

## G21 REGIONAL GROWTH PLAN UPDATE – PHASE 4: FINAL REGIONAL GROWTH PLAN

### Written submission summary and response

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
1.	<p><b>Context</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the land identified for F.I.A however have concerns the alternate F.I.A at 'Lovely Banks' has been given a higher priority</li> <li>• Planning should provide a contingency that would allow for earlier growth demands to be accommodated. (Reference to page 16 – 'no new growth front will be required within at least the next 10 years...') Noted the Batesford South area presents an opportunity for accommodating earlier growth demands.</li> <li>• The submission notes that the Batesford South area could address the challenges identified on page 18. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· planned sewerage and water supply services – could be available by 2015</li> <li>· Close proximity to Geelong CBD, opp to rebalance linear growth and facilitate sustainable and timely reuse. Could contribute towards compact urban area and minimising travel distances.</li> <li>· concept plan demonstrates the potential liveability of Batesford South would be outstanding and unique</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>The G21 Economic Strategy (reference with G21 RGP)</b></p> <p>The development of Batesford South would support the following 'Game Changers'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of the ring road – ensure ring road and employment precincts can reach their full potential</li> <li>• Geelong City Centre Reactivation – proximity to Central Geelong (more closely linked than Lovely Banks)</li> <li>• Co-ordinated delivery of critical infrastructure to support growth – selected for water infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning. The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>Further Investigation Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Batesford South area reflects the information provided to G21 in December 2011 and is welcomed by the landowners.</li> <li>• The submitters believe that there is enough strategic knowledge available to confirm that the Batesford South area could be developed earlier than 2030 and that the attributes of the area are superior to those at Lovely Banks. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Sewerage services will be available</li> <li>· Transportation links are in place</li> <li>· The terrain and setting have high recreation potential and high amenity values</li> <li>· The land has a close contextual relationship to Central Geelong</li> <li>· Land ownerships arrangements are simple and would facilitate initiation, staging and coordination of development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Batesford South would be well serviced by transport and communication infrastructure. Leveraging off the Midland Highway, Hamilton Highway, and Geelong Ring Road. The NBN would pass through Batesford South.</li> <li>• The submitters have already undertaken initial environmental, landscape cultural heritage, land capability assessments and conceptual design that confirm the ability to develop high quality neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lovely Banks area should not be favoured over Batesford South.</li> <li>• Seek recognition of the opportunity presented at Batesford South for development to come on stream from 2020.</li> </ul>	
2.	<p>Submission on behalf of businesses located in the West Fyans Precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both businesses have made a significant contribution to the local economy, community and the social cultural heritage of Geelong.</li> </ul>	<p>The Greater Geelong Planning Scheme and the Housing Diversity Strategy recognise a number of</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission refers to the recommendation that 40% of the proposed population be accommodated in established urban areas, with 26,857 infill dwellings be provided within Urban Geelong area.</li> <li>The West Fyans Precinct is nominated as a key mixed use infill consolidation precinct providing opportunities for residential uses. The City suggests that existing industries should consider relocating to other suitable employment nodes submitters do not wish to do this.</li> <li>The infill targets for this area will be detrimental to the existing businesses as development will encroach on buffers</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submission acknowledges the support of the G21 Draft Growth Plan to provide local employments which are well connected to a variety of transport node, the protection of well established and viable industries such as the submitters should be supported in the G21 Regional Growth Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Key Development Areas for medium-higher density housing in Geelong including Central Geelong, West Fyans precinct and a Waurin Ponds node. The West Fyans Precinct Structure Plan is being implemented over 2 stages (with stage 1 having been implemented) reflecting the important economic contribution of industries in the western portion of the precinct and associated transition challenges. As this node is not an identified key employment node (at a regional level) no changes are recommended.</p>
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter represent 90% of a proposed 'Lovely Banks North' growth investigation area</li> <li>The identified area should be extended because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site abuts a main transport route for Bacchus Marsh along the Geelong Road</li> <li>Is within 5.5km of the Lara train station.</li> <li>Adjacent the existing Lara West PSP area soon to be developed</li> <li>Serviceable with all reticulated utilities able to be sourced from Lara West PSP area</li> <li>Close proximity to employment precincts (GREP and Avalon)</li> <li>Landowners are committed to undertaking further planning investigation to facilitate the growth of this area</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direction connection to Melbourne and links with the proposed national transport and logistics and employment area</li> <li>Within drainage catchment of Lara West PSP</li> <li>Comprised of vacant farmland and is bound by Bacchus March Road to the east, Hams Road to the south, Stacey Road to the West. The site has a total area of approx 250ha</li> <li>Consortium comprises 80% of land owners that represent 207ha of the total area.</li> <li>The submission provides a response to the Principles, below is a summary of key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Takes advantage of the infrastructure in the proposed Lara West PSP by allowing continuation of utility services.</li> <li>Provides for diverse housing supply. Utilises existing education facilities and provides security of cliental to education and the employment industries.</li> <li>Provides opportunity for a connected community by providing sustainable transport connections to both Melbourne and Geelong's CBD. Provides an alternative to inner city living whilst providing regional connections</li> <li>Site is currently degraded farmland. Future development would include environmental improvements</li> <li>Development would provide improvements for water course protection. No negative impacts on energy production.</li> <li>Consolidating residential and community activities adjacent to existing and developing areas. Close proximity to Lara/ Lara West PSP provides access to local employment, infrastructure and community facilities</li> <li>Construction of infrastructure and housing will provide a boost to the economy. Once established will create demand for local business and services for the immediate and surrounding areas.</li> <li>Provides local and regional transport. Access to the Lara train station</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The identified Investigation Areas including the priority status, indicative timing and boundaries are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p> <p>The directions and commentary around the Further Investigation Areas have been updated to clarify directions and the generalised nature of these nodes (refer submission 23).</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>providing direction connection to Melbourne and Geelong CBD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lovely Banks will then be able to contribute to the current community services and facilities</li> <li>• The submission provides a response to the considerations identified in the background paper (pg 72/73) and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to Corio and Lara. Separated by the Ring Road. Lara West would be developed first create a connection between Lara and the subject land west of Bacchus Marsh Road.</li> <li>• Good road connections. Other services and infrastructure all available</li> <li>• High to all Services developed via Lara West PSP</li> <li>• Grep, Avalon</li> <li>• High – Current preliminary planning has been undertaken in regards to the site investigation</li> <li>• Fireworks site Evans Road (requires suitable buffers)</li> <li>• ESO4 – some preliminary investigations undertaken which identify limited impact if managed</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <p>Request the Lovely Banks Further Investigation Area be extended to include the 'Lovely Banks North Growth Investigation Area' incorporating the land identified in submission (For privacy specific addresses have been removed)</p>	
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a context for employment and economic opportunities contained with the Draft G21 growth Plan</li> <li>• Supports the importance of linkages along arterial roads and passenger/freight lines</li> <li>• Identification of growth opportunities, particularly employment growth, should remain within the remit of the Gheringhap Structure plan process, currently being undertaken rather than subject to an apparent limitation of growth through the RGP to land already identified as planned growth.</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan provides a broad direction for land use and development at a high level. The role of local land use planning remains with Councils through its Structure plans. The Growth Plan is not a limitation to the opportunities in the Golden Plains</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growth opportunities within Gheringhap and surrounding hinterland remain to be fully considered</li> <li>• The timing of planning for and delivery of new growth fronts in the region should be matter of negotiation with Council and subject to evidence of land supply and the ability of any developer to meet and bring-forward infrastructure costs. The submission does not see the role of the RGP to preclude the development where these can be brought forward and where the developer acknowledges and wars the risk and cost of infrastructure embellishments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opportunities available within the Gheringhap area of Golden Plains Shire would further the achievement of the strategic intent and should remain an option within the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Shire.</p> <p>The Growth Plan was developed in collaboration with Golden Plains Shire and fully considered existing council strategies. The Gheringhap Structure Plan which is underway would be considered as part of the proposed 3-5 year review process for the Growth Plan.</p>
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debate the ability of the region to sustain a population of 500,000 as the areas must have increased employment opportunities (80,000 jobs). Large housing developments are presently going ahead at a rapid rate. Infrastructure and employment opportunities should be the first priority before people are encouraged to live here. Australia's economy is slowing and full time employment decreasing – do not want a similar situation to Ireland, Spain, USA with empty house and no jobs.</li> <li>• Contends that foremost in this growth plan must be food and water security. The submission finds that Map 2 is misleading as it shows the Bellarine as predominately mixed farming and grazing. Residential development and hobby arms (which are often unproductive) are the predominate use. Also appears to be happening in the farming areas to the west and north of Geelong as residential development expands.</li> <li>• Doubts recent water and sewerage infrastructure is sufficient to meet the residential and employment demands for a population of 500,000. Climate</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan acknowledges that the regions population is growing and infrastructure needs to grow with it. The plan is also cognisant of the fact that his has to happen sustainably by providing for well planned housing, jobs and protecting our assets including the environment and natural resources.</p> <p>The Growth Plan acknowledges the challenges of climate change and food security and reinforces the value of rural land</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>change with predicted longer dry spells, increased burden of costs for water and infrastructure on families, farmers and manufacturers must be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the environment must be further researched with ground water supplementing our water usage. Scientists are unsure whether this ground water can ever be replaced.</li> <li>• Developers should be made to commit to prior permit promises of funding dual water pipes systems for recycling (example Stockland canal developers)</li> <li>• Region's wetlands, lakes, rivers and marine parks are already under threat from over development. The present Municipal planning schemes are not adequate and should be restructures before this population explosion to protect the above natural assets.</li> <li>• Land should be set aside to compensate for possible inundation through climate change, resulting in loss of environmentally sensitive areas. The QCA are hopeful that the RGP's Environmental Management Strategy Review will bring solutions</li> <li>• Pleased that the RGP's emphasises the need for defined boundaries and settlement breaks between towns. Concerned that low lying developments between Ocean Grove and Pt Lonsdale may join and therefore lose character.</li> <li>• Pleased that the RGP recommends each town's assets are to be nurtured and protected. Concerns that heritage within Queenscliff and Geelong is not protected within the Planning Schemes – hopes the RGP will convince the borough to reverse its very poor record in protecting unique heritage and environmental assets.</li> <li>• Raises concerns about the waste disposal created by 500,000 people as garbage collection cost increase and land fill sites become scarcer. G21 Growth Planners with Local councils will need to do more research on the issue (possibly through the environment management strategy)</li> </ul>	<p>for production. Existing rural land use mapping is based on VLUI data.</p> <p>Barwon Water's infrastructure planning provides a basis for supporting a region of over 500,000.</p> <p>Projects such as VSHREW and the CCMA Regional Catchment Strategy are the appropriate level documents to examine river and catchment health challenges and programs in the context of the Growth Plan framework.</p> <p>The Growth Plan provides a broad settlement and land use framework. Its role is not to identify the application of specific controls which remain a local level consideration.</p> <p>Future management of the waste stream is identified as a key Infrastructure consideration. This work will be a key challenge for the next iteration of the BRWM Plan.</p> <p>Key project lobbying remains a</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RGP notes the need for increasing public transport however notes developer's within the region desire's to obtain the maximum number of lots resulting in narrow streets that larger PT vehicles cannot navigate.</li> <li>• Infill development is going to exacerbate parking problems where already most multi car dwellings have parking difficulties.</li> <li>• Identified the need for improvements to public transport including rail links to Avalon Airport, Geelong Port, Queenscliff/Bellarine Peninsula, Torquay/Armstrong Creek, improvements to rail services to western regions and improved bicycle network.</li> <li>• Geelong Port is underutilised. Water transport should be researched.</li> <li>• Duplication of highways encourages heavier traffic and can be detrimental for smaller towns. Concerns the Ferry operator's requests for a dual high through Queenscliff would have a drastic impact on the town. It should be stopped at Pt Lonsdale.</li> <li>• Supports vision for Geelong to become a leading innovation and academic city but will require lobbying due to recent cuts.</li> <li>• Supports the Plans prediction for improved medical services, training and research. Question whether this will be enough to cope with the population increase.</li> <li>• The Growth Plan team must raise the issue of traffic safety and consult with council planning officers and appropriate authorities for wider, safer street and roads as there is also the increased need for bike and pedestrian paths.</li> </ul>	<p>major focus of the G21 Regional Alliance.</p> <p>Duplication of Bellarine Highway to Point Lonsdale only is identified.</p>
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the concept of G21 Regional Growth Plan and inclusion of Bell Post Hill area west of the Ring Road as a Further Investigation Area.</li> <li>• Committed to developing an overall master plan for the Bell Post Hill area in order to facilitate orderly planning.</li> <li>• Willing to engage consultants to access infrastructure requirements, traffic, environmental issues and all other associated expert input required and</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>thereafter develop an Overall Concept Plan identifying various land uses that this can accommodate and will need in the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning and location of growth should be undertaken by the responsible authority to ensure orderly planning believe that the timing of release of land should be driven by the market.</li> <li>• Investment into developing land will only happen in its financially viable; therefore an oversupply of land should not be a concern within the G21 Regional Growth Plan.</li> <li>• Allowing the market to drive release of land will improve housing affordability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the final report be amended to remove any reference to timing of the planning and development if further investigation areas to allow the land owners the opportunity to investigate the potential to development with the Bell Post Hill area.</li> </ul>	<p>planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas including the priority status, indicative timing and boundaries are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p>
