

**MORNINGTON PENINSULA RATEPAYERS AND RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION  
INC.  
A0034245B  
PO Box 4087 Rosebud 3939**

The Manager  
Strategic Planning  
Mornington Peninsula Shire Council  
Private Bag 1000  
Rosebud Vic 3939

Dear Mr. Shedden,

**Re: Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme Amendment C52 and Permit  
Application CPO2/003. 611-613 Pt. Nepean Rd. McCrae**

The Mornington Peninsula Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc.  
wishes to object to the above named Planning Scheme Amendment and Permit  
Application on the following grounds:

1. The proposal to amend Design and Development Overlay 3 (DDO3) to Design and Development Overlay 1 (DDO1), to accommodate the investment opportunities of one developer does not provide any community benefits which could not be readily achieved by pursuing development opportunities within a current DDO1 township boundary, in line with appropriate Design and Development Overlays.
2. The proposal does not meet the broad objectives of *Melbourne 2030*, the *Victorian Coastal Strategy 2002*, nor the draft *Mornington Peninsula Mt. Eliza to Pt. Nepean Coast Action Plan 2021*. These visionary documents are intended to guide future planning and design decisions and are geared towards equitable sustainable access to and preservation of our landscape and lifestyle, especially in our unique coastal areas.
3. The presence of the large billboard sign 'For Sale' on the property during the public submission period has contributed to confusion in the community regarding the intentions of the Shire and the developer. 'For Sale' sends a clear message that the amendment and permit will be approved and the units will be available. Developer and purchaser interest, created by false advertising may have sought to influence Council's deliberations and the community to accept a *fait accompli*. It is noted that the sign was in place for several weeks, but has been recently removed possibly even creating a further assumption that the 'deal has been done'. In view of the expectation and confusion created in the community and the advantage created for the developer, I suggest that this amendment process be cancelled.
4. There have been several land slippages within this vicinity, involving the cliff face to the rear of the property, within recent years. Best practice in Planning and Design would dictate that intensive development in land slippage areas is unwise. This is reflected in the classification of DDO3 'Coast and Landscape' for the property. DDO3 objectives include being responsive to the environment landform, site conditions and character of coastal villages, hillsides and cliff top areas,

avoiding higher densities of development in areas subject to instability, erosion etc., proper regard for established streetscape. The proposed amendment ignores these objectives. Clearly, and sensibly, the intention for this section of land was for it to retain its DDO3 classification once the non-conforming right had expired.

5. Design and Development Overlay 3 was only included in the Mornington Peninsula Planning Scheme on 16 December 1999, at which time, *just over three years ago* DDO3 was considered the most appropriate classification for that site. The very steep, unstable topography immediately to the rear of 611-613 Pt. Nepean Rd, and indeed all properties between Anthony's Nose and the DDO3/DDO1 interface west of the properties under consideration, indicate that DDO3 was chosen specifically to suit the physical features of the site. Furthermore DDO3 will continue to be appropriate evermore, because these topographical features have been so for many millions of years, imposing real physical constraints to land capacity and safe habitation in the area.
6. The proposed development, and any further linear developments as is promoted and recommended by the developer, would most certainly be seen from the most public of all viewing points – Pt. Nepean Tourist Rd. which carries many thousands of cars per day. Further development of the area would also put increased pressure on the adjacent foreshore by overuse and vegetation removal for view enhancement, thus rendering further development more visually intrusive from the beach.
7. The proposed amendment and development, and its attendant consequences would not protect the individual character of McCrae and Dromana, it would contribute to a decline in the visual and lifestyle amenity for residents and day-trippers. It is unthinkable that in this world class unique coastal area, that this proposed amendment and development, unremarkable in every way, can be contemplated. A completely standard, unremarkable design is being offered to the community in return for our loss of privacy, amenity and lifestyle in our much-loved coastal area. If residents had wanted to live in a medium density setting they would have chosen to do so, not waited to have it imposed upon them because of the investment desires of ONE developer. Unfortunately, the investment desires of one investor may initiate the imposition of a development style, where high density dwellings cling to the coast as has occurred in other coastal locations around the world, to the vast detriment of those areas.
8. The community has provided considerable and careful input into the entire Planning Scheme, and its guiding documents such as the Victorian Coastal Strategy 2002, Melbourne 2030 and the current draft of the Coast Action Plan 2021. Objective reading of these documents provides sound advice against proceeding with this foolish proposed amendment.

Our Association therefore requests that Council does not proceed with this proposed planning Scheme Amendment and Planning Permit Application.  
Yours sincerely,

Dr. Carole Ford  
President

Mornington Peninsula Ratepayers and Residents Association Inc.

14<sup>th</sup> February 2003