

Attachment 2: Responses to the written submission received during public consultation.

<p>The summary of the written submissions is a collation of the key issues raised and are not reproduced verbatim.</p>	
<p>Submission 1. (A. Richards)</p>	<p>Overall Structure Plan Area</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. George Town and Low Head are intrinsically connected and well as two very different socio economic areas, each benefiting from relying on each other. Careful attention is required to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historical precinct preservation; • expansion of convenience retail businesses and human services to a level that serves both communities and nearby settlements; • recognition and enhancement of the unique recreational and tourism opportunities of the combined area. 2. The Structure Plan should look towards 2040 and beyond. 3. Requests to include neighbourhood precincts particularly east of Bellbuoy Beach. 4. Mandatory Environmental Effects Studies be conducted prior to approving developments and discarding public open space for enjoyment. Reinstatement of public open space to all areas containing indigenous vegetation. Retain She Oak Hill, the complex lagoon system at Low Head, Tamar riverbanks and beaches, Mount George. Supports reduced speed limit to reduce roadkill. 5. The original character of George Town and Low head should be preserved as much as possible. 	
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Structure Plan’s planning principles and recommended actions seek to facilitate use and development with the objective of achieving growth and a vibrant town centre in the Structure Plan Area. The natural, cultural, heritage and scenic attributes defining George Town and Low Head must balance the desired growth. The Structure Plan is not tourism-driven, but it will be beneficial to the visitor economy through careful management of future use and development, improved facilities and amenity of the Structure Plan Area. 2. The Structure Plan plans for twenty years. The intention is to review the Structure Plan at least every four years to adjust the planning principles and recommended actions, ensuring it remains responsive and the desired planning outcomes are reasonable. 3. The Structure Plan does not include the Bellbuoy Beach precinct as it is a coastal settlement removed from the urban area in the Structure Plan Area. The Structure Plan seeks to focus on infill and consolidation of serviced land. Take up of the serviced land area will remain priority until supply is diminished. The regular review of the Structure Plan aids will enable the land supply to be monitored. 4. Any proposal for use and development on land including natural values (priority vegetation, threatened flora or fauna) are likely trigger specialised site specific assessment. The Structure Plan seeks to protect the natural values in the Structure Plan Area. 5. See comment 1. above. 	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Minor changes to the Structure Plan have resulted to include reference to cultural and heritage values.</p>
<p>Submission 2 (A. Batt)</p>	<p>Pipeclay</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Footpaths and crossovers (pedestrian and vehicles) pose challenges for persons using a mobility scooter. 	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Footpaths require improvements to accommodate kids, scooters, mum with prams walking or cycling and are not forced to walk on the road. 3. Upgrade access with a foreshore path – South Street too Esplanade South/Yorke Cove. 4. The Strand and Tamar Street – waterfront reserve must be improved and eradicated from weeds and pests. Walkways to be sign posted. Sealed foreshore pathway by cyclists is not supported. 	
<p>Response</p> <p>The online survey responses and this submission note the footpath network's importance to all users regardless of their abilities. The recommended actions in Part 2 and Part 3 seek to build all abilities primary walking and cycling route in the Structure Plan Area. The recommended actions propose that a footpath plan be devised which specifically addresses.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	No change is proposed as the planning principles and the recommended actions seek to implement a walking and cycling route that provides for all users regardless of ability.
Submission 3 (B. Bowring)	Overall Structure Plan Area
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests that Council-owned land at top of Anne Street be formally returned to Aboriginal ownership and support a new 'takina centre' or George Town Aboriginal Cultural and Community Centre. Requests that the public land adjacent to the kanamaluka trail and George Town Conservation Area also be returned to Aboriginal Ownership. 2. Requests to increase the Structure Plan Area to include land east of the current Low Head residential area, possibly including the Bellbuoy Beach village. Increase the Urban Growth Boundary to include Lagoon Heights and Potato Hill/Bell Buoy South. Include a new alternate road to create a supporting link to develop the new areas as suggested as part of a Tam O'Shanter Drive. 3. The George Town Mountain Bike Village be acknowledged in the Structure Plan. 4. Supports the population target of 10,000 people with the lion share of growth accommodated through density intensification. 5. Supports the maintenance of transition areas. 6. Supports walkability and rideability in the Structure Plan Area. Consider partnering with State Government and other interested parties to implement a micro-public transport approach with the municipality as undertaken by the Huon Valley. 7. Activating and increasing density around secondary centres of Friend Street and Victoria Street is supported. 8. Supports improved linkages of Gerzalia Drive, White Street and Tamar Avenue. 	
<p>Response</p> <p>1. Determining the indigenous values and whether a George Town Aboriginal and Cultural Community Centre should be established at the top of Anne Street requires consultation with the Aboriginal community. While the importance of indigenous issues is not discounted, it is premature for its inclusion in the Structure Plan as it would not be culturally respectful. Based on comments received, an additional recommended action is proposed ensuring that future use and development considers indigenous issues.</p>	

2. The Structure Plan seeks the efficient use of land and is confined by the parameters of the established development pattern. The Structure Plan does not propose an outcome resulting in the further rezoning of land at Low Head.