7.	<p><b>Remove Date Specific Triggers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the identification of Lovely Banks as a 'priority' future Greenfield development area.</li> <li>• Does not support the proposed timing which defers development until 2030-2040</li> <li>• States that there is an adequate supply of zoned and planned land in Geelong South and Bellarine areas, the northern growth only have limited growth areas.</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To enable Geelong to best meet its increased short and medium term dwelling needs provision for more zoned land in the northern catchment is now required.</li> <li>• Challenges the aspirational population target of 500,000 people, demand and supply scenarios and the rational for deferring future development future greenfield development</li> </ul> <p><b>Lovely Banks is a priority</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lovely banks is justifiably recognised as a potential new growth area for Geelong and the G21 region</li> <li>• Will accommodate future demand in North Geelong region and offers strategic advantage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Proximity to designated employment</li> <li>· Transport and infrastructure connections</li> <li>· Social improvements to the wider area</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of Lovely Banks will have far reaching benefits for Geelong including Corio/Norlane. New investment will be a benefit and create a population influx</li> <li>• New sustainable master plan community will transform the perception of the north, increase the local population and support existing and future services</li> </ul> <p><b>Faster Population Growth</b></p> <p>Suggests that Geelong not the whole of G21 could support a population in excess of 500,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expected to growth at 2.2% per annum (moderate growth rate) and will reach 500,000 by 2038</li> <li>• The submission provide figures which contrast with G21 RGP projections</li> </ul> <p><b>Increased Dwelling Demand</b></p>	<p>security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas including the priority status, indicative timing and boundaries are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p> <p>A review of the population and dwelling demand/supply figures provided with the submission concludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the supply quoted for the northern region is significantly under for the northern SLA's as it does not consider construction of dwellings</li> </ul>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VIF dwelling demand projections of 2.2% per annum are 25% greater than G21 projects. It projects that 27,798 extra people will be living in the Northern Geelong region.</li> <li>• The increased demand in the Northern Geelong region will reduce the greenfield land supply to 15 years under a base case, 9 years in a medium growth rate (2.2%)</li> </ul> <p><b>Northern Employment Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to jobs – GREP is located within 2km of Lovely Banks and is planned to accommodate 10,000 jobs</li> <li>• Close to employment hubs – Avalon, Geelong Port, Northern Geelong industrial areas.</li> <li>• Project ed to generate thousands of jobs during construction phase</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure is available</b> and readily connected to critical infrastructure and has direct links to rail and road transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes innovative infrastructure funding arrangements that address Barwon Water and Council's financial and governance considerations without compromising community objectives and housing affordability.</li> <li>• Proposed infrastructure servicing model could be applied across the entire growth area</li> </ul> <p><b>Planning Framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lovely Banks is the most logical next growth node is Geelong</li> <li>• The long lead times to release Greenfield to release greenfield land requires detailed strategic planning investigations and assessments</li> <li>• These should commence whilst there is still supply in the market</li> <li>• Deferring will lead to an undesirable position of limited supply, lack of competition and decline id affordability in the market.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p>	<p>within established areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Macroplan estimate future supply for the North region of 7,065 which is based only a partial area of the Corio – North SLA and is substantially less than the estimated 16,000 dwellings available in this SLA</li> <li>• the demand figures suggest that much of a higher growth uptake for northern suburbs/areas will be a transfer of demand from elsewhere in Geelong</li> <li>• the assumed household size (1.95 people per household) is very low for a new growth area. A household size of 2.5 is more reasonable. The lower household size results in unreasonably high demand for housing in the northern SLA.</li> </ul>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lovely Banks remains identified as a priority growth area</li> <li>• Timelines for the planning and development in 'Further Investigation Areas' are removed from the Draft G21 Regional Growth Plan</li> <li>• Population and dwelling projections are updated in accordance with MacroPlan Dimasi figures</li> <li>• The G21 Final report is subject to panel style review to final decision</li> </ul>	
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largest theme park in the Bellarine Peninsula region plays a significant role in bringing visitors to the region and Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>• Adventure park located at the gateway to the Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>• Note that Geelong and Bellarine generate \$478 million to the local economy and the equivalent of 4200 full time jobs</li> <li>• Key attractors to the region were around based activities</li> <li>• Adventure park is a key tourist attractor for the region with flow on affects to other tourist facilities in the region</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should strengthen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Its position on protecting the high quality amenity and strategic priorities to preserve the rural landscape and support horticulture, viticulture and tourism on the Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>· Its position on protecting the local tourism industry - which will support the communities and local economy on the Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>· Its direction as to where intensive agriculture use maybe considered appropriate for the region (noting Bellarine Peninsula suited to viticulture and horticulture)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consider extending the significant tourism routes and assets trail to include additional regional tourism attractors such as Adventure Park.</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan supports the protection of the region's productive agricultural areas, rural landscapes and tourism areas with the identification of four key settlement brakes and the designation of settlement boundaries for all towns.</p> <p>The Growth Plan recognises the Bellarine's strengths in tourism and intensive agriculture. It is not the role of the Growth Plan to identify specific recommendations for the Bellarine around these strengths but provide a framework for settlement, and employment growth and infrastructure in the region. The Plan does not hinder opportunities. The existing Greater Geelong Planning Scheme provides alternative policy mechanisms to manage major</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>tourist sites.</p> <p>The significant tourism route has been extended to show the entire Bellarine linking back into Geelong.</p>
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Torquay's role needs to be elevated to accommodate growth pressures.</li> <li>The submission challenges the anti growth position for Torquay and requests that plan is amended to reflect Torquay's role as a key coastal growth node and that it should accommodate more growth</li> <li>Future development in the north west of Torquay should be recognised as a future priority in the G21 RGP</li> </ul> <p><b>Torquay Population Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presents alternate figures for dwelling demand in Torquay/Jan Juc suggesting that 9,826 dwellings will be required by 2031 (reflects an additional 2706 dwellings on figures within the G21 RGP)</li> <li>Further work by Macroplan Dimasi state that at a moderate growth rate of 2.2%, 10,317 dwellings will be required and at high growth rate of 2.5%, 11,543 dwellings by 2026.</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategic Advantages of further development in Torquay North</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct has direct transport linkages to Geelong via the Surf Coast Highway</li> <li>Barwon water has committed to constructing a 'Class A' water connection from the west which will improve access to infrastructure and provide opportunities for recycled water.</li> <li>Its proximity to employment/civic services</li> <li>Recreation and open space facilities in close proximity to the Surf Coast transport corridor</li> <li>Opportunity to enhance the gateway entrance to Torquay</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan does not take an anti growth position for Torquay. Torquay is a nominated District Town. Through Sustainable Future: Torquay - Jan Juc 2040 Project and incremental infill an additional 15,241 people have been planned for in Torquay.</p> <p>Noted comments in regards to projected dwelling and population forecasts. Without detailed information from Macroplan Dimasi further work the Growth Plan is unable to make a detailed response. A review of the figures quoted in the Growth Plan and Background report are generally consistent with VIF data and unpublished data from UDP 2012, DPCD and as such the figures will remain unchanged for Torquay/Jan Juc.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revisions to the projected dwelling and population forecasts for the Torquay/Jan Juc area, to be better aligned with the projections released by the State Government VIF 2012 program. Would require an additional 2,706 dwellings by 2031</li> <li>• Update Map 3 – Settlement and Employment Growth directions of the plan to include Torquay North as a new targeted growth node for Torquay/Jan Juc area.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes to the Settlement and Employment Growth Plan will be made in regards to Torquay/Jan Juc.</p>
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earth resources – oil and gas exploration (fracking) must be banned. The long term environmental effects are unknown. The region's future agriculture and potable water could be jeopardised.</li> <li>• Brownfields site – why rezone land which could be polluted making it unsafe, low lying, flood prone, close to power cables, busy roads, which can lead to illness, deaths and health costs.</li> <li>• Population 500,000 – why passively accept that the Region's population will be 500,000 which will require all manner of crowded, inappropriate housing, specifically infill. Spare child thinking is defunct. Why is there a photo of a couple with 4 children?</li> <li>• Higher density – extremely undesirable for family homes. Children need space</li> </ul>	<p>Earth resources are recognised in the Growth Plan as providing opportunities to meet future energy demands. Extensive legislative processes are in place to ensure activities meet environmental requirements etc. It is not the role of the Growth plan to prohibit activities which can legally be undertaken.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>to run around. Australia's obesity rates rival the US.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational land – public space is insufficient for the current population, despite recent population increase in Grovedale/Waurn Ponds there is only three parks, one which is inaccessible for walking with prams.</li> <li>• Infill not the answer. The claim in works in the Europe is irrelevant. After 14 years in the UK, I assure you people do not like it. Houses are being demolished and replaced with units on pocket handkerchiefs. ABC's Catalyst, Thursday 17 May reported that high density housing makes it extremely difficult to contain serious diseases.</li> <li>• Targeting infill in West Fyans, Central Geelong, Corio Norlane – high density for these areas smacks of snobbery. Why do these perceived low socio economic areas get all the rubbish dumped in them. Why doesn't it happen to the beautiful people in Newtown, Highton, Torquay and Jan Juc</li> <li>• Reinforcing Central Geelong – the CBD is dying because of extortionate parking fees, pale coloured footpaths which look scruffy, extending nightclub opening hours has resulted in shoppers having to negotiate vomit, faeces and blood on footpaths – very unpleasant.</li> <li>• Planning for employment growth – why create new industrial areas which may never be filled. After 15 years Torquay Road, Grovedale is only half full. The reports authors must live where they won't be impacted nor endure the pollution and noise of unexpected proximity to new roads.</li> <li>• Identifying the major infrastructure – all proposed works must be subjected to thorough, transparent, fair and appropriate consultation, people, loading consultations with staff from participating bodies does not constitute appropriate consultation, planning a road extension within 50 metres of existing homes does not constitute appropriate consultation.</li> <li>• Retaining unique settlements – existing settlements are already being ruined.</li> <li>• Quality of design, walkable communities – walkable communities area great</li> </ul>	<p>Brownfield sites provide opportunities not only for residential living (where contamination and other issues can be effectively managed) but for other employment activities (retail, offices etc).</p> <p>The regions households are diverse (a 2 adult 2 child family represents less than a third of all households) and current housing provision does not meet these changing needs. This requires alternative approaches to housing including infill housing and higher densities (but well planned) at locations which have the infrastructure to support them. Significant greenfield or conventional housing areas are already nominated around the region.</p> <p>The Growth Plan identifies significant projects which have been identified to revitalise Central Geelong.</p> <p>The principles relating to public transport have been</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>but must be maintained. As COGG have refused to construct a path to Coolabah Park have little faith that they would care for new areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major infrastructure investment – authorities totally disregard people's right to enjoy their homes. Infrastructure development must not be at the expense of people's lives and homes.</li> <li>• Minimising water- not just a matter of clever design, must re-educate people and authorities. Each house could have an allowance of water, builders must be forced to put the thickest batts into roofs and all walls. Houses must be redesigned so that all wet areas are on one side and water is not wasted waiting for it to get hot.</li> <li>• Public transport – must be heavily promoted as the preferred alternative. Geelong bus timetables need work to more closely meet trains as some stations have little cover.</li> <li>• Peak oil – some scientists believe peak oil has already occurred.</li> <li>• Health services –There appears to be no mention of how the 500,000 people will be catered for medically.</li> </ul>	<p>strengthened. The Growth Plan was developed in consultation with DHS and Barwon Health. The Growth Plan enables key service providers like Barwon Health with a framework for future service planning to meet future population needs.</p>
<b>Submission 11.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport in supporting growth – Refers to Section 4C advisory panel report – State Government has not allowed sufficient funding for the investigation of a suitable route between Anglesea Road and Surf Coast Highway.</li> <li>• Avalon – highlights the potential for job losses at Avalon, Aloc and Ford. Relying on Avalon for only personal/freight flight related employment is assuming that there will always be fuel. Asks if G21 is taking these seriously or negotiating with these companies</li> <li>• Timing and sequencing – authorities totally disregard people's right to enjoy their homes. Secretive planning of section 4C, Grovedale station and the Norlane Infill flats and the intermodal was outrageous. The residents of breakwater are subject to horrendous noise and pollution. Development must not be at the expense of people's lives and health.</li> </ul>	<p>Similar to above.</p> <p>The Implementation Plan will look at key future regional infrastructure planning so as to provide a greater level of certainty.</p> <p>Identified employment nodes will be required to meet future employment needs of a region of over 500,000</p> <p>Both Growth Plan and G21 Region</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites – why rezone polluted industrial and recreate it in greenfields. Fraught with danger. Living in polluted areas causes illness – physical and mental and possible death.</li> <li>• Infill – not the solution. Lazy thinking that to house people cheek by jowl is acceptable. It creates huge social problems and failed in western civilizations. Having originated from the UK with high density housing and associated problems, convinced we should not contemplate this retrograde step. Australia's obesity rates rival the US. Houses on large blocks are constantly being demolished and replaced by units. This maybe ok for older, single or Dinks but totally inappropriate for families with children. Why is the plan only targeting areas for infill – is it because they are deemed low socioeconomic?</li> <li>• Regional activity centres- public transport must be the preferred alternative. Public transport timetables need to be better coordinated – noting it is not unusual for a bus to arrive after the train departs.</li> <li>• Natural landscape – questions why intermodal transport hub was proposed for Lara. Questions why Armstrong Creek developers will be permitted to bulldoze vegetation provided they replace it with appropriate substitute?</li> <li>• CBD – the CBD is dying because of extortionate parking fees, ridiculous to charge Melbourne prices, policy encourages people to shop at homemaker centres, and extended opening hours for nightclubs has resulted in paralytic drunks vomiting on shop fronts and footpaths.</li> <li>• Employment – report seems to suggest that increased population will bring extra jobs. In reality it is the reverse, people move to where the work is. Highly qualified people are unlikely to find relevant work here.</li> <li>• Employment growth – new industrial areas planned or under construction is ridiculous. Most existing industrial estates are nowhere near fully occupied. Is there evidence that people want to live close to work, particularly is that workplace is unpleasant/polluting.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan advocate robust consultation processes.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FIA – people living near the bypass routes with pollution and noise would disagree. Industrial development areas must be contained to protect peoples housing investments. Notification of planned developments must be widely promulgated in plain English not planner speak.</li> <li>• Design – walkable communities can be created but how do you propose getting people to use them. Residents may use paths on the weekend but it is unlikely that working parents will walk to work/day-care/school.</li> <li>• Minimising water – not just a matter of clever design, must re-educate people and authorities. Barwon Water's conservation efforts were jeopardised by the unnecessary poisoning of supply by addition of fluoride against the wishes of the population. Thick insulation batts must be put in all roofs, external and internal walls.</li> <li>• Population – massive population increases should be accepted as inevitable. Action needs to be taken to encourage the births of fewer children.</li> <li>• Retaining unique identity – existing settlements are already being ruined. Far too many units.</li> <li>• Earth resources – oil and gas exploration (fracking) must be banned. The long term environmental effects are unknown. The region's future agriculture and potable water could be jeopardised.</li> </ul>	
