; Loss of foreshore land to private operator; Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; Car parking issues were explored by Panel during Amendment C16 (Harbour Redevelopment). Community assured no further development or loss of vegetation beyond new road; Existing flora provides faunal habitat; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; Proposal contrary to Coastal Planning. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer Officer Response to Submission No. 1 as to whether exemption should be provided for infrastructure/works; Exhibition of C23 enables community input to be considered; Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents' accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as a essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance; Parking available within Weeroona Parade is remote from the Terminal building. Implementation Plan seeks to provide improved set down and pick up areas for all vehicles, including public transport (bus) and taxis; Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”</i></p> Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|----|---|
| | | | | <p><i>separate process.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Draft Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Flora and Fauna Assessment report (14 Jan 2009). made no observations of threatened fauna species. The majority of birds observed were marine or migratory species with the subject site unlikely to support significant or permanent habitat for any threatened species. A small number of species have a low likelihood of utilising the site on a seasonal or opportunistic basis for foraging. Marine birds are the only species likely to be using the area. Given the small area of clearing proposed and the availability of better quality habitat in the local area, these species are unlikely to be impacted; • Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; • The Summary Report (AECOM) outlines and responds to Coastal Policies, and includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (AECOM 3 Sept 2010) which assessed the implications of projected sea level rise, the adequacy of the sea wall (up until 2060) and outlines adaptation strategies including: monitoring and maintenance, future requirement for detailed coastal vulnerability assessment and potential need for modifications to the structure. DSE (Submission No. 33) notes: <p><i>“The Department is satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner that is appropriate for an amendment.”;</i></p> |
| 20 | Ms C. Johnson | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does removal of native vegetation and increased car parking and development satisfy Clauses 21.03 and Clause 21.05 of the Municipal Strategic Statement?; • Ferry Terminal is integral part of Harbour and should maintain the same Planning controls for both; • Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; • Other businesses deal with lack of parking during peak, why should ferry operator be any different?; • Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal satisfies Clause 21.03 by addressing car parking and mobility issues so as to improve the tourist experience and support the ongoing development of the ferry service which is a key contributor to the local economy. AECOM submit that: <i>“Measures to balance the needs of natural and built environment, tourists and permanent residents include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Providing for the enhancement of the natural environment through the planting of indigenous vegetation in the local area as part of the Net Gain offsets and vegetating of the dune</i> ○ <i>Expanding the car park and road to provide for additional car parking for foot passengers and improved access for emergency and other vehicles</i> ○ <i>Maintaining beach access for local residents who use the foreshore.</i> ○ <i>Improving directional signage.</i> ○ <i>Replacement of the ferry terminal building in the longer-term.”</i> • Clause 21.05 addresses matters such as: Environment, Economic Development (Tourism) and Infrastructure (Transport, Traffic and Parking). It is considered that the Amendment has addressed the often competing objectives in a balanced approach. • The majority of land forming part of the Amendment is currently located within a Special Use Zone - Schedule 1 (<i>Queenscliff Harbour</i>). Objectives and decision guidelines primarily relate to the Harbour Precinct and do not sufficiently provide for use and development specific to the operations of the Ferry Terminal Precinct. During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|----|---|
| | | | | <p><i>separate process.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents' accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as an essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance. |
| 21 | Joan Lindros | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of foreshore land to private operator; Significant loss of visual amenity and landscape values and overall reduction in the quality of the local facilities; Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses; Important to protect environmental and landscape assets – once lost cannot be recovered; No confidence in Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) being either accurate or reliable; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscaping and vegetation planting both within and outside of the site is expected to improve the visual amenity of the foreshore; Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents' accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as a essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance; Removal of native vegetation will be Offset by revegetation within the vegetation compensation area; Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions is covered by separate legislation. |
