

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
1.	10 Carlisle Street WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommends an analysis of trends (over the last 5 years) of medium density development as the absence of this information (p21) undermines the stated land supply for Woodend in the document. 2. Reevaluate the recommendation of “investigate area 3 – northeast”. The opening up of this area would require the removal and destruction of valuable and varied tree species (in Gregory St): stand of poplars providing visual amenity; a stand of gums which is a major bird site. The area is bordered by a significantly steep escarpment with associated fire risk [presumably due to poor access?]. 3. Concerned that key statement on p19 is not clear. The statement is that the “15 year supply” of land is on a municipal basis not a town by town one. Yet appendix B gives the impression Woodend must meet the 15 year rule [presumably it is inferred that the impression is Woodend must meet the quota for the entire municipality?] 4. Boundary along Old Lancefield Road needs to be addressed. 5. Question: has an investigation into the hypothetical flooding of the Plants Lane area been undertaken. The freeway impacted heavily upon many creeks in the area. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land supply analysis has noted the recent building approvals in Woodend which includes medium density development. The land supply analysis is a conservative assessment and does not include assumptions about future medium density development. 2. The constraints assessment for the three investigation areas has been updated in response to issues raised in submissions and further detailed constraints analysis will be necessary before any area is determined to be appropriate for future growth. 3. The requirement for a 15 year supply of land has been clarified in the revised plan. 4. Boundary issue has been investigated. The township boundary was amended along the Old Lancefield Road during the preparation of the New Format Planning Scheme (circa 1998). 5. In the event that investigation Area 2 - northeast is further considered as a potential growth option, detailed analysis of flooding will be required.
2.	6 Buckland Street, WOODEND VIC 3442 PO Box 459 ALBERT PARK VIC 3206	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very impressed with the draft Plan and congratulates Council on the amount of input, thought and personal consultation 2. No more facilities are needed at the reserve area around the Five Mile Creek (on both the Children’s Park side and Campaspe Drive side) as pleasant picnic spot as is. The areas around the Five Mile Creek on the other side of High Street could be enhanced via more shade trees and picnic tables. 3. Strongly object to the application to build 24 two storey town houses on land between Five Mile Creek and Islay House. Would be detrimentally contrasting in character to surrounds. 4. Introduce Heritage Overlay either side along High Street up until Romsey Road due to the historic significance of some of the housing along this stretch. 5. Concerned by proposed future development of sites such as “Flint Hill” due to the impacts upon visual amenity of the entrance areas of the township. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. Council refused a permit for this proposal. VCAT decision pending. Future proposals will need to consider guidelines for the Historic Residential and Garden Setting Precinct. 4. Introduction of a HO is not considered appropriate. The revised plan includes the properties on either side of High Street between Five Mile Creek and Romsey Road in the Historic Residential Precinct. 5. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2.
3.	30 Donalds Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Address flooding issues along Five Mile Creek and Slatey Creek to determine current and 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The constraints assessment for the three

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
	WOODEND VIC 3442	<p>future zoning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. No need to alter existing town boundaries. 3. Fire risk evaluation must include local knowledge input, and therefore local CFA should have significant input. 4. Charm of Woodend has been eroded by subdivisions of land and growth of subsequent suburban character. This charm is important to both residents and visitors alike. 	<p>investigation areas has been updated in response to issues raised in submissions and further detailed constraints analysis will be necessary before any area is determined to be appropriate for future growth. It is not proposed to alter the township boundary at this stage.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. CFA has provided input into the investigation area options as part of this initial review of options. Further, more detailed fire risk assessment will be undertaken to determine a preferred growth option (when the 15 year trigger is reached). 3. The Neighbourhood Character Study has been prepared in response to concerns about the loss of the valued character of Woodend. The revised plan includes guidance to manage the character of the township’s important entrances / gateways and the township character.
4.	10 Morris Road WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the recommended growth rate of 1.35% is both fundamental to the functioning of the document and based upon most recent data it should be adopted as the standard until new ABS data is released. 2. The suggested areas for growth will ensure that development conforms to the preferred town character of the public. These proposals would encourage discussion and debate about future growth, drawing attention away from the Villawood proposal which would create a satellite township rather than allowing for Woodend to grow in a logical and coherent manner. 3. It is not clear whether the draft plan has taken into account any trend for some larger residential blocks to be subdivided for higher density housing. 4. A master plan should be developed for the Five Mile Creek precinct, encouraging day and weekend visitors and ensuring the conservation of the waterway along its full length to where it joins the Campaspe River. 5. The construction of footpaths throughout the township must be of high priority. Additional pedestrian crossing points must also needed: near the site for the new supermarket and also on the Daylesford-Tylden Road/Forest Street just off High Street due to the mass of community infrastructure on one side. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreed 2. Noted 3. Refer to response to submission 1 point 1. 4. Plan includes suggests a masterplan for the Five Mile Creek as a potential future action for Council to consider. 5. The plan supports an additional pedestrian crossing of High St but notes that this is subject to VicRoads approval and State Government funding. Council will continue to improve footpaths through the annual footpath construction program with priority given to footpaths in and around commercial areas, schools and medical centres. 6. Agreed. The plan supports relocating heavy industry to Clancy’s Lane. This will be achieved by rezoning the existing Industrial 1 Zone area

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Relocate the heavy industries in the town to the Clancy’s Lane area but allow appropriate light industries to remain in limited areas. Construct footpaths, implement environmental controls upon industrial that remains, and if possible, encourage the freed land to be developed for medium density housing close to the town centre. 7. Visitor accommodation should be in the form of small apartments, bed and breakfasts, boutique hotels and the like rather than a caravan park (which would not attract a viable number of customers, and for which there is no space available close to town). 8. As an aside, Council should adopt a policy of utilising plain English in its documents so as to avoid a mass of turgid and largely incomprehensible verbiage. The Draft Plan is a good example of such plain English used effectively. 	<p>east of High St to Industrial 3 to encourage light industrial development and provide greater flexibility. Council’s industrial design guidelines apply to future proposals on industrial zoned land. Future industrial expansion at Clancy’s Lane is subject to analysis of the road network capacity for increased heavy vehicles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Noted. This issue cannot be resolved through a structure plan. 8. Noted.
5.	<p>‘Glen Osmond’ 62 Old Lancefield Road WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extension of the Town Boundary to include the frontages of the properties on the east side of Old Lancefield Road between Romsey Road and Honeysuckle Lane must either be clerical error or a response to lobbying from land owners and Real Estate Agents. 2. The organisation known as Very Special Kids currently utilise the Glen Ormond Farm to provide hospice and relief for families and their children who are suffering from life threatening illnesses. Development near the farm would compromise the natural elements of the landscape and thus negate the value of the farm derived from this and its close proximity to Melbourne and hospital care. 3. Whilst the area on the East of Old Lancefield Road is not identified in the study area, there have been false representations of the boundary including the Glen Osmond Farm site. 4. The site near the Five Mile Creek and Islay House should be acquired by Council and included into a Five Mile Creek precinct/recreational area as a wetlands and bird sanctuary. This would protect it from unsuitable developments such as that proposed for the site – 23 units. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to response to submission 1 point 4. 2. Concerns noted. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 3. Refer to response to submission 1 point 4. 4. Refer to response to submission 2 point 3.
6.	<p>(26-28 Brooke St) P O Box 466 WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As owners of 26 – 28 Brooke Street, land originally purchased as Industrial Zone 1, a rezoning to Industrial 3 would be detrimental to business operations on the site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change is recommended. The site is currently used for Landscaping Garden Supplies (included in Retail Premises in the Planning Scheme) which is currently an allowable (Section 2) use in both Industrial 1 and 3 Zones.
7.	<p>66 Old Lancefield Road WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The placement of the boundary amidst the land to the east of Old Lancefield Road, rather than along this road between Honey Suckle Road and Romsey Road is undesirable. The use of this land for residential development would compromise its capacity for agricultural use (currently beef and sheep production), and degrade the visual amenity offered to the residents of the “suburban” areas near to Old Lancefield Road, as well as tourists who provide economic benefit to the Woodend area. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns noted. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2 and submission 1 point 4. 2. Concerns noted. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 3. Concerns noted. 4. Concerns noted.

