



Submission at the Public Exhibition Phase of the 2015 Aireys Inlet to Eastern View Structure Plan

A. Draft Aireys Inlet to Eastern View Structure Plan

AIDA is generally supportive of the draft Aireys Inlet to Eastern View Structure Plan on public exhibition. Many of the most significant issues have been resolved in terms that would be acceptable to members based on recent surveys. Despite that note of support, AIDA has a large number of comments to make about this document as we know how important it is with respect to future planning in our area.

The comments that follow refer to the July 2015 draft subtitled Planning for the Future. There are 2 documents in the public arena with the same title and date. The one we refer to has the fewer photos and is included with this submission. Our concerns are as follows:

1. p5-6 –

AIDA would expect that for every Key Direction there should be a Key Action and where possible vice versa. For example, Action 10 is really two Actions in one, with future tourism opportunities perhaps sitting under Direction 7 but the important community role of the Pub is not apparently based on any Direction. Also, Action 12 doesn't appear to be based on any of the Directions and Direction 4 doesn't appear to be followed through in any of the Actions. This part of the Executive Summary needs to be revisited to accommodate pairing of Directions and Actions, as the context and nature of any Action is not clear without it responding to a Direction.

2. p5 Key Direction 6 –

What is meant by "adequate car parking"? Adequate in what season? Also, the Shire's 2011 Aireys Inlet Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines provided for at least some of the Bottom Shops parking being internal to the larger sites and not fronting the GOR.

3. p5 Key Direction 5 –

AIDA would be concerned if the encouragement of housing diversity in this Direction was applied to the proposed Fraser Drive development, as there is no Action which picks up how this diversity should otherwise be achieved. Perhaps this Direction should be split into its components i.e. older persons housing and the rest or at least an additional Action for housing diversity added.

4. p5 Key Direction 7 –

This action must also recognise and incorporate that the peak summer visitor period is the period of our greatest bushfire risk.

5a. p6 Key Action 6, relating to dot point 2 on p32 of Walking –

It is not clear from this description where the "pathway from the Bottom Shops via the pedestrian laneway and River Reserve Road to Bambra Road" will be located. We believe that the section from the Bottom Shops to Bambra Road should be along the shared River Reserve Road, and not through the grassy reserve beside the creek. Where is the path

proposed to be located after reaching Bambra Road? Is this the path on the eastern side of the Painkalac Creek that has been in the budget for several years or is it along the alignment of Bambra Road?

- 5b. p6, Key Action 6, and dot point 1 on p32 under Walking. –
The continuous path along the GOR between the Top and Bottom Shops already exists in a functional form. The proposal in the Urban Design Framework is considered by AIDA to be a waste of money.
6. p6 Key Action 8 –
What does the phrase “discourage any uses” mean? Are these uses over and above those controlled by the RCZ?
7. p6 Key Action 9 –
*This Action should be implementing both the Urban Design Framework and the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines. There is little material incompatibility between the Urban Design Framework as proposed **and the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines** and AIDA would be opposed to any proposal which does not also incorporate its important and valuable principles, which have already been endorsed by Council.*
8. p6 Key Action 12 –
*The SCS should be **applying** to VicRoads, not lobbying them. AIDA suggests that the speed reduction should be **seasonal**, not permanent – at least in the first instance. Thirdly, the 60 kph zone would be from the SLSC to the end of Eastern View, the current description appears to exclude Moggs Creek. AIDA believes that the speed limit should be kept at 80 kph in the very quiet off season – as a bad regulation will be ignored.*
9. p14 Key Action 14 –
What will be monitored? It is worth being specific here so all will understand what is to happen, as there are diverse views as to what might need changing or might constitute an improvement.
10. *Is the use of a range of terms including "town, township and settlement" to describe Aireys Inlet, Fairhaven, Moggs Creek and Eastern View appropriate? In planning terms, are they synonymous? We note that in the 1993 structure plan, “settlement” and “township” were used.*
11. *“Fire” is used frequently throughout the draft document. We believe that in most if not all cases it should be “bushfire”, to remove any ambiguity with other types of fires such as structure fires.*
12. p17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions dot point 6. –
The dot point should have this phrase inserted at the end ... incremental growth while adhering to the principles of the Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines.
13. p 17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions dot point 7.
The dot point should have this phrase inserted at the end ...amenity impacts, recognizing the impact of peak summer periods and bushfire risk.
14. p17, The Structure Plan, Key Directions. –
The second to last dot point talks about what the pedestrian and cycle paths link. Mentioned are commercial centres, community facilities, recreation and open space

areas, and coastal and hinterland walking trails. Not mentioned but possibly most important for many would be the use of these paths to visit friends in nearby townships.