| 22 | David Kenwood | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of foreshore land to private operator; Proposal contrary to Coastal Planning; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; Why the need for a distinct Special Use Zone for Ferry? | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Summary Report (AECOM) outlines and responds to Coastal Policies, and includes a Preliminary Hazard Assessment (AECOM 3 Sept 2010) which assessed the implications of projected sea level rise, the adequacy of the sea wall (up until 2060) and outlines |

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--|----|--|
| | | | | <p>adaptation strategies including: monitoring and maintenance, future requirement for detailed coastal vulnerability assessment and potential need for modifications to the structure. DSE (Submission No. 33) notes:</p> <p><i>“The Department is satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner that is appropriate for an amendment.”;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Reconfiguration of the car parking layout within the existing lease boundary would be unlikely to deliver significant improvements to access, circulation and provision of car parking; The majority of land forming part of the Amendment is currently located within a Special Use Zone - Schedule 1 (<i>Queenscliff Harbour</i>). Objectives and decision guidelines primarily relate to the Harbour Precinct and do not sufficiently provide for use and development specific to the operations of the Ferry Terminal Precinct. During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report: <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process.”</i></p> |
| 23 | Geelong Environment Council Inc. | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of foreshore land to private operator; Loss of vegetation and vegetated public open space; Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses; Expanse of car park will detract, not add to landscape attractiveness of Queenscliff; Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; Inappropriate to cater for 100% of peak car parking demand; Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval; Value of land underestimated – a wide range of plant species within the two EVC's and 44 species of birds recorded in the dunes; Only one EVC has been identified as being present within Native Vegetation Precinct Plan 2010; Opposed to proposed Offsets by wedding / maintenance only; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; Improved public transport required to move away from car dependence. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSE support the principle of 'Improvement Gain' to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent 'vegetation compensation area'. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents' accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as a essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance; Landscaping and vegetation planting both within and outside of the site is expected to improve the visual amenity of the foreshore; Traffic Development Plan provides for 129 spaces, which combined with 50 spaces in adjacent Harbour (179 aggregate) would be sufficient to meet 67% of Christmas Holiday period demand and 95% of annual year; Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation; The NVPP is supported by: |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|----|---|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft Queenscliff Ferry terminal Flora and Fauna Assessment report (14 Jan 2009); ○ Updated Habitat Hectare and Net Gain Assessment - Supplementary report (25 Aug 2010). ○ Vegetation Offset Management Plan (1 September 2010) <p>The Updated Report (section 4.1, p. 4) notes:</p> <p>“To determine which component EVC to use (and discuss offset options with a Parks Victoria representative) a site visit was conducted on the 12 of August 2010. During this site visit the vegetation subject to removal was determined to be consistent with EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland. Some vegetation characteristic of EVC 160: Coastal Dune Scrub was also present within the general area but this vegetation generally formed behind the primary dune whilst EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland formed in the foredunes and at the beach margin.” Additionally, the VOMP requires revegetation (Section 5.0) consisting of species taken from both EVC 160 (Coastal Dune Scrub) and EVC 879 (Coastal Dune Grassland).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSE support the principle of ‘Improvement Gain’ to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent ‘vegetation compensation area’. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); • Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; • Implementation Plan seeks to provide improved set down and pick up areas for all vehicles, including public transport (bus) and taxis. |