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Development to the east of Old Lancefield Road would possibly compromise the “Flint Hill” property whose gardens and surrounds are internationally recognised. It is an attraction for tourists and valued by Woodend residents and the Macedon Ranges Community. 3. The encroachment of residential uses into predominantly agricultural areas increases the likelihood of residential dog attacks upon livestock – particularly during lambing and calving season. Species of native wildlife are also threatened by an increased presence of domestic pets and humans. 4. Development on the east side of Old Lancefield Road would have negative impacts upon the organisation Very Special Kids who operate a hospice/retreat at the Glen Ormond Farm for children with life threatening illness and their families. 5. Does not agree that Area of Investigation 2 should be considered for residential development. This area should also be preserved (including areas to the east of Old Lancefield Road) as “Rural Protection Zone”. 6. P89 outlines “Possible Future Development Scenarios” (for investigation area 2-northeast) and the comment on the map states “investigate options for future residential expansion 15 years +”. In contrast, some comments in the draft read that the investigation has already gone ahead with specific strategies being decided but not circulated. Concerned over possible lack of consultation, further investigation, appropriate process etc. 7. Access to industrial land – Clancy’s Lane. There is definite need to improve road access which will minimise danger to pedestrians from heavy vehicles and increased traffic. Access to the area for industrial purposes should be from the freeway exit nearby so as to draw additional traffic away from the area. If this cannot be achieved then there should be no further development of the area. 8. Five Mile Creek – acquire the privately owned land between High Street and Davey Street (adjacent to Islay House) so as to include into the open space corridor around the Creek area. Development of this space, such as the 23 houses proposed, would be detrimental to the site and character of the area; instead the creation of wetlands is encouraged. 9. Flooding. The draft/the consultants have made reference to the areas of Tennyson Street and others for their issues of flooding, yet have omitted the “regular flooding in the area mentioned above” [presumably the site encouraged for wetland use?]. The Council Flood Committee has been provided with photos showing the regular flooding of the area, which should be passed on to the consultants. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The analysis of options for potential future growth outside the town boundary is in response to a recommendation in the Panel Report for Amendment C84. The Plan does not indicate a preferred growth option given that there is sufficient land supply within the town boundary. Further detailed constraints analysis will be necessary before any area is determined to be appropriate for future growth. 6. In the event that any of the investigation areas are considered for future rezoning, a more detailed analysis of constraints and public consultation through a planning scheme amendment process would occur. 7. Refer to response to submission 4 point 6. 8. Suggestion noted. Refer to submission 2 point 3. 9. Point noted.
8.	‘Glen Osmond’ 62 Old Lancefield Road WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is poor or possibly deliberate timing on behalf of the Macedon Ranges Shire administration to make the first and “presumably most important” of the study aims, the consideration of outcomes and recommendations of the Planning Panel for the C84 Amendment when the Panel are not even up “to the stage of responding to its draft 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan has considered the recommendations of the C84 Panel Reports 24/9/14 and April 2014. 2. It is considered premature to rezone land

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<p>report”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Two possible areas for development have been ignored, areas identified in previous Council studies – north of Honey Suckle Lane, between the Old Calder and Old Lancefield Road, south of Kronks Lane; and the area to the west of Gregory Street, between the railway line and Five Mile Creek. 3. The draft plan, in its analysis of Area 2, makes no mention of a number of important issues: impacts upon Flint Hill Gardens; impacts upon the Glen Ormond Farm and the Very Special Kids organisation; detrimental impacts upon the “rural atmosphere” of the area enjoyed by local residents; and function of the area as a sound buffer from the nearby Freeway. 	<p>north of Honeysuckle Lane for low density residential development given the proximity to existing and potential expansion of industrial uses at Clancys Lane and the need to retain appropriate buffer distances. The area west of Gregory St within the north-west growth area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. The plan indicates a buffer from the freeway would be required if Area 2 is considered for future growth.
9	988 Black Forest Drive WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rehabilitate the Black Forest Timber Mill site for recreational purposes, attracting both local residents and visitors to Woodend. The aim is to showcase the history of the local area [via this specific industry] and local produce and artisans. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change is required. This site is outside the plan’s study area. Notwithstanding this, Council supports the adaptive reuse of this site within the context of the existing planning scheme controls and site constraints. Alternatively, rezoning could be supported subject to resolving an appropriate concept for the site.
10	DTPLI 53-61 Lansell Street Bendigo 3550	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The transport folio supports the general vision, strategic framework and implementation actions of the draft Woodend Town Structure Plan in relation to improved active transport links and a pedestrian focussed and well-connected public realm”. 2. Contact VicRoads and Sandra Wilson to discuss fine details of number and type of pedestrian and cycling treatments. The MRSC Walking and Cycling Strategy (currently under development) should assist in identifying these. 3. The folio also supports the future growth scenario outlined in the plan – residential growth achieved by in-fill development within current boundary. Growth should maximise the use of existing infrastructure and be alongside existing urban development is preferred, as per the Regional Growth Plan for Loddon Mallee South. 4. New Bus Service – The provision of a bus service is subject to available funding. Service provision from providers other than public transport ones is sometimes suggested, yet this should not be construed as a commitment by government that on-going funding will be provided. Should a service be established, identified bus routes should accord with the former Dept. of Transport’s <i>Public Transport Guidelines for land Use and Development (2008)</i>. 5. Commuter Car parking – Plan should not preclude alternate options to parking such as “Kiss and Ride” approaches. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The plan has reduced the number of pedestrian crossings and Council will continue to consult with VicRoads concerning improvements to crossings on High Street. The recommendations in the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy have been considered. 3. Noted 4. The plan supports advocating for a local bus service but acknowledges that this does not imply a funding commitment from State government. 5. The plan promotes alternatives to car parking at the station. 6. Agreed.

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<p>6. Proposed developments adjacent to or nearby the railway station and rail corridor, including the proposed supermarket, require careful consideration so as not to impact future station and rail operations. Therefore, it is recommended that PTV/DTPLI is engaged early in discussions regarding any proposed developments.</p>	
11.	<p>Coliban Water P O Box 2770 Bendigo 3550</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to the northwest of the town boundary would be severely constrained by the declared water supply catchment. Unsewered rural and low density subdivision and dwelling development in this area should be carefully considered so as to avoid increased risks to potable water supply catchments. 2. Suitable riparian buffer zones for waterways and implementation of Council’s DWMP would reduce risk and provide development opportunities to the northwest of the boundary. 3. Appendix A Background view summary of Environmental Significance Overlay 4 should be amended so as to indicate the regional role of catchment protection and supply of urban water to towns within and beyond Macedon Ranges. 4. Use and development will also require consideration from water corporations prior to permits being issued. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 2. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 3. Plan has been amended to include ‘Statement of environmental significance’ from Schedule 4 of the ESO. 4. Plan has been amended to add a reference to ‘Use and development will also require consideration from water corporations’.
12.	<p>26 Corinella Road WOODEND 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The WSTP does not “adequately provide for infill development in existing residential areas within the existing town boundaries” 2. Areas proposed for development are inappropriately located away from the town core. 3. Corinella Road area is zoned R1Z and is located under the Large Lot Rural Living. This is inappropriate due to size of the land (1,744 m²): the Large Lot Rural Living overlay specifies that lots should be 5,000 m² - 7,000 m² up to 10,000 m². Many other lots in this area do not match these specifications. A more appropriate overlay would be Township Residential. 4. Such large lots do not reflect the potential for appropriate utilisation of existing infrastructure to encourage a compact, walkable town. This walkability, in lieu with closely located public transport options provides the young and elderly with access to “health, education, social and entertainment options in surrounding towns and cities”. 5. A more compact urban form of Woodend would be an encouragement of housing diversity away from predominant percentage of separate dwellings and toward units/flats/apartments. Such an urban form would be more sustainable than a dispersed one, reducing need for additional public infrastructure, and improving accessibility to town centre and train station. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan promotes infill development that is sensitive to existing neighbourhood character. Areas suitable for medium density development have been identified. 2. The distance from the investigation areas to the town core has been noted. The plan supports development close to the town core and within the township boundary prior to considering potential options outside the township boundary. 3. The land has been identified as the Large Lot Township neighbourhood character type. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct. 4. Infill and medium density development is encouraged adjacent to the rail station and town core where it is possible to walk to existing services. 5. Refer to response to point 1 above.
13.	<p>67 Honeysuckle Lane WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no discussion about the north of Woodend as viable option for development, only the east, northeast and northwest. This is an oversight and damages the value of the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is considered premature to rezone land north of Woodend for residential development

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<p>reference document in the future development of Woodend.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Larger, rural living lots should be opted for rather than smaller, suburban like in-fill. The land to the north of Woodend is ideal for this. 3. The land around Honey Suckle Lane should be considered for its development potential: the properties are connected to town water, natural gas and are 2km from sewerage treatment plant. There should be potential to develop these blocks as the residents there are being encroached upon by nearby existing developments and associated run off, increased traffic. Should the Davies Hill area and Old Lancefield Road be allowed to fulfil development potential, so should the Honey Suckle area. 4. There has been increased traffic volume along the Honey Suckle Lane. 5. Drainage – problems with drainage and subsequently flooding of the area around Honey Suckle Lane, Tree Change Way, Barbara Street. Works underway by Council to amend this but submitter expresses concerns the works will only shift the problem further along until it arrives near Clarks Lane and the Old Calder Highway. 6. Entry Points and Access - Honey Suckle Lane should be sealed so as to carry additional traffic from Honour Avenue. 7. The town boundary should be extended from Honey Suckle to Clarks Lane. 8. Submitter feels the area north of Honey Suckle Lane should never have been identified as FZ; instead its current use would better suit that of a low density residential zone given the lack of scale to each block required for adequate farming practice. 9. Infill development can cater for medium density living while rezoning to the north of Honey Suckle Lane can provide small acreage options for development. 	<p>given the proximity to existing and potential expansion of industrial uses at Clancys Lane and the need to retain appropriate buffer distances.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The neighbourhood character study encourages a variety of lot sizes in Woodend. The neighbourhood character guidelines will inform future planning controls to achieve a variety of lot sizes. 3. Refer to response to point 1 above. 4. Noted 5. Concerns noted. Council’s engineers have been advised. 6. Council continues to maintain unsealed roads. A Special Charge Scheme is an option that could be explored by residents to seal an unconstructed road. 7. Extending the town boundary to the north is not supported. 8. Refer to response to point 1 above. 9. Point noted.
14.	1 Mahoneys Road WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter feels that the demarcation of the area which their property is located in (Large Lot Rural Living) does not adequately reflect the characteristics of the housing options in the area and subsequently does not best serve the potential of said property. Instead, as the property is zoned as Residential 1 Zone, it has potential for additional housing within walking distance to the railway station and town centre. 2. The submitter feels the Large Lot Rural Living identification of this area is incorrect. The area does not possess anything particularly rural and there is an assortment of medium and small lots in addition to large ones. The submitter feels the differences between this area and the adjacent one identified as Township Residential are minimal and therefore a reassessment is necessary to determine the potential of sites that may otherwise go unacknowledged. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land has been identified as the Large Lot Township neighbourhood character type. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct. 2. Refer to response to point 1 above.
15.	P O Box 351 SUNBURY VIC 3429	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development Density and Diversity - There should be an objective to ensure the diversity of lot sizes in new subdivisions and incorporation of medium density development. This will also help to ensure that a lack of diversity in housing types and styles is not a flow on effect of such monocultures of lot sizes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to responses to submission 12 point 1 and submission 13 point 2. 2. Council supports an additional pedestrian crossing along High St to improve pedestrian

