

BELLARINE PENINSULA DISTINCTIVE AREA AND LANDSCAPE (DAL)

DRAFT BELLARINE PENINSULA STATEMENT OF PLANNING POLICY

I live in the Borough of Queenscliffe, more specifically in Fisherman's Flat which represents the original fishing village of the Township of Queenscliff which was established in the 1860's.

Fisherman's Flat is an Urban Conservation Precinct with heritage and local provisions restricting dwellings **to single-storey up to a maximum height of 6 metres above natural ground level.**

Fisherman's Flat has been covered by Heritage Overlay 1 (HO1), and Design and Development Overlay – Schedule 6 (DDO6) since establishment of the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme. Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 2 (NRZ2) was added in 2014 *via* Planning Scheme Amendment C26 by Ministerial Intervention under Section (20)4 of the Planning and Environment Act 1978 by then Planning Minister Matthew Guy.

In 2017, Planning Scheme Amendment VC110 was introduced by the State to introduce NRZs into all planning schemes.

And on 23 December 2020 Amendment GC172 was approved by the current Minister for Planning, Richard Wynne, and published on the Government Gazette to mark 'the end of building height inconsistencies in residential zones across Victoria' which now have been standardised to 9 metres and 2 storeys in the NRZs, and 11 metres and 3 storeys in the GRZs.

This is of great concern to us in Fisherman's Flat where our NRZ2 Schedule initially stated in Clause 5.0 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT REQUIREMENT FOR A DWELLING OR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING: **a buildings used as a dwelling or a residential building must not exceed a height of 6 metres.**

I note that the most recent iteration of SCHEDULE 2 TO CLAUSE 32.09 NEIGHBOURHOOD RESIDENTIAL ZONE (NRZ2) *via* planning scheme amendment C30quen implemented 04/02/2021 does not specify any heights in Clause 5.0, leaving it open to interpretation.

Fisherman's Flat now ends up with conflicting overlays stating different height requirements. That is not only confusing but no doubt will lead to challenges by those who wish to develop to the maximum allowed.

The continuous attempts to standardise planning provisions, which no doubt can be useful in Metropolitan areas, across the whole State of Victoria may be helpful to those who make their living from planning rulings. However, it does have some unforeseen consequences, particularly in regional areas, that are very undesirable and causes extra workloads for under-resourced Councils.