12.	<p><b>New Growth Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that new growth areas need to be identified such as Batesford South and Lovely Banks</li> <li>• Geelong is dependent on these areas being available in a timely and cost effective manner</li> <li>• Do not believe that identifying specific timing and priority is appropriate in the context of other works that are required</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing of New Growth Area</b></p>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the timing of either development should not be expressed in years but by a series of triggers that would indicate the need and appropriateness of each development. Could include population, demand, growth rates and socio economic trends.</li> <li>• Possibility of creating a gap in land stock in the next decade that would have unfortunate consequences for Geelong and its residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Priority of New Growth Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are good reasons that could be sited for either project to proceed first, one element that seems to have gone missing is the environmental impact of each development</li> <li>• Batesford South has a significant rehabilitation opportunity including – 300 hectares of planted space and quarry rehabilitation will provide a much stronger environmental case</li> <li>• Proximity to site to Geelong CBD further underscores the environmental considerations</li> <li>• Close location is in alignment with the Strategy's identified goal to preserve and enhance the Geelong CBD</li> <li>• Believe that is inappropriate to suggest precedence of one area over another, especially in light of further investigation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report should not specify timing but point to future works and their ability to identify growth requirements.</li> <li>• Priority should be determined as part of further investigations</li> </ul>	<p>considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>Based on existing commitments of infrastructure agencies and planned growth across the region, no new growth fronts are required within the next 10 years under either a base (1.5%) growth or a higher (2.5%) growth rate.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about implementation remain from early contribution during stage 1</li> <li>Tone of plan seems populist. It predicts significant and rapid growth over a sustained period yet reads as if it is trying to appease widespread antigrowth sentiment. Implication is that we can have exponential growth with all gain and no pain</li> <li>Would like to see a realist appraisal of the benefits and consequences of growth, the choices/trade offs of accommodating this growth - some of this material is contained within the background report and issue papers but is not clear within the Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges with regional growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not sufficiently highlight and discuss the challenges facing the region.</li> <li>The overall challenge to evolve as a self sustaining region that uses existing infrastructure and land more efficiently does not appear to be adequately reflected in the rest of the documents.</li> <li>Maximising use of existing infrastructure and using land more efficiently are largely missing from the challenges list on page 18</li> <li>The challenges were generally agreed with the G21 community. However these challenges are ok as far as they go but are not comprehensive and the plan does not deal in sufficient detail with the practical implications of responding to them – wonders how respondents are interpreting the challenges – perhaps they mean things to different people</li> <li>The plan assumes 40% of future population will be accommodated through infill housing activity or urban consolidation but provides little detail what this means in practice.</li> <li>Fails to make a start on managing the expectations of the G21 Community</li> <li>The submission refers to the key implications contained with the housing issue paper. Questions how the plan tacks such issues</li> </ul>	<p>Accept that further discussion is needed to fully convey the challenges facing the region. The context section has been revised to include a more detailed discussion of the G21 region, the role and functions of key areas and the role and function of Geelong. This material was previously contained within the Background Report and 6 issue papers.</p> <p>The challenge - 'sustaining region that uses existing infrastructure and land more efficiently' is a key theme and is addressed throughout the whole document. In particular the Growth Plan responds to this challenge through the Settlement and Employment Growth Directions and Major Infrastructure Directions.</p> <p>The Northern Gateway discussed on page 15 of the draft plan has been separated into two, the north east gateway and the north west gateway.</p> <p>The rating of towns in terms of their growth capacity on a number of factors needs to be considered in the context of other centres measured i.e Torquay, Colac. <u>Within</u></p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reality in tackling means a change to current planning policies and decision making.</li> <li>Challenges that the Plan does not indicate how principle 9 will be done. Reads more like business as usual</li> </ul> <p><b>The plan needs to be robust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overriding concern of the robustness of the plan. The ultimate test of strategic plans is how effectively they are implemented – how robust they are over time</li> <li>Feel that a RGP which glossed over the real issues and presented a rose coloured view of the world would serve no purpose</li> <li>It could be too easily ignored or contradicted by planning authorities in the face of political pressures. Fail to provide clear direction and certainty sought by many stakeholders</li> <li>A more realistic discussion about the challenges facing the region will result in a more robust plan which would be more likely to be implemented effectively</li> <li>We see too many examples of short term decision making based on political expediency, which destroys confidence in the planning system and creates uncertainty. It frustrates and deters companies who have the capacity to invest in the region.</li> <li>Provides a recent experience with the Lara Structure Plan – identifying the inconsistency with the Minister for Planning decision making. Further supporting a need for implementation of the RGP</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see the challenges facing the region given greater prominence, defined more clearly and discussed in greater depth. Should not be sugar coated or presented as broad motherhood statements.</li> <li>The challenge of becoming a self sustaining region that uses existing infrastructure and land more efficiently should be a key theme and discussed more explicitly throughout the plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Lara there are limited numbers of major employment nodes relying predominantly on the existing town centre and the GREP. The town however still ranks highly overall as a centre with capacity for growth.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the least should be given the same treatment as principles and would assist in following the numbers in the table pg 28/29</li> </ul> <p><b>Specific references to Lara</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think that it is misleading to couple Lara with Bannockburn as part of a Northern Gateway (pg 15) – Lara s a large township on the Geelong-Melbourne rail/road transport corridor and adjacent to two of the four major employment precincts. Makes Lara unique in the region.</li> <li>The wording of the plan characterises Lara first and foremost as 'larger lifestyle lots'. While these exist they house an increasingly small minority</li> <li>In Background Report - surprised to see Lara's growth capacity for employment rated only 3 on a five point scale.</li> </ul>	
14.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter own and operate two successful wineries which make a significant contribution to the viticulture and tourism industries within Bellarine Peninsula and Geelong region.</li> <li>Notes the Plans recognition of tourism and the importance of agriculture and viticulture for the G21 region.</li> <li>Identifies the potential for these industries to expand resulting in the diversification of employment opportunities and the economic value add through increasing tourism opportunities for the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should strengthen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Its position on protecting the high quality amenity and strategic priorities to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan supports the protection of the region's productive agricultural areas, rural landscapes and tourism areas with the identification of four key settlement brakes and the designation of settlement boundaries for all towns.</p> <p>The Growth Plan recognises the</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>preserve the rural landscape and support horticulture, viticulture and tourism on the Bellarine Peninsula</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Its position on protecting the local tourism industry - which will support the communities and local economy on the Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>· Its direction as to where intensive agriculture use maybe considered appropriate for the region (noting Bellarine Peninsula suited to viticulture and horticulture)</li> <li>• Consider extending the significant tourism routes and assets trail to include all the tourism operations located along the Bellarine and Portarlington Highway in the communities of Clifton Springs/Drysdale</li> </ul>	<p>Bellarine's strengths in tourism and intensive agriculture. It is not the role of the Growth Plan to identify specific recommendations for the Bellarine around these strengths but provide a framework for settlement, and employment growth and infrastructure in the region. The Plan does not hinder opportunities. The existing Greater Geelong Planning Scheme provides alternative policy mechanisms to manage major tourist sites.</p> <p>The significant tourism route has been extended to show the entire Bellarine linking back into Geelong.</p>
15.	<p><b>New Growth Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that new growth areas need to be identified such as Batesford South and Lovely Banks</li> <li>• Geelong is dependent on these areas being available in a timely and cost effective manner</li> <li>• Do not believe that identifying specific timing and priority is appropriate in the context of other works that are required</li> </ul> <p><b>Timing of New Growth Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Belief that the timing of either development should not be expressed in years</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>but by a series of triggers that would indicate the need and appropriateness of each development. Could include population, demand, growth rates and socio economic trends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of creating a gap in land stock in the next decade that would have unfortunate consequences for Geelong and its residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Priority of New Growth Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are good reasons that could be sited for either project to proceed first, one element that seems to have gone missing is the environmental impact of each development</li> <li>• Batesford South has a significant rehabilitation opportunity including – 300 hectares of planted space and quarry rehabilitation will provide a much stronger environmental case</li> <li>• Proximity to site to Geelong CBD further underscores the environmental considerations</li> <li>• Close location is in alignment with the Strategy's identified goal to preserve and enhance the Geelong CBD</li> <li>• Believe that is inappropriate to suggest precedence of one area over another, especially in light of further investigation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report should not specify timing but point to future works and their ability to identify growth requirements.</li> <li>• Priority should be determined as part of further investigations</li> </ul>	<p>infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>Based on existing commitments of infrastructure agencies and planned growth across the region, no new growth fronts are required within the next 10 years under either a base (1.5%) growth or a higher (2.5%) growth rate.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process</p>
16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission on behalf of the owners of the land in Spring Creek Future Urban Growth Area immediately west of Duffields Road. This land is planned for the future growth of Torquay/Jan Juc as reflected in the Surf Coast Planning Scheme (Clause 21.08)</li> <li>• Concerned that the G21RGP is not based on and does not reflect current</li> </ul>	<p>Noted the Surf Coast Shire Planning Scheme does identify this land as future urban growth. Council through the development of Sustainable Futures: Torquay/Jan Juc has amended their view and is</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>planning policy for Torquay/Jac Juc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The document known as Torquay 2040 has not been published in final form nor has it been the subject of public consultation and is not included as local policy in the Surf Coast Planning Scheme.</li> <li>• Figure 4 – shows identified planned growth for Torquay is a location which is not reflected in either the surf Cost planning scheme or the last published final draft of Torquay 2040.</li> <li>• There is no adopted policy document which describes areas to the north of Torquay. Established planning policy designates Spring Creek as Torquay's future urban growth area. However it appears to be omitted from figure 4.</li> <li>• Surf coast Shire only recently resolved to prepare an amendment to the Surf Coast Planning Scheme which would change the designated growth areas from Torquay by excluding land west of Dufflieds road from future urban development.</li> <li>• Has not yet received authorisation to prepare the amendment.</li> <li>• Submit that the SCS suggested revised strategy is flawed and the land that is now alternatively nominated to accommodate urban growth has not been properly assessed for capability or viability.</li> <li>• The future supply of land within Torquay in accordance with State Policy would no longer be secure.</li> <li>• Provides a statement from the independent panel appointed to hear submissions to Amendment C71 pt 3 – suggesting the decision on 27 July 2011 reverses more than 30 years of planning that identified Spring Creek as an urban growth area.</li> <li>• The role of Torquay as a large coastal centre in the region has been confirmed by this policy and the RGP and is consistent with the aims of the Victorian Coastal Strategy.</li> <li>• This role should not be undermined by the poorly executed planning decisions</li> </ul>	<p>currently running an amendment process to action that.</p> <p>The Growth Plan has adopted the outcomes of the Torquay/Jac Juc 2040 as Council policy and as such the area known as Spring Creek has been not been included for future growth.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>by the Surf Coast Shire.</p> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly submit that the G21RGP should not be approved unless it reflects current planning policy for all towns with the G21 region including Torquay.</li> <li>• Object to its present form and content (references page 53 and figure 4)</li> <li>• The G21 RGP sets out an alternate position for growth at Torquay that is contrary to established Planning Scheme policy.</li> <li>• Should not be further advanced until the assumptions on which it is based are confirmed as correct.</li> </ul>	
17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan is a substantial piece of work and to be commended on many levels. Its sets out a positive vision that Geelong could work towards.</li> <li>• Impressed that the words 'peak oil' has been included as a possible challenge. It is a relief that there is some recognition of the potential for declining energy supplies. Especially important given declining oil availability is an absolute certainty in the 20-40 year timeframe. Submit that is more likely 5 years. Recognition is a vital step; the report does base the majority of its assumptions on growth in population, economic output, infrastructure investment and the growth in oil use. Believe within the 40 year timeframe there will be a significant paradigm shift due to peak oil that will render many of the assumptions of the current plan redundant.</li> <li>• Submitter focuses on small grassroots initiatives rather than attempting to plan for change from the highest levels. However as long as business as usual continues the group's initiatives will seem insignificant in the large schemes of things.</li> <li>• The Growth Plan does a great job in what it sets out to do and notes that the plan in able to adapt to changing circumstances which are impossible to predict.</li> <li>• Transitions and G21 RGP have the same objectives just are working at opposite</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The term 'peak oil' has been removed from this document and replaced by the term 'increased vulnerability to rising energy costs' in line with State Policy.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	ends of the scale.	
18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Winchelsea is going to grow to a city of 10,000 people in the future why are Vic Roads not putting in a by-pass route in now while they are doing the duplication?</li> <li>• Can see in 40 years time that Winchelsea will be in the same boat as Colac – not having any real effective options.</li> </ul>	Noted. Growth Plan (Appendix B) identifies this as a future infrastructure planning issue for Winchelsea.