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

Sub No.	Address of submission	Submission summary and key issues raised	Officer response
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Automobile centrism and dependency should be discouraged along High Street, with the precinct becoming more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. 3. Commuter Parking at Station – alternate methods of transport to the station should be encouraged which require less space. This could include bicycles and scooters, and improving pedestrian access. 4. Page 16. Pedestrian is misspelt. 5. It would be preferable for any LDR development to occur where land holdings are fragmented or full servicing of the land is problematic. Such an opportunity exists north of Honey Suckle Road: fragmented ownership, with potential for rezoning LDR and on-site treatment plants. Such development would also provide a northern barrier to the northern expansion of Woodend. 	<p>access. Bike and pedestrian accessibility is supported on High St by maintaining footpaths and a bicycle lane within the road reserve.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The plan supports alternatives to car parking at the station. Council regularly engages with Public Transport Victoria, including advocating for bike parking at the Woodend Train Station. 4. Error amended. 5. Refer to response to 13 point 1.

<p>16.</p>	<p>32 Forest Street WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The submitter considers the entire plan in need of a redraft. 2. Disregard the C84 process and its relevance to the SP as it is out of control and instead refer to the Loddon Mallee Growth Plan. 3. It should be Council not the drafters of the plan who are considering C84. Therefore page 6 deletes the words: “Consider the outcomes and recommendations of the Planning Panel...implement Council’s Settlement Strategy”. 4. The map on p. 16 of the plan should not “survive” as it depicts Woodend as suburban sprawl – a dormitory suburb of Melbourne. The inclusion of the area over the Golf Course and to its south, as well as the inclusion to the north and north east is not appropriate. If at all, there should be limited growth to the east. 5. Delete: “Set a trigger point...available in 2018” (p. 22) the submitter feels there should either be a plan or there is not one. 6. Delete: “The Panel made a number...take into consideration.” (p. 19) The submitter feels that the Panel is to advise the process of C84 only, not draft the Structure Plan. Instead it should be a process of public consultation. 7. Delete: “However it is vital that this plan...beyond this timeframe” (p. 21) 8. Delete: “It is suggested that a trigger point...to be closely monitored” (p. 21) 9. Delete the “Broad Hectare Development” section on p. 32 along with p. 32 and 33. The submitter considers these sections to be “twaddle”. 10. The submitter feels that the words on p. 43 are too vague to be meaningful: “Investigate the potential...if deemed appropriate.” 11. The submitter considers the whole of p. 53 to be unnecessary. 12. The text on p. 37 should be enlarged upon or deleted: “Over the next 15 years...the increased population.” 13. All the points on p. 37 should be illustrated with maps. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The entire plan has been reviewed in response to submissions received. Some revisions to the text and plans have been made. 2. The plan has considered and had regard to Amendment C84 and the Loddon Mallee South Regional Growth Plan. This is considered appropriate. 3. No change recommended. The reference cited in this submission is to the aims of the Study established by Council at the project’s inception (and then included in the background section of the plan for transparency). 4. The plan is included to provide context to Woodend’s location. Refer to response to submission 7 point 5. 5. No change recommended. It is considered appropriate to include a trigger point for a review of the land supply assessment. 6. No change recommended. This section is a background section to provide information about current and “seriously considered” strategic projects. The reference is valid in this context. 7. Refer to response to point 6 above. 8. No change recommended. 9. No change recommended. Principles to guide the initial consideration of broad hectare development as well as future consideration is a useful strategic planning tool and supported by Council. 10. No change recommended. 11. No change recommended. Council supports urban design guidance for future public realm works as part of the Structure Planning of the Woodend township. 12. No change recommended. 13. No change recommended. The plan includes a series of maps illustrating the preferred future
------------	--	---	---

<p>17.</p>	<p>P O Box 298 WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documents that should have been included as reference for the preparation of the draft were: written responses from community; C84 Interim Panel Report; and letters from each member of the CRG. 2. The single 2 hour community meeting was not satisfactory. Nor is the lack of direct consultation between Council Officers and/or consultants and the submitters (own 150 acres within the eastern area of the study area). 3. The village atmosphere of Woodend can be retained alongside “necessary” the growth of Woodend via carefully managed Greenfield development (such as proposed to the north-west). 4. (Similar to 3) If Greenfield development is feared to threaten the character of neighbourhoods in the town, then development should proceed outside the boundary, therefore mitigating any impacts. 5. Housing growth (in a Greenfield sense) will boost economic development in the town and subsequently provide for local jobs. 6. Tourism will impact the number of people in the street and the availability of parking more so than an increase in population from Greenfield development. 7. A development plan for the land in the NW of Woodend should be formulated that is sensitive of the needs of and interface between the Environment and the Community. This should be done so now rather than later so as to avoid a circumstance of less caring (for environment and community) land owners, political influence and changes to the planning scheme. 8. There already exists a well developed transport network of freeway and high-speed rail in Woodend. 9. Development to the east, between the township and the Calder freeway would damage the secluded aesthetics of Woodend by possibly increasing visibility of housing to freeway motorists. 10. Confined growth within the boundary will increase the cost of housing and thereby making it less affordable for people wishing to live in Woodend. This will encourage a proliferation of demographics most heavily skewed towards older people with no children. 11. There does not seem to be any background research provided as the setting of the township boundary. 12. Medium to high density housing, encouraged by a set boundary, will not allow for larger lots (“1000 square metre lots and the like”). Broad hectare development is supported. 13. Preliminary assessment outlined in Appendix B is not agreed with: assessment of growth potential based upon existing overlays etc. Is at odds with Panel recommendations. 	<p>outcomes for Woodend as suggested.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change recommended. The plan summarises the consultation that has occurred and includes appropriate references to Amendment C84. 2. Engagement with the community has generally been well received. In addition to the community meeting, Council held a ‘drop in’ session where more than 5 council staff and 2 representatives from Planisphere were available to talk to attendees. This provided the opportunity for landowners to clarify and discuss how the draft plan affected their land. 3. Point noted. Refer to response to submission 3 point 4. 4. The majority of submitters do not support this view. 5. This point applies equally to potential opportunities to develop or rezone land inside the township boundary. 6. Woodend is considered to have adequate car parking for tourism and commercial uses. Further car parking will be provided as part of future retail / commercial developments. 7. There is no requirement to prepare a development plan for any of 3 potential growth options at this stage given the quantity of unconstrained and undeveloped residentially zoned land currently available in Woodend. 8. Noted. 9. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 10. The plan does not confine growth. It provides more than 15 years supply and indicates possible long term growth options once a trigger point of less than 15 years supply is reached. A range of lots sizes and housing options are supported. 11. This issue has been investigated. The township
------------	---	--	--