| 24 | Felicity Thyer | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car access is adequate, however pedestrian access requires improving; • Ample parking available within Weeroona Parade; • Many parts of coastline in Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale have been influenced by human habitation and are degraded. Such areas can be managed appropriately with ongoing work; • Pedestrian access from terminal into Queenscliff is more attractive than at Sorrento and this should be enhanced; • Provision of car parking at Queenscliff does not benefit local businesses. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement to pedestrian pathways, road network and parking arrangements are expected to improve safety for all Terminal users and reduce conflict between vehicles entering the parking area as opposed to the ferry queuing area, and reduce conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians as foot traffic will not be forced to walk along the outbound terminal lane; • Weeroona Parade is not within a reasonable walking distance of Terminal given needs of elderly and family groups; • DSE support the principle of ‘Improvement Gain’ to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent ‘vegetation compensation area’. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); • Council's Ferry to Pier path network seeks to enhance the attractiveness of the entry from the Terminal into Queenscliff; • Car parking is not intended to benefit only the local community and/or local businesses. The primary rationale for the expansion of car parking is to redress the current deficit in parking available to those using the Ferry Terminal. Despite this, improvements to the layout are likely to attract greater visitation and tourist experience as well as benefiting local residents’ accessibility from the Terminal into the Town. It should be noted that as an essential service, the ferry provides benefit to not only the local community but is also transport infrastructure of regional and State significance. |
| 25 | M & M & M Grundy and J Gilbert | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long held concerns regarding substandard / haphazard access / parking at terminal; • Embarrassed by important entry to Town – need for attention; | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--|----|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area around Terminal not reclaimed, rather resultant from tidal and wind action. Was not in existence prior to excision of 'The Cut' linking Swan Bay to port Phillip; Vegetation taken root in dunes primarily environmental weeds and coastal dune grasses; Present layout does not encourage Terminal users to appreciate nearby features (Harbour, Maritime Museum and parklands) when access is poor; Access route to Terminal from Town Centre daunting for disabled, elderly, families with young children and able bodied pedestrians with luggage; Imperative that Ferry entrance is similarly enhanced - both visually and physically. | | |
| 26 | Friends of Buckley Falls | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ludicrous to be re-planting and weeding coastal and cliff vegetation in one location and removing native ecosystems on the same beach several hundred metres away, with no replacement land available; Two EVC's (879 Coastal Dune Grassland and 160 Coastal Dune Scrub) are present. ; Value of land underestimated – 20 plant species and 44 species of birds recorded in the dunes; Presence of Environmental Significance Overlay indicates land is valued and should not be lost to car park; FOBF only support net gain where removal of native vegetation can be avoided. Significant net loss will result if approved; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently, preferably by Parks Victoria; Loss of foreshore land to private operator. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSE support the principle of 'Improvement Gain' to be realised by revegetating denuded areas within the adjacent 'vegetation compensation area'. Such an approach is consistent with DSE publication: Native Vegetation gain Approach – Technical basis for calculating gains through improved native vegetation management and revegetation (2006); The NVPP is supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Queenscliff Ferry terminal Flora and Fauna Assessment report (14 Jan 2009); Updated Habitat Hectare and Net Gain Assessment - Supplementary report (25 Aug 2010). Vegetation Offset Management Plan (1 September 2010) The Updated Report (section 4.1, p. 4) notes: <p>"To determine which component EVC to use (and discuss offset options with a Parks Victoria representative) a site visit was conducted on the 12 of August 2010. During this site visit the vegetation subject to removal was determined to be consistent with EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland. Some vegetation characteristic of EVC 160: Coastal Dune Scrub was also present within the general area but this vegetation generally formed behind the primary dune whilst EVC 879: Coastal Dune Grassland formed in the foredunes and at the beach margin." Additionally, the VOMP requires revegetation (Section 5.0) consisting of species taken from both EVC 160 (Coastal Dune Scrub) and EVC 879 (Coastal Dune Grassland).</p> Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>"The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance."</i></p> |
| 27 | Richard Webb | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established business with Management team that supports tourism in Victoria; Objections to redevelopment of Harbour seem silly in hindsight – Harbour now provides good facilities; Need to further attract tourists (day and travellers) to Great Ocean Road Region and both Queenscliff and Sorrento; Sorrento Terminal well presented despite lack of parking – leaving Queenscliff lacking in terms of presentation and parking; | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|----|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade will redress inferior parking – a blight on tourism infrastructure within area; Development is not speculative – merely responding to current demand. | | |
