



Submission at the Vision & Principles Phase of the 2015 Aireys Inlet to Eastern View Structure Plan

Over its history AIDA has taken a strong interest and position in all planning matters which affect the Aireys Inlet to Eastern View district, as this is the main reason AIDA was formed by local residents and property owners 50 years ago. AIDA made substantial contributions to the text and supporting data of the original 1993 Structure Plan. We appreciate the opportunity now being afforded by the Shire to contribute to the current review of the 2015 Structure Plan by commenting on the Vision & Principles and Phase 1 documents.

Taken overall, there is much to endorse in the current documentation, which by and large we are pleased to see supports many of our members' views and AIDA's policies. It would be difficult and possibly tiresome here to explicitly endorse all of these major agreed points and therefore they are generally enthusiastically endorsed unless otherwise noted.

It is the nature of this type of submission that we need to point out all of what we see as the problematic or weaker areas, and we trust that this submission will not appear too negative as that is not intended. Since the Structure Plan will be a long term document, our aim is to assist in ensuring that its meaning and intent will in all cases be clear to future users who were not involved in its preparation.

There are several areas in the documents where either incomplete, unrepresentative, tangential or contradictory observations are made. Also, in some other cases there are assertions made and/or conclusions drawn which don't appear to be based on evidence or, in some cases on Council position or policy.

In some areas, hard-won planning principles enjoying wide support have been neglected or forgotten while in others, unresolved, minority or contentious positions appear to be endorsed. In many cases it is far from clear how some important values or outcomes being supported could practically be implemented.

This submission discusses these points under generic headings, and where relevant each point made is cross-referenced back to the appropriate document, page and paragraph in the documents.

Environment

Aireys Inlet to Eastern View has the highest value biodiversity and local environment of any settled area within the Shire. For this reason this single characteristic should have principal importance underpinning all aspects of local planning and development in the Structure Plan – to be protected and where possible enhanced. Virtually all aspects of local development, whether well meaning or intrusive, have over time impacted adversely on the local environment, and this is the principle planning challenge to our area. AIDA continually sees adverse and irreversible impacts of both private developments overstepping control objectives and of infrastructure initiatives which do not recognise the special local objectives, circumstances and challenges. Preventing ongoing gradual degradation of the local environment will require more focused planning provisions, with suitable priority, so as to recognise and resist this process.

Local environmental value was factually identified at the 2005 panel hearing for the introduction of the Neighbourhood Character overlay, when the Department of Sustainability and Environment gave evidence that of all areas on the Shire's coastline Aireys Inlet's environment was of such importance that no township development would today be permitted there under current standards. Because of this, in the Department's view strict planning controls would be needed to prevent further compromise of local biodiversity and endangered species.

The environmental, and also the scenic value, have been overwhelmingly endorsed by the whole community in well-supported AIDA surveys conducted over the past 25 years, where 92% believe that the area should be conserved for its natural beauty and serenity as a retreat from the pressures of big city living and 90% to 94% support further marine, coastal, wetland, heathland and forest conservation.

The Painkalac Valley is not a community focus point as stated in the documentation in *The Natural Environment [p 4, Vision & Principles]* but is treasured locally for its undeveloped scenic environment providing natural vegetation and water, drawing kangaroos and other wildlife into the vistas between Fairhaven and Aireys Inlet. This is a reflective undisturbed space, rather than a community focus.

The 3rd dot-point [*p 4, Vision & Principles*] should be changed to "... between the townships and also the great Otway National Park" to support the long-standing objective of retaining environmental buffers between the four townships.

The last dot-point [*p 4, Vision & Principles*] should not conflate the environmental protection of the Painkalac Valley with local recreational needs as these are two separate ideas and in this context are conflicting principles.