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

			<p>boundary was amended through a public and transparent process to its current configuration during the preparation of the New Format Planning Scheme (circa 1998).</p> <p>12. Refer to response to submission 13 point 2.</p> <p>13. The assessment of potential growth options has been updated in response to submissions. Also, refer to response to submission 7 point 6.</p>
18.	1098 Black Forest Road, Woodend	<p>1. Submitters land is incorrectly zoned as RCZ instead of LDR. This is believed to have occurred during the alteration of digital information as a result of the planning scheme amendment C21/48.</p>	<p>1. The land was rezoned to Rural Conservation Zone in 2006 (via Amendment C48). Council and the CFA do not support rezoning land to the south of Woodend for further residential development due to bushfire risks.</p>
19.	Woodend Golf Club WOODEND VIC 3442	<p>1. Submitter is concerned that the land size of the Woodend Golf Course will be reduced. In addition to this, the annotation on the Draft Plan map “Investigate potential for public open space and lookout” suggests issues of liability.</p> <p>2. Submitter perceives these annotations as outlined changes. Confirm that these are but suggestions, as it is a policy document rather than legal?</p>	<p>1. No change required. The annotations about public open space and lookout are indicative and conceptual only.</p> <p>2. The suggestions do not have any legal implications for the golf club.</p>
20.	Woodend Heskett Football Netball Club Inc. P O Box 152 WOODEND VIC 3442	<p>1. The Woodend Township Structure Plan could be further strengthened by reference to the Draft Macedon Ranges Open Space, in particular that it heeds recommendations to consider and provide for future recreational and open space needs of the community.</p> <p>2. A DCP could be established for new residential developments that would provide funding for the renewal of the Gilbert Gordon Oval Master Plan. This renewal would be a considerable impost on Council otherwise (\$3.56M, including a \$764K outlined in the 2013/2014 budget for upgrades to the playing surface of the field).</p>	<p>1. The Open Space Strategy and its recommendations have been reviewed to ensure consistency with the plan.</p> <p>2. A DCP is not proposed for Woodend at this stage.</p>
21.	Suite 3, 39 Anslow Street WOODEND VIC 3442	<p>1. The Draft Plan does not represent the views of the community, instead that of the consultants as was presented to the CRG by consultants in the second and last meeting of the CRG.</p> <p>2. Lack of evidence regarding what R1Z land is available – many variations.</p> <p>3. No studies into scenarios of growth in Woodend, and the merits suggested by these. The only three suggested in the draft plan are those chosen by the consultants.</p> <p>4. With cooperative guidance Davies Hill offers tremendous benefits to Woodend.</p> <p>5. Development to the north east offers possibilities with only four owners, but close to Calder.</p> <p>6. Difficult due to fragmented ownership to the east and abuttal to freeway.</p> <p>7. Neighbourhood Character pages in Draft Plan are misleading and deceptive due to the incapability of enforcement.</p>	<p>1. Disagree. The community’s views have informed the plan’s vision and have been included in key sections of the plan where appropriate. Council has received positive feedback from the community on how their feedback has been reflected in the plan.</p> <p>2. A thorough assessment of all residentially zoned land has been undertaken to inform the plan. A copy of the land supply analysis was made available to the Community Reference Group to confirm the ‘weight of evidence’ approach used.</p>

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

		<p>8. The C84 Panel has directed that Woodend review its projected population growth with studies undertaken into Greenfield site development. This has not been undertaken.</p>	<p>3. Refer to responses to submission 7 points 5 and 6. 4. Noted. 5. Noted. 6. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 7. Disagree. The neighbourhood character study will inform future planning controls which will be enforceable. 8. The results of the land supply analysis confirm that there is no requirement to consider greenfield rezoning until a trigger point has been reached. The plan recommends a review of the land supply analysis be undertaken in 2018.</p>
22.	<p>Western Water P O Box 2371 WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<p>1. Comments made with population of Woodend at 5000. 2. Any resident land supply investigation in the vicinity of the Western Water recycled water plant should take into account the findings of a preliminary study currently underway by Western Water of the appropriate odour buffer required for abnormal operating conditions. 3. WW would utilise EPA guidelines for minimal separation distances (pub. 1518) for the protection of the amenity and public health of potential residents as well as the operation of the plant. 4. It is recommended that an ESO be established in the planning scheme, particular to the site and its surrounds. 5. With the growth of Woodend, WW will need to review the need of the township for water filtration and recycling capacities. Therefore it is hoped that available land will be released in a staged process so as to allow for such assessment and subsequent efficient and timely infrastructure provision. 6. There exists a network of recycled water built to service the golf course which could be utilised for the maintenance of sporting fields and open space in the township given the appropriate physical extensions.</p>	<p>1. Noted. 2. This has been noted as a constraint for the northwest investigation area. The need to introduce an ESO will be reviewed during the planning scheme amendment process to implement the directions of the plan. 3. Noted. 4. Refer to response to point 2 above. 5. No change – Rezoning to increase land supply will be limited to land within the existing township boundary and will occur gradually. 6. This point is supported and has been referred to Council’s Recreation Unit.</p>
23.	<p>Level 2, 55 Southbank Boulevard WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<p>1. Population growth estimates within the draft structure plan are too conservative and do not make adequate allowance for predicted future growth of Woodend. 2. The structure plan should not overly prescribe the growth rates across the 15 year period. 3. The town boundary as it is, approximately 170m east of Old Lancefield road, is unlikely to achieve the intent of the structure plan. Alteration of the boundary, so as to accommodate scenario 2 outlined in the submission (Appendix 2), is ideal.</p>	<p>1. Disagree. Population growth projections have considered a range of potential growth rates and the rate of 1.35% is considered realistic. 2. Noted. 3. Refer to response to submission 1 point 4. The land supply analysis does not support an alteration of the town boundary at this stage.</p>
24.	<p>111 Muntz Rd,</p>	<p>1. The Woodend Structure Plan should adhere to the resolution of the consultations with the</p>	<p>1. The plan’s recommendations are consistent</p>

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

	Woodend 40 Napier Street FITZROY 3442	<p>“Woodend community regarding the Settlement Strategy”, namely being that there be “no Greenfields rezoning and that the town boundary of Woodend would remain unchanged”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Questions relating to a “master plan” in relation to the potential for future development in the north-east of the township – what is it? Has there been any consultation? In investigation of the north-east area of Woodend for development has there been consideration of risk from grass fire? The historic growth rate of the township can be accommodated within the existing township boundary to 2030. 	<p>with the proposed changes to the MSS (Woodend Township Structure Plan) resulting from the implementation of the Settlement Strategy through Amendment C84.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No masterplan has been prepared for the northeast of Woodend. Refer to response to submission 7 point 6. The CFA has provided advice in respect of all 3 investigation areas including the potential for grass fires. Agree, however the plan needs to show where long term growth would occur.
25.	23 Old Lancefield Road WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> If the north east of Woodend must be developed, then it should only be considered for LDRZ. This is due to three main reasons: high density development would be detrimental to the neighbourhood character/“natural small town feel” of the area; low density development would be more sensitive than other forms to the extant environmental values in the area; and the operation of the Glen Ormond Very Special Kids Farm hospice would be effected. Should the area be developed, and be primarily residential, then the industrial estate to the north of Woodend should be relocated. The amount of heavy traffic along Old Lancefield Rd would be unsuitable for a residential area. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No decision has been made about the future zoning of this area. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. The concerns about industrial traffic on the Old Lancefield Road are noted however Old Lancefield Road is a designated truck route to provide access between the industrial area and the Calder Freeway. The speed limit along Old Lancefield Road has been reduced to a 60km limit south of Honeysuckle Lane in recent years. There may be an opportunity to investigate alternative truck access in the future if expansion of the existing industrial area is required. Relocating the industrial area at Clancys Lane is not supported.
26.	29 Honeysuckle Lane Woodend P O Box 351 SUNBURY VIC 3429	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The area to the north of Honey Suckle Lane offers an opportunity to expand low density residential land supply and simultaneously create a barrier to northward expansion of the township at higher densities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to response to submission 8 point 2.
27.	31 Forest Street WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand Heritage Overlay in Woodend. A number of properties and entire streets (Carlyle Street for example) would benefit from this. Street planting of the same species is encouraged, to give a street “grace, dignity and cohesion” and provide an overall avenue effect. Development in the northwest is not appropriate as this contradicts findings of housing needs up until 2036 (Planisphere and the Loddon Mallee South Regional Growth Plan). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This suggestion has been reviewed. The plan includes areas to be included in the historic residential neighbourhood character precinct. Expansion of the HO is not recommended. Council maintains a list of preferred street trees for Woodend based on existing

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Gregory Street and the hill beside are covered by eucalypt, providing an expanse of habitat for wildlife. In addition, the area below the hill and bounded by Tylden Road is subject to inundation. These areas are inappropriate for development consideration. 5. Development of land with agricultural potential is in contradiction with the MRSC Agribusiness Plan and the Loddon Mallee South draft. 6. The increasing truck traffic along Forest Street needs to be addressed: greater speed limitations and consideration of the use of public amenities along this road. 7. Planting of pine windblocks on large rural living lots such as Clarks Lane pose a fire hazard, are an introduced species, and detrimentally affect the aesthetic of the township. 	<p>established trees to maintain this important element of the town’s character.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Noted. 4. Refer to submission 1 point 2. 5. If additional land outside the township boundary is needed for Woodend, efficient use of land will be a consideration in determining a preferred area to minimise loss of agricultural land. 6. Council’s engineers advised that Forest Street is a designated truck route. 7. Concerns noted.
28.	Level 1, 6 Riverside Quay Southbank 3006	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The strategic context section in the plan makes no reference to particular materials lodged in support of the Davies Hill rezoning request and subsequently it is questionable whether Council’s consultants have indeed received these. Request for briefing with the consultants has been denied. 2. Criticises the lack of any specific consultation held with landholders. 3. Does not support the containment of growth within the township boundary and questions the preconditions of the consideration for development outlined in the structure plan requiring development proposals to demonstrate the need for them. 4. Due to the recommendation by the C84 Panel that Woodend can support additional growth; the Structure Plan should outline preferred locations and performance criteria instead of excluding proposals based on in-fill land supply. 5. Development to the east should not occur. This would risk creating a poor interface with the Calder freeway and impacting the secluded nature of the town. Reference to “options for residential expansion (long term – 15 years+ supply)” is not supported. The Davies Hill site offers an opportunity to consolidate the town and offer limited growth, all within the limits of the town. 6. The direction to contain growth within the town boundary is not supported as it is simply a historical boundary as opposed to a product of the review recommended by the Panel. The action to set the boundary is in conflict with Council resolution in relation to the Settlement Strategy and is not supported. 7. Greenfield and infill sites should be provided for rather than the latter only, with proposals for subdivision and rezoning being allowed for and assessed in accordance with their potential to positively benefit the township. 8. Broad Hectare development parameters are supported with extension to include reference to: utilisation of existing road reserves; provision for a range of lot sizes; identification of building envelopes; identification and enforcement of design guidelines; and other sustainability guidelines. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planisphere reviewed a copy of the proposal prepared for Davies Hill. However, the rezoning request is not an auditor’s strategic document and does not warrant inclusion in the structure plan. 2. Refer to response to submission 17 point 2. 3. Refer to response to submission 17 point 10. 4. The plan’s assessment of long term potential growth options has had appropriate regard to the recommendations of the Amendment C84 Panel Report. It is considered premature to evaluate performance criteria for potential growth options until the trigger point has been reached and further consideration of growth options occurs. 5. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 6. Refer to response to submission 17 point 10. The land supply analysis does not support an alteration of the town boundary at this stage. 7. Disagree. Refer to response to submission 21 point 8. 8. Refer to response to submission 13 point 2. 9. The neighbourhood character assessment has carefully considered the potential impacts of infill development. 10. Agreed. 11. Noted.