15. p19, 4.1 Natural Environment. 2nd sentence in Environmental Protection. The sentence ends with "heathlands and indigenous tree cover, all contributing to the district's attractiveness". –
*We believe an important component of the vegetation is missing with this statement, namely the **understory vegetation**. This is most evident at present with the understory wattles in stunning bloom. A change such as the following would be appropriate "heathlands and indigenous tree cover and understory all contributing..."*
16. p19, 4.1 Natural Environment, Objective 1.1, Actions dot point 1. –
Should the Environmental Overlay Schedule be introduced and called up here?
17. p20, Bushfire Management. –
Despite all the good work done by the CFA and SCS, we do not consider that "Most residents are well aware of and prepared to live with the risk." It may be ill-advised to include such a statement in the absence of specific supporting evidence.
18. p21, –
Delete the last sentence in Bushfire Management. The sentence is "Consideration should be given ... surrounding hinterland." The message of that sentence is contained in the strategies and action that follow immediately.
19. p21, Objective 1.2, Action, dot point 4. –
We do not think that "Undertake periodical investigations into NSP-PLR and informal shelter options" is an adequate response. Rather the intent should be to provide a PLR or a shelter/refuge. The SCS has acknowledged how devastating a bushfire would be to this community. A more determined response is essential.
20. p22/23, Residential Development and Housing, first sentence in the last paragraph on p23 ends with "and / or social housing".
Delete this phrase. See reason for deletion below in item 21.
21. p24, Objective 2.1, Actions dot point 2. –
*The Action should become "Progress investigations into the options for higher density housing **for older persons** on the Council owned site at 2 Fraser Drive, Aireys Inlet". AIDA has been told in discussions with the Shire and the Office of Housing that social housing is better provided in the larger towns of Torquay and Winchelsea, and that it is unsuited to areas of low community service levels and poor public transport like Aireys Inlet to Eastern View.*
22. p24-26, Infrastructure. –
At various places in this section what the community has said it wants (Neighbourhood Character Study 2004, Citizen Juries, AIDA Community Survey 2015, etc) clashes with the policies of SCS Infrastructure. The majority of the community has said that they want unsealed roads and paths. The hierarchy of paths in the Shire's Pathway Strategy applies Shire-wide and specifies what the surface of the path will be – regardless of community desires. Furthermore "informal appearance" seems to be interpreted by SCS Infrastructure to be the use of a washed exposed aggregate concrete path surface rather than standard trowelled concrete paths, whereas the community's understanding of "informal appearance", as documented in the Neighbourhood Character Study and in numerous surveys of local opinions, is informal unsealed gravel roads and paths. In view

of this clash, how does the community get what it wants? Could the community's desire for the surface type for roads and paths be specified in the structure plan? How can we ensure that roads and footpaths are designed and constructed to achieve an appropriate informal appearance, with an emphasis on retaining vegetation within road verges and alternatives to concrete kerbing?

23. p28, Objective 3.1, Strategies, dot point 2 –
AIDA strongly encourages that the Community Hall/Recreation Reserve be seen and used as a community hub and encourage integration with the Primary School. In two other communities in Victoria, the school has been constructed or modified to allow it to be used as a community refuge from bushfires. This outcome in Aireys Inlet would be a most appropriate development.
24. p34, Objective 3.4 “Lobby VicRoads to consider introducing a permanent 50 km/h speed limit on the Great Ocean Road...”. –
*Rather than “permanent” we suggest that consideration be given to a “**seasonal**” speed limit.*
25. p35, Commercial Activity. –
Was the floor area of the shops associated with the development nearing completion at 2/42 Great Ocean Rd (behind the general store) included in the floor space recorded here and used in the assessment of future need? And what about the floor space of the restaurant, art gallery, hotel, Willows Café and medical centre? Despite them not been located in designated commercial areas, they are commercial enterprises.
26. p43, 5.2 Ongoing Actions and Advocacy. –
We do not consider advocacy for improved telecommunications services to be an adequate response. Until the telecommunications black spot problem is overcome, we feel that it would be appropriate for a temporary telecommunications facility to be obtained at least for each bushfire season. A notional costing should be included under item 5.1 of the Structure Plan.
27. *If certain of the above points are accepted, they will have implications for what has been included elsewhere in the Structure Plan document.*
28. *There are a number of references to acid sulphate soils in the district. However, while AIDA is aware that some acid sulphate soils exist in the Painkalac valley, we are unaware of these soils having been fully mapped. If they have not been mapped, we request that mapping be done and once mapped that an appropriate overlay be developed. These requests should be included as an objective in the Structure Plan.*

B. Aireys Inlet Top Shops and Bottom Shops Urban Design Framework – July 2015

AIDA has a number of concerns about the Urban Design Framework and trusts that the document on exhibition is a draft only and that our comments /suggestions will be incorporated or influence the final version of this document.