Heritage

We are pleased to see the indigenous heritage value of the Painkalac valley recognised in the documents and believe it would be appropriate in the Structure Plan to identify the creek as the boundary of the Waddawurrung traditional lands, a fact which has particular resonance back to 1803 when William Buckley was adopted here by the local indigenous people. Also the undeveloped nature of the Painkalac valley, separating Aireys Inlet and Fairhaven as an undeveloped estuarine environment is valued strongly and vocally, by 75% of the local community, which has fought successfully for its preservation from the 1960s to the present as an important local environment which should never be developed.

There should be explicit mention of the Split Point Lighthouse, together with the protection of its scale and prominence and the views to and from it, as the main visual heritage symbol of the area.

Character

AIDA endorses the first paragraph under *Coastal Village Character [p 5, Vision & Principles]* but as described under Environment above, "low-key development and informal infrastructure" will require stronger and more consistent planning provisions and more appropriate local infrastructure standards than those at present if this is to be achieved.

Over 85% of the local community have identified the need for "improvements in the conservation of the natural environment within the residential township areas" consistently over the past 25 years – both before and after the introduction of local neighbourhood character provisions, and 57% believe the environmental protection aspects of local character need strengthening. At the same time, an increasing proportion, now standing at 91%, believe there is a need for "improvements in the siting and design controls that aim to improve the visual and environmental impacts of future development".

The second paragraph [p 5, *Vision & Principles*] correctly identifies freedom from large-scale developments and urban looking infrastructure, and also the nestling of buildings within the trees and below ridgelines. These are all issues which AIDA has had extensive experience supporting over many years but they are now an increasing challenge as the desirable limitation of local township size means that more dollars are chasing the very attractive but limited local development opportunities, leading to larger and more elaborate proposals and influential development interests.

As local character has already, and is increasingly, being compromised by development (e.g. sub-standard set-backs are commonly accepted) and infrastructure inappropriate to the area (e.g. 74% of the community favours unsealed local streets, as adopted as part of local neighbourhood character, while contrary to this an additional 26% of local streets have been sealed since 2000, most of these, sadly, since Council's neighbourhood character objectives were adopted). Enhancement of degraded environment and character is an objective in the Planning Scheme and may need to be increasingly relied on.

It would be stronger and more focussed if the 4th dot-point [p 5, *Vision & Principles*] was revised to "Retain **and enhance** the **existing** low-key, informal character ...". While the photographs of streets on this page accurately illustrate the adopted local street character as indicated above, less than half of local streets now remain in gravel and retain this character.

People and Housing

The demographics of Aireys Inlet to Eastern View are very untypical of the Shire generally and the rest of the State, having distinctive characteristics which, while to an extent shared with Lorne, require further examination if planning is to be successful. These are generally well described [pp 6-8, *Background Report Summary*] but additional key and unusual factors could be further highlighted or clarified as challenges for planning, e.g.:

- the population and dwelling statistics [p 6, *Background Report Summary*] show that the resident population at the 2011 census was only 376. This is a small base for planning over the bulk of the year for typical permanent resident needs, with 75% of dwellings vacant and an average household of 2.8 in those occupied. But the holiday population of over 8,000, with an overall average household of over 5.3, has a very different profile of planning needs and impacts compared with those of the permanent residents.
- the text [p 7, *Background Report Summary*] gives a population loss of 68 permanent residents between 2006 and 2011 but the chart shows a loss of 115, or approximately 20 per year when the statistical boundary change is taken into account. This decline appears to be potentially very significant after 25 years of steady population growth averaging 33 permanent residents per year. The Structure Plan process should provide for planning contingencies pending clarification of the significance of this change.