19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commends G21 and partners for taking a regional strategic view to considering how future growth can be best accommodated and supportive of the collaborative process being followed to develop the Plan.</li> <li>• Identifies the need for the assumption of a population of 500,000 be robust and be supported by up to date information.</li> <li>• Irrespective of where growth physically occurs it will lead to indirect pressures and impacts on coastal assets. The pressures and impacts have been identified in GORCC current coastal management plan (Community consultation notes on CMP attached to submission)</li> <li>• The plan currently provides little information about how such pressures will be managed.</li> <li>• Proposed regional public land, parks and reserves strategy appears to be an important initiative and one supported, including assisting the impacts and pressures of growth.</li> <li>• Research into the vulnerability of the coast to the impacts of climate change to be released in the coming weeks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to review populations figures using the latest available data</li> <li>• Understand that it is a high level document and detail will evolve. Believes coastal values is an important topic and requires further attention in the plan.</li> <li>• To maximise the benefits of a regional public land, parks and reserves strategy</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan does not predict a growth rate or forecast population size at specific periods in time. Instead, it accepts there will be steady growth in the region and that the population is likely to reach, and potentially exceed, 500,000 in the next 30 - 40 years.</p> <p>The region is currently growing at 1.6% and if this trend continues will see the Region at 400,446 by 2031 (Victoria in Futures, 2012). The Plan has been updated to clarify this.</p> <p>The context section has been revised to include a more detailed discussion on the challenges facing the G21 environment. Map 5 Regional Strategic Assets has been amended to show the coastline and the region's marine parks as strategic assets.</p> <p>The Infrastructure component of the Implementation Plan will only be</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>the stakeholders should be expanded to include relevant land managers such CoM and Parks Vic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsibility for the provision and maintenance of infrastructure and how it should be funded should be identified in the Regional Infrastructure Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>able to consider regional infrastructure provision rather than local infrastructure or general maintenance.</p>
20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter owns 529 hectares of land in the further investigation area identified as Batesford South. This contains part of the Batesford Limestone Quarry as well as surrounding areas.</li> <li>Forward thinking of the G21 Project Management Team is commended.</li> <li>The recognition of Batesford South as a Further Investigation Area is regarded as most positive</li> <li>Concern that Lovely Banks has been given a priority over Batesford South</li> <li>Fully supports the need for further assessment of potential growth areas identified in the Growth Plan and are confident that the attributes of the Batesford South area will be more fully recognised. This process should be allowed to determine the prioritisation of the greenfield growth area</li> <li>Confident that Batesford South would favourably meets these challenges and importantly, will be well position to offer affordable housing packages and have the flexibility to accelerate the delivery of land supply should the need arise.</li> <li>Well position to take advantage of both existing and planned infrastructure in the area.</li> <li>Note Barwon Water has planned a Recycled Water Plan on the land to accommodate for growth in Fyansford and the Batesford South Area.</li> <li>Proximity of Batesford South to Central Geelong for public transport as well as the Geelong Ring Road for transports logistics and ready access to Melbourne CBD and the Sur Coast.</li> <li>Its geographic will support issues of reinforcing the role of Central Geelong. Efficient use of the infrastructure and will provide regional employment</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenario. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>opportunities. Best positioned to make a significant contribution to the revitalisation of Central Geelong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to community services and amenities along with the simplified land ownership and facilitation of timely supply of land to the market.</li> <li>• ABCL is well advanced in its rehabilitation planning and work has already commenced.</li> <li>• Once complete the Batesford area will be enhanced by a lake and 300ha along the Moorabool River to be set aside for passive recreation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with the priority given to Lovely Banks over Batesford South</li> </ul>	
21.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission relates to Lethbridge Airpark and references to current and future directions within the RGP</li> </ul> <p><b>Lethbridge Airport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operating airport with a number of businesses located on site and 150 member flying club. Links to emergency services</li> <li>• Recently been rezoned to Special Use Zone to facilitate the expansion for a range of airport uses.</li> <li>• Only airport in the G21 Region other than Avalon which has realistic potential to accommodate greater levels of activity. Activity in the recreational and general aviation areas, train and education are significant and would complement Avalon.</li> <li>• Rare example where a regional airport has the space and circumstances to</li> </ul>	<p>The Lethbridge Airpark is located outside of the region and therefore is not represented on maps within the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan acknowledges the role of Lethbridge Airpark for general aviation and the role and importance of general aviation as part of the regions transport infrastructure/network.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>grow without being compromised by encroachment of urban and other development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are exploring grant opportunities for funding for a range of infrastructure provision.</li> <li>• Plays a role in the region and its expansion is formally supported by Golden Plains and the G21 and the State Government.</li> <li>• The Geelong Regional Airport Feasibility Study identified it with Avalon as the only airport able to support a region of 500,000</li> <li>• Consider the airport worthy of consideration and inclusion in the G21 RGP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including pg 15, first dot point – productive farmland, regional airports and major employment activities</li> <li>• Include the following dot point pg 21, competitive advantages – regional aviation opportunities</li> <li>• Identification of the site on map page 27 as an airport</li> <li>• Include aviation in the dot points on page 32</li> <li>• Under Draft G21 Economic Strategy after last paragraph– include the words 'similar protection via overlays or similar may be required to protect uses which may be compromised due to growth</li> <li>• Addition to second dot point in colour block page 36 – general and recreational aviation facilities in the region.</li> <li>• The additional of Lethbridge to the transport and logistics network illustrated on p37.</li> </ul>	
22.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpreted the document as a follow on from the G21 Region Plan which identified an aspirational population target of 500,000</li> <li>• Raises concerns about global warming and its link to population growth it is unlikely that population growth will cease</li> <li>• Planning is justified even if the actual growth is less than present projections</li> </ul>	Noted

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>indicate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the loss of rural land to urban sprawl. Pleased that significant amount of new housing is within the existing areas</li> <li>Submitter expects that growth will be less than the plan predicts but assumes figures can be adjusted as time informs us.</li> </ul>	
23.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representing landowners on Bacchus Marsh Road, Anakie.</li> <li>Submission provides a description of the site and its opportunity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Background Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the Lovely Banks further investigation area is limited by the notion adjacent figure 4.11. Support the designation of the Lovely Banks area as being suitable for urban growth however believe at this stage of regional planning it is not necessary to specify boundaries to this area.</li> <li>Section 6.4 - Notion of a Regional Infrastructure Plan to be unnecessary limiting.</li> <li>Table 4.3 has the opportunity to be further refined when more detailed infrastructure and land capability assessments are completed.</li> <li>Noted that the clients land also provides a substantial land holding that is in single ownership. Makes the extension of Lovely Banks more attractive as development can be bought online more quickly. Given the scale of the site any servicing limitations can be accommodated for within an overall development scheme</li> <li>Provides a general discussion re growth rates, highlights that whilst there is an understanding as to where further urban growth may be channelled it is premature to specify exactly how much area may be required in locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>The Regional Growth Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary concern of my clients in relation to the Growth Plan is that Map 3 does not currently show their land within the 'Further Investigation' area that is</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas including the priority status, indicative timing and boundaries are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>Accept change to Figure 4.11 in the Background report to include the following words 'The boundaries of these areas are</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>located along Bacchus Marsh Road (Lovely Banks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes the potential regional population of 500,000 however it is conceivable that these predictions are significantly underestimated.</li> <li>• Submission notes that the designation of a growth limit/boundary is not necessary at this time and in fact could deter investment interest in Geelong.</li> <li>• Don't believe at a regional scale that a limit should occur and the actual site conditions/limitations of further investigation areas are not fully known.</li> <li>• It is foreseeable that growth in employment around the Avalon, Geelong Port, GREP and upgrading/development of infrastructure could alter the role the region play within the local and global economies. Investment in these areas is likely to result a significant increase in demand for housing within the Lovely Banks area due to its proximity to these key attractors and employment opportunities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the notations from figure 4.11 of the background report that define the extent of the further investigation areas or include 'the capacity to accommodate urban growth within the preferred further investigation areas will be further assessed during the preparation of the Regional Infrastructure Plan and other future detailed planning processes. It's not the intentional of the Regional Growth Plan to strict growth within the preferred further investigation areas where demand exists'</li> <li>• Amend Map 3 to extend the Lovely Banks further investigation area to the north or expand the notation relating to the identification areas in Geelong to state ' the boundaries of these areas will be reviewed during future detailed planning processes'</li> <li>• Amend map 3 to use less definitive symbols. For example, the shape could be replaced with numbers that generally identify the location for growth.</li> </ul>	<p>notional only. Subsequent detailed examination of these areas should consider the potential of adjoining lands.'</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
24.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with overall analysis and identification of growth issues within the region.</li> <li>• Support the proposed spatial strategy for the management of growth by containing and consolidating established settlements</li> <li>• Identification of Lovely Banks as a 'FIA' is considered necessary.</li> <li>• Appreciate why Lovely Banks was nominated as a long term growth however feel that the timeframe will be shorter than that nominated, because:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Choice of location for new development is restricted to the city's north and there is a present and emerging need for greenfield land in the city's north. This land should be available concurrent to land in Armstrong Creek</li> <li>· History of land development within the Victoria has been marked and driven by land development interests committed to the earliest realisation of development potential commensurate with demand for new housing.</li> <li>· Elements of the development industry already hold land within Lovely Banks and we anticipate other larger industry members acquiring land within the area in the short term.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge G21 and the City of Greater Geelong to be open, flexible and supportive of creating an opportunity to development Lovely Banks provided that an appropriate infrastructure strategy to service the area can be prepared and endorsed.</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas including the priority status, indicative timing and boundaries are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p>
25.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of surrounding regions is inadequate – what is occurs in neighbouring regions can be of great significance. Example – extensive mining exploration to the North toward Bacchus Marsh. Impact on population, employment and infrastructure is likely to be greater than anything currently proposed in the draft RGP. Another example is growth in the city of Wyndham.</li> <li>• The draft RGP and many plans before it ignore Little River – there are very real economic and social connections between Little River and Lara it is not</li> </ul>	<p>Additional commentary included in Growth Plan and Background Report relating to cultural heritage Mapping revised to add to legibility and include Little River Context around tourism strengthened including bike trails</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>acceptable to assume little river is an extension of Lara.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the principles for growth, in particular the 'optimising infrastructure and consolidating', 'Unique and connected communities' and 'Protect, restore and enhance our unique environment'.</li> <li>• The submission provides a commentary on the particular relevance of the above principles for growth.</li> <li>• The Lara and Little River area includes popular tourist attractions. It is a gateway to other attractions, and attracts many people for sporting pursuits such as shooting and cycling.</li> <li>• The area is characterised by open space and low density rural residential development that compliments the natural landscape.</li> <li>• The existence of major road and rail corridors through the area should not been seen as justification to allow extensive industrial development along the length of this corridor.</li> <li>• As then Northern Gateway to Geelong the rural character needs to be maintained for Geelong to change the industrial feel that has shaped people's perception of the city for decades.</li> <li>• Does not support rezoning more agricultural land in the area for industrial use. Forecasts for the supply and demand for industrial land much takes account the turnover of existing land as the operation of existing users change freeing up land that can be used by new businesses.</li> <li>• Better use should be made of existing rail connections between the Port and GREP.</li> <li>• General observation is that the maps are difficult to read and more particularly are to interpret. For example – it is not clear what area 'key settlement breaks' is supposed to cover or represent. The markings appear to cover both settled and farm land which begs the question of what is permitted in the settlement break.</li> </ul>	<p>etc</p> <p>Not possible to map all potential earth resources sites. While it is noted that exploration of various sites around the region are taking place and their winning will have impact on traffic movements and other environmental considerations, it is problematic to identify these sites until major proposals are forthcoming for assessment.</p> <p>Growth Plan identifies significant infrastructure required to support current and future growth of Lara. Refer submission 37 response re Intermodal.</p> <p>Major regional employers include those identified in Economic Indicators Bulletin as top 10 employers (Barwon Prison not specifically identified)</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The attraction and appeal of Lara and Little River for residents is the opportunity to enjoy a country atmosphere and rural lifestyle in close proximity to major employment and social opportunities.</li> <li>• Lara's population grew at an annual rate of 2.34% between 1985 and 2006 and reach almost 12,000 people in 2008. Critical infrastructure has not been developed fast enough to keep pace with the population growth.</li> <li>• Curious that prisons are not mentioned as a current or future employment sector in the Appendix for Lara. There is also no mention of possible mining developments to Lara's north.</li> <li>• The development of the RGP is a timely initiative which is needed to draw together a range of public and private proposals that have had insufficient public exposure and therefore appear to be poorly coordinated.</li> <li>• Concerned that the current draft is that it reinforces rather than challenges the priorities and direction of current planning schemes.</li> <li>• The Draft RGP must challenge the current paradigm. Believes the draft fails to do this to any extent.</li> <li>• Concerned that the Council's will not open up their planning schemes to review at the end of this process. The final plan should provide an outline of the general process Councils are required to undertake and timeframes within each Council is expected to review their Planning Schemes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should include a more detailed analysis of major current and planned developments in neighbouring regions.</li> <li>• The Draft Plan should explicitly recognise Little River by marking it on all maps such as figure 4. Mention it in relevant text including the Provincial Centre and District Town Directions table in the Appendix and reference to relevant City of Wyndham planning documents.</li> </ul>	

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