Not all submissions made support for residential expansion at Low Head. There are opposing views expressed requesting that further subdivision is prohibited, and that farmland is protected.

If the take up of land accelerates over the next five years, a Structure Plan review may revisit the opportunity for new development. Currently, expansion is not warranted and would deviate away from the priority focus of the Structure Plan to intensify residential use on serviced land.

In the absence of any proposed expansion of residential development at Low Head, planning for the road network extension is unnecessary.

3. The RSL site is appropriately zoned and is not seeking any changes concerning the hub. It is premature to reference the RSL as the Mountain Bike hub as there are matters that require further investigations.
4. The comment is noted.
5. The Structure Plan review in time will reassess if the population growth remains an attainable target within the timeframe. The population target can be reviewed and adjusted as required.
6. The Structure Plan sets a framework which will allow consideration of transport diversification.
7. The comment is noted.
8. The Structure Plan will enable investigations that support improved linkages as referred to in the submission. These streets were also referenced in the online survey.

Structure Plan Change	Insert additional recommended action to require consideration of Aboriginal cultural issues in any rezoning of land or any other proposal undertaken by the Council.
Submission 4 (B. Walsh)	Low Head

1. Requests that Council commission studies like those commissioned for the first iteration of the Hillwood Structure Plan 2016.
2. Queries the Structure Plan's consistency with the Tasmanian Planning Scheme.
3. Requests that the population statistics in the Structure Plan are reviewed once the Australian Bureau of Statistics completes and releases the data associated with 2021 Census. 4% growth rate stated for Low Head is not realistic or reasonable. The submission requests clarification over the growth rate for Low Head.
4. It is noted that the Structure Plan Area does not align with the George Town Planning Scheme Overlay Maps. Requests the boundary to be amended to match the LGA and Planning Code Overlays.
5. Queries if a study of Aboriginal use and reconnection has been commissioned.
6. Several mapping inconsistencies identified. The Ruin Paddock is referred to in the submission noting that it is zoned General Residential and also shown to be on land containing priority vegetation.

7. The Low Head Neighbourhood is not clearly defined, and a character statement should be provided. Submission notes that an 800m catchment is not possible for the Low Head Neighbourhood.
8. Editorials noted.
9. The submission queries the purpose of seeking a population of 10,000. Further demand and supply analysis is required. The purpose of the Structure Plan is to be agile and responsive and plan for potential growth. The rate of growth should be reviewed at regular intervals.
10. The submission is of the view that the Structure Plan is trying to impose an Urban Growth Boundary by stealth.
11. The submission is confused by the Zone Map as it is not reflective of the George Town Draft Local Provisions Schedule.
12. Remove references to open space in the Structure Plan that are on private land.
13. Notes that the State Planning Provisions in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme and implementation of the exemptions in the Interim Planning Scheme are removing controls for use and development.
14. Public open space shown on the Open Space map has recently been offered for sale.
15. Inconsistencies with mapping in the Structure Plan when compared to previous zoning plans dating back to the 1960s. The submission notes that there is an increase in the land area zoned Environmental Management.
16. Interface Area – Submission queries why references to Agriculture?
17. Requests that a new access between North Street to East Beach is investigated to improve road user safety.
18. Comments concerning Low Head, some wording changes recommended.

Response

1. The recommended actions throughout the Structure Plan will require further analysis and review as information and data is collected. In many instances, especially for any rezoning of land, further studies will be commissioned. Local heritage studies have not been commissioned. It is not mandatory to include local heritage places in the George Town Draft Local Provisions Schedule.
2. The Structure Plan and recommended actions will not result in any immediate changes to the planning scheme, and it will not impede the Council from continuing with the George Town Draft Local Provisions Schedule forming part of the Tasmanian Planning Scheme. The Ministerial Planning Directives referred to in the submission will not be impacted by the Structure Plan. The recommended actions in the Structure Plan seek to introduce specific use and development controls in the planning scheme to improve Council's ability to achieve planning outcomes desired for its local area. Any changes proposed to the planning scheme will be tested against the requirements of the Land Use Planning and Approvals act 1993.
3. Population growth will be minimal at Low Head. There is no intention for the Structure Plan to drive a growth rate of 4% per annum at Low Head. George Town will absorb most of the population growth. There are no recommendations to increase the land area zoned General Residential at Low Head. Admittedly there is vacant land at Low Head that could potentially be subdivided. Low Head may achieve a small population increase if vacant land is developed.
4. The Structure Plan area was defined with a specific purpose to investigate sustainable growth and improve outcomes for residents, workers and visitors who interact with the Structure Plan Area. The Structure Plan is targeted and focussed and is in accordance with the Project Brief.
5. No special studies have been commissioned but a recommended action is inserted to note the importance of indigenous issues.