The *Snapshot* [p 8, *Background Report Summary*] makes two important assertions which aren't supported by the facts or evidence:

- Under *Community and Recreation*, the statement is made that "Areas for active and social recreation are limited". It isn't clear what "social recreation" means here, but the earlier reference to the "primary school, multi-purpose community hall, tennis courts, ... community garden, surf lifesaving club, skate park and three playgrounds" seem to bely this conclusion. The reference to "active recreation" AIDA believes, would better be changed to "Local areas for organized team games are limited but are conveniently accessed in nearby towns".
- Under *Economy*, the statement that "A small supermarket would reduce escape spending" fails to take into account that the economy of the Shire's small coastal townships cannot and should not be seen as being self-sustaining. This mistaken viewpoint was thoroughly aired and explored during the enormously unpopular and unsuccessful 2011 application for a supermarket at the Bottom Shops, which the

developers admitted would not be viable if it was smaller, but which would have robbed the existing Aireys Inlet General Store and the IGA Anglesea supermarket of their own viability. The recently closed produce store at the bottom shops was very popular and valuable to the townships, but could not be compared in any sense to a “small supermarket”, filling a different niche, but which was itself unfortunately presumably unviable.

There is a creative character in the district – art, craft, sculpture, writing and music – which should be recognised under *Living Towns* [p 6, *Vision & Principles*]. It would be appropriate to change the 2nd sentence to: “... close, diverse friendly **and creative**, with adequate facilities ...”. The use of “commercialised” in the 2nd sentence isn’t correct as there are clearly many popular local commercial activities– yet the word is used here in a pejorative sense. Maybe it should be replaced as: “... basic yet well serviced ~~and not commercialised~~, **supported by small local businesses**.”

The 2nd paragraph [p 6, *Vision & Principles*] would be better targeted if changed to “A range of housing types, sensitively designed and suitably located supports a ~~range~~ **variety** of ages and abilities, and provides housing ~~within a range of~~ **for different** budgets.”

The 2nd dot-point [p 6, *Vision & Principles*] fails to recognise that Aireys Inlet to Eastern View already has by a considerable margin, more public open space per person than any other part of the Shire. This open space is well used by the community and visitors in a variety of ways, but very commonly for walking. As it is, this point creates the impression that yet more open space is required, and that open space improvements are needed, but this isn’t clarified, except for the discussion of a possible sports oval in the Phase 1 documents.

Two references to “Fraser Street” [p 11, *Background Report Summary*] should be changed to “Fraser Drive”.

76% of the community supports the proposals for an older persons’ housing development in Fraser Drive. AIDA was the initial proponent for an older persons’ housing development on this site, made major inputs to the early planning after being appointed as Council’s project facilitator in 2003, and strongly supports the proposal. AIDA commissioned the original needs analysis, architectural designs and development financial model for the project, funded by Council, and has undertaken extensive implementation planning work on the project. At all times a community garden has been seen as a part of the development – although, pending finalisation of the project design, not in the current location on the site. The reference to the need for further investigation of this [p 11, *Background Report Summary*] should be removed, at least regarding the mooted relocation of the community garden to another part of the district. The recent uncertainty and community disquiet surrounding the suggested relocation seems to have been mistakenly caused by a Council officer who was unfamiliar with the project background.

Tourism, Activity and Commercial Areas

What is an “authentic” experience as in the 1st paragraph of *Local Economy and Tourism* [p 7, *Vision & Principles*]? What would an unauthentic experience be, and how is the distinction able to be addressed in planning terms? It would appear better to replace “authentic” with “local”.

The word “vibrant” is used in the documents [pp 4, 6, 7 & 8, *Vision & Principles* and p 41 & 16, *Background Report and Summary*] to describe local communities, retail opportunities and activity centres but while often used in urban planning at present it is quite inappropriate here, creating a misleadingly bright and energetic impression of the local community and character instead of its actual low key and recessive nature. The characterisation of local communities as “small but vibrant” [p 6, *Vision & Principles*] would be better stated as “small, slow-paced and peaceful” as in the 1st paragraph [p 7, *Vision &*

Principles] which is much more appropriate when it refers to “the slower pace of life within a peaceful environment of natural beauty and serenity”. That is the real Aireys Inlet to Eastern View. In the 2nd paragraph of this section the meaning would be more accurate and clear if the word “vibrant” was replaced by “versatile”.