26.	<p><b>Housing affordability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan does not specifically address housing affordability, the region currently completes on price with western Melbourne as an affordable place to buy.</li> <li>• Without a strong emphasis on the drivers of potential price rises e.g. land supply the plan could fail to deliver its objectives.</li> <li>• If competition is not maintained house and land prices will begin to rise to the unaffordable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Role of the Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarity is needed on the role of the plan in a regional and statutory context. It is unclear how the settlement breaks will be implemented</li> <li>• Concerned that Armstrong Creek dominates whilst Torquay presents an anti growth</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic development and planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledges the draft g21 economic development strategy</li> <li>• Supports the principle should be more jobs created in the G21 region.</li> <li>• Need to consider the changing nature of the economy needs to be considered when determining the amount of land required for employment.</li> <li>• Detailed future planning should be flexible in deciding whether the extent of employment land is required either at the time or in the future.</li> <li>• Concerned that the servicing authorities such as Barwon Water have not been integrated into the process through the Plan.</li> <li>• Concerned that despite there being settlement boundaries that shows the limit of growth and where public infrastructure will be required, developers will</li> </ul>	<p><b>Housing affordability</b></p> <p>Noted – the need to provide affordable housing within the region has been identified as a challenge.</p> <p>The need to provide affordable housing, services and education has been added to the principles for growth.</p> <p><b>Role of the Plan</b></p> <p>Further detail has been provided on the implementation process for the Growth Plan</p> <p>The Growth Plan does not take an anti growth position for Torquay. Torquay is a nominated District Town. Through Sustainable Future: Torquay - Jan Juc 2040 Project and incremental infill an additional 15,241 people have been planned for in Torquay.</p> <p><b>Economic Development and Planning</b></p> <p>Detailed planning will be</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>still be required to pay out of sequence cost, even if they are within the activated areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of emphasis on retail in the plan, needs to be revisited.</li> <li>• The plan needs to provide strong support for key tourism developments in the region</li> </ul> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sees the major role of government is decisions regarding the timing, funding and delivery if major critical infrastructure required</li> <li>• The submission provides an overview of previous submissions to State and Commonwealth regarding infrastructure. The fundamental issue to the considerations outlined is the timely development of policy and the timely delivery of infrastructure.</li> <li>• Government has a role to play in funding new and improved infrastructure which could assist in achieving larger scale infill development and denser outer metropolitan development</li> <li>• Consider infrastructure implementation issues, for instance the practicalities of delivery of the required ring road infrastructure</li> <li>• It is important that there are strong infrastructure links and that investment is made and retained in the Melbourne to Geelong corridor.</li> </ul> <p><b>Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests the plan is conservative and that the population will reach 500,000 sooner than expected. Supports a higher population.</li> <li>• Supports both greenfield development and urban renewal projects</li> <li>• Supports the plans and vision2 identified need reactivation and revitalization of Central Geelong the plan does not specify what 'active encouragement' will be required to achieve this.</li> <li>• Supports the designation if the further investigation areas including Lovely</li> </ul>	<p>undertaken as required to address how employment land will be delivered across the region Barwon water are members of the project team and have contributed to the development of the plan.</p> <p>Retail is considered a local challenge for councils. The Growth Plan acknowledges the role Geelong plays as a region city providing significant retail opportunities and provides support for its reactivation.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>An infrastructure plan will be undertaken as part of the implementation plan as detailed in section 6.0.</p> <p><b>Growth</b></p> <p>The Growth Plan does not predict a growth rate or forecast population size at specific periods in time. Instead, it accepts there will be steady growth in the region and that the population is likely to reach, and potentially exceed, 500,000 in the next 30 -</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>banks and Spring Creek (spring creek is not nominated).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Argues multiple growth fronts are required to ensure competition in the house and land market.</li> <li>Critical that land is released in multiple areas within and across the G21 municipalities.</li> </ul>	<p>40 years.</p> <p>The region is currently growing at 1.6% and if this trend continues will see the Region at 400,446 by 2031 (Victoria in Futures, 2012).</p> <p>The G21 region has a 15 year zoned land supply and a 17 strategically identified land supply. This is across multiple growth fronts within each of the G21 municipalities.</p> <p>A robust land monitoring process will be investigated as part of the implementation plan to ensure adequate land supply is maintained across the region.</p>
27.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan fails to provide any new ideas in terms of location and management of growth.</li> <li>Much of the plan is set out in the SPPF, reference Victorian Coastal Strategy and local policies in the G21 councils. The plan is therefore seemingly superseded by such strategic work and is effectively redundant.</li> <li>Implementation plan is also lacking detail as to how the plan will be implemented by the five councils. It is important that there is opportunity to comment on how the plan is implemented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residential growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential growth strategies within the plan are inconsistent and in the case of Torquay/Jan Juc rely on strategic works which has not been tried and tested through the planning scheme amendment process.</li> </ul>	<p>Further detail on the implementation has been provided in section 6.0</p> <p>Noted the Surf Coast Shire Planning Scheme does identify this land as future urban growth.</p> <p>Council through the development of Sustainable Futures: Torquay/Jan Juc has amended their view and is currently running an amendment process to action that.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes Torquay/Jac Juc growth is limited to infill development. Object to this as Surf Coast Planning Scheme currently identifies a number of Greenfield growth corridors to accommodate future growth.</li> <li>• Note that the Sustainable Futures Plan which the Plan relies on has been adopted by Council but is yet to form part of the Surf Coast Planning Scheme.</li> <li>• This plan does it have significant stature weight and should to form the basis of growth prospects in the G21 plan.</li> <li>• Paradoxically, the plan identifies that growth has been allowed within existing growth boundaries. This suggests that growth within Spring Creek corridor would be adopted in this plan.</li> <li>• Supports the identification of Torquay as a district town. This supports the submissions proposition that Spring Creek is a necessary urban growth corridor to accommodate growth.</li> </ul> <p><b>Economic development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally support the Plan's findings and strategies in relations to economic growth.</li> <li>• Supports the finding of tourism and education as key employment sectors and the strategies to accommodate employment in activity centres within Torquay/Jac Juc</li> <li>• Note the plan does not identify the need for a NAC within the Spring Creek as per Retail Strategy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Physical Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the need to provide physical breaks between towns and settlements. Particularly the ever closing gap between Torquay North and Armstrong Creek. Strongly advocate that the growth of Torquay Jan Juc be directed to maintain the break and uphold environmental principles</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p>	<p>The Growth Plan has adopted the outcomes of the Torquay/Jac Juc 2040 as Council policy and as such the area known as Spring Creek has been not been included for future growth. It is not the role of the Growth Plan to identify individual neighbourhood activity centres. Updated commentary around settlement breaks particularly the role of the break between Armstrong Creek and Torquay</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the currency of the plan and its overlap with existing policies.</li> <li>Implementation strategy also lacks detail as to how the regional plan will be translated in to the respective planning schemes</li> <li>Associated issues with the contradictory residential growth policies in relation to Torquay/Jan Juc</li> <li>The plan should reference the opportunity for an activity centre in Spring Creek</li> </ul>	
28, 29 and 30.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that Lovely Banks area will not be developed for the next 20-30 years. Allows Armstrong Creek to be protected from any other competitive development in Geelong.</li> <li>Severely limits the choices for both Geelong people and those who might seek to relocated to our city</li> <li>Implementation and funding for this has not been identified including the monitoring land supply and sales over 3-5 year period and when funds are available to identify any infrastructure requirements for any area noted for longer term residential development.</li> <li>The land owners in the Lovely Banks area are willing to commence an assessment of the areas needs in relation to infrastructure studies and other required to develop Master Plans for the area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the final report should be amended to allow the Land Owners the opportunity to develop and provide a case to bring forward any rezoning in the Lovely Banks Area.</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.
31.	Supports the proposed development and incorporation of the regional Principle Bicycle Network in the Regional Growth Plan as outlined by Bike Safe Coast – Geelong – Bellarine and the participating councils. It will support active transport and leisure use for residents but is important to attracting cycling tourists. The added economic benefit to the tourism sector and our region is a significant bi-product.	Noted. Refer response to submission No. 40
32.	Submission seeks to include land in Cochrane's Road, Waurin Ponds which backs onto Marcus Oldham College's western boundary within the future employment node.	No change recommended. No definitive western boundary identified for Deakin-Marcus Oldham College node. Future planning exercise with key partners can explore edge/transition options
33.	<p><b>Human-induced climate change and population:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G21 and COGG appear to not doubt the science of human induced Climate Change. Increasing our regional population to 500,000+ will place significant burden on abating the region's overall carbon footprint.</li> <li>• People will always want to live here – but it doesn't mean the planet has the capacity to deliver.</li> <li>• Continuing to grow is not possible, sensible or a pathway to prosperity.</li> <li>• For some countries improving GDP whilst maintaining a sustainable population is not new i.e. Sweden.</li> <li>• Solving climate change and the energy crises does not equate to sustainability.</li> <li>• Our current global trajectory is for somewhere between 3-7 degrees. Scientist</li> </ul>	This submission raises some significant issues about growth and associated environmental impacts. While the Growth Plan is primarily a land use and settlement planning framework which seeks to avoid direct environmental impacts of growth (on habitat/waterways etc) by directing growth to major centres and away from vulnerable locations the indirect impacts of

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>strongly urge not exceeding 1.5 degrees Celsius.</p> <p><b>Peak Oil:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No one knows but probably happened in 2005. Given the entire industrial world is built around the availability of oil it follows there will be unparalleled problems.</li> <li>• The latest move into coal seam gas exploration and that Anglesea Brown Coal mine has been resigned for 50 years provides clues to the looming energy crises in our own backyard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Biodiversity decline:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scientist are documenting the disappearance of biodiversity across the planet at rates not seen for 60 million years.</li> <li>• Geelong's biodiversity had had a long history of abuse. Only 5% of former pre-European indigenous vegetation exists.</li> <li>• Birdlife Australia is concerned about the Hooded Plover's fate in the Geelong/Bellarine region. Additional human and domestic dog pressure on beaches will tip the balance of these birds.</li> <li>• The fact is revegetation, restoration and environmental weed removal is slow, costly and imperfect.</li> <li>• The Environmental Unit cannot be held responsible for the whopping increase in pressure that will arise as a result of a doubling population pressure on our local beaches.</li> </ul> <p><b>Freshwater:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diamond (2007) nominates water management as one dozen environmental issues causing collapse of past societies.</li> <li>• Our current trajectory, by 2025 two thirds of the world's population will face water scarcity. Australia will not be exempt from this.</li> <li>• Geelong and regional Geelong is currently in a period of good rainfall. This</li> </ul>	<p>growth on the regions environment are real.</p> <p>The region is continuing to experience growth (VIF, ABS 2011 census data) with increasing numbers of people indicating the want to move to coastal areas around Victoria. The role of the Growth Plan is to manage the impact from a land use planning perspective and in the context of current state and federal population and planning policy. The Growth Plan is one of a suite of strategies (7 other Growth Plan's plus metropolitan Strategy which will provide a state wide perspective on growth management).</p> <p>The Growth Plan provides a framework for local level planning. Individual rezoning's still requiring detailed assessments in terms of examining a range of environmental, social and economic considerations. Similarly a range of local work continues to take place in the</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>won't last for ever.</p> <p><b>Food security:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia at present produces nearly 3 times as much food as it consumes.</li> <li>• Doubling of population will halve our per capita resources of land, fresh water and sea food and thus eliminate much of our food exports.</li> <li>• CSIRO has recommended that about half of our farmland should be withdrawn from use until it can be repaired.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sustainability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the planet's 7 billion people all aspire to have an equal standard of living to Australia, then we would need somewhere between 2-5 each earths.</li> <li>• Solving the energy crises locally does not equal solving climate change globally.</li> </ul> <p><b>Employment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The biggest employers in Geelong are highly carbon exposed and could easily close or downsize in the short to medium term.</li> <li>• Add to this the huge boost in population with the report calculating a minimum extra 70-80000 jobs needed to be found at a time when oil prices are shortages are likely to be common place.</li> </ul> <p><b>Social aspects:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Food prices are likely to increase dramatically in the future as the planet's ability to support the human race reaches new levels of stress.</li> <li>• The G21 Growth Plan document makes only passing reference to peak oil and avoids most of the issues raised in this document.</li> <li>• It has leap frogged the fundamental question of whether we should proceed with growth and consequently where there is an alternative pathway other than growth to long term prosperity.</li> </ul>	<p>environmental space i.e Low Carbon Growth Plan (CoGG), Environmental Management Plans and Strategies and associated programs, CAP's etc. The Growth Plan provides a framework or context for these projects and programs. The Growth Plan has been revised to reinforce this link to a large range of environment themed projects underway (i.e G21 pillar projects).</p> <p>Water is a fundamental need for human life, and therefore critical to a functional society and a liveable environment. Adequate and safe water supply is important to support and develop the region. Where new needs have arose Barwon Water has actively invested in new water sources to diversify and secure water supplies. The reliability and quality of supply is closely monitored to ensure that these goals are not compromised. Barwon Water's Water Supply Demand Strategy,</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p><b>Global financial instability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The currently global economic situation has a long way to travel before it is resolved. Launching a high growth plan for the Geelong region is particularly high risk strategy as it relies on growth when all the global indicators suggest that this is unlikely to occur even in the short term.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Growth Plan is misleading in that its main aim is to sell the public the plan rather than provide honest discussion points.</li> <li>• At the very least a chapter outlining the dangers should be included in the discussion so that people are given that nowhere in the currently plan does it even suggest a downside to this Growth Plan.</li> <li>• Important to consider that globally climate change will continue to intensify as time goes.</li> <li>• Being overarching body responsible for the welfare of 222,000 people already living within its purview, the onus is on COGG to act prudently.</li> <li>• I would have thought it axiomatic that sustainability replaces growth at the top of the masthead as our collective pathway to long term prosperity.</li> </ul>	<p>2012 to 2062 identifies a range of future actions that will ensure water supply is sustainable for a very long time.</p> <p>The latest CSIRO and SEACI climate change projections have been considered in Barwon Water's forecasting and most systems are secure for many years without further upgrade. New upgrades will be selected and sized so that each service area is prepared for future climate challenges.</p> <p>Barwon Water's forecasting is based on a range of computer modelling analyses that consider a number of drought scenarios and dry years. Each supply system is 'stress tested' to ensure that it can continue to meet supply standards under a dry climate. As consumption grows over time, due to forecast population growth, system upgrades and new source options will continue to buffer</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>these drought periods.</p> <p>The importance of the regions agricultural assets is in a large part due to consideration of issues relating to climate change, peak oil and food security. While many of the issues raised may not necessarily be obvious in the Growth Plan, the Plan is supported by a Background Report and a series Issue Papers (including Environment) which examine these considerations and challenges in more depth and provide the basis on which the plan was developed.</p>