6. Land areas can be set aside for residential use but can also be subject to natural values or natural hazards. The Ruin Paddock is an example where it is zoned for residential use but also shown to be in a priority vegetation area. The bushfire-prone area shown under the heading 'Natural Hazards' in Part 1 is amended.
7. The statement has been reworded to provide further clarification with respect to the catchment area.
8. The recommended actions throughout the Structure Plan will require further analysis and review to gather appropriate evidence to support the desired changes. In many instances, especially for any rezoning of land, further studies will be necessary to support a rezoning.
9. Minor editorials made to the Structure Plan in context of the submission made..
10. Reference to the Urban Growth Boundary is removed.
11. The zoning changes shown are proposed rather than actual. To remove confusion zoning referencing the interim planning scheme is removed.
12. Reference to open space on private land in the Structure Plan has been removed at Low Head.
13. The Structure Plan supports the implementation of tailored use and development controls to provide the statutory assessment tools to obtain the desired planning outcomes. Exemptions have been included in the George Town Interim Planning Scheme prior to the amendment in February 2021. The Structure Plan does not have any bearing on the Exemptions.
14. The Structure Plan seeks to provide additional areas for public open space. The sale of Council land is subject to a previous decision.
15. The Structure Plan does not propose to rezone land at Low Head to General Residential. The Priority Consolidation area shown in the Structure Plan reflects the existing developed area and does not propose to reduce the Environmental Management Zone. While public open space is shown in the Structure Plan, it is not automatically rezoned for this purpose.
16. There is farmland in the Interface Area of the Structure Plan Area. It is merely noting that the Interface Area is important for managing potential land use conflict between residential and non-residential uses.
17. The Structure Plan only is budgeting for a minor population increase at Low Head and there is no expansion of residential areas. An alternate road access is not warranted at this stage. However, if take up of land is accelerated then in time a further review of Low Head is likely and this issue can be revisited.
18. Low Head wording adjusted.

Structure Plan Change

- Reference to the growth rate of 4% amended to refer to population numbers.
- Amendment to the spatial area showing the bushfire-prone area on the Map in Part 1 of the Structure Plan.
- Minor editorials made throughout the document.
- Maps and references to the Urban Growth Boundary is removed.
- Remove zoning map and refer to changes generally.
- References to public open space on private land removed.

Submission 5 (Tamar Valley Wildlife Roadkill Initiative)	Low head
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Tamar Valley Wildlife Roadkill Initiative concerned about the roadkill that occurs between Low Head Road and Anne Street. 2. The submission requests installation of electronic signs registering excessive speeds could assist with reducing roadkill. 	
<p>Response</p> <p>The Structure Plan is a high-level document to provide strategic guidance to future use and development. The road network's speed environment, particularly along the primary route through to Low Head, could potentially benefit road user safety and address reducing roadkill. Reducing roadkill, while an important initiative, is not a planning consideration.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	No change
Submission 6 (C. Flood)	Overall Structure Plan Area
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests that further subdivision at Low Head be restricted. The Structure Plan is important to protect and conserve the Low Head farmland for benefit of future generations. Low Head Peninsula is unique and being eroded by development. 2. Clarence Council has apparently decided that they will delay further subdivision until they have their own Master Plan. Recommend the George Town Council take same approach. 	
<p>Response</p> <p>The Structure Plan does not propose increasing the zoned land area for residential development and seeks to protect the farmland on the eastern side of Low Head Road. A Structure Plan cannot prohibit subdivision if there is a permit pathway in the planning scheme. The Structure Plan is consistent with the submission made.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	No change.
Submission 7. (D. Rainbow)	Mount George, Central
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned that the Structure Plan lacks cohesiveness and definition caused by plans produced by several different authors which appears ad-hoc at times and at times in conflict. Plan reflective of the past rather than future, seeking to construct a bigger town with little insight or respect of the town's evolution. 2. The Structure Plan is wishing to attract young families and has disregarded inhabitants of retirement age in the municipality. The only consideration is to remove them from their homes. Are single persons or elderly persons in three bedroom homes to be offered alternative accommodation? 3. The Structure Plan is another way for the Council to control how people live and an attempt to circumvent planning scheme, allowing decisions to be made by the Council. 4. The plans are inaccurate not clearly defining land in use or ownership by not recording true boundaries or property recording watercourses or the areas defined as channels with natural banks that carry surface water. 5. Walking trails will be inhibited if shared with scooters cyclists and will create a hazard. Cycling tracks will be potentially a liability for residents and result in loss of privacy, risk of fire and inappropriate behaviours. 6. Regent Square and Macquarie Street – destruction of the iconic areas. 	