The planning objectives underlying the 1st dot-point [*p 7, Vision & Principles*] are understood, and form part of the Planning Scheme, but this principle presents problems as there are many non-conforming land uses along the Great Ocean Road between the two commercial zones which are of high importance to the township and area. It isn't clear that it would be practical or desirable to depend on the “natural” relocation by market forces of these uses within the commercial zones in the future. These include the hotel, which is a key social focus within Aireys Inlet – one of the community's traditional hearts – and would be unlikely to be able to be re-established within a commercial zone if it were to close where it is. This closure almost occurred recently and was only able to be rescued in place by local subscription.

Other similar activities include the community's only high-end restaurant, the motel and the medical centre. It is not clear whether the commercial zone capacity study conducted by Council around 2006 examined whether the land capacity exists within the existing zones to accommodate these businesses in their present form in addition to other natural growth in demand for commercial land.

Some planning documentation – and it is suggested here that the Structure Plan might be appropriate – should recognise the high value of these existing businesses to the community even though they are non-conforming commercial land uses. Possibly this 1st Principal could have the following text added: “while supporting existing non-conforming land uses such as the hotel, motel and restaurant until they are able to be re-located within a commercial zone”.

It may be appropriate to recognise that in managing visitor demand at the Memorial Archway as in the fourth dot-point [*p 7, Vision & Principles*] the land in question is the responsibility of VicRoads and GORCC and at Step Beach, Split Point Lighthouse parking is the responsibility of GORCC.

AIDA endorses “improved pedestrian connections with the creek reserve and across the Great Ocean Road to the playground” in the 1st paragraph under *Activating the Shopping Centres* [*p 13, Background Report Summary*]. And would like to see this objective strengthened along the following lines:

- There was good community support for these principles, linking the diverse pathways of south of the Great Ocean Road with the newer paths to the north, and particularly establishing an attractive and safe pedestrian connection from the frontage of the Bottom Shops via the laneway running between 83 and 85 Great Ocean Road to the pathway running in either direction along the southern bank of the Painkalac Creek.
- This pathway was singled out for mention in the 1993 Structure Plan and is of key strategic importance to the overall pedestrian network. AIDA recommends that it be given similar clear priority in the 2015 Structure Plan.
- In addition, and in support of the attractiveness and safety of the pathways around the Bottom Shops, the 2009 Commercial Areas Urban Design Guidelines, which were endorsed by community, shop owners and Council, set an objective of encouraging active pedestrian frontages along both the laneway and the Painkalac Creek path alignments of the commercial zone. In this way a pleasant zone of cafes etc. along the creek path would be encouraged in this area, providing a relaxed and shaded north-facing aspect across the creek to the valley and a new meeting place for the community and for visitors.

The reference to “signage that identifies the centres” in this paragraph and subsequently, will not be supported by the community. AIDA believes that place management in our low-

key informal coastal setting is superfluous and the proliferation of signage by the Shire and other agencies in the district is opposed by 75% of the community. The breadth of this opposition extends well beyond AIDA's polite membership and we note that when a low-key "Bottom Shops" sign was erected following the 2005 Pride of Place project it was removed by vandals within 24 hours, never to be replaced.

Recreation

- *Walking & Cycling*

Walking, and also cycling, are far and away the most popular and demanded recreation activities in the district. This is an important and singular preference, the scale of which distinguishes these townships from communities elsewhere in the state and therefore should be better recognised in the documents. The Background Reports only refer to walking in general planning terms, which would be equally applicable to any town or suburb anywhere, and the Vision & Principles draft does not mention walking at all – but walking and the local demand and love of walking are central to the reality of living in and visiting Aireys Inlet.

The Shire's 2007 Recreation Infrastructure Strategy surveyed all recreation types and identified walking as the most popular, with 81% participating across all age groups in summer and 74% in winter. Organised recreation ranked at less than a third of this level. AIDA's community opinion surveys support this, showing additional walking tracks as the most favoured recreation development by 88% of respondents, and bicycle tracks by 72%, consistently over the past 25 years. These very high levels of participation and support for walking and cycling compared to the Shire overall, and elsewhere in the State, should be noted in the first paragraph of the discussion [p 12, *Background Report Summary*].