34.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disappointed that G21 did not take up request to meet with G21 planners to expand on its earlier submission.</li> <li>Believes that the development of Geelong towards the north suggest that families will move into the area and will require education</li> <li>Given pressure on independent schools in Geelong currently an additional to the independent schools family in the Lovely Banks Growth area should be welcome and encouraged.</li> <li>Submission is pleased to see its proposed new school site included within the</li> </ul>	<p>No changes to the sections 4.3 and 4.4 supported. The Growth Plan addresses regional infrastructure such as hospitals and higher education facilities. The Growth Plan considers primary and secondary schools a local issue/asset.</p> <p>The priority, sequencing and</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>northern investigation area however believes the timetable for the commencement of development is unreasonably conservative. Having regard to the experiences and lessons learned from the Armstrong Creek growth areas planning and recent development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for diversity require greater support and flexibility than simply being included in a general statement of principles.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 4.3 – under key regional assets, 4th dot point remove the word higher from the statement</li> <li>• Section 4.4 Critical drivers for growth – could include a short statement about a strong diverse and growing education sector to include new primary and secondary opportunities</li> <li>• Section 4.12 Sequencing of Growth and Planning. – believe the timeframe for the detailed investigations of the nominated greenfield growth areas are too broad and provide little scope for flexibility. Could be expanded to 4 – 2012-2020, 2020 – 2030, 2030-2040 and 2040+. Detailed planning for identified investigation areas should be undertaken towards to the end of 2020 period. The region could face supply shortages and price escalations.</li> </ul>	<p>notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p>
35.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with overall analysis and identification of growth issues within the region. Support the proposed spatial strategy for the management of growth by containing and consolidating established settlements</li> <li>• Identification of Lovely Banks as a 'FIA' is well considered and necessary.</li> <li>• Lovely Banks area offers the Greater Geelong community with the prospect of</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>an additional settlement area with a high degree of amenity. Reinforced by its elevated position, proximity and accessibility to the Geelong Ring Road and areas of employment including the Geelong CBD and Avalon. It will be important that the concept of sustainability drives the design and vision for the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciate why Lovely Banks was nominated as a long term growth however feel that the timeframe will be shorter than that nominated, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Choice of location for new development is restricted to the city's north and there is a present and emerging need for greenfield land in the city's north. This land should be available concurrent to land in Armstrong Creek</li> <li>· History of land development within the Victoria has been marked and driven by land development interests committed to the earliest realisation of development potential commensurate with demand for new housing.</li> <li>· Elements of the development industry already hold land within Lovely Banks and we anticipate other larger industry members acquiring land within the area in the short term.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urge G21 and the City of Greater Geelong to be open, flexible and supportive of creating an opportunity to development Lovely Banks provided that an appropriate infrastructure strategy to service the area can be prepared and endorsed.</li> <li>• Ask the City of Greater Geelong as the planning and responsible authority be vigilant and not facilitate or approve any rural based use within the Lovely Banks area that might impose serious constraint on residential development at a later date.</li> </ul>	<p>are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p> <p>Implementation of the RGP into Planning Schemes will provide a statutory mechanism to avoid land use decisions which compromise future strategic site opportunities.</p>
36.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surprised that in the Surf Coast Shire only two projects are thought prominent enough to be reported by G21 as growth drivers.</li> <li>• Questions where the investments that are required to:</li> </ul>	<p>Noted – submission also relates to draft G21 Economic Development Strategy and</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upgrade the Great Ocean Road,</li> <li>• Protect access and environmental integrity of the Bells Beach Precinct</li> <li>• Establish community safety and evacuation facilities</li> <li>• Provide small businesses support</li> <li>• Meet community infrastructure needs</li> <li>• Establish health networking and local communities</li> <li>• Promote the creation of wellbeing</li> <li>• Create the means by which the massive potential for jobs, training and social development that is associated with support for art and culture spending.</li> <li>• Meet emerging primary secondary and post secondary education needs</li> <li>• Two projects worth noting which are not mentioned include – a regional facility to be developed at the SCS Civic Precinct and a Sound Shell to facilitate our cultural events to be located in the rolling country of Spring Creek in the Shire.</li> <li>• Need to review G21 Economic Development Strategy – link game changes to existing strengths</li> <li>• Plan should have a more challenging and exciting vision</li> <li>• Development of Portland as states primary port would be a major game changer</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asks that G21 re-examine its reports to incorporate responses to the foregoing.</li> <li>• Consider a more challenging vision</li> </ul>	<p>submission has been referred to that process for consideration. A number of these issues are identified within the Growth Plan directions where of a regional scale. Changes have been made to the appendix B – Torquay/Jan Juc.</p> <p>No change to vision – this is linked like other RGP's to the Region Plan vision.</p> <p>Significance of Geelong Port and linkages to GREP/Avalon is a significant game changer for this region.</p>
37.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the proposed Intermodal Freight facility at Gheringhap did not feature in any of the plans presented. Concerned Vic Roads were not aware of the proposal. Traffic on the Midland Highway could be affected by</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan does identify the value of an intermodal facility as a key piece of infrastructure linking the Geelong Port, Avalon and</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>the proposal was not recognised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bridge at Batesford is too narrow for increased traffic and a new road from Gheringhap to the Hamilton Highway as part of the Gheringhap Intermodal proposal was not addressed.</li> <li>• Since the Golden Plains Shire presented this plan four years ago, submitter has not seen any suggestion that the intermodal proposal had been abandoned.</li> </ul>	<p>Geelong Ring Road Employment precinct (GREP). A range of potential intermodal sites were analysed in a preliminary feasibility study for the Department of Transport over 2 years ago which included Gheringhap, GREP, Avalon Airport and land between Lara and Little River (the initial preferred site).</p> <p>The draft Growth Plan does not nominate a preferred site. This is in part due to new study being prepared for Department of Transport which looks at land uses and transport between Wyndham and North Geelong again in the context of the Regional Rail Link project, Avalon Master Plan project, proposed rail link to Avalon and current Lara 'on hold' rezoning proposal before the City of Greater Geelong. Golden Plains Shire is also yet to develop the Gheringhap Structure Plan which will identify future land use directions for the Gheringhap area.</p>
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key element of the Draft Growth Plan is the identification of two investigation areas to the north and west of the Geelong Ring Road for potential development beyond 20 years.</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the identification of Batesford as a potential greenfield expansion.</li> <li>• Do not believe Lovely Banks investigation area should be given a 'higher priority' over the Batesford investigation area in the final G21 Regional Growth Plan.</li> <li>• Key attributes of the Batesford area include: proximity to Geelong, accessibility to key transport corridors and employment centres, the availability of servicing infrastructure, its ability to provide extensive recreational and public open space and its lack of environmental constraint.</li> <li>• The above suggests that Batesford should be at least an equal priority for urban development and infrastructure provision.</li> <li>• The draft growth plan does not identify any key factors or attributes that indicate Lovely Banks should be afforded higher priority.</li> <li>• Given the future rate of growth for the G21 region is unknown it is possible population growth may exceed current expectations and projections.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further investigation or priority ranking should be determined by the capacity to efficiently deliver infrastructure combined with capability to deliver urban development.</li> <li>• Suggest the Regional Growth Plan should reduce the anticipated timeframes for the growth areas to short – medium term (5-15years)</li> </ul>	<p>unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p>
39.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a strong interest in the progression of the G21 Regional Growth Plan and is generally supportive of the plan and supports the requirement to identify land to accommodate the growth throughout the region.</li> <li>• Recognises the importance of identifying potential growth areas to accommodate future growth as Geelong approaches and beyond 500,000</li> <li>• Supports the location of the two Further Investigation Areas</li> <li>• Recognises that the priority of development will be informed by the Regional</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>Infrastructure Plan and the ability for the responsible authority to service the areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledges that the objectives of the infrastructure plan informs the priority of the further investigation areas and allows for planning of the priority development with the FIA by identifying appropriate use of existing infrastructure and a cost benefit of new infrastructure.</li> <li>• Extremely concerned with the 18 year timeframe contemplated for the preparation of the Regional Infrastructure Plan and identification of the preferred greenfield growth areas.</li> <li>• Considers that the commencement of development within the Further Investigations Areas beginning after 2030 to be excessive and inappropriate.</li> <li>• The Growth Plan specifies that careful monitoring of the rate of development and land supply will be required every three to five years. Submitter is concerned that neither the funding for a mechanism for the implementation of these reviews has been devised.</li> <li>• The Growth Plan shows that zoned land currently identified for planned growth and infill growth is expected to meet the requirements of a region at 500,000 parcels of proposed land may not be available and developed for various reasons. Therefore creating a shortfall of available land.</li> <li>• Submits that investigation into potential development of the FIA's to accommodate growth should be allowed to proceed immediately. Any timing of development should be determined by the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The individual characteristics of the site.</li> <li>· Each site's ability to demonstrate it can be serviced with infrastructure</li> <li>· Driven by market demand</li> <li>· Allows for a variety of lifestyle choices throughout Geelong to suit different sectors on the market.</li> <li>· Depend upon rare opportunities where multiple landowners are prepared to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p> <p>The implementation plan is expected to be completed by 2014 and as such will be completed prior to development of Further Investigation Areas.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>work together to prepare a proposal and develop the land in a coordinated and logical approach resulting in a better planning outcome and better neighbourhood community precincts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The option of offering land in Lovely Banks, Bell Post Hill and Batesford South will allow for balanced planning and development throughout Geelong.</li> <li>· Make the most of the current and future infrastructure already available in the local area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of any referencing to timing with respect to the Further Investigation Areas</li> <li>• Removal of requirement to complete the Regional Infrastructure Plan prior to commencement of any development within the Further Investigation areas</li> <li>· The 3-5 year review of rate of development and land supply should not have any impact on the timing of development within the Further Investigation Areas.</li> </ul>	
40.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission is based on G21 Transport Pillar Minutes April 2012, G21 Sustainable Transport Sub Committee Minutes – March 2012 and G21 Region Principle Bicycle Network Meeting – 4 May 2012</li> <li>• Supports identified Critical Divers – an efficient and effective transport network and challenges 1, 2, 3 and 4 – reduce dependence on cars</li> <li>• Provides a definition of Principle Bicycle Network</li> <li>• The final growth plan should canvas routes which are bitumen sealed and exclusive to cyclists eg Geelong – Torquay, Point Lonsdale to Ocean Grove, Winchelsea to Moriac, Ocean Grove to Portarlington, Bannockburn to Geelong.</li> <li>• Part 2 – Geelong – Torquay Sustainable Transport Corridor - Strongly support this initiative with a few qualifications – a dedicated bicycle path, separated from cars and pedestrians, would be used as a serious transport connection</li> </ul>	<p>Noted comments and suggest amendments within the parameters of the projects scope and role. The following changes have been made:</p> <p>Principle 8 revised to include the words <i>integrated and sustainable transport options</i>.</p> <p>Revised direction <i>‘an efficient and equitable public transport, road and freight network leveraged off existing</i></p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>alternative ( as well as a significant regional tourism attractor)</p> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 24 – unique and connected communities – provide for local sustainable transport solutions to join community hubs, encouraging local patronage.</li> <li>• P25 – 8. Accessible Transport Choices – Prioritise sustainable transport infrastructure investment – pedestrian, cycling and public transport. Linkages, completion, improvements and integration will be essential in encouraging accessible choices.</li> <li>• P27 – Regional Strategic Assets – Transport Corridors – ‘the proposed principle bicycle network will also become a key transport asset within the defined transport corridors, linking new growth zones.’ – Significant tourism routes and assets – ‘the proposed PBN will become a key attractor in one of the fastest growth and most valuable regional tourism sectors – cycling tourism’</li> <li>• P29 Regional Growth Plan – Consolidation – How - creating an efficient and equitable transport network ‘integrating sustainable transport solutions and choices, locally and via hub connections’. Optimising how – ‘providing infrastructure for new growth areas and infill development ‘incorporating linked sustainable transport initiatives’</li> <li>• P37 Map 4 – an efficient and equitable transport network ...to Colac. ‘The implementation of the Principle Bicycle Network via sealed on road and off road transport options will help to achieve practical sustainable transport solutions.</li> <li>• P45 6.3 Infrastructure Plan – transport – to identify future transport infrastructure and services ‘pedestrian, cycling (sealed on and off road linkages, local and regional), public transport (bus, ferry, train, planes), freight (air, land and sea incl. Logistics), car (transport and parking).</li> <li>• P45 6.4 Planning ‘...such as creating efficient sustainable transport dependent communities and...’</li> </ul>	<p><i>infrastructure. ‘</i></p> <p>The PBN is an potential initiative as a result of the direction ‘an <i>efficient and equitable public transport, road and freight network leveraged off existing infrastructure.</i>’</p> <p>The implementation plan and specifically the infrastructure component will consider such initiatives.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
41.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The identification of Batesford as a potential greenfield expansion area for Geelong is well supported.</li> <li>• With regard to timing and sequencing of urban development and infrastructure provisions we do not believe that the Lovely Banks investigation areas should be given a higher priority over the Batesford area.</li> <li>• Key attributes of the Batesford area include: proximity to Geelong, accessibility to key transport corridors and employment centres, the availability of servicing infrastructure, its ability to provide extensive recreational and public open space and its lack of environmental constraint.</li> <li>• The above suggests that Batesford should be at least an equal priority for urban development and infrastructure provision.</li> <li>• The draft growth plan does not identify any key factors or attributes that indicate Lovely Banks should be afforded higher priority.</li> <li>• Given the future rate of growth for the G21 region is unknown it is possible population growth may exceed current expectations and projections.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further investigation areas should be determined by the capacity to efficiently deliver infrastructure combined with capability to deliver urban development.</li> <li>• Reduce the timeframes for the growth areas to short-medium term (5-15 years)</li> </ul>	<p>The priority, sequencing and notional boundaries of the further investigation areas remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Further Investigation Areas are options for growth beyond planned growth to provide for security of land supply and higher growth rate scenarios. These areas will be considered after further infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The identified Investigation Areas and priorities are not definitive and have no formal status as 'future development' sites without further work.</p>