Response	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structure Plan balances a range of planning issues to achieve the best outcomes and seeks implementation of a strategy that uses land resources and existing infrastructure services wisely. The historical development pattern strongly influences the development pattern for the next twenty years. The Structure Plan is driven to provide a built environment that strives for the wellbeing of residents, workers and visitors. 2. Population growth is desired for George Town as articulated by the <i>George Town Community Strategic Plan 2020-2030</i>. The Structure Plan recognises that the established housing stock does not reflect the needs of certain parts of the population residing in the Structure Plan Area. The Structure Plan cannot force or change a person to move or relocate, it is merely recognising that a mix of housing choice, diversity and affordability are important to facilitate wellbeing. 3. The Structure Plan is a high level document providing strategic direction for future zoning or amendments to planning scheme. The Structure Plan provides a framework, and its endorsement does not make automatic changes to the planning scheme. Amendments to a planning scheme are subject to separate legislative processes. 4. The high-level document shows maps at a large scale where the correct title boundaries in relation to infrastructure or facilities is not shown. This is deliberate as the Structure Plan provides a framework and in-builds flexibility allowing it to be finetuned. 5. The Structure Plan directs recommended actions which will require further analysis and possibly community consultation before any footpath network is constructed. 6. The comment is noted. 	
Structure Plan Change	No change.
Submission 8. (Department of State Growth)	Overall
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Passenger Transport – bus stops shown in the Structure Plan is not shown in the correct locations. In sufficient population density to support new bus stops. 2. Travel links and footpaths will need to be prioritised by the Council to achieve objective of the Structure Plan. Active travel links to the Bell Bay Industrial Area might be a worthwhile addition. 3. Noted that Growth Area identified is outside of the Northern Tasmania Regional Land Use Strategy. The Tasmanian Gas Pipeline requires further consideration to determine impact on infrastructure. 	
Response	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comments by State Growth are noted. The bus stops are adjusted in the Structure Plan. However, it should be noted that the proposed bus stops shown are indicative rather than actual locations. 2. The comment is noted. 3. The Structure Plan acknowledges that changes to the Regional Land Use Strategy of Northern Tasmania are required to facilitate future growth areas. A recommended action is to pursue changes to the Regional Land Use Strategy. 	
Structure Plan Change	Change the location of current bus stop locations shown on the map.

Submission 9. (G. Neilsen)	Overall
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports a working planning document for the future. 2. Supports connected open spaces and linkages. Council recently supported the reduction of public open space. 3. Bring to the attention of property owners the possibilities of subdividing and developing land. 4. Supports the preparation of a car parking plan. 	
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comment is noted. 2. The Council is seeking to support and set aside land areas for strategic public open spaces. It must be noted that it is desired to create public open spaces with frontages or direct linkages to a road network. Public open space should not be hidden away or created between houses where back fences form the boundaries. 3. The recommended actions seek for Council improve, facilitate property owners understanding of development opportunities within the Structure Plan Area. 4. Recommended action in place to consider parking at Regent Square and adjacent Macquarie Street. 	
Structure Plan Change	Minor editorials made to the Structure Plan document to reflect comments.
Submission 10. (Communities Tasmania)	North Neighbourhood
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports and recognises the importance of strategic planning that Councils undertake and the positive impacts that are achieved. 2. Communities Tasmania manages numerous properties in the George Town area which under the ownership of the Director Housing. These properties are held for the purpose of providing housing for Tasmanians. 3. CT240776/1 located east of Agnes Street is serviced with a full range of infrastructure (sewer and water) and is currently zoned Rural Resource. Agnes Street site is proposed to be set aside for open space and zoned accordingly. Preference that a residential zone be applied rather than the proposed open space zone. 	
<p>Response</p> <p>The comments made are noted. The Structure Plan will be adjusted to show an alternate location for the proposed public open space. It should be noted that the proposed public open space location shown on the maps is indicative only and its siting can be adjusted at the time development occurs.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	The Structure Plan maps are adjusted to reflect the comments made in the submission. The location of proposed public open space shown for the North Neighbourhood is adjusted. A note has been added to the Structure Plan advising that the proposed public open space shown is indicative only.
Submission 11 (Leonie Gordon)	Low Head
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ludicrous plan to propose walking over private land and through protected penguin colony. 	