Due to the breadth of age groups participating and wanting to participate, walking and cycling provide the best opportunities for planning to support community fitness as well as interaction and cohesiveness, for both locals and visitors. AIDA believes, and has advocated for some years that Aireys Inlet to Eastern View should be identified as a "walking destination" with local infrastructure as well as retail and tourism branding encouraged to support this. However the Vision & Principles document fails to mention walking as a central characteristic of the present and future of Aireys Inlet to Eastern View.

- *Sporting Oval*

The lack of viable local demand levels for an oval in Aireys Inlet for any team games, as mentioned at the foot of the page [p 12, *Background Report Summary*], should be added to the second paragraph or the text tends to be misleading. Similarly, the fact that the sports ovals in Lorne and Anglesea are already underutilised and subsidised by Council needs to be recognised and added in the last paragraph on the page.

The 2nd paragraph [p 13, *Background Report Summary*] contains many misleading statements and errors and requires revision regarding:

- The context of a "preferred site" for an oval is misleading. It should be made clear that this was the recommendation of a past Council report which could not be implemented. The feasibility of this proposition in environmental terms appears very dubious and has not been assessed or tested. Its economic feasibility appears similarly implausible. 76% of the community is opposed to the introduction of public facilities in the Painkalac Valley and AIDA is also strongly opposed. As at several times in the past, there would almost certainly be bitter community opposition to any explicit proposal to construct an oval in the Painkalac Valley. While there is a consistent minority view that Aireys Inlet requires an oval, local demography dictates that this will never be a majority view, and regardless, there is simply no wish for development of any significant nature in the Painkalac Valley.

- The claim that “an open space reserve however could integrate with and restore the environmental values, particularly in the areas of re-vegetation and improvement of water quality” is inaccurate, misleading and irresponsible in a public planning document.
- The idea that such an oval could also be used for “a community gathering space for a number of activities other than sport, such as passive and social recreation including walking, events and unstructured play” is not based on any evidence of demand for these activities in this location and has the feel of a “thought bubble”. Unstructured play occurs in the existing play grounds, generous reserves and the exciting pathways of the foreshore. In a beautiful rural setting such as this district no-one will visit a local sports oval to walk, or for passive recreation, when there are scenic pathways, seating and shade throughout the much loved natural environment closer at hand and in the National Park.
- The idea that such a development could be “low-key and compatible with the surrounding environment and landscape values” and the consultant view expressed at the community consultation that the oval improvements could be “nestled into the ground” is implausible and impractical on such a flood plain. The intrusion of lighting and aerial structures in views across the valley and the impracticability of resisting future demands for further development and increased car parking in such a sensitive area have not been addressed.

The 4th paragraph [p 13, *Background Report Summary*] would provide a less subjective and more accurate meaning if changed to “...Significant further design work and investigations ~~is~~ would be required to ~~develop~~ determine whether a workable solution is possible, including flood and water quality modelling, a detailed flora and fauna survey, toxic soil analysis and cultural heritage assessment of the area, and the land would need to be compulsorily purchased”. A capital cost as low as the stated \$1.9 million seems very unlikely and its source here should be referenced, while the ongoing costs of such an oval, buildings, lighting, car access and parking are likely to be of more significance but are unstated.

Nowhere in the *Background Report Summary* or the *Vision & Principles* is there adequate acknowledgement that there has been a lot of consultation and investigation of options for the location of an oval over the years in a succession of initiatives. There is simply no location acceptable to the community in general for a full-scale oval.

Transport and Roads

- *Sustainability*

AIDA agrees in the 3rd paragraph under *Transport, Access and Traffic* [p 14, *Background Report Summary*] that walking, cycling and public transport should ideally be the first choice for short trips. The objective here for walking and cycling would appear to be dependant on sensible linkages and routes within the network rather than any more “formal” pathways with “well maintained pavements” as stated.

