Structure Plan Submission – Diversity of lot size

Summary

I am opposed to elements of Amendment C87 to the Golden Plains Planning Scheme, as it does not provide any form of compromise between "Inverleigh as we know it" and "Inverleigh as is proposed" in the Structure Plan, in relation to lot sizes. I believe the Structure Plan contradicts itself and is misleading when suggesting there will be lot sizes larger than 0.4ha in the proposed LDRZ areas.

Submission

The Structure Plan states "…State Planning Policy requires Council to ensure a sufficient supply of urban land is available…..to accommodate projected population growth over at least a 15 year period…." The Structure Plan fails to explain, as per Clause 11.02-1S of the Victorian Planning Scheme, that the "residential land supply will be considered on a municipal basis, rather than a town-by-town basis". As the requirement for residential land is across the whole of the Golden Plains Shire there is no *requirement* for Inverleigh specifically to have 430 lots available, much less: the 525 proposed through Potential Growth Areas 1, 2 and 3; the unquantified but potential for hundreds of lots through Potential Growth Areas 4, 5 and 6; and the potential for many more lots should current land owners subdivide, given Amendment C87GPLA proposes to decrease the minimum lot size to 0.4ha.

In the Structure Plan a Residential Development Principle notes "Residential development will continue to incorporate the existing landscape as a design objective through maximising the retention of landscape features such as trees, ridgelines and waterways and using larger lots *where necessary* to achieve this outcome". "Where necessary" implies the default will be to have lots of the minimum allowable size (0.4 ha) and it will only be by exception that a lot will be larger than 0.4ha. Yet the correlating Residential Development Strategy notes "Plan for new residential development to provide a diverse range of lot sizes which reflects the country lifestyle character of Inverleigh and responds to site conditions". The Principle and the Strategy do not align; one plans for a diverse range of lot sizes, the other only allows a variation from the minimum lot size by exception.

As noted in the Structure Plan and from the Inverleigh Structure Plan 2017 Community Survey (Attachment 1) there are a variety of views on lots sizes; "…some residents want to subdivide because they don't want to manage large lots, others want to retain the 1 ha minimum lot size" and 53% of residents do not want greenfield development (37% No development + 16% Infill development (only)). Furthermore since the 2005 Inverleigh Structure Plan the community still "…wants to retain the values and character that make Inverleigh popular", one element being the option of larger lot sizes.

To consolidate the above points I believe the Structure Plan must be updated to include an additional Residential Development Strategy; it would read "At the development planning permit stage the Council will advocate on behalf of the Inverleigh community for, and ensure, diversity of lot size".

This proposal would: allow for actual diversity in lot size; it would show that the Council has listened to the community and is genuinely attempting to "maintain Inverleigh's rural village atmosphere" vs succumbing to pressure from developers (who have no interest in the towns' values and vision), and it would be a compromise between "old" (1-2ha minimum) and "new" (0.4ha minimum). The Council has the powers and is able to make the *choice* to have larger block sizes, as 0.4ha is the <u>minimum</u> for un-sewered LDRZ; it is not the required size nor is it the only allowable size.