2. High tides, erosion, roadkill in areas where traffic should be 50km/hr should be more of a concern.	
Response The comments concerning LHN2 are noted and have been addressed by responses to other submissions summarised in this table.	
Structure Plan Change	Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.
Submission 12 (Lorraine Wooton)	Overall Structure Plan
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Incorrect references within Part 1 of the Structure Plan. Notes incorrect references to schools, Tourist Park and other references. Page 47 has incorrect text under the heading Agriculture. Minor editorials noted. 2. Car parking spaces available in the business area of George Town cannot meet parking demand. The car parking spaces have been reduced via the redevelopment of Regent Square. The creation of a 'destination playground' there is a dangerous parking on both sides of Anne Street. The 1999 George Town Central Area Strategy identified the need for a large central car park between the hotel/shops and Council chambers between and Anne and Sorrell Street. 3. The aim of getting people riding and walking is unrealistic as people are 'time poor' and use a car for convenience. Some are unable to ride a bike or walk. Most people that walk or ride a bike choose to do so for exercise, leisure, well-being. 4. Does not agree with allow three storey developments, set-back or not, especially along the foreshore. There are low set historic, but not all heritage listed buildings around the Cove. Three storey buildings will alter the character of the foreshore. 5. Plant more trees to add height and improve the aesthetics. Put powerlines underground. Develop planned and unmade streets such as Bathurst Street or Davies Street. 6. Local shops are supported on the IGA site. 7. George Town needs a well-planned retirement village of compact houses like Bridport and Scottsdale. 8. Killara Park should have some of seating and tables and may be a better place for the pump track. 9. Agrees with LHN10 to limit fragmentation of Low Head Neighbourhood. 10. Not necessary to provide paved areas to walk everywhere. Disagrees with any sealed paths all around the Pilot Station. 11. Pathway close to the penguin rookery is not supported as well as a trail over private land such as the golf course. She Oak Point should be made more accessible. Low Head Experience interpretation panels are almost inaccessible. 12. Many attractive beaches in the area suited to surfing, wind surfing, canoeing, fishing and boating. 13. Request reinstatement of trees particularly along Anne Street. 	
Response	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The errors are corrected. 2. The recommended actions note the requirement of undertaking further car parking demand and supply analysis for the general business area of George Town. 	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The comments are noted. A primary walking and cycling route is an essential ingredient to improved amenity in the Structure Plan Area. 4. The current planning scheme and the State Planning Provisions in the Tasmanian Planning Scheme will provide permit pathways for three storey developments on land zoned General Business. The Structure Plan seeks to prepare tailored use and development controls to manage building form and scale on land zone General Business and adjacent to the waterfront. 5. The recommended actions directs the Council to invest in a tree planting plan. 6. The comment is noted. 7. The recommended actions intend to increase housing density within a 500m radius of shops and services. 8. The recommended actions are in place to achieve this outcome. 9. The comment is noted. 10. The Structure Plan does not intend to seal all walking trails as this could place a financial burden on the Council and would not be appropriate in sensitive natural environments. 11. The comment in the submission regarding the penguin rookery is noted. Recommended actions for Low Head with respect to walking trails near the rookery has been adjusted. 12. The comment is noted. 13. Refer to comment at 5. 	
Structure Plan Change	Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.
Submission 13 (Low Head Progress & Heritage Association Inc)	Low Head
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned that action LHN2 refers to diversifying the user experience of the kanamluka trail. The Submission notes that include private land leased by the Low Head Progress & Heritage Association. This land extends town to the high-water mark. 2. Inadequate consultation with the Low Head Progress & Heritage Association. A letterbox drop would and should have been more appropriate. 3. Council does not consider the Structure Plan until the August meeting. 	
Response	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comments concerning LHN2 are noted and have been addressed the responses provided to other submission in this table. 2. Community Consultation was undertaken in accordance with Council's Community Consultation Framework. 3. The Structure Plan is being considered as part of the July meeting. The primary policy direction of the Structure Plan is focussed on infill and consolidation. The nature trails and access to the coastal reserve is important, however, this requires further investigations to determine which sections of the coastline could be utilised for walking. At this stage the comments concerning LHN2 (now LHN1) are noted, and the action has been revised. It should also be noted that the recommended actions may not be in order of priority. 	