There is no problem with the amount of walking being undertaken. In Council’s 2007 Recreation Infrastructure Strategy an extraordinary 81% of people walk as their main recreation and 17% enjoy road cycling (strangely the study did not measure off-road cycling). But AIDA’s recent community survey showed that 89% want additional walking trails and 65% more bicycle tracks. These figures may indicate that the walking network has incomplete internal linkages to reach its full potential and that much more attention is needed to off-road cycling.

Separate agencies – the Shire, GORCC, Parks Victoria and VicRoads – tend to focus on their own areas and networks, while it should be a planning objective to link these pathway networks together. This is often a problem for agencies employing inconsistent approaches and infrastructure standards.

- *Character*

It should be noted there is considerable opposition in the community to formal or paved pathways. The low-key character of the townships strongly favours gravel or even simple grass pathways and this should be reflected in the Structure Plan. The remorseless accretion of formal infrastructure, often gratuitous, is deeply unpopular and these values and objectives are unambiguously supported by the local character objectives of both the Planning Scheme and the Victorian Coastal Strategy. Problematically, the Shire Infrastructure Department culture is at odds with these objectives, citing the maintenance and accessibility objectives of concrete, GORCC provides an extensive and well-constructed gravel pathway network which is widely enjoyed, accessible and safe. While discreet lighting is mentioned for safety this would be a new infrastructure intrusion, possibly requiring overhead or underground cabling and would require careful design and minimisation of potential intrusion to conform with the district's environmental protection, low-key development and night sky objectives.

There is strong support from 74% of the community for the retention of unsealed gravel residential streets, and this aligns with the adopted Aireys Inlet to Eastern View neighbourhood character. However some residents oppose this policy, either because of local street maintenance failings or simply because they prefer a more conventionally suburban appearance.

However despite the popularity of the Shire's street character objective for the district under the Planning Scheme the Shire has at the same time pursued an active program of support for sealing local streets. As already stated, since 2000, when only 25% of local gravel streets were sealed, now more than half are bituminised, progressively transforming the desired and agreed character of the townships.

The statement [*para 4, p 15, Background Report Summary*] that "the sealing of Pearse Road has been hailed as a success" appears misinformed and a misleading case of special pleading since a larger roads and drainage scheme in this precinct was very strongly and successfully opposed by local property owners prior to the approval of the smaller Pearse Road scheme. There was also widespread resident opposition to the roads and drainage scheme in Fairhaven in 2007, and in Precinct 1 in Aireys Inlet road sealing as proposed by the Shire was rejected by a Council Citizens' Jury in 2008.

- *Shared Use*

There are different categories of pathway users, and different pathway strategies will be needed for some of these. It seems that a user-oriented path type hierarchy, rather than a path construction-type hierarchy as at present under the Pathways Strategy, will increasingly be needed in the district, particularly due to the aging population. A system of inter-linked user routes variously suited to walking, jogging, cycling, prams and mobility buggies – and to combinations of these, should be considered.

The community favours the relaxed beach tradition of pedestrians sharing the local streets with vehicles rather than providing separate roadside footpaths as in a conventional suburban setting. This year 73% expressed their support for pedestrians continuing to share local streets with vehicles. An appropriate planning response to this may be the introduction of Shared Zone traffic controls in residential streets. The existing gravel streets are seen as facilitating the safety of this arrangement by reducing vehicle speeds and at the same time providing warning from tyre noise on gravel of approaching traffic. In association with this preference 93% support the retention of naturally vegetated residential roadsides.

- *Tourist Traffic*

Paragraphs 2 and 3 [*p 15, Background Report Summary*] describe the successful management of the long term problem of disruptive tourist traffic including large buses and other long vehicles in the Lighthouse Precinct. The Step Beach car park is the

responsibility of GORCC but this is not made clear in the report. While Council did not support GORCC's 2012 proposal for the Step Beach car park this was largely because it was proposed that the car park be sealed rather than gravelled. The Shire and AIDA both support a gravel car park in this location which protects vegetation, is limited to 24 spaces, has no long vehicle parking and does not exit to Eagle Rock Parade. This may now also be preferred by GORCC.