	<p>9. Potential threats associated with infill should be recognised within the Town Centre Character section. Greenfield development could alleviate these pressures.</p> <p>10. The secluded nature of the town should be a main priority within the Landscape and Environment section of the draft.</p> <p>11. The recommendation for an SLO over the Avenue of Honour should recognise that the existing interface on the east side is a back fence.</p> <p>12. Appendix A should recognise Am C84 Panel Report and material submitted in support of the Davies Hill rezoning request.</p> <p>13. Preliminary assessment of growth in Appendix B is not supported due to the inappropriate foundation on existing overlay controls and it being at odds with Panel recommendations. Assessment criteria for each site should have included the following: service potential and proximity of access to services; distance from town centre; ability to deliver open space network improvements; ability to retain existing vegetation; and ability to retain existing gateways and town character.</p> <p>14. References to “cultural, landscape and environmental sensitivities” and the recommendation that “this area should not be considered as an option for future development at this stage” in relation to area 3 have not been established and should be removed from the document.</p> <p>15. It is requested that Council await the revised Davies Hill proposal prior to advancing the WTSP. Afterwards, the substantive matters that need addressing are: revision of the recommended town boundary; reconsideration of the eastern growth options (proximity to Calder); and ability to consider proposals for rezoning on their merits and against specific performance criteria.</p>	<p>12. refer to response 1 above.</p> <p>13. Disagree. Refer to response to submission 17 point 13</p> <p>14. Disagree, no change recommended.</p> <p>15. It is not recommended that the plan be put on hold pending the revised masterplan for Davies Hill.</p>
--	--	--

<p>29.</p>	<p>28 Royle Court WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>1.2 Land Supply within township boundary:</i> The criteria and mapping of lots is not made available in the plan by the consultants, therefore it is difficult to examine the conclusions of the land supply analysis. 2. Submitter is concerned that there has been an undercount of available land and the analysis has not recognised the many possible types of infill – opting for clear cut vacant lots. Categories of development not identified include: Constrained land with flooding or vegetation issues; infill development on titles with existing dwellings; demolition of existing dwellings to replace with medium to high density development; and housing in commercial areas. Therefore, with consideration of the development opportunities that the plan encourages, there is more than sufficient supply within the boundary for the forecast population growth to 2036. 3. Current planning controls within township indicate that development is not particularly constrained by controls. Examples exist of land that is considered constrained being developed regardless as medium density. 4. Rural land within boundary (NE) has been identified for development potential yet has not been included in land supply analysis due to constraints on land. Suggests the land supply analysis does not measure the actual dwelling capacity within boundary. 5. In the Structure Plan, areas are nominated for medium lot density via creation of lots smaller than existing. Despite this, the land supply analysis does not account for these lot size consolidations encouraged in the envisaged outcomes. 6. Undercount has implications for the discussion of the 15 year land supply. Is the structure plan recommending that rezoning commence now so as to maintain the supply in the town? 7. Structure plan should acknowledge that more lots may be created than are needed in any one year, with take up via dwelling construction not matching the creation. 8. The medium density/commercial precinct is proposed as an extension of High Street commercial area. It would be better for medium density to occur in this precinct only until clarity is given as to medium densities proposed for additional residential areas. Clarity should be provided in the plan as to the nature of the medium densities prescribed for the Township Residential areas in the town so as to avoid future confusion. These densities may be higher than elsewhere in the town, offering opportunity for consolidation, yet not correlating to examples of medium density in a Melbourne context. 9. Responses provided in the April 2013 community forum supported the provision of smaller lots in different locations, thus offering a diversity of housing options. This could be met via the proposed 500 m² lots for Township Residential areas acting as contextualised “medium densities”. Infill sites in these areas could also provide for smaller townhouses. 10. Area combined of investigation areas would hypothetically double the size of the town. Therefore reconsideration should be made: areas are too large or there are too many of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to response to submission 21 point 2. 2. The plan acknowledges that there is a variety of potential options for infill development. However, due to the uncertainty about infill redevelopment or re-subdivision of existing lots constrained sites have been excluded from the land supply assessment. This is to ensure that the assessment is robust enough to withstand the scrutiny of a Panel Hearing. The next review of land supply in 2018 will also look at what level of infill and medium density development has occurred and what constrained land has been developed since the adoption of the plan. 3. Refer to response to point 2. 4. The land supply analysis does not measure actual dwelling capacity within the township boundary. It has made an assumption that zoned land will be developed in accordance with minimum subdivision sizes specified in each neighbourhood character precinct. No assumptions have been made for unzoned land. 5. Correct. Refer to response to point 2 above. 6. The plan does not recommend rezoning take place now. The land supply analysis will be reviewed in 2018 to determine what land supply remains and whether there is a need to consider rezoning of land at that point in time. 7. This is acknowledged. 8. The plan directs medium density development to the township residential precincts. The plan provides guidance on the nature of medium density development envisaged. 9. Refer to responses to submissions 12 point 1 and 13 point 2. 10. Concerns noted. The investigation areas are potential options for long term growth. 11. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2.
------------	--	---	--