<p>The Structure Plan is recommended to be subject to regular review and assurance is offered that further community consultation will be undertaken with residents at the time any proposal is put forward within the coastal reserve.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.</p>
<p>Submission 14 (S. Hickling)</p>	<p>Low Head</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes that East Beach Tourist Park is incorrectly referred to Low Head Beachfront Holiday Village in the Structure Plan. 2. Notes that Low Head Tourist Park is incorrectly referred to George Town Holiday Park/Tourist Park in the Structure Plan. 3. There is no golf course in Low Head. It is private land. 4. Notes that Ainslie House is incorrectly referred to as Ainslee House in the Structure Plan. 5. The kanamaluka trail is located on the western side of Low Head Road. 6. Residential development which extends down to the foreshore of the Tamar is located on the western of Low Head Road. 7. The trails on Crown land opposite Low Head Tourist Park, She Oak Point are great detours for walkers. These areas are neglected. The privately owned Low Head Lagoon has development potential development potential as a nature walk. Dog walkers should not be encouraged in these areas. 8. The trail across farmland between East Beach to North Street are working farms. Investment into sealed footpaths opposite the North Street intersection continuing south along Low Head Road all the way to Anne Street to provide improved connections to the IGA at Friend Street and Macquarie Street. Traffic management devices may also be required. Marked coastal walk around the Low Head Lighthouse using existing racks linking up East Beach could be beneficial. 9. Signage needs to be installed along East Beach to indicate a shared zone. 10. Speed limit reduced to 50km/hr needs to apply to all the Low Head Neighbourhood area. 11. Additional rest stops and facilities along the kanamaluka trail are supported. 	
<p>Response</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The error is corrected. 2. The error is corrected. 3. The support for the nature walks is noted. The recommended actions for Low Head are modified but generally retain their intention. All references to the golf course on private land are removed from the Structure Plan. 4. The error is corrected. 5. The error is corrected. 6. The error is corrected. 7. The trail across farmland between East Beach and North Street is retained and is identified for investigations. The trail is indicative for the future and would not be a high priority. It is acknowledged that there are several matters that require investigations before any trail becomes reality. 8. The comments are noted. 	

<p>9. The installation of signage and improved amenities is promoted in the recommended actions in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>10. A potential speed limit reduction requires further investigations.</p> <p>11. Noted that there is support for additional rest stops.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	Remove references to the 'golf course' from the Structure Plan. Correct minor errors.
Submission 15 (M. Muir)	Low Head
<p>1. Bus stop required outside of Ainslie House complex.</p>	
Response	
<p>The Structure Plan seeks to increase the number of bus stops in the Structure Plan Area; however, this will be dependent on population growth.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	No change.
Submission 16 (M. Taylor)	Low Head
<p>1. The submission notes that the trail and residential development is on the western side of Low Head Road.</p> <p>2. Objects to a nature walk along the coastline from the Pilot Station towards the Lighthouse due to the location of the penguin rookery.</p> <p>3. The trail from the Lighthouse to East Beach and trail from East Beach through farmland to North Street is not ideal as it is over private land.</p>	
Response	
<p>The LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 are integrated into one recommended action to generally explore the opportunity for public access to the coastal reserve. Public access will not be appropriate in all instances due to natural and cultural values that may apply to a particular section of the coast or river. The Structure Plan is directing Council to investigate the opportunity to improve access, but this will not be pursued until due diligence is completed. When investigations eventuate, further consultation will be undertaken with residents in accordance with the Council's Community Consultation Framework.</p> <p>The trail from East Beach over farmland to North Street is in private ownership and this is acknowledged.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.
Submission 17 (M. Bodman)	Low Head
<p>1. Objects to any trail from Low Head Tourist Park along the foreshore until it meets the kanamaluka trail at North Street. Many negative implications and could encourage petty crime, theft and inappropriate behaviour, impact on 'Marion Villa' built in 1850s. Strong concern that trails will result in detrimental impact of the Penguin Colony and other birdlife.</p>	
Response	
<p>The LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 are integrated into one recommended action to generally explore the opportunity for public access to the coastal reserve. Public access will not be appropriate in all instances due to natural and cultural values that may apply to a</p>	