Fire Risk and Safety

It is overly optimistic, misleading and possibly dangerous to state that "residents have successfully managed to balance bushfire risk with preservation of the landscape character and natural environment" [p 4, *Vision & Principles*] as while this is the objective, no one locally believes that it has as yet been, or may ever be achieved, and most local fire plans provide for pre-emptive evacuation. In recent years AIDA has moved its well-attended annual general meetings from the long-term tradition of early January, to Easter, because of the increasingly unacceptable risk of bringing people to Aireys Inlet on days rated Extreme or Code Red. Nevertheless the 2nd dot-point principle is appropriate.

It should be recognised in the Structure Plan that the existing Neighbourhood Safer Place at the Bottom Shops has problems and that alternatives are urgently needed. Little action is currently taking place regarding the resolution of this problem and it seems that the Structure Plan might be an appropriate place to signal the urgency and apply some resolve to plan for two better situated and designed Neighbourhood Safer Places. Mention should be made of the potential of the Fairhaven Surf Life Saving Club building and the Community Hall for this purpose and the need to examine these and any other potentially viable options.

The Structure Plan should canvass the high risks posed and either:

- the associated planning responses, or
 - the means of determining the appropriate planning responses,
- to the potential disconnection of reticulated power under existing bushfire power distribution protocols, and also the consequent risk of a broadband outage, or alternatively the independent risk of broadband bandwidth overload, all in the event of a serious bush fire event.

The Structure Plan should record the capacity of the Great Ocean Road for vehicle movements on Extreme and Code Red days and during emergency evacuation at the time of a bush fire emergency together with the summer township population numbers in the Aireys Inlet district, Lorne and Anglesea.

During the past summer numbers of day visitors added to local fire risk by arriving to visit Aireys Inlet and picnic in the Great Otway National Park during extreme fire days. Concern should be voiced that the State Government's emphasis on public education has not worked to date and mention should be made of the potential desirability of restricting numbers entering our area on Extreme and Code Red days and the need for changes in police authority needed to facilitate this.

AIDA agrees that "the risk of fire puts a critical limit on the amount and location of development" within the Aireys Inlet to Eastern View district.

Planning for the Future

The following changes are suggested to clarify the meaning and scope of Planning for the Future [pp 16-17, *Background Report Summary*]:

- *Protection of the natural environment*, last dot-point:
"Supporting the social and recreational needs of current and future generations" is not logically or necessarily connected with "protecting and enhancing the open, natural character of the Painkalac Creek Valley". These are separate ideas and objectives which

are not necessarily linked, except in one possible outcome. Only the protection objective should be shown under this heading.

- *Economic development and tourism*,
 - 1st dot-point:
"Vibrant" should be replaced with, e.g. "versatile" as discussed above.
 - 2nd dot-point:
Revise to "Improve the quality of the **pedestrian access to and the** pedestrian environment ...".
 - 4th dot-point:
Revise to "opportunities consistent with the **limited capacity of the Great Ocean Road and the** character of ...".
- *Community and recreation*,
 - 1st dot-point:
Revise to "... the provision of quality **increased walking routes, experiences**, accessible community services ...".
 - 2nd, dot-point
The need for new "quality sporting facilities" has not been established and should be qualified if it is used here.
- *Connectivity (Access and movement)*,
 - 1st dot-point:
Add "**and linking with the foreshore, creek valley and hinterland**".
 - 3rd, dot-point:
Add "**more effectively and proactively than in the past**".
 - 4th, dot-point:
This is too general and does not adequately address a very fraught issue.
 - Last dot-point:
What is wrong with the existing signage between the two commercial precincts as implemented in 2005? Who is confused or disoriented by the signage as it is currently provided? Does way finding signage require specific improvement, and if so on what evidence and in what way?