	<p>them.</p> <p>11. Land in east is most suited for development (if required) with the acknowledgement that the south eastern section of this land is subject to fire risk. Land to the northwest is least suited due to fire risk from north and northwest. In the draft, these conclusions must be stated more clearly than are currently.</p> <p>12. With respect to the eastern investigation areas: Include master plan and statutory controls the protection of trees, landscape buffers alongside roads (retaining existing rows of trees) and landscape buffers alongside the Calder Freeway; Development of rural land within the township boundary (Old Lancefield Road) should respect and incorporate the concepts identified for the NE investigation area; The Structure Plan suggests converting the east and NE land to largish town blocks if and when it is developed. Given the overland flow path and flood storage of this land, rural style blocks (2 – 5 acres in size) may be more appropriate.</p> <p>13. The discussion of investigation areas within the plan invites owners of land to argue for rezoning at any time. Such speculative and ad hoc proposals should be discouraged. Instead, the development of the plan provides an opportunity for more rigorous approach and provision of greater certainty about the planning framework.</p> <p>14. Plan must be clearer about the retention of the township boundary during the period of the structure plan. Monitoring of dwelling construction in township and periodic review is encouraged.</p> <p>15. Should development outside the boundary be needed at a later date, then Council should state that the responsibility for the development of the master plan and the identification of the specific site is that of the Macedon Ranges Shire Council. This will avoid the outsourcing of such decisions to development interests. It would be prudent to nominate the east or NE investigation areas, or part of these given their size, for possible development beyond 2036 within the Structure Plan document. The remaining investigation areas will not be required and should not be given status in the planning scheme.</p> <p>16. Supports the use of the neighbourhood character areas including minimum lot sizes.</p> <p>17. Recent infill developments have not been integrated as well as possible in town. Design could have been improved to include water sensitive urban design and an emphasis on visually identifiable characteristics. Additional principles could have been included in the Structure Plan such as the following:</p> <p>Ensure development faces the road where this is the prevailing pattern and avoid high boundary fences along the road frontage.</p> <p>Arrange diverse lot sizes in the subdivision with reference to the traditional streetscape.</p>	<p>12. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2.</p> <p>13. Concerns noted. The plan cannot prevent speculative proposals being advanced.</p> <p>14. Noted. The plan recommends periodic review.</p> <p>15. If a decision is made to rezone one of the investigation areas, a development plan would need to be prepared in tandem with Council.</p> <p>16. Noted.</p> <p>17. These types of concerns support the rationale for preparing the neighbourhood character study. The plan and neighbourhood character guidelines have been updated to take on board submitters’ suggestions where appropriate.</p> <p>18. Plan has been updated in respect of these policy documents.</p> <p>19. The plan seeks to do this.</p> <p>20. The implementation of the plan will occur as part of a separate (planning scheme amendment) process following adoption of the plan.</p> <p>21. This appendix to the Council report has responded to this request. The Community Reference Group and Councillors have been briefed on the submissions.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>The lots facing the street should have frontages at least as wide as the prevailing pattern and allow for building setbacks. Smaller lots sizes can be nestled behind the road frontage where they will not be visible. This approach may not be suitable for upward sloping sites.</p> <p>Adopt public realm design and road treatments consistent with Woodend’s character. Road verges should be integrated with water sensitive urban design to minimise kerbing and encourage grassed verges (resident mowing allowed). Traditional canopy street trees should be planted to provide summer shade and winter sun. Footpaths should be of simple materials. Street lighting should use Woodend’s original light pole design.</p> <p>18. Update text accordingly in regards to the Loddon Mallee Regional Plan within section 4. Updated Planning Framework. Additionally, reference should be made to the work being done on the Localised Planning Statement for the Macedon Ranges.</p> <p>19. The structure plan should responsibly direct development away from fire risk areas as per Clause 13.05 of the SPPF.</p> <p>20. In terms of guidance, the Structure Plan does not outline its implementation.</p> <p>21. An interim report for public review should entail a summary of the received submissions and outline intended changes to the draft.</p>	
<p>30.</p>	<p>P O Box 183 WOODEND VIC 3442</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WTSP dependent upon Amendment C84 which may not be approved. 2. WTSP relies upon older version of the Loddon Mallee South Regional Growth Plan which has now been superseded. Quotes from LMSRGP are taken but which are not present in new version. 3. WTSP does not recognise the Localised Planning Statement described in both Plan Melbourne and the LMSRGP. 4. Inappropriate use of MSS boundary around Woodend. Needs to be clarity in the application of the town boundary rather than being based upon the C84 Amendment which is yet to be approved. 5. Woodend is recognised in the WTSP as having high bushfire risk. The Victorian Bushfire Risk Register classifies Woodend as extreme bushfire risk. These differences have implications at a state policy level and allowances for growth. 6. It would be appropriate for the WTSP to recommend new flood and drainage studies be undertaken. Current LSIO does not reflect flooding characteristics. The Coomes 1997 study recommends a drainage study for Slatey Creek (not done). FOs and UFZ have not been applied. Council deferred application of a UFZ to Five mile Creek as requested by NCCMA in Am C88. The WTSP would be an appropriate method of applying this. 7. The 1998 new format planning scheme panel report recommended areas of known overland flow and drainage problems be investigated and a Special Building Overlay be applied prior to subdivision (not done). 8. There is no legitimate basis or need for retaining all of the land identified for residential growth due to constraints on the town (extreme bushfire risk, flooding, environmental 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Both Amendment C84 and the Woodend Structure Plan will be submitted for Council adoption in May 2014. 2. Plan has been updated to refer to newer version. 3. Plan has been updated to refer to LPS. 4. The strategic work undertaken for the plan supports retaining the township boundary largely in its current form. 5. Plan has been updated. 6. Noted. Further flood studies are recommended in the plan. 7. Noted. Plan contains a reference to this outstanding piece of work. 8. Refer to responses to submission 29 points 10 and 6. 9. Refer to response to submission 20 point 8. 10. A revised Town Structure Plan is included in the final recommendations of the C84 Panel. The WTSP& NCS will be updated to reflect these recommendations. 11. Agreed. Reference to potential outcomes of