Note that AIDA's responses in sections B & C are in italics and specific proposed changes are in red ink.

P3 – last paragraph - The Top and Bottom Shops.....with emphasis on low rise buildings (2 stories, active frontages “to the creek and Great Ocean Road” and well defined pedestrian areas and connections. –

We suggest that this quoted phrase above be inserted.

P5 - Top Shops Existing Character – “... lack of a recognizable, cohesive and consistent theme.”

Isn't that what we wanted and asked for and got in the 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines? Why is it noted here?

P5 - New development of townhouses with offices behind the Store, “opposed by Surf Coast Shire and local residents”, may be setting a precedent for more intensive development in the centre.

We suggest that this quoted phrase above be inserted.

P5 - Signage is a mix of directional and commercial, which could benefit from consolidation; this is an opportunity for artistic elements to be introduced to enhance the image of the area. –

It is assumed that this suggestion relates to public signage only, rather than commercial signs. AIDA is opposed to the idea of introducing “artistic” signage to “enhance the image of the area”. The proliferation of signage, particularly inessential, over-large or self-conscious signage, is strongly opposed in the local community. The local character objective is to retain a low key and informal appearance. The prevailing opinion would be that recessive, low scale signage enhances the image of the area.

P6 - Potential Development Pattern - “... smaller residential units over commercial buildings; this would suit down-sizing retirees and also young families”. –

Aren't these the very people who should not have to negotiate upper stories? Most – probably all – local commercial buildings have top floor access only via stairs.

P6 - Potential Development Pattern –

What is a moderate amount of two-storey development? Has the need for additional office space been established?

P6 - Community Plaza at the Top Shops–

AIDA does not support this development. It is an unnecessary urbanization.

P7 - Opportunity to improve links between the Pharmacy and the Medical Centre (currently on opposite sides of the Great Ocean Road) – provide better pedestrian crossing –

AIDA is not convinced of the need for this crossing, nor of the feasibility of implementation given the locations of the bus stops and the traffic constraints of moving the existing crossing nearer to Albert Avenue.

P7 - Constraint: Existing car park with granitic sand finish, timber bollards & ropes.

Opportunity: Consider using multi-tier raised edge kerb to work with traffic and drainage requirements. Coastal plants selection to provide softening to car park while maintaining view lines to shops and for safety. –

We do not know what a multi-tier raised edge kerb is and hence it is not possible to comment? Further consultation regarding this with the community is essential.

P7 - Improve all abilities access to (northern) bus stop. –

Is this a V/Line responsibility?

P7 - Potential to make this (the north verge of Great Ocean Road opposite) informal parking area formalised. –

AIDA considers this proposal to be dangerous and unnecessary but, if done, should accommodate parallel parking only, and then only seasonally.

P8 - Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 2 –

The community does not see 89 GOR as a “landmark” development – quite the contrary. Please delete that descriptor. Also, surely the development of this commercial space has no place in the UDF.

P8 - Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 6. –

AIDA welcomes the suggestion for a GOR pedestrian crossing between the Bottom Shops and the Recreation Reserve. It is already listed on the Pathways Strategy as one of the four accepted proposals for Aireys Inlet and this might enable it to be implemented earlier.

P8 - Bottom Shops, Existing Character, para 7 –

AIDA welcomes the proposal to distinguish private land at 83 & 85 GOR from public land that includes both the lane (formerly Painkalac Lane) and the creek interface. We note the proposal to colour code the pedestrian pathway across and down Painkalac Lane. However we do not see the need for a wavy line being used here. Activation of the interface with the creek has long been an AIDA objective, as has distinguishing private from public land in this area. Both are strongly supported.

P.8 - Planting/landscaping - Appropriate sculptural elements here could include: a surfer holding their board, people perched on a rock, a mermaid. –

The preferred and approved character of Aireys Inlet is low-key and informal. In this suggestion there appear to have been no lessons learned from previous proposals, vigorously opposed by the community, for grandiose sculpture in key public places in Aireys Inlet. AIDA strongly recommends deleting this proposal.

