

Questions Submitted for Community Questions and Hearings Meeting 2 September 2024

Question
Why does the Council think that benchmarking to other LGAs (as endorsed in item 4(b) of LAS resolution 19/8/24) is appropriate, given that farms are not a homogeneous category and vary widely in soil types, livestock, scale of operation, productivity, and the nature of farming enterprises?
What does Council mean by "rural amenity" (as endorsed in item 8 of LAS resolution 19/8/24) and how does the Council plan to ensure that the reinstated "rural amenity" objective will be meaningfully integrated into the permit requirements and not just a symbolic gesture?
What steps will the Council take to address the broader concerns that the LAS prioritises landscape aesthetics over the practical needs of farmers, particularly in light of the initial removal of the "rural amenity" objective?
Beyond simply expanding the contact list, what specific strategies will Council implement to ensure meaningful and effective consultation with the impact landholders? (Referencing Item 6 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
What are the total costs incurred by the Council on this project to date split between internal and external costs?
What costs does council estimate for <u>the remainder of the project</u> including implementation of all the steps encompassed by resolutions 1-8? Please provide a break-down between categories?
How has Council assessed the likely economic impact of these SLOs on the shire?
What will be the cost of the benchmarking study endorsed in item 4b? (Referencing item 4(b) of LAS resolution 19/8/24)
Given that the LAS resolution passed on 19/8/24 does not explicitly make Items 2 & 3 contingent on Items 7 & 8, what specific steps will the Council take to ensure that these conditions are fully addressed before proceeding with statutory implementation?
How does Council intend to incorporate the feedback and SLO wording amendments into the Landscape Assessment Study if statutory implementation is already being progressed independently of these new conditions? (Items 2&3 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
Why does the proposed SLO wording duplicate the requirement for a permit to remove native vegetation that is already within the specific provisions of the MPS (52.17)? This appears to breach Rule 3 of the Victorian "Rules for Writing a Planning Scheme Provision" which states that "a provision must not conflict with or duplicate other legislation, instruments, or planning scheme provisions."

Questions Submitted for Community Questions and Hearings Meeting 2 September 2024

Question
Why did the Council choose to cross-reference only two exemptions from Clause 52.17 in the SLO, while excluding at least 16 other exemptions commonly used on farming properties, such as those for the removal of native vegetation for grazing, fencing, emergency works, pest control, and routine maintenance? (Referencing Item 4(a) of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
Cr Stevens stated on 19/8/24 that the Council shouldn't dictate the size of sheds because the needs vary depending on agricultural activities. How will Item 4(c) of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24 be implemented within the permit requirements of the proposed SLO as currently drafted, especially regarding the previously proposed 5m height limit?
Did the Council intend for Items 2 & 3 of the LAS resolution passed 19/8/24 to be contingent on the conditions outlined in Items 4-8, particularly Items 7 & 8?
Item 1 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24 refers to "attached items" What are they and where are they?
Why has a benchmarking study been endorsed (item 4(b)) given that item 4(c) specifies that permit exemptions and decision guidelines will include language ensuring that "where it is demonstrated the buildings and works are directly related to an agricultural activity occurring on the site? (Referencing Item 4 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
What are the milestones and timelines for genuine engagement with those directly impacted by implementation of the LAS recommendations? (Referencing Item 5 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
How will the Council link the findings of the impact assessment to the statutory processes, given that no connection is outlined in the resolution? (Referencing Item 7 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24)
Are councillors aware of the concerns raised by the Victorian Planning Panel (VPP) regarding Claire Scott's Landscape Assessment Study methodology, particularly the subjective nature of her work, the inconsistencies between included and excluded areas, lack of distinction between locally and regionally significant landscapes, and unresolved methodological flaws identified by the VPP? eg https://www.planningpanels.vic.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0041/597875/distinctive-areas-and-landscapes-standing-advisory-committee-surf-coast-report.pdf
What is the timeline for <u>completion</u> the impact assessment study referred to in item 7 of LAS resolution passed 19/8/24?

Questions Submitted for Community Questions and Hearings Meeting 2 September 2024

Question
Will the council compensate farmers for any loss in land value or economic operating losses?
Will Council undertake pre and post valuations by an independent valuer?