		<p>sensitivity), its ability for it to absorb residential growth within boundary almost up to 2020, and that it is not identified as a town for growth in the MRSS, the LMSRGP or Plan Melbourne.</p> <p>9. The WTSP should recognise the MRSS findings that no greenfields rezoning is required to accommodate growth to 2036. It should maintain existing scheme provision to investigate possible growth to the north east if required.</p> <p>10. The WTSP (p. 84) “The revised MSS indicates this area as an option for subdivision as low density residential lots”. This misquotes the statement in the re-exhibited C84 Woodend Structure Plan.</p> <p>11. Page 84. “Council is currently undertaking a Rural Living Planning Review which will include directions about this land” and this land “will have minimum lot size of 2ha under the proposed new rural zones (where there is no minimum requirement listed in a zone schedule)”. It is inappropriate and premature to rely on a Rural Living Planning Review that has not been formalised by process or approval and therefore vaguely refer to RLZ land outside the town boundary. RLZ1 specifies 40ha minimum and does not/will not default to 2ha. Additionally, the RLZ land did not contribute lots to the MRSS land supply analysis. The MRSS and the WTSP do not recommend additional land supply from RLZ outside boundary.</p> <p>12. RLZ from outside boundary has been included in Precinct 6 and has been labelled as R1Z instead.</p> <p>13. The 10 year window used for the historical growth trend does not portray true growth rate of the town. Additionally, revision of the 2011 ABS figures for the Shire has reduced population by around 2000 people. VIF projections are impacted by this also. The WTSP should reference and consider this change. The WTSP should also recognise that the VIF projections are Shire wide and not specific to Woodend.</p> <p>14. Demand for housing is not high in Woodend: the rate of dwelling construction does not match the rate of subdivision approval; and large subdivision in Washington Lane has been available for years but has not sold.</p> <p>15. The 300 dwelling identified as required to accommodate population growth to 2018 can be met partially by the 38 lot R1Z subdivision at Noonan Grove (lots are smaller than WTSP 800 m²), 20+ new LDRZ lots at Mt Macedon Rd/East St approved in Am C88, and an existing and extended permit for 200+ unit retirement village (RLZ, south side of Mt. Macedon Road) outside town boundary. Additionally, there is the current application for 51 lots in Goldies Lane. These will provide diverse housing options. Currently not recognised in the WTSP or taken into account in dwelling or land supply analysis.</p> <p>16. On page 20 of the WTSP it is stated that residential zoned land analysis was undertaken to estimate growth that could be accommodated within the existing town boundary. Included was the phrase: “within town boundary as defined in the MSS and the Settlement Strategy”. The SS study area includes rural zones outside the existing town</p>	<p>Rural Living Review deleted.</p> <p>12. Error noted. Plan corrected.</p> <p>13. Disagree. Population growth projections have considered a range of potential growth rates including VIF and the rate of 1.35% is considered realistic. The latest census data has informed the analysis.</p> <p>14. Noted. The review of the land supply analysis in 2018 will consider what subdivided land remains unsold.</p> <p>15. The land supply analysis has considered approved permits for subdivision such as on Mt Macedon Rd. Whilst, the proposed retirement village may assist with the turnover of existing dwellings in Woodend, it is not something that can be relied upon in a land supply analysis.</p> <p>16. The plan indicates what further housing could be accommodated in the Rural Living Zoned land within the study area defined in the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>17. Plan has been amended to reflect changes to LDRZ.</p> <p>18. Action has been deleted.</p> <p>19. This work will be undertaken in the implementation stage. The plan recommends using the NRZ and schedules where appropriate.</p> <p>20. The extent of areas recommended for medium density development has been reassessed in response to submissions. The plan includes further policy to protect Woodend’s gateways. Council is currently working on a Heritage Strategy that will set out processes and priorities for implementation of future heritage outcomes. The plan does not support expansion of commercial areas along town gateways.</p> <p>21. The land has been identified as the Large Lot</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>boundary. What was counted and where?</p> <p>17. Low Density Residential: Options for the Future, page 21, dot point 4 states that LDRZ min lot size will be 0.4ha. State zone changes apply a 0.2ha min lot size default to sewerer LDRZ unless otherwise specified. The MR LDRZ does not specify 0.4ha for sewerer LDRZ. The WTSP should recommend an Amendment to address this.</p> <p>18. Strategies and Actions (dot point 7, page 22): included is an action of rezoning rural living land within the MSS boundary to allow for new residential development. If this is the RLZ1 land rezoned to LDRZ in Am C88, this action can be deleted.</p> <p>19. Neighbourhood Character Precincts must be appropriately translated into the new Neighbourhood Residential Zone schedules as well as necessary policy and overlays.</p> <p>20. Conflict of intent in WTSP regarding the protection of road and railway gateways aesthetics. Protection is identified as critical yet medium density areas and smaller lot subdivision sizes have been identified as preferred.</p> <p>Greatest concern is with medium and higher density areas at Tylden Rd, along High St, Corinella/High Street, and Carlisle St/Romsey Rd.</p> <p>Properties with frontage to any gateway should not be designated for medium development. New gateway precincts or discrete gateway controls should be considered to preserve the character of the town. Include existing policy to not support expansion of commercial use and development along gateways to town.</p> <p>The Woodend Corinella Street Residential Precinct is identified in the Macedon Ranges Cultural Heritage and Landscape Study and is recommended for planning scheme protection. This has not been done. This should be considered in terms of the densities sought by the WTSP for this particular area.</p> <p>21. Large Lot Township precinct near Wood Street shown as medium density represents contradictory outcomes and appears to be an error.</p> <p>22. Neighbourhood Character Guidelines: Clarity of guidelines must be achieved. Dot points outlining key character features and values requiring protection could be included. The interfaces of rural zones are not addressed. Suburban paling fence should be avoided, and preferred fencing outcomes addressed. Concrete kerbs and footpaths should be tinted to blend into streetscape.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Garden Setting precinct includes an area south of Mt. Macedon Rd with drainage issues. Reconsider the minimum lot sizes and/or make provisions for the drainage solutions. b. Eastern-most land in the Bush-Setting precinct south of Mt. Macedon road has major flooding constraints. Reconsider the proposed 800 m² minimum lot sizes and State policy requirements to achieve sufficient protection zones and 	<p>Township neighbourhood character type and not preferred medium density. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct.</p> <p>22. The neighbourhood character guidelines have been revised and updated to respond to submissions and in the context of what can realistically be controlled through future overlays or schedules.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Only 1 site in this area is large enough to be subdivided into the minimum 800m² lot size of the Garden Setting precinct. b. This site is currently zoned Residential 1 and the 800m² minimum lot size is appropriate in this context. Drainage issues will require consideration at planning application stage. c. A minimum lot size of 2000m² is recommended for the Bush setting precinct. Bushfire issues will be considered in detail for any application within the BMO. d. The minimum lot size for Large Lot Township has been increased from 1000m² to 1200m² in the final draft. No lots within the Ashbourne Road area would have subdivision capacity under this minimum. <p>23. Plan has been updated to reference this document.</p> <p>24. Text amended.</p> <p>25. Noted.</p> <p>26. Use of SLO's will be further considered for gateways during the plan's implementation stage.</p> <p>27. Noted.</p> <p>28. Plan has been updated to include important views.</p> <p>29. Concerns noted. Refer to response to</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>c. Bush Setting cell proposed at Booths Lane is within the BMO. Reconsider the lot sizes of 800 m² for bushfire risk and State policy requirements to provide sufficient protection zones.</p> <p>d. Large Lot Township precinct at Ashbourne Road is a relatively recent development falling partially within the BMO. Logic for the conversion of the area from 2000 m² to 1000 m² is not obvious. Rethink?</p> <p>23. The Black Gum management plan 1994 is not listed as a reference document for the WTSP. The plan recognises the trees as significant yet omits that they are listed on the Flora and Fauna Guarantee of State Significance, endangered and a planning constraint. The threat of residential development to this species should be recognised.</p> <p>24. The Black Forest is densely vegetated rather than “planted” (p. 11, para 2). The Wombat State Forest to the west and southwest of the town is also a significant and valued environmental feature.</p> <p>25. Supports the extension of the SLO to Golf Course Hill and its surrounds is supported. The 1999 New Format PS Panel Report supported the application of an SLO to geomorphologic features, as requested by the National Trust (this was not done). Development on and around the hill, including ridgelines, should be prevented.</p> <p>26. SLO of Honour Ave is supported, but extent proposed is inadequate. Apply SLO or other development controls to Black Forest Drive and consider the protection of other gateways in such a manner.</p> <p>27. The importance of the street trees in the town should not be overlooked or considered expendable.</p> <p>28. Strategic Framework at page 16 does not include “significant views” which should be protected.</p> <p>29. Page 62. Landscape buffer along Calder Freeway and Five Mile Creek would impact the views of Mount Macedon and Golf Course Hill respectively. The Shire has State significance for its open, rural landscapes. Therefore, these should be protected and the development which would require such buffers should also be avoided.</p> <p>30. Expansion of Commercial Area: Supports the expansion of commercial area to the east yet with proviso that the open drain that traverses this area undergo the necessary works as per the recommendations of the 1997 Coomes drainage study. This would avoid the significant flooding of the area and address the subsequent inundation of the 19th Hole Shopping Centre via the movement of water on towards Five Mile Creek.</p> <p>31. St Ambrose is incorrectly included in the area identified for commercial expansion.</p> <p>32. Page 41. “Civic Centre” should read “Community Centre”.</p> <p>33. Page 43. “Foster” Street should read “Forest” Street.</p> <p>34. Improved ability to cross High Street is supported, yet there are reservations regarding the impact that the addition of up to five zebra crossings in the area will have.</p>	<p>submission 1 point 2.</p> <p>30. Council has programmed works on a retarding basin in Quarry Road to be carried out in the short term as a solution to downstream flood management.</p> <p>31. Plan amended.</p> <p>32. Noted.</p> <p>33. Error corrected.</p> <p>34. The number of suggested crossings has been reduced.</p> <p>35. Plan amended to reflect these points. Noted.</p> <p>36. This comment relates to the Vision for Woodend which was prepared in consultation with the community, CRG and Councillors. Change to this vision is not supported.</p> <p>37. Plan on page 9 will be amended to remove land in the railway reserve from ‘Open space’ category. It is not proposed to acquire land at Islay House for open space in the Open Space Strategy.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>35. Page 51. Building Design Guidelines: “All New Development...that compliments” and add <i>and doesn’t dominate</i>.</p> <p>High Street, dot point 5. The Woodend Urban Design Framework confirmed that community preference is for verandas the full width of the footpath. This should be included.</p> <p>36. Industrial 3 rezoning is supported for the light industrial area near the town centre, along with requirements for improved landscaping.</p> <p>37. Page 14. At dot point 5 – “a strong connection to...” add <i>heritage</i>.</p> <p>38. Page 9. Open space shown along the railway line b/w Tylden Rd and the railway station, is not formal open space or zoned for that purpose. Consider alternative identification.</p> <p>An uncoloured parcel of land at the north of the Gold Course is part of the Golf Course but not identified as open space.</p> <p>The WTSP should recommend purchase and addition of flood prone land next to Islay House for public open space.</p>	
<p>31.</p>	<p>P O Box 421 Bendigo 3552</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The draft structure plan does not resolve the no growth within/no growth outside the town boundary issue due to inherent contradictions between the draft structure plan and the character study component. 2. Residential land supply analysis was drawn from the settlement strategy which was found to be flawed. Therefore it should be “considered with reservation”. 3. Supports the consideration of future growth outside existing boundary. 4. Growth outside boundary, not constraints, will allow for the application of the neighbourhood character study guidelines. Conserving the township character while also limiting growth are imperatives at odds. 5. Additionally, NCS may be used to reject change which could be beneficial in areas such as environmental impacts, transport access etc. 6. Revision to Character Study. Reassemble the study so that it is a tool demonstrating neighbourhood evolution rather than a policy tool for restricting natural change: description and cross time comparison of change over time (100 years) in neighbourhood character and an understanding that it will continue to evolve; acknowledge that character responds to changes in tech, work patterns and types, transportation, family size, population demographics; identification of which key elements can be utilised for integration and extension of future character in the town; acknowledging a crossover between character forms rather than a stark separation – the study areas are currently too restrictive and do not allow for natural variation. 7. The NCS should direct the sympathetic development of private landowners AND public infrastructure via tools and infrastructure standards that are town specific. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to responses to submissions 7 point 5 and 21 point 8. 2. The land supply analysis underpinning the plan’s recommendations was prepared specifically for Woodend using more recent data such as the 2011 Census. 3. Noted. 4. Disagree. Refer to responses to submission 12 point 1 and 17 point 10. 5. The Structure Plan process has considered the impact of its recommendations in the strategic context of supporting objectives of sustainable planning. 6. It is acknowledged that change will occur in the future. The Neighbourhood Character Study is a tool that will allow change respectful of existing character and is supported by the local community. 7. The Structure Plan includes recommendations for public realm spaces such as verge, street tree and footpath treatments. In addition, Chapter 5 - town centre character sets out

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. R1Z and LDRZ land that is covered by ‘Bush Rural Living’ and ‘Large Lot Rural Living’ will result in confusion in statutory planning process. 9. Application of minimum lot sizes and maximum site coverage (precincts 3 and 5), at odds with lot sizes specified under the residential zone, is unwise and unwarranted – they are zoned appropriately for land within the town boundary, and close to amenities. 	<p>preferred treatments for public realm elements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Neighbourhood character classifications have been updated so that all Low Density Residential zoned land (and only LDRZ land) is within the Large Lot Rural Living precinct. 9. The single Residential 1 Zone has been replaced by a suite of 3 residential zones that allow residential outcomes to be differentiated and locally specific controls introduced. The Structure Plan will provide the strategic consideration to implement the new residential zones.
<p>32.</p>	<p>VicRoads 53-61 Lansell Street Bendigo 3550</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General support for the vision in the plan for Woodend transport – more consideration is needed in balancing competing interests in road space between all users (including pedestrians and cyclists). 2. Without detailed investigation, it would be premature to commit to any proposals of arterial network plans as set out in the draft plan. 3. <i>1. Proposed pedestrian crossing. Figures on page 67 and 72, chapter 7. “Proposed pedestrian crossing” should be changed to “potential future pedestrian crossing facilities”. Additional crossings will impact the traffic of High Street so investigation required.</i> 4. <i>2. Reduced Traffic Speed. Figure on page 9, executive summary, page 67 and 71, chapter 7. Speed reduction not warranted at this time and future application for speed limit reduction along High Street will need to be assessed against VicRoads’ Speed Zoning Guidelines. The draft should be revised to reflect the above.</i> 5. <i>3. Shared-path spine within Woodend. Figure on page 9, executive summary and page 68, 71 and 72, chapter 7. On-road bicycle paths already exist along High Street and within Woodend. VicRoads generally prefers on-road bicycle paths over shared-use paths. No objection is held though to off-road shared-use paths along arterial road reserves with the proviso there exists adequate allowance for cyclist crossings and Council is responsible for delivery and funding of the paths.</i> 6. <i>4. Upgrade planting along arterial road network – figure on page 9, executive summary and page 61, figure on page 62, chapter 6 and figure on page 67, chapter 7. Street trees already exist along High Street. Any proposed enhanced tree planting along the arterial road network will require approvals from VicRoads.</i> 7. <i>5. Analysis of future growth options – Appendix B. VicRoads supports containing growth to infill sites. Rezoning of land outside the town boundary for new residential purposes should be referred to VicRoads. It is recommended that in future development internal</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. The plan seeks to achieve an appropriate balance between competing demands for road space. 2. Noted. There is no commitment at this stage. Further discussions will take place with VicRoads concerning any proposals along High Street. 3. Plan amended to reflect this point. 4. Plan amended to reflect this point. 5. Agreed. 6. Noted. 7. Suggestion about off street shared paths noted. In the event that the investigation areas are further considered, VicRoads would be consulted.