| 28 | Bob Fuller | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of foreshore land to private operator. Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval; Once converted to car parking, area will not be returned to existing conditions; Sufficient car parking in area. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation; Empirical assessment has indentified a lack of available parking proximate to Terminal following removal of parking from along Larking Parade (pre Harbour development). |
| 29 | Alf McKenzie | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not oppose creation of distinct Special Use Zone for Ferry Terminal, nor opposing RDZ1; However, does not support any exemption from requirement for a Planning Permit as listed within Clause 37.01, 42.01 and 42.02; Any change to Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) that differ from the offset strategy should require approval of BOQ as well as DSE; Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently, preferably by Parks Victoria. | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for both rezoning to a dedicated Special Use Zone and road widening (and rezoning to RDZ1) noted; Refer Officer Response to Submission No. 1 as to whether exemption should be provided for infrastructure/works; NVPP and VOMP must be approved both by DSE and Council. Any variations to the Offset Plan must be approved only by DSE. It is considered this is an appropriate mechanism; Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP. |
| 30 | Queenscliffe Maritime Museum | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car Parking at Terminal currently inadequate; Ferry users often park over 350 metres distant, adjacent to the Maritime Museum and in Weeroona Parade. Such a distance unreasonable for elderly, people with disabilities and families with young children; Ample land available for development adjacent to Terminal. Such land not primary dune, but land reclaimed over 15 years + post construction of harbour / sea wall; This land not used by public and infested by weeds; Supports proposal for car parking, weed control and associated landscaping. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 31 | Peter & June Negri | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reclaimed land adjacent to Terminal is infested by weeds and not used for passive recreation; Tourism is a major contributor to the local economy and proposal will enhance visitor experience; Supports proposal for car parking, weed control and associated landscaping. | No | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 32 | Queenscliff Community Association Inc. | <p>OPPOSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support any exemption from requirement for a Planning Permit; Why the need for a distinct Special Use Zone for Ferry?; Ferry operator shown past contempt for Planning Scheme by removing vegetation without approval; Enforcement of planting and vegetation requirements under previous | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer Officer Response to Submission No. 1 as to whether exemption should be provided for infrastructure/works; The majority of land forming part of the Amendment is currently located within a Special Use Zone - Schedule 1 (<i>Queenscliff Harbour</i>). Objectives and decision guidelines primarily relate to the Harbour Precinct and do not sufficiently provide for use and |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>applications by ferry operator required;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of foreshore land to private operator; • Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) should be managed independently; • Possibility of subsequent expansion requests; • Sufficient car parking along Harbour; • Reconfiguration of existing car park within existing footprint preferred; • Siting and Design Guidelines for Structures on the Victorian Coast does not recommend large scale car parking within foreshore areas; • Employee parking should be provided off site; • Why is such a large Ferry Terminal Building required, unless to serve further expansion? • How does proposal satisfy Clause 21.03 of the Municipal Strategic Statement? | | <p>development specific to the operations of the Ferry Terminal Precinct. During consideration of Planning Scheme Amendment C16 to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme it was noted within the Explanatory Report:</p> <p><i>“Peninsula Searoad Transport have plans to redesign the ferry terminal to improve the efficiency of this area in terms of car parking provision and vehicular circulation. This will be the subject of a separate process.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement of any past breaches of Planning Scheme / Permit Conditions are covered by separate legislation; • Given land tenure near Terminal, any expansion of operations requires permission to develop Crown Land. The Explanatory Report accompanying the Amendment notes: <p><i>“The proposed development is to occur within an area that is deemed not to be part of the natural dune system, having been created only in the past 15 years as a result of sand accretion along the foreshore. The vegetation to be affected is of low environmental significance.”;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once NVPP and VOMP have been approved by DSE and Council, ferry operator will make a payment covering costs of revegetation and ongoing management. Payment will be to Parks Victoria who will facilitate the works per VOMP; • Any subsequent expansion request (beyond the scope of that provided for within C23) would be the subject of a separate Amendment or Planning Permit; • No suitable areas within reasonable walking distance of Terminal given needs of elderly and family groups; • Siting and Design Guidelines for Structures on the Victorian Coast (Section 3.1.2) considers appropriateness