

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

12 August 2021

Dear Planning Department,

I am writing to object to the proposed planning scheme "Draft Bellarine Peninsula Statement of Planning Policy", as it generates perverse outcomes which are not fully thought out in the context of land owners along the eastern settlement boundary in Portarlington.

The decision to classify the Land bordering existing developed land and specifying as a "green break" needs further consideration, here are some reasons for consideration:

A genuine green break zone should mandate the state government compulsory acquire all land outside of the main township. Not penalize existing owners' rights to achieve a new ideology as there is high density housing already in your green break zone, contradictory to the current status. This is not a green break.

A more equitable proposition is to generate a zone which accommodates a low density footprint which achieves a break and satisfies a green break, such as 1 acre allotments with very specific planning requirements. This planning regime and specific zone will create the correct type of development in the area and allow the town to retain its unique character and meet the strategic objectives.

The requirements around planning for infill is counter intuitive to the current demand for manageable acreage. Your study does not entertain market demand as there is only high density infill allotments or multi-acreage lots (> 10 acres). There is nothing in between, the strategic plan has missed the mark, now and into the future 50 plus years.

The current statutory farming zone is completely out of step with land that is adjacent to high density allotments. Adding a house to a farming allotment is quite onerous and needs a full suite of statutory planning documentation to satisfy the statutory requirements. The land is not farmable without significant investment. A private consultant estimated \$1 million dollars to condition the soil in the farming zone. This is contrary to the legislation section 35.07.

The strategic plan does not consider these facts and generates perverse outcomes for long term land owners. Granted the state government's motivation to protect farm land is plausible but it has taken a generalized approach without analysing all the facts. The strategic plan does not analyse the facts it also undermines market drivers and focuses on a narrow aspect. The strategic plan really needs to unwind and reassess land that needs a zoning scheme which meets ALL constituents of the community. Don't be lazy.

To add further, City of Greater Geelong over numerous telephone conversations has encouraged me personally, to not further engage with a request for a zoning assessment in the 121-139 Mitchell Street area as it was more likely to adjust the urban growth boundary to include this area as a residential zone. This is completely contrary to the state government plan. It is quite obvious the City of Greater Geelong is deeming this as the "too hard basket."

As land owners for over 40 years and multiple failures at getting reasonable responses can we please get some equity in this strategic plan that looks at all aspects?

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]