

4 March, 2018.

SUBMISSION – MACEDON RANGES LOCALISED PLANNING STATEMENT

To those in power with the strength to reject this Localised Planning Statement:

We, the undersigned **DO NOT ACCEPT** that the proposed Localised Planning Statement will protect the Macedon Ranges.

We DO NOT ACCEPT that the government of Victoria is **LISTENING** to the people of this shire.

This Localised Planning Statement **moves the Macedon Ranges Shire in the OPPOSITE direction to the needs and wishes of the people of the shire**, and **does NOT** reflect the protection that has been **PROMISED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT** in the past.

It is promoting a range of activities and developments that we, as the residents of the shire, **wish to be, and need to be, protected AGAINST.**

Specifically:

- The statement **does NOT purport** to undertake the protection of the Macedon Ranges, as indicated in legislation currently under consideration.
- It is **IGNORING** the recommendations of the **Macedon Ranges Protection Advisory Committee.**
- **Statement of Planning Policy No 8 identifies a number of implications in regard to expanding urban development within the shire which are NOT addressed by the LPS.** These include but are not limited to:
 - ⇒ Pressures being exerted on the Macedon Range and its surrounds are intensifying with the increasing demand for recreational outlets and attractive residential areas with reasonable proximity to major centres of population. **Planning ... will have to be directed to regulating these demands, in order to maintain the continuing value and utility of its natural resources to the community as a whole and to the local communities.**
 - ⇒ Outstanding landscape features, Importance as a water source, scientific and education resource ... are threatened by problems resulting from urban expansion...
 - ⇒ **Increased bushfire risk** due to increasing residential development and difficulties faced by local fire prevention authorities.
 - ⇒ Demand for rural/urban and rural/forest residential sites may increase ... **if the value of such areas for other purposes is to be protected, these pressures should be RESISTED AS FAR AS POSSIBLE.**
 - ⇒ **There is a need to retain a buffer zone of predominantly rural land-uses between any concentrated urban development at Sunbury and the major recreational and scenic attractions, water catchments and forest resources of the Macedon Ranges.** This can be best achieved by the encouragement of **legitimate farming concerns,**

prevention of small rural subdivisions, controls on allowable residential density, regulation of land-uses, including building works ... retention of a rural buffer zone ... will also create a perceptual gradient between the built up areas and the essentially natural areas used for outdoor recreation.

⇒ **The list goes on how does excessive growth in GISBORNE for example, meld with the above?**

- The LPS is supposed to be based on **Statement of Planning Policy No 8**, but instead, is going to **delete that policy**. Hence **ALL OF THE ABOVE** may not be appropriately considered. This is not a Statement of Planning Policy; **it does make any attempt to integrate recommendations with other policies relevant to the shire**. How are we to achieve balanced growth whilst protecting the special attributes of this shire?
- **How is the associated Framework Plan supposed to assist in making relevant and appropriate decisions in relation to future growth and development in the shire?**
- The statement **contains NOTHING** about its proposed implementation or which entities **it will be binding upon**. Therefore, **whose interests will be best served by this LPS?** Developers? Telecommunications companies and other commercial interests? The list goes on. Should it not be those who already live and/or work in the shire and those whose businesses are located here??
- The urban growth proposals that have been published are unwarranted, based on recent research. The LPS adds 800ha of 'future investigation areas' at Woodend, Kyneton and Riddells Creek to create additional urban development without demonstrated need, investigation or process. Within their town boundaries, these 3 towns grew by 1,725 persons and produced 862 new dwellings between 2006 – 2016, and in 2016 had 459 unoccupied dwellings. Using 85% of 800ha produces an additional +6,800 lots (1,000m²) or +9,716 lots (700m²), or +8,400 dwellings (70% of 800ha @ 15 dwellings/ha), all **ADDITIONAL to existing land supply**.

This level of growth is comparable to growth proposed for the "Lancefield Road" precinct in the Sunbury urban growth area: 1,095ha / 8,000 new dwellings. Assuming one house per lot, and the average of 2016 ABS persons per household in these 3 towns, the LPS potentially adds another 17,204, 24,581 or 21,250 persons **ADDITIONAL** to the +6,800 persons already planned for these towns by 2036, and also **well above the +15,500 persons planned for ALL 6 towns**.

- **The LPS expanded settlement boundaries for Gisborne and Romsey have not been published and will not be available for another 18 months**. Why? Is it because even more growth is planned for these towns, despite Gisborne already having capacity for 1,100 more lots (3,320 people) than needed (2,200) for its projected 2036 growth (+5,800), and Romsey growing at less than half its projected growth rate for the past decade?
- The urban growth proposals will **DESTROY** the character of our towns, rural and native landscapes, heritage and environment, rather than protect them. These are the aspects that draw people to the Macedon Ranges in the first place. These are the aspects that people such as us, residents for just on ■■■ years, have worked hard to protect. For

example, the southern gateway to the Macedon Ranges and other significant parts of our shire, are under constant threat from telecommunication companies telling us what we need and want, rather than consulting properly with the community and establishing our real priorities – it is only due to the strength of our relatively new councillors that this is being somewhat controlled. The LPS will do nothing to assist their role in representing the needs of the people of the Shire in a balanced and thoughtful way.

- **The focus of the LPS should be on heritage, biodiversity and landscapes of ALL SIGNIFICANCE**, not just of state and national significance. A focus on state and national significance only **eliminates the need to communicate with the residents to establish what is significant to US**, not just to bureaucrats going through the process of ticking boxes against already identified areas of significance. Again, please consider the following, also from Statement of Planning Policy No 8:

“Planning of the area should make provision for the selection of certain areas deemed of significance for recreation or nature conservation to be acquired by the State. Public acquisition could ensure the preservation of areas of valuable natural vegetation at present on private land; the maintenance of landscape values in important scenic areas; and protection of areas under threat from pressures of inappropriate subdivision or development.” **This is clearly at odds with the proposed LPS.**

- **Where is the identification of, and cost/benefit analysis in relation to possible threats and difficulties** that will arise as a result of this LPS? What conclusions may be drawn from such analyses? Where is the public discussion of such? In other words, where is the communication to, consultation with and consideration for, the residents of this beautiful shire? **WE DO NOT WANT THE PROPOSED LOCALISED PLANNING STATEMENT IN ITS CURRENT FORM.**

WE REITERATE – WE DO NOT ACCEPT THAT THIS LOCALISED PLANNING STATEMENT IS PROTECTING THE MACEDON RANGES.

THE GOVERNMENT MUST START TO LISTEN TO THE VIEWS OF THE RESIDENTS OF THIS SHIRE.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]