42.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responds to the apparent lack of information on Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale</li> <li>• The Searoads Ferry, the Queenscliff Harbour, the amount of vehicular traffic coming to Queenscliff from across the water and via the Bellarine Highway has been seriously ignored.</li> <li>• The Bellarine is a Tourism, Recreational, Attraction and Winery growth corridor of growing proportions with a road that is a single thoroughfare from Grubb Road – while having massive use in the obvious peak times, yet growing even</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan includes a number of graphical and written acknowledgements of the role of the harbour and ferry service in terms of tourism and providing a key eastern link. Similarly the role of the Bellarine Peninsula is acknowledged from a tourism</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>mote with large developments in Point Lonsdale stimulating transport in the non-peak timeframe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This does not take into account the future infrastructure and growth that mode of transport such as the huge ferry provides from two directions.</li> <li>• The map provided did not even include Queenscliff or most of the Bellarine which is appalling particularly as members of G21</li> <li>• The urban development seminars were introduced to this void in their particular future plans – assumed that this information may would have been circulated to G21.</li> <li>• Request meeting with Elaine Carbines or nominated representative</li> </ul>	<p>perspective but in the same context as the regions other significant tourism assets. Context and assets mapping has been updated - Queenscliff has been included on all maps.</p> <p>Growth Plan is primarily concerned with the most suitable locations for future residential and employment growth in the G21 region so is not designed to address all the points covered in the submission.</p> <p>The duplication of Bellarine Highway to Point Lonsdale (Fellows Road) is supported.</p>
43.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A major challenge will be to arrive at a Bellarine focus then have the critical local issues acknowledged for further consideration.</li> <li>• Reinforcing and strengthening Central Geelong – bold thinking will need to be encouraged and supported to bring about this evolution.</li> <li>• Efficient and equitable transport network/national transport and logistics precinct – i.) provision of logistical centre at Avalon to further reduce Melbourne suburban based traffic congestion and major capital projects. ii) Queenscliff – incorporate the current ferry feeder and future water taxi services. iii) Portarlington Safe Harbour and Drysdale Ring Road – both need to be activated.</li> <li>• Land and infrastructure for existing and future employment nodes – a challenging exercise</li> </ul>	<p>While acknowledging the work done within the Bellarine Peninsula community to develop a future plan for the Bellarine (Bellarine 2050) the Growth Plan is not in the position to adopt the summary of existing workshop ideas and opportunities (although many of them were recognised in the draft Growth Plan). Nor is it within the scope of the Growth Plan to</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBN Roll out – the extension through to townships within the northern Bellarine region must be included in the current installation timeframes and scope of the plan.</li> <li>• Education, knowledge and research – relies on the NBN and associated infrastructure</li> <li>• Maintain and improve natural assets and infrastructure – important and critical when considering further settlement and infrastructure issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bringing the above to fruition will be the engagement of local communities within a shared ownership of the outcomes.</li> <li>• Bellarine 2050 Our Place Our Future program is now complete and ready for next stages.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <p>The following steps are critical to the ultimate future of the Bellarine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of an appropriate group in conjunction with CoGG and key community personal</li> <li>• Formal adoption of the objectives and scope of the Bellarine 2050 project.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement and endorsement of the Bellarine 2050 Symposium outcomes.</li> <li>• Development of suitable funding models based on private/public partnerships.</li> <li>• Expansion of the items list on page 49 of the draft Regional Growth Plan to incorporate the attached symposium workshop summary notes.</li> </ul>	<p>establish a group within COGG, nominate dedicated personal or commit CoGG to undertaking the Bellarine 2050 project.</p> <p>Fundamental to the development of the plan has been working with adopted or approved planning strategies that have been developed following public consultation. The current work by the submitter while of value has not been formally receive, considered or adopted by Council. The Growth Plan will provide a basis for considering more localised policy direction and planning for the Bellarine.</p>
44.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek clarification regarding residential growth recommendations for coastal towns on the Bellarine Peninsula.</li> <li>• Seek clarification whether recommendations to 'limit growth in adjoining coastal settlements of Barwon Heads, indented heads, St Leonards, Portarlington, Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale to existing settlement boundaries</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan allows for the standard process for Structure Plans reviews to take place. These will need to consider the Growth Plan when adopted as policy.</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>as per structure plans' restrict growth to existing Structure Plans boundaries only or whether these areas will be determined by future structure plans, UGPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that if growth in these towns is restricted to existing settlement boundaries then this recommendation essentially prevents any additional changes without amending the G21 Regional Growth Plan.</li> <li>• Any revision of these Structure Plans cannot consider amending the settlement boundaries as this is not supported under the Regional Growth Plan.</li> </ul>	
45.	<p>Waurn Ponds (Lemmins Road area) is not on the development plan and therefore our zoning remains the same. Has all our work and common sense gone out the window.</p>	<p>The purpose of the Growth Plan is to examine where a further 210,000+ people are to be accommodated across the region. One of the key findings is that extensive areas have already been identified to accommodate short and medium term growth needs. A number of areas were examined to identify potential areas (Further Investigation Areas or FIA's) that might provide for longer term growth needs. The 2 FIA's that were ultimately identified were done so on the basis of a number of factors including scale (ability to deliver substantial housing numbers), level of fragmentation and capacity to provide for planned community outcomes. Based on</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>conversations and communications with residents in this area it is clear that the resident community has a preference for a low density outcome rather than conventional – higher density outcomes that would make appreciable difference to housing the targeted long term population. For this reason this area was not identified. Opportunity exists for the Council to consider other residential zoning options for this area (i.e LDRZ if environmental and landscape issues can be managed) given it has not been targeted for conventional housing.</p>
<b>46.</b>	Concerned about the advertised location of the Colac Open House. Provided submission via survey.	Noted
<b>47.</b>	We need a train station desperately now, let alone in 20 years! Thousands of people live in Torquay but travel to Melbourne to work every day. The area is growing fast and should have basic infrastructure such as a rail way line.	Noted. Changes to directions around sustainable transport options including public transport services responding to growth
<b>48.</b>	Supportive of:	The Growth Plan is unable to

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NBN broad band network being rolled out for the Bellarine Peninsula</li> <li>• The proposed growth areas nominated in the plan – find it difficult to see how people will have new employment opportunities to support increasing populations in places such as Colac, Winchelsea and Bannockburn.</li> <li>• The proposed settlement breaks and strongly recommend there be on between Point Lonsdale and Ocean Grove</li> <li>• Maintaining the existing town boundaries</li> <li>• Maintaining existing wetlands and import bio-diversity areas – COGG needs to move towards incorporating these policies into the planning schemes.</li> <li>• Development of the Port and Avalon Airport as future growth centres.</li> <li>• Creating a good public transport system</li> <li>• Improved food and water security</li> <li>• Improving conservation areas and heritage places.</li> </ul> <p>Not supportive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A two lane highway through Queenscliff to the car ferry</li> <li>• Cuts to education funding for TAFE Colleges and education in general.</li> <li>• Any attempts to introduce 'Fracking' on the Bellarine Peninsula or the Geelong Region.</li> </ul> <p>Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our ability to cope with 500,000 people</li> <li>• Dismantling our heritage buildings and streetscapes</li> <li>• The centre of Geelong seems to be dying since the two malls have attracted a large part of the retail activity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly recommend there be a settlement break between Point Lonsdale and Ocean Grove</li> </ul>	<p>address cuts to education funding. The Growth plan does not identify any opportunities for 'fracking' within the Bellarine Peninsula. The plan does identify the renewable energy opportunities are geothermal. Duplication of Bellarine Highway to Point Lonsdale (Fellows Rd only) is supported.</p> <p>Settlement breaks have not been identified around all settlements. The Growth Plan confirms the role and importance of settlement boundaries as identified in township structure plans. These boundaries are critical in creating breaks between settlements and preserving the natural and landscape values and settings of all towns and settlements in the region.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
49.	<p>Submitter has interests in land in Colac. Submission highlights relevant elements of the Draft Regional Growth Plan and responds with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Colac being acknowledged as an important regional growth node given its strategic role as a regional centre in the western district.</li> <li>• Concur with the scale envisioned for Colac</li> <li>• Understand the Colac Otway Shire expect to undertake a Structure Planning process for the Colac once the G21 RGP has been adopted.</li> </ul>	<p>No change recommended. Structure Plan processes for these towns undertaken by Council's will need to examine in more detail growth locations, major infrastructure issues and needs and potential planning/release triggers.</p>
50.	<p>Submission highlights relevant elements of the Draft Regional Growth Plan and responds with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of Winchelsea being acknowledged as an important a regional growth node</li> <li>• Concur with the scale of growth envisioned for Winchelsea</li> <li>• Understand that the Surf Coast expect to review and revise the Winchelsea Structure Plan in response to the adoption of the G21 RGP.</li> <li>• Disagree with the G21 RGP limiting the growth opportunities in Winchelsea to the south or west. Suggest that the identification of appropriate growth fronts within Winchelsea should be left to the structure planning process.</li> <li>• Suggest that once the structure planning process has been complete the timing of rezoning and subdivision should be a matter of negotiation with Council subject to evidence of land supply and the ability of any developer to meet any bring forward infrastructure costs. We do not see the tole of the G21 RGP to preclude or delay the development of a new growth front within Winchelsea where this is consistent with a town structure plan and the developer wears the risk and cost of infrastructure embellishments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p>	<p>Accepted – the growth of Winchelsea is not limited to the south and west. Further work by Surf Coast Shire will be undertaken to consider how Winchelsea will accommodate growth to 10,000 people.</p> <p>The proposed timing of growth within Winchelsea will remain as Medium term but will be reviewed as part of the further work (see comment submission 49)</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that any notation within the G21 Growth Plan limiting Winchelsea's growth to the south and west be removed.</li> <li>Bring forward the timeframe for delivering a new growth front within Winchelsea to enable a competitive housing market to emerge in the region.</li> </ul>	
51.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission provides a description of the site opportunity generally in the area of Tower Road, Allen Road, Batman Road and Geelong Road. Provides a map of the Portarlington Structure Plan boundary which identifies the site as longer term residential growth area.</li> <li>Primarily concerned that in both the Background Report and the Regional Growth Plan is that it is unclear whether the site is shown as identified planned growth – figure 3.4 and figure 4.</li> <li>Believe table 3.1 should further clarify the areas that are expected to accommodate this growth.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggested improvements/amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the designation of the identified planned growth area be made clearer in the Background Report and Regional Growth Plan so that it reflects the direction contained within the Portarlington Structure Plan.</li> </ul> <p><b>Background Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend figure 3.4 to show the site as identified planned growth by relocating the red shading on the eastern side of Geelong Road to the west side of Geelong Road</li> <li>Include the following note at the bottom of table 3.1: the identified planned growth (greenfield) area in Portarlington is located between Tower Road, Allen Road, Batman Road and Geelong Road, Portarlington.</li> <li>Where a structure Plan exists it may also be appropriate to make similar notes for other smaller non growth settlements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Regional Growth Plan</b></p>	Accepted. The location of Portarlington Road was incorrect. The identified planned growth, settlement and employment growth directions and major infrastructure maps have been updated to show the subject site as planned growth and within the Portarlington Structure Plan Boundary.

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend figure 4 to show the site as identified planned growth by relocating the red shading on the eastern side of Geelong Road to the west side of Geelong Road</li> </ul> <p>Amend Map 3 to show Portarlington settlement boundary in the same location as it is shown in the Portarlington Structure plan</p>	
52.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refers to earlier submission to the stage 2 in January 2012 and a number of suggestions that had not been included in the Draft Plan. Submission wishes to reiterate the points raised in that submission and addresses a number of key additional issues.</li> <li>Key themes on page 9 require additional points that encourage consideration of the importance of retaining cohesive communities and building social capital. The Plan would be strengthened by recognising these issues require more than well managed infrastructure, employment and town character.</li> <li>The identification of summer population peaks and pressures on infrastructure (p15) is supported but should be extended to recognise the pressures on communities and services at these times.</li> <li>The list of challenges and sustainable solutions provides a good base for the ecologically sustainable development in the region yet the bar should be raised.</li> <li>The list should be extended to include the need to invest in the necessary innovation to address the challenges.</li> <li>Coastal climate challenges are considered significant and should be specified in this section.</li> <li>The principles are broadly support but would be strengthened and more effective if the approach taken by the VCS hierarchy of principles. Directions in principle 1 appear to contradict and should be more clearly worded. Principle 4 requires reference to coastal and marine areas.</li> <li>The strategic assets of the region requires marine areas to be considered for</li> </ul>	<p>The context section has been revised to include a more detailed discussion on the challenges facing the region, the role and functions of key areas and the role and function of Geelong.</p> <p>Only minor changes to the principles have been made. These principles were broadly accepted by the community during stage 2 and 3 engagement. Principle 4 has been revised to include the words marine.</p> <p>The assets map has been updated to include marine parks and the coastline.</p> <p>Further work has been identified for DSE to develop a regional plan for public lands addressing resilience in a range of challenges including climate change and population growth.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>inclusion. The inshore marine area underpins recreational activity. Marine areas support the fisheries identified in Principle 5. Marine National Parks and sanctuaries should be recognised as strategic assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The framework for growth does not provide sufficient logic in all areas to illustrate how this will be achieved.</li> <li>• The statement for modest growth for other rural and coastal settlements pg 30 does not appear consistent with limiting growth in other rural and coastal settlement boundaries on page 28.</li> <li>• The framework also refers to identified settlement boundaries but on map 3 it refers to identified structure plan settlement boundaries.</li> <li>• Not clear why employment growth omits construction and retail foundations. The projected population will clearly require significant housing, facilities and shopping.</li> <li>• Supports the establishment of settlement breaks and suggest that the Coastal spaces landscape assessment and recommendations for SLOs influence their locations.</li> <li>• The western Victoria boating CAP recognises gaps in recreational boating services and infrastructure. Apollo Bay was identified as a high priority and regional level location.</li> <li>• The Great Ocean Road is currently compromised by landslips and threatened by coastal erosion. Will require significant maintenance and possible rerouting. Critical safety issues should be recognised.</li> <li>• Existing infrastructure will require significant investment in future to cater to higher levels of demand.</li> <li>• The social and environmental impacts of infrastructure provision and growth also require investment and monitoring to ensure all rgp principles are met.</li> <li>• Strongly supports the need for future work identified to prepare a strategy for the resilience of public land, resilience to climate change</li> </ul>	

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 1.5 lists the VCS as VCS review – should be reworded to Victorian Coastal Strategy 2008 and Mid-term review</li> <li>Reference to CAPs should be reworded to Regional, Local and Boating CAPs</li> </ul>	