of development, noting that examples of development for which a coastal siting are appropriate include facilities such as: boat launching facilities, boat moorings etc. Support uses such as car parking which underpin selected primary uses are also considered appropriate; • Employee parking (4 spaces) are to be provided in addition to the 129 spaces available to the public; • Rationale for footprint of Future Terminal Building outlined within Implementation Plan; • The proposal satisfies Clause 21.03 by addressing car parking and mobility issues so as to improve the tourist experience and support the ongoing development of the ferry service which is a key contributor to the local economy. AECOM submit that: <i>“Measures to balance the needs of natural and built environment, tourists and permanent residents include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Providing for the enhancement of the natural environment through the planting of indigenous vegetation in the local area as part of the Net Gain offsets and vegetating of the dune</i> ○ <i>Expanding the car park and road to provide for additional car parking for foot passengers and improved access for emergency and other vehicles</i> ○ <i>Maintaining beach access for local residents who use the foreshore.</i> ○ <i>Improving directional signage.</i> ○ <i>Replacement of the ferry terminal building in the longer-term.”</i> |
| 33 | Department of Sustainability and Environment | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments incorporate those of Parks Victoria; • Crown land status, tenure and management; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed use and development located on coastal Crown land. | <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Requests that the three supporting documents and NVPP be updated to finalise DRAFT</p> | <p>1. Accept Change to Supporting Document. FINAL versions of all four documents to be prepared by Proponent.. Updating from DRAFT to FINAL versions can occur Post conduct of</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | (DSE) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal policy; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coastal policy is set out within the Victorian Coastal Strategy 2008 (VCS); ○ Supporting documents provide an extensive consideration of VCS Strategy; ○ Department satisfied that the Amendment adequately addresses relevant coastal policy in a manner appropriate for an Amendment. • Coastal Management Act 1995 consent requirement; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Notwithstanding the Amendment, use and development of coastal Crown land also requires consent from the Minister for Environment and Climate Change under the Coastal Management Act 1995 (CMA); ○ Department recommends and is prepared to facilitate liaison with Council regarding simultaneous consideration of CMA consent application concurrent with a draft Development Plan (or stage thereof); ○ Exhibited Schedule 3 to Special Use Zone (which requires comments from DSE / Parks Victoria) facilitates such an approach; ○ Items of interest with respect to CMA consent will include (but not be limited to) matters such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vulnerability / adaptability to coastal processes and climate change; ▪ Design life, condition and adequacy of sea wall; ▪ Siting and design considerations of future passenger terminal building (or other new built form); ▪ The above matters are no impediment to the Amendment proceeding. • Native vegetation policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Department generally supports approach to preparing a Native Vegetation precinct Plan (NVPP); ○ All four documents (including the NVPP) require review to update the documents in the 18 months elapsed since first being prepared and to ensure consistency with current policy approach; ○ Any changes should be reflected in FINAL documents prior to Incorporation of the NVPP into the Planning Scheme; ○ Department understands that Parks Victoria support intent and outcomes of the Draft Vegetation Offset Management Plan (VOMP) and offset works proposed for the Offset Site; ○ VOMP identifies offset being achieved by improvement / revegetation. Species listed in Section 5.0 are taken from Ecological Vegetation Class (EVC) benchmarks. Department recommends that the enclosed list of native plants (Bellarine Catchment Network) also be included within the list within Section 5.0; ○ Offset and site on Crown land will need to be registered with Bush Broker (fee applies); ○ During Pre-Exhibition discussions DSE indicated expectation that NVPP be endorsed by Minister for Environment and Climate Change prior to Exhibition and that DSE would facilitate this on request. Whilst this has not yet occurred, it is expected that endorsement occur prior to Amendment being finalised. Timing of this opportunity will be guided by the need for a Panel Hearing, any alteration to design and amount of loss during the Amendment process; ○ Department notes that the Exhibited Schedule to Clause 52.16 lists 'Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Implementation Plan 2010' instead of the NVPP as intended by the structure of VPP Clause 52.16. This should be rectified. | <p>documents and to ensure consistency with current native vegetation policy and practice. Any change in circumstance should be reflected in FINAL versions of each <i>prior</i> to Incorporation of NVPP into Scheme;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Requests that VOMP include a statement of commitment to the delivery, management or ongoing implications in relation to the offset; 3. Requests that VOMP (Section 5.0) should be updated and expanded to incorporate the list of native plants identified by the Bellarine Catchment Management Network (use previously in CMA Consent for path connection from Terminal site to pier); 4. Requests procedural opportunity for NVPP to be endorsed by Minister for Environment and Climate Change <i>prior</i> to finalisation of the Amendment. Timing to be guided by need for Panel Hearing, any alteration to design and any loss having occurred during intervening period; 5. Requests that proposed Schedule to Clause 52.16 be amended and corrected to refer to (Final) NVPP as opposed to Implementation Plan. | <p>the Panel Hearing, but must occur prior to Endorsement and Adoption.