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

		off-street shared pedestrian and cycle paths be established through open space areas to reduce reliance on arterial roads for access and movement.	
33.	Level 2, 55 Southbank Boulevard WOODEND VIC 3442	<p>Re: 29 Goldies Lane, Woodend & Campaspe House</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Goldies Lane site is located within the existing town boundary and will assist in providing for projected growth in Woodend as per outlined in draft plan. 2. The Goldies Lane proposal site is currently zoned for residential purposes, which should be formally recognised when considering future character of the area, and adjoins existing urban edges to the immediate north and west. The site is covered by two of the character precincts outlined within the draft plan: Bush Setting and Bush Rural Setting. 3. The subdivision proposal generally accords with the Bush Setting character: large lots fronting Booths Lane and along the northern boundary, abutting existing residential properties. 4. The proposed subdivision contains sites varying in size from 925 square metres to 2,466 square metres – large enough to allow for appropriate setbacks whilst accommodating required building footprints. 5. It is recommended that the minimum lot size requirements of Bush Setting should include 800 square metres as an average rather than a minimum. 6. It is submitted that the land to the north of Campaspe House be included in the Bush Setting Character precinct as is consistent with the land to the immediate north and west. 7. The large bush lots to the south of property have no residential development proposed and are heavily vegetated. Therefore, these should remain Bush Rural Living with the minimum lot size reference stating “average” rather than minimum. The proposed lots directly abutting Goldies Lane and those to the south of proposed development can comply with the Bush Rural Living character requirements. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The land has been identified as the Bush Rural Living neighbourhood character type. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct. 3. Noted. 4. Noted. 5. Disagree. It is recommended that the use of minimum lots size be retained as opposed to averages. 6. The land to the north of Campaspe House has been identified as the Large Lot Township neighbourhood character type. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct. 7. The land to the south has been retained in Bush Rural Living precinct. This is considered appropriate given the prevailing lot sizes in this precinct.
34.	P O Box 141 WOODEND VIC 3442	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports growth rate of 1.35% per annum. 2. No indication of the criteria that guided the consultant’s nomination of lots and conclusions about lots supply. 3. Lot count analysis is flawed and therefore does not meet the strategic objectives of the Plan. There has been a serious undercount of available development opportunities in the township due to selection of lots that are completely free from constraints. 4. Categories of development not identified include: Constrained land with flooding or vegetation issues; infill development on titles with existing dwellings; demolition of existing dwellings to replace with medium to high density development; and housing in commercial areas. 5. The need for rezoning of land outside the town boundary is distorted by this land supply as there may be more than the presented land supply actually available for development. This needs to be reconciled prior to the finalisation of the Structure Plan. 6. Higher than usual densities (for Woodend) are encouraged in the Town Residential areas. 7. More information and consideration is required as to the transition and modelling of the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Refer to response to submission 21 point 2. 3. Refer to response to submission 29 point 2. 4. Refer to response to submission 29 point 2. 5. Refer to response to submission 29 point 2. 6. No change is recommended. Medium density is preferred in the Township Residential precinct which advocates for minimum lots size of 500m². Compared to the unrestricted minimum lot size allowed under Clause 55, the Neighbourhood Character Study will support a minimum lot size and density more compatible with the small town context of Woodend. 7. Agreed. The plan has been updated to clarify

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

		<p>medium density/commercial precinct. The term “medium density” is not well defined, so there may be issues of clarity between community and the translation of the plan into practice. It would be better for the medium density/commercial precinct to cater only to medium density development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Greater clarification is required in the final plan of the terms high and medium density and the application of these terms across the Woodend town area. 9. Land in east is most suited for development (if required) with the acknowledgement that the south eastern section of this land is subject to fire risk. Land to the northwest is least suited due to fire risk from north and northwest. In the draft, these conclusions must be stated more clearly than are currently. 10. Any master plan or statutory controls of the land to the east must include: protection of trees; landscape buffers along roadsides with the retention of existing trees; and landscape buffers alongside the Calder Freeway. 11. Should land to the east or northeast be developed, lot sizes of 2 to 5 acres would best address overland flow paths and flood storage functioning. Master plans of these areas would be best developed by should the need arise for their development rather than relying upon outsourcing to developer interests. 12. Establishment and maintenance of wildlife corridors is necessary. 13. Additional principles of character and design for inclusion (see page 4-5 of submission). 14. Update text accordingly in regards to the Loddon Mallee Regional Plan within section 4. Updated Planning Framework. Additionally, reference should be made to the work being done on the Localised Planning Statement for the Macedon Ranges. 15. The structure plan should responsibly direct development away from fire risk areas as per Clause 13.05 of the SPPF. 16. In terms of guidance, the Structure Plan does not outline its implementation. 17. An interim report for public review should entail a summary of the received submissions and outline intended changes to the draft. 	<p>these matters.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Agreed. The term medium density has been defined in the plan. 9. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 10. Agreed. Refer to response to submission 1 point 2. 11. It is premature to determine future lot sizes for the investigation areas at this stage. 12. Agreed. 13. Some of the changes suggested have been incorporated in the final Structure Plan. 14. The changes suggested have been made to update the Policy Context section in Chapter 2. 15. Agreed. This is one of the plan’s aims. 16. Refer to response to submission 29 point 20. 17. Refer to response to submission 29 point 21.
35.	No address provided	Requests changes to photo credits – photos credited in the document to Virginia Poletti should be credited to Carl Poletti.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan amended as requested.
36.	EPA (late submission)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please use publication 1518 - recommended separation distances for industrial residual air emissions when determining industrial area and/or permits. 2. Be mindful of any current/previous industrial land being used for more sensitive uses due to the potential for contamination. 3. EPA can assist council assess strategies and applications for industrial uses that may cause amenity potential. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Points made in submission noted and amendments made where appropriate.
37.	46 High Street, Woodend (late submission)	Very pleased with the plan on the whole and was really happy to see the open land on Quarry road (just behind the high street residential properties) has been identified as a community park. Recommend considering using part of this area as a dedicated dog off lead area.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission forwarded to MRSC Parks Planning team.

Woodend Town Structure Plan – Summary of Submissions

38.	PO Box 284, Woodend (late submission)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission objects to the prescriptive planning controls for the historic residential precinct which affects two properties owned by the submitter’s family (12 Collier Street and 42 Forest Street). This part of Woodend should be designated as the “preferred area for medium density housing”. 2. Setting prescriptive planning controls across the whole township will reduce opportunities for urban consolidation and is likely to lead to urban sprawl. 3. It is also unclear why so much land shown as potential Commercial 1 Zone east to Wood Street. There are a number of heritage buildings within this area that have not been included in the Heritage Overlay, but require further investigation. 	Submitter advised that contents of submission would not be considered given that it was received significantly after the closing date for submission.
39	CFA (late submission)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The most likely potential fire scenario to impact Woodend is a fast moving grassfire approaching from a north-north-westerly direction then swinging around in the afternoon to approach from the south west. The risk from this scenario can largely be mitigated through the use of – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Hard straight edges along the urban-grassland interface (including the appropriate staging of large subdivisions) b. Good access for fire fighting vehicles along the urban-grassland interface (including the use of permitter roads wherever possible) c. Landscaping and building construction (non-combustible fences, AS3959-2009 etc) 2. The fire scenario with potentially the highest consequence to Woodend is a fire approaching from the south west (which may or may not be ignited by a northerly grassfire). 3. As all the investigation areas are at a considerable distance from any non-fragmented forested area, it is CFA’s view that none appear to present an unacceptable level of risk at a strategic planning level. 4. However, development of investigation area 1 may place increased pressure on development to the east of the Calder Freeway or further south of the railway line. As the town appears to be largely unconstrained to the north, it is recommended that growth be directed generally in this direction and an urban edge to the south be clearly defined. Any future development expectation towards the south, south-east or south west needs to be carefully managed through strong policies so that growth does not creep towards areas of significant bushfire hazard. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. The land to the south was not included as an investigation area in recognition of fire risk. 3. It is noted that none of the investigation areas present an unacceptable level of risk at a strategic planning level. 4. Concerns noted. No preferred direction for growth has been established. It is not proposed to develop towards the south.
40	DEPI (late submission)	Include reference to “Macedon Regional Park” at page 38	Plan amended to reflect this point