53.	<p><b>Population Growth</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unable to support the large increase in growth proposed in the plan. There is no rational presented for the need for growth this size. Does this figure assume that the population of Victoria should more than double in size or is there a desire for Geelong to be special in its expansion aims? Who will benefit from an enlarged city of this nature? Myth that more people will result in more employment is now contradicted.</li> <li>It appears that the economy is built on the building industry ever expanding and that more people are required for more houses and other facilities such as roads, public transport and public buildings.</li> <li>More people have not made for a better city; it is now dirtier, with unattractive streets full of struggling shops and the unemployed youth with nothing to do have made people feel unsafe.</li> <li>It appears that at present land subdivision and housing developments precede the siting of community assets and infrastructure, public transport and general facilities.</li> <li>Infrastructure should be developed before land sales take place and until this can happen there should be no further releases of large scale development areas with the only beneficiary being the agents.</li> <li>Believes that further expansion of this region should not be promoted until Armstrong Creek is a thriving suburb and community.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It must be presumed that doubling the size of the population will double the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Population Growth&amp; Employment</b></p> <p>Growth projection data is based on 2011 Census data and VIF projections for the state. Rather than nominate a specific population size at a particular date the Plan provides a framework to respond to growth at the rate it occurs linked to infrastructure sequencing and trigger points. Further explanation about this is proposed in the final Plan.</p> <p>The building sector is an important part of the economy however the Plan identifies that key jobs growth will be in a range of other sectors building on the regions competitive advantages. The Plan recommends the development of an Implementation Plan including an Infrastructure Plan to minimise infrastructure lags and to prioritise existing urban and identified</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>amount of water required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At present Geelong region contains two very stressed rivers with the Moorabool river being the most stressed in Victoria.</li> <li>• The Anglesea bore field has not yet proved that the aquifer will recharge at an appropriate rate and whether this source of water is sustainable.</li> <li>• If an increase in population takes place urges that the government require that both Ballarat and Geelong establish water recycling plants to potable standards.</li> </ul> <p><b>Loss of biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this time biodiversity has declined in all locations and the Geelong region is no exception.</li> <li>• Species decline in the Geelong region included many bird and animal species which have disappeared or become seriously threatened.</li> <li>• We do not know the long term effects of the increase of human population in our area.</li> <li>• The precautionary principle must be an overarching guide to population expansion in the region.</li> </ul> <p><b>Land for food production</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There does not appear to be any urgent plan in progress to evaluate how best to protect arable land for food production.</li> <li>• Believes that before boundaries of settlement are expanded an in depth analysis of the state of soils and the capacity of the area to provide food for 500,000 people.</li> <li>• Research into the possible carrying capacity for this region in about 30 years time must be undertaken.</li> <li>• Quality of life for residents and workers in the region should be the aim in current planning. With the population and housing doubling in size these advantages and general a lifestyle quality and community health may not</li> </ul>	<p>growth areas (including Armstrong Creek) ahead of new greenfield areas. The Plan has been revised to further detail land/infrastructure sequencing</p> <p><b>Water</b></p> <p>Population growth is a key driver for growth in water consumption in the Barwon Region. Despite this, consumption modelling indicates that water efficiencies will continue to improve due to continued improvements in housing fixtures and appliances. I.e. each new washing machine is much more efficient than the last. Despite the growth forecast in the region, Barwon Water's <i>Water Supply Demand Strategy, 2012 to 2062</i> indicates that there is sufficient water resource available to secure supply long term.</p> <p>In line with the Central Region Sustainable Water Strategy, Barwon Water has transferred 1075 ML per year of its Bulk Entitlement to an Environmental</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>last.</p> <p><b>Employment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• G21 had indicated that an extra 80,000 jobs will be required. Employment in Geelong is rapidly shrinking with a number of industries disappearing or lost.</li> <li>• Future employment for the existing unemployed looks bleak.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is concerned that there has been no comparison and discussion of various population levels for the region. Where is the discussion on the very large and significant disadvantages of a doubling population? The figure of 500,000 seems to have no basis for choice.</li> <li>• A basic paper on the means by which any expansion can be done in a sustainable way and level is required.</li> <li>• Work must first be done to resolve whether it is possible and desirable to increase the city areas and human impact by an increase in population.</li> <li>• Does not accept that 500,000 is the ideal population number and can see no discussion on how the decision was made.</li> <li>• Geelong and the G21 region should aim for a truly sustainable future, including the natural environment, rather than a bigger is better region with its associated dangers and disadvantages.</li> </ul>	<p>Entitlement to be used to improve the condition of the Moorabool River.</p> <p>The Anglesea borefield has been operating since October 2009 in accordance with the Bulk Entitlement (Anglesea Groundwater) Order 2009. The Bulk Entitlement (BE) was prepared to ensure the extraction of groundwater is sustainable. Barwon Water will complete a further review by July 2013 that answers questions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the long term sustainability of groundwater resources in the Jan Juc Groundwater Management Area (GMA),</li> <li>• protecting the environmental values and health of groundwater dependent ecosystems, and</li> <li>• improving resource management arrangements under the BE.</li> </ul>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>Barwon Water has made considerable investment in new recycled water initiatives over the last few years. This includes using Class A recycled water to service the growth areas of Armstrong Creek and Torquay North. To provide water for future growth a number of potential options are identified in the <i>Water Supply Demand Strategy</i>, including potable reuse options. Current government policy and regulation does not allow these options to be selected. However in the future this may change.</p> <p><b>Loss of biodiversity</b></p> <p>Mapping undertaken in the development of the Growth Plan (included in Background Report) highlights a range of areas within the region with significant biodiversity values as well as areas vulnerable to climate change, fire and flooding etc. These have informed where future growth should occur to avoid direct.</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>More environmental context detail has been added to the final Plan.</p> <p>Agree that the precautionary principle should be used. The revised discussion on FIA's and in the Implementation Section identifies key issues which will need to be addressed in the planning and investigation of any FIA.</p> <p>The growth of the region and adjoining regions will undoubtedly have significant impacts on our environment (greater use and pressure on resources and coastal environments for recreation and tourism etc). The role of a range of other projects and strategies including Corangamite CMA's Regional catchment Strategy and G21 priority and pillar project will have an important ongoing role in development and implementation to address these challenges. The RGP provides a strategic growth framework under which these projects can be</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>prioritised..</p> <p><b>Land for food production</b></p> <p>The Plan reinforces the regions important agricultural land resources with many opportunities for food production development particularly where key infrastructure (water, transport network improvements, gas) etc can be provided.</p>
54.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned to the low growth level. It is very conservative in nature and has low population growth rates.</li> <li>Urge G21 to reconsider releasing this report.</li> <li>The manner in which this report is written makes it difficult to achieve any growth rate beyond the conservative forecast.</li> <li>The small amount of residential land and the staged release of land is an example of how this report will effectively limit growth.</li> <li>Fear that if the plan is released it will be more difficult to attract an international operator.</li> <li>Documents such as the Draft Growth Plan can be extremely damaging for a region trying to attract private investment.</li> <li>It is important that the G21 region can attract new investment to established new industries. New industries will only consider a vibrant and growth region to invest.</li> </ul>	<p>No change to the projected growth rates. Further clarification has been provided in sections 1 and 2 in regards to the purpose of the Growth Plan and its role in managing the impacts of growth.</p> <p>The Growth Plan does not predict a growth rate or forecast population size at specific periods in time. Instead, it accepts there will be steady growth in the region and that the population is likely to reach, and potentially exceed, 500,000 in the next 30 - 40 years. It is acknowledged that major catalyst infrastructure projects will potentially increase growth rates. The Growth Plan provides a basis to respond to increased growth activity linked to</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>coordinated infrastructure rollout and service provision.</p> <p>The Growth Plan establishes a framework for strategic land use and settlement planning that can sustainably respond to and accommodate growth at projected and potentially higher growth rates. The plan identifies a land supply of over 20-30 years and with the proposed growth directions will cater for a region beyond 500,000.</p> <p>The Final Draft Growth Plan will be handed over to the five G21 councils in July/August as planned.</p>
55.	<p>Seeks identification of land (formerly subject to the now repealed Port Bellarine Tourist Resort Act 1981) west of Point Richards as a potential growth area adjoining Portarlington. Suggests that land is suitable to accommodate growth as previously designated as a tourist resort.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p> <p>The subject land is located outside the settlement boundary identified in the Portarlington Structure Plan 2007. The Port Bellarine Act has been repealed. The submission provides no substantive case for review of the Structure Plan or Clause 21.14 directions.</p>
56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Key Infrastructure</b> - Importance of delivering key infrastructure to support the</li> </ul>	<b>Key Infrastructure</b>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<p>land use change. Notes realignment of Anglesea road is still unresolved and is fundamental to the success of the proposed employment precinct in the Armstrong Creek. Considers that G21 should specifically address this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning complexity</b> – delivery of the Armstrong Creek Growth area has been delayed by lengthy planning processes. This significant issue is not reflected in the Growth Plan and appear to be no specific implementation strategies to address the issue.</li> <li>• It is considered that urgent attention needs to be given to ensure swift approval of Amendment C240 to enable delivery of much needed land supply to the growth area.</li> <li>• <b>Cost of development on housing affordability</b> – care needs to be taken that this affordability is not compromised by excessively high planning costs. These costs relate to both the cost of the planning process itself, the cost of delays and the cost of development contributions.</li> <li>• Development costs for Armstrong Creek are cause for concern. The plan should seek to find an appropriate balance that does not rely solely on development to fund infrastructure in growth areas.</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan is a high level plan which sets the framework for infrastructure to support growth. The G21 economic Development Strategy and Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan recognise the importance of a high speed link to the Surf Coast Highway from the Ring Road. The investigation of this option by VicRoads was identified in the Ministers Review of the Stage 4C amendment. Specific reference to the realignment is not considered necessary at a regional level beyond existing identification of building on the Ring Road connections.</p> <p><b>Planning complexity</b></p> <p>It is not within the scope of the Growth Plan to implement growth that is already planned and subject to PSP's. This is the responsibility of the individual councils. The RGP does identify a process to investigate barriers and incentives for greenfield areas that have been identified</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		<p>for growth but not yet rezoned.</p> <p><b>Housing affordability</b></p> <p>As mentioned above the Growth Plan is a high level document which sets the direction for growth within the region. An implementation plan is proposed and will address key regional infrastructure and associated funding responsibilities.</p>
57	<p>Submits that Business Park within Torquay be identified within the G21 Growth Plan and also nominated on the maps as an important strategic employment node for the region. Noted that other business parks / estates in Geelong have been given such recognition and have been identified on some of the maps as employment nodes.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <p>Torquay is nominated as a subregional employment centre which includes the Business Park.</p> <p>Direction is provided on the Settlement and Employment Growth map for strengthen and protecting existing and planned employment areas' which includes the Business Park. The Business Park is identified in Appendix B as a Key employment node for Torquay.</p>
58	<p>Provided presentation on the use of the abundance of industrial waste heat and build wise with low temperature hydronic systems.</p>	<p>Noted. No change recommended.</p>



Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
		The Growth Plan is a high level strategic plan which sets the framework for growth and does not provide specific recommendations for infrastructure or potential solutions.
59	<p>Submitter supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no new growth fronts required for the next 10 years due to the existing significant existing planned growth areas in the region. Proceeding with additional major growth fronts in the short term would require major investment by submitter, cause a reduction in growth rates in existing serviced areas and put upward pressure on prices to existing customers.</li> <li>• That no new growth front is required in the northern/western area of Geelong in the short term due to the significant land supply soon to be available in west Lara and Armstrong Creek</li> <li>• The development of triggers to guide timing of introduction of any major new growth front</li> <li>• The recognition of infill development as a contributor to future supply</li> <li>• A greater focus on sequencing of development to avoid inefficiently associated with provision of social and physical infrastructure to and give certainty on future growth distribution to inform long term strategic planning service provision.</li> </ul>	No change recommended.
60	<p>Submitter acknowledges that the regions natural resources and values were reasonably well represented throughout the draft plan and are recognised as an asset and their protection are fundamental to the regions past and present growth. Two opportunities identified that would enhance the plan:</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p> <p>Exploration of the incentives for urban renewal and infill and well as a land supply monitoring</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to undertake further investigation to confirm the likely capacity of infill development in the region, identify barriers to infill and identify potential incentives that would encourage infill.</li> <li>• Encouragement of councils to improve policy around developers open space contributions that would see greater emphasis and requirement for protection, enhancement and ongoing maintenance of environmentally sensitive areas.</li> </ul>	<p>process will be undertaken as part of the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Noted comment on developer contributions however this is out of the scope of the Growth Plan and should be considered at a local level.</p>
61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter acknowledges that while various levels of government have their hands on a diverse range of levers for residential, industrial and commercial growth there will be growth in the region.</li> <li>• This growth can be shaped and promoted to deliver better economic, environmental and social outcomes but is of course unavoidable.</li> <li>• Submitter believes that the Growth Plan could be more aspiration – the plan in its current form is perhaps too conservative in what it seeks to portray as the region's future.</li> <li>• Needs to better acknowledge the role the Geelong region can play as a growth node of State and National importance. Geelong will be a significant partner with Melbourne in delivering the State's economic, employment and population growth.</li> <li>• At a local level the plan should not shirk the need for well planned population growth across all the G21 constituent councils and their own local growth nodes.</li> <li>• Land market release dates should be set against population growth target rates. The target growth rate should be no less than 3% across the region.</li> <li>• Submits that the Geelong region is now large enough in both population and economic terms to warrant an equivalent body to Melbourne's Growth Area Authority.</li> </ul>	<p>The Growth Plan does not predict a growth rate or forecast population size at specific periods in time. Instead, it accepts there will be steady growth in the region and that the population is likely to reach, and potentially exceed, 500,000 in the next 30 - 40 years.</p> <p>The region is currently growing at 1.6% and if this trend continues will see the Region at 400,446 by 2031 (Victoria in Futures, 2012). The Plan has been updated to clarify this.</p> <p>Geelong has a 15 year zoned land supply and a 17 strategically identified land supply. This is in addition to the multiple growth fronts within each of the G21 municipalities.</p> <p>A robust land monitoring process will be investigated as part of the</p>

Submission No.	Summary	G21 Regional Growth Plan Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for a new organisation to manage both growth and infrastructure planning to ensure timely infrastructure development and delivery and should be charged with developing innovative funding models.</li> <li>• There is a need for regionally consistent and coordinated messages and promotional materials and programs that support residential and commercial growth.</li> </ul>	<p>implementation plan to ensure adequate land supply is maintained across the region. Allowing for the release of land if growth rates increase significantly as the result of major investment.</p> <p>The identification of other authorities to manage growth within the region is not within the scope of the Growth Plan and is not considered necessary.</p> <p>An Implementation Plan will be undertaken to investigate and identify any preferred Further Investigation Area, including infrastructure sequencing and triggers for planning and land release linked to an identified land supply monitoring process.</p> <p>The implementation plan is expected to be completed by 2014 and as such will be completed prior to development of Further Investigation Areas.</p>