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Accept Change to Supporting Document. VOMP to be updated to include statement. 3. Accept Change to Supporting Document. In addition to list of plants taken from EVC's 160 & 879, list of plants should be expanded to incorporate list of native plants identified by the Bellarine Catchment Management Network. 4. Accept. 5. Accept Change. Clerical error. Amend Title of Document within Schedule to Clause 52.16 to: "Queenscliff Ferry Terminal Native Vegetation Precinct Plan 2010" |
| 34 | Department of Transport (DOT) | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOT involved in significant consultation over several years; • Planning controls pertaining to land for transport facilities should facilitate | <p>Yes</p> <p>Requested change to Local Policy and Schedule to</p> | Accept Change |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>transport operations. Proposal would serve this purpose;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of transport options should be facilitated, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walking, cycling, bus, taxi and delivery vehicles. | <p>Special Use Zone.</p> <p>Submitter seeks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Following Clause 21.05-4 “Other Businesses and Industry” – “Strategies” after the 2nd Dot Point amend the proposed new Dot Point: <p><i>“To ensure appropriate vehicle, bus, taxi, pedestrian and cyclist access and infrastructure is provided to the Queenscliff Ferry terminal.”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Under Part 3.0 of Schedule 2 to Clause 42.02 “Permit Requirement” after the 2nd Paragraph insert: <p><i>“A permit is not required for building and works in the Queenscliff Ferry terminal Special Use Zone that are in accordance with a development plan approved by the responsible authority.”</i></p> | <p>Consistent with the objective of providing for a range of transport options it is considered appropriate to accept the recommended change by referencing both bus and taxi.</p> <p>No change required. Text within Part 3.0 of Schedule 2 to Clause 42.02 already includes the proposed wording.</p> |
| 35 | VicRoads (‘A’, 13 March 2012) | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VicRoads involved in significant consultation over several years; Traffic Management Plan proposes erection of a gantry style advance direction sign. Detailed design engineering plans must be submitted for approval by VicRoads prior to construction of gantry; VicRoads believes proposal will provide significant improvement to road safety in vicinity of Terminal. | <p>No</p> <p>Refer Submission No. 36 (below) for Addendum requesting Changes.</p> | <p>No Action Required.</p> <p>Support for Amendment noted.</p> |
| 36 | VicRoads (‘B’, 14 March 2012) | <p>SUPPORTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addendum to VicRoads Submission No. 35 (dated 13th March 2012); Notes existence of existing anomaly in Queenscliffe Planning Scheme (Map No. ?), in respect to part of the declared Bellarine Highway being mapped within the (current) Special Use Zone 1 (SUZ1) and not within a Road Zone, Category 1 (RDZ1); In order to rectify this Mapping Anomaly, VicRoads requests that the Zoning Map accompanying Amendment C23 be amended to incorporate the mapped anomaly land within RDZ1 (per attachment). Subject to resolution of the above, VicRoads reaffirmed their support for the proposal. | <p>Yes</p> <p>Requested change to Zone Map.</p> <p>VicRoads notes the existence of an anomaly in the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme, in that part of the declared Bellarine Highway is included within a Special Use Zone (SUZ1).</p> <p>Attached Government Gazette Plans GP19335 and GP20712 (refer Appendix A) show the declaration as ‘Road’.</p> <p>As a means of correcting the anomaly, the Submitter seeks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Current Amendment Plan be altered to extend the RDZ1 as indicated. | <p>Accept Change.</p> <p>Background review indicates that the anomaly exists as below:</p> <p>Government Gazette G9 (6th March 1997) This resulted in declaration of C/A 7E (northern portion of sphere) and C/A7F (southern portion of sphere) by the Roads Corporation as ‘State Highway’ under the <i>Transport Act</i> 1983.</p> <p>Special Government Gazette S255 (29th September 2006) This resulted in the Arterial Road status of C/A 7E (northern portion only) being revoked and discontinued by VicRoads under the <i>Road Management Act</i> 2004. The southern portion retained ‘Arterial Road’ status.</p> <p>Planning Scheme Amendment C16 It appears that a mapping anomaly (Planning Scheme Map No. 4) resulted from Gazettal of Amendment C16 on 25th August 2005 (refer attached Map). The southern portion should <u>not</u> have been rezoned SUZ1.</p> <p>It is appropriate to rectify this anomaly to incorporate that part of the declared Bellarine Highway as RDZ1. Planning Mapping Services (DPCD) have prepared an Amended Zone Map reflecting the additional portion of RDZ1 (refer attached).</p> |