P9 - Bottom Shops, Laneway – Bottom Shops, para 4 –

AIDA supports the aim of making it clear that the lane is a public right of way. It would clarify this intention if this is qualified as a “pedestrian” public right of way.

We suggest that the quoted word above be inserted here.

AIDA believes that the tranquil natural view across the creek at this point, framed by trees on either side, is the strength of this location and therefore should be retained as the focus. A pavilion in this location would tend to block the view to the creek from along the laneway and is therefore not supported, but a simple BBQ area on the creek bank at the end of the laneway might act to draw people in, providing a nucleus for creek-side activity.

P10 - Bottom Shops –

The notation between the creek and the back of 89 and 85 GOR is “potential for activation facing river”. AIDA recommends that the remainder of the River Reserve Road frontage be also included in this recommendation. The whole frontage has great potential for activation.

- P10 - Bottom Shops - Constraint: insufficient car parking near the landmark building. –
89 Great Ocean Road should not be referred to as a landmark building. The demand for car parking in this specific location was created by a particular highly popular shop tenancy in the past, but there is no intrinsic need for additional parking in this location.
Opportunity: provide linear parking for visitors along (the north side curve of) the Great Ocean Road. –
Parking was once allowed in this location but was later disallowed by the SCS and VicRoads because of many near missed collisions it caused. AIDA believes that this is too hazardous to try again.
- P10 - Bottom Shops - (At the entrance into Inlet Crescent West)
Constraint: Left turn (from the Great Ocean Road, travelling west) into (Inlet Crescent West to access the Aireys Inlet Reserve) car park is narrow
Opportunity: Expand the roadway for left turn. Provide additional parking (as per the Traffic Management Plan). –
If the reference here is to the 2010 Morgan Traffic Management Plan, this was part of complex negotiated local traffic considerations at that time but was itself not adopted by Council. After substantial recent traffic improvements in this area, AIDA believes that the entrance to both Inlet Crescent West from the GOR and into the Aireys Inlet Reserve car park are perfectly adequate as they exist and there is no need for this proposal.
- P10 - Bottom Shops - (Pointing to 77 Great Ocean Road, but possibly applying to the whole commercial zone) “Future re-development sites; opportunities for mixed use development with car parking.” –
AIDA endorses this note on the basis that the Council-adopted 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines should be applied throughout this zone.
- P10 - Bottom Shops - Public parking (at rear of 83 to 87 Great Ocean Road) – to be retained. –
AIDA strongly opposes this proposal which is contrary to Council’s 2011 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines, which provide for the pedestrianisation of the creek-side land and the associated unmade River Reserve Road road reserve, except for emergency vehicles. The current vehicular usage pattern in this area establishes it as merely a car park and roadway for abutting properties and is incompatible with the creek-side Public Conservation and Resource Zone (PCRZ), the 2011 Commercial Areas Design Guidelines and also the Structure Plan’s proposal for a pedestrian pathway running along the creek in this area.
- P10 - Constraint: path not well defined – it is not clear that there is access to the riverbank and path.
Opportunity: clear directional & interpretive signage to give indication of river pathway and nature area. –
This pathway is currently missing its original low key entry sign due to vandalism, but its replacement is all that is needed. The Aireys Inlet to Eastern View community is strongly opposed to the unnecessary proliferation of signage and it is important that where needed, signage remains low key. The GORCC signage along the cliff path is a good model for this.
The path itself is, and should remain, an informal gravel surface, which is quite adequate.

C. The Connections

P12 - *AIDA questions the value of the proposal to modify the existing path along Barton Court and also the service road as far as Kerrie Court. We see it as a waste of money that could be better spent elsewhere in our area.*

D. Bigger Ideas

P. 13 - A theme that Aireys Inlet could adopt to brand itself and give the town and both shopping centres an individual yet consistent image is most likely to relate specifically to Aireys Inlet's beautiful natural setting where the bush meets the ocean.

This would be a good topic for community workshops, involving all ages to develop a theme that can then translate into a consistent and planned approach for including artistic and characterful elements in; landscaping, street furniture, lighting, pavement material, signage, flag poles/banners, artwork, etc. –

The values and objectives underlying these suggestions are completely incompatible with the preferred local character and the underlying ethos of the Aireys Inlet to Eastern View community and therefore should be deleted from the document. These proposals appear to relate to the idea of "place management", prevalent in city suburbs, where establishing differentiation and identity between one suburb and the next is seen as important – but the unique natural environment and special visual character of Aireys Inlet to Eastern View, coupled with its relaxed and modest development style are what defines it, rather than any self-conscious local image management.