<p>particular section of the coast or river. The Structure Plan is directing Council to investigate the opportunity to improve access, but this will not be pursued until due diligence is completed. When investigations eventuate, further consultation will be undertaken with residents in accordance with the Council's Community Consultation Framework.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.</p>
<p>Submission 18 (Mr and Mrs Burgess)</p>	<p>Low Head</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action LHN2 is objected to in the submission. It is private land immediately adjoining the representors property. Objects to a nature walk over land owned by the Low Head Company. There are alternatives available for walkers such as Pilot Beach, Lagoon Beach and Pilot Station. 2. The submission is concerned that the Council did not conduct a letterbox drop or adequately raise awareness of the document. 3. Queries whether the Council has conducted a study for more walking areas at Low Head. 	
<p>Response</p>	
<p>The LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 are integrated into one recommended action to generally explore the opportunity for public access to the coastal reserve. Public access will not be appropriate in all instances due to natural and cultural values that may apply to a particular section of the coast or river. The Structure Plan is directing Council to investigate the opportunity to improve access, but this will not be pursued until due diligence is completed. When investigations eventuate, further consultation will be undertaken with residents in accordance with the Council's Community Consultation Framework.</p> <p>The Structure Plan was advertised in accordance with the Council's Community Consultation Framework.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Combine LHN1, LHN2 and LHN4 to explore opportunities for nature walks in locations that is not detrimental to natural or cultural values.</p>
<p>Submission 19 (Nick Gee)</p>	<p>Low Head</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Structure Plan doesn't appear to cater to 2040 and beyond, concentrating instead on infill development of developed and semi developed areas. 2. Most of the beaches in the region have superior access by road from Tasmania. Ocean Beach in the Central North, public access to which is somewhat constrained. The Central residential area and adjacent residential areas a providing superior amenity, cleaner air and a warmer climate. One of the nation's most important and well preserved historical areas. 3. The Structure Plan Area expanded to include the Airfield and all the land south of East Beach for future integration and include access to Bell Buoy Beach. If planning does not incorporate these areas, then it is likely that planning will be ad hoc and result in ribbon development. 	

<p>4. Alternative access to East Beach to avoid driving through built up areas should be considered. The Submission notes the slip lane that has been constructed from the Bridport Highway into Sandy Beach Road providing alternative access to the beach, camping and caravan area.</p>	
<p>Response</p> <p>1. Growth in the Structure Plan Area, until recently, has been relatively slow with development occurring sporadically. The priority focus at present, as noted in the submission, will be on development that seeks infill and consolidation, improving the land efficiency and utilising established infrastructure most effectively. The approach is critical to building cohesive and connected neighbourhoods. If take-up and development of land is high within the Structure Plan Area, then it is suggested that a review within the next 5 years is appropriate to determine if land supply is adequate.</p> <p>2. The positive attributes of George Town in the Structure Plan Areas are highlighted and noted.</p> <p>3. The Structure Plan Area is restricted to focus mostly on the urban area. The airfield is noted to be adjacent to the Structure Plan Area and is acknowledged as an important asset. The Structure Plan does not promote development of land east of the Low Head Neighbourhood.</p> <p>4. Council is seeking to improve the amenities and parking arrangements at East Beach. However, at this stage, a new slip road or alternative access is not identified as a priority for investigation.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Submission 20 (Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service (PWS))</p>	<p>Overall Structure Plan Area</p>
<p>1. The PWS note that some of the proposed infrastructure activities within the Structure Plan may occur in reserved or unallocated Crown Land. Proposals on Crown Land could be subject to required assessment and approval by the PWS. These required assessments are to ensure reserve area management objectives specified in the <i>National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2000</i> and <i>Nature Conservation Act 2002</i>.</p>	
<p>Response</p> <p>The comments from the PWS are noted and any proposal on Crown Land will be assessed as required under the <i>National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2000</i> and <i>Nature Conservation Act 2002</i>.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Submission 21 (Rosemary Hill)</p>	<p>Low Head</p>
<p>1. The footpath on the west of the road (constructed) is very welcomed. Concern regarding any nature walk near the penguin colony. Increased foot traffic may bring in dogs which could destroy the fragile environment.</p> <p>2. The submission concerned that a construction a footpath/riding (cycling) path across private land will result in insurance claims. There are beautiful memorial gardens and columbarium over the golf course land that would open it to vandalism.</p>	

3. Supports upgrading facilities at East Beach and suggests promotion of a coastal walk further to the east.	
Response	
<p>The Structure Plan seeks to improve public access to the coastline. Any pathways in the coastal reserve are likely to be unsealed trails.</p> <p>The coastal reserve, due to the environmentally sensitive nature, is not identified for any formal or all abilities sealed footpath/cycleway. Walking and cycling trails will not be encouraged in areas where it is detrimental to the penguin rookery, or areas of cultural significance that may be identified.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	Minor modifications to the Recommended Actions in Part 2 and Part 3 of the Structure Plan.
Submission 22 (Sandra Bell)	Low Head
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representations of the Tamar River section of Low Head were unaware of the Structure Plan. A letter drop or some other form of communication could have been employed. 2. Proposed footpath/riding (cycling) path to be built in front of residences from Mandalay, 155 to 163 Low Head Road (and to be continued in front of the Ainslee House residential units and so on). 3. Concerned that a construction a footpath/riding (cycling) path will result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy; • Destruction of a pristine flora and natural habitat will be threatened; • No access for emergency services; and • Does not account for coastal erosion, storms and cultural significance to First Nation People. 4. Queries what will happen to the boat shed at Mandalay contained on Crown Land. 	
Response	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Structure Plan was placed on public consultation for a period of four weeks. Public notices in the newspaper (Examiner and The Tamar) were published discussing the plan. The Structure Plan was also promoted on social media and was available for viewing at the Council offices. The consultation undertaken was consistent with Council's Consultation Framework. 2. The Structure Plan seeks to improve public access to the coastline. The intent of the Structure Plan is to facilitate opportunities to improve coastal access. Any pathways in the coastal reserve are likely to be unsealed trails and may be subject to additional approval processes or consent from Crown Land Services. The coastal reserve is public land and can be accessed by the public. 3. The coastal reserve, due to the environmentally sensitive nature, is not identified for any formal or all abilities sealed walking or cycling trails. Walking and cycling trails will not be encouraged in areas where it is detrimental to the penguin rookery, or areas of cultural significance that may be identified. Human behaviour is not a planning matter. 	
Structure Plan Change	Minor modifications to the Recommended Actions in Part 2 and Part 3 of the Structure Plan.
Submission 23	Low Head

(Crosswell & Others)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The representations of the Tamar River section of Low Head were unaware of the Structure Plan. A letter drop or some other form of communication could have been employed. 2. Proposed footpath/riding (cycling) path to be built in front of residences from Mandalay, 155 to 163 Low Head Road (and to be continued in front of the Ainslee House residential units and so on). 3. Concerned that a construction a footpath/riding (cycling) path will result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy; • Destruction of a pristine flora and natural habitat will be threatened; • No access for emergency services; and • Does not account for coastal erosion, storms and cultural significance to First Nation People. 4. Queries what will happen to the boat shed at Mandalay contained on Crown Land. 	
Response	
<p>The Structure Plan was placed on public consultation for a period of four weeks. Public notices in the newspaper (Examiner and The Tamar) were published discussing the plan. The Structure Plan was also promoted on social media and was available for viewing at the Council offices. The consultation undertaken was consistent with Council's Consultation Framework.</p> <p>The Structure Plan seeks to improve public access to the coastline. The intent of the Structure Plan is to facilitate opportunities to improve coastal access. The coastal reserve is public land and is not privately owned. Any pathways in the coastal reserve will be left in its natural state as it will not be feasible in many instances to create trails. If trails are considered, it is intended that these will be unsealed. Any trails are likely to be subject to additional approval processes or consent from Crown Land Services.</p> <p>The coastal reserve, due to the environmentally sensitive nature, is not identified for any formal or all abilities sealed walking or cycling trail. Walking and cycling trails will not be encouraged in areas where it is detrimental to the penguin rookery, or areas of cultural significance that may be identified.</p> <p>The recommended actions for Low Head in Part 3 of the Structure Plan are exploring opportunity to improve public access to the coastal reserve. Investigations are required and additional public consultation is likely before any changes are implemented on the ground.</p> <p>Minor wording changes are incorporated in Parts 2 and 3, Structure Plan.</p>	
Structure Plan Change	Minor modifications to the Recommended Actions in Part 2 and Part 3 of the Structure Plan.
Submission 24 (TAS Water)	
Overall Structure Plan Area	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land in the Structure Plan Area shown for development can be serviced for both water and sewer but dependent on final engineering design. 2. Individual sewer pumping stations may be required to be upgraded as town develops. 	

Attachment 2: Responses to the written submission received during public consultation.

<p>3. The George Town Sewage Treatment Plan has adequate hydraulic capacity to meet growth projections.</p> <p>4. Any demands to service a potential Hydrogen Hub at Bell Bay are not considered as significant process water is required by this industry.</p>	
<p>Response</p> <p>The comments from TasWater are noted. There are no changes to the draft Structure Plan required.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Submission 25 (Tim Parish)</p>	<p>Central</p>
<p>1. Supports development in the CBD.</p> <p>2. Concerned that the onus is on the developer to construct road and install infrastructure services to subdivide land. Installation of road and services benefits other developers at no cost. Council considers a policy of cost sharing approach.</p> <p>3. Council considers a trial where Council constructs roads and then back charges the developer.</p>	
<p>Response</p> <p>The Structure Plan seeks to promote growth and recognises that support is required to facilitate development. The Structure Plan recognises that forging relationships with property owners and stakeholders is required to facilitate new development. An additional action is inserted in the Structure Plan to seek fostering relationships with property owners and developers.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Additional Recommended Action inserted in Part 2, Sustainable Growth.</p>
<p>Submission 26 (Tim Gregory)</p>	<p>Low Head</p>
<p>1. Incorrect reference to the location of houses on Low Head Road.</p>	
<p>Response</p> <p>Text in Part 3, Low Head Road, Structure Plan is amended to correct the reference to the orientation houses on Low Head Road.</p>	
<p>Structure Plan Change</p>	<p>Error corrected.</p>