

Planning Scheme Amendment C79muri – Summary of Submissions and Recommended Responses

Submission Number	Submitter*	Requests change/s?	Council response – officer recommendation re changes requested
1	Landowner – industrial land in Whittlesea	Yes 1. Provides general support for the amendment including Clause 11.01 policy direction 2. No change is requested; however, the submitter has several requests regarding future implementation of the Yea Structure Plan, summarised as follows: a) That contamination assessments for future rezoning of the industrial land east of Boundary Creek not be applied as a blanket requirement but take consideration of land that has not actually been used for industrial purposes. b) That the submitter be recognised as a key stakeholder and directly consulted regarding amendment processes and future strategic work (specific industrial land-related items being added to Clause 74.02) that affects their land. c) That their industrial zoned land that is now earmarked for potential transition to residential use be protected for that	1. General support for the amendment is noted. 2. Regarding future actions to implement the Yea Structure Plan, a. An exemption from contamination assessment under <i>Ministerial Direction No. 1 – Potentially Contaminated Land</i> will be considered in the course of any process to rezone the land, noting both the submitter's claim regarding land that has never been used for industrial purposes and Council's obligation to adhere to State Government requirements. b. The submitter's status as a key stakeholder in future strategic processes and amendments affecting their land is recognised and Council undertakes to consult the submitter directly and pro-actively in this regard (e.g. with the Industrial Land Strategy that is currently underway). c. This request is supported and can be accommodated by a minor change to the amendment. While the landowner has a high degree of control over any statutory planning applications for use and development of the land, an additional strategy will provide clearer support for investigating land use transition and

OFFICIAL

		purpose in exercising planning functions in the interim.	for the relevant elements of the Yea Structure Plan to be considered in any future strategic planning processes for the land and adjacent areas. Recommendation: Insert the following under Strategies in Clause 11.01-1L-02 Settlement - Yea: Investigate land use transition of undeveloped industrial zoned land in North Street/Whittlesea-Yea Road (east of Boundary Creek) in order to assess its suitability for residential uses and encouraging housing diversity; avoid compromising this land for such potential future use until the investigation has been undertaken. The submitter provided a supplementary response 17/8/26 confirming that this response and recommended wording change is satisfactory in resolving their request.
2	Goulburn Broken CMA	Yes 1. Add additional comment to the 'schedule to clause 74.02 further strategic work' to review the existing Planning Scheme following completion of the Yea Flood Study, to ensure alignment with the findings of the study and the provisions within the Murrindindi Planning Scheme.	1. Agree - the request is appropriate and low impact, as it does not affect the current amendment but introduces a future review trigger. It ensures the planning scheme aligns with the outcomes of the new flood study and reflects more accurate, data-driven flood mapping Recommendation: Insert the following into Schedule 1 to Clause 74.02 Further Strategic Work: Consider appropriate changes to the Yea Structure Plan and the Murrindindi Planning Scheme to implement the Yea Flood Study once it has been completed. The submitter provided a supplementary response 12/8/26 confirming that this response and recommended wording change is satisfactory in resolving its request.
3	Goulburn Valley Water	No 1. Supports the amendment and Yea Structure plan, recognising that future urban growth must be aligned with available water and wastewater servicing capacity.	1. Support for the amendment is noted.

		2. No changes are requested; however, the submitter seeks ongoing consultation with GVW on future growth investigations, development staging and infrastructure planning, including early engagement on rezonings, development plans and subdivision proposals. 3. The submitter also recommends detailed servicing assessments, protection of key infrastructure, and consideration of integrated water management and climate resilience principles in future planning.	2. Request for ongoing consultation is noted and supported. 3. Request for these considerations in future planning is noted and supported. Recommendation: No change requested.
4	Resident (Marshbank Street, Yea)	Yes (subsequently withdrawn) 1. Raises concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Yea township boundary, particularly the potential impact on properties in the Marshbank Street and Craigie Street area. The submitter considers the mapping unclear, is concerned about potential impacts on property values and future saleability, and requests that the Yea River remain the township boundary. 2. The submitter considers that affected landowners were not adequately notified. The submitter requests further explanation of the proposed change to the township	Recommendation: No change to the amendment is recommended. 1. The concern is based on a misunderstanding as no change to the township boundary in the Marshbank Street and Craigie Street area is proposed. The boundary will remain as currently shown in the planning scheme, as defined by the outer edge of the General Residential Zone (GRZ) where it abuts the Urban Floodway Zone (UFZ). The Yea River itself is not the township boundary in the planning scheme, although in functional terms the river floodplain as defined by the UFZ serves this purpose. While a concern about the existing township boundary (running through properties rather than along boundaries) is valid, the amendment has not created this issue and can't resolve the underlying concern with a simple change. 2. Notification of the amendment was provided via a public notice in the Yea Chronicle and information on Council's website. This met the requirements of authorisation for the amendment, which is of a general nature for the township as a whole. Council undertook substantial community engagement during preparation of the Yea Structure Plan in 2025, including information available at the Customer Service Centre at Yea Library and online, with opportunities

OFFICIAL

		boundary and of why more substantial consultation was not undertaken.	for input via a community workshop, a drop-in information session and a survey. If the submitter's concern that there was a direct impact on property owners (as per Issue 1) was in fact the case, direct notification would have been undertaken. Council has engaged with the submitter via telephone and mail to clarify the issues and respond to concerns as above. In discussions, it was also noted a change to the town boundary alignment may be considered in the future, triggered by either a new flood study (proposed for 2027) or by a new process to establish an 'urban settlement boundary' following a recent State Government policy change. If this were to occur, affected property owners would be appropriately consulted and provided the opportunity to raise issues and lodge submissions. The submitter provided a supplementary response 18/8/26 as follows: <i>"I have received written clarification of the issues raised in my submission and understand that no change to the township boundary in the Marshbank and Craigie Street area is proposed in the amendment. I am satisfied with this response and therefore withdraw my submission."</i> Recommendation: No change to the amendment is recommended.
5	Goulburn-Murray Water	Yes (subsequently withdrawn) Provides general support for the amendment and the Yea Structure Plan; however, it requests stronger recognition of State planning policy directions to provide greater certainty for long-term waterway protection as future development occurs, including: 1. More explicit reference to, and application of, Clause 12.03-1S (River, Waterway Corridors, Water Bodies, Wetlands and Coastal Areas), including consideration of impacts on land within 200 metres of a waterway.	1&2. It is contrary to requirements for the form and content of planning schemes to replicate specific State policy provisions in local policy. Existing State policy at Clauses 12.03-1S and 14.02-1S is considered sufficient to address the concerns in the submission, as the provisions in these clauses already need to be addressed in applications for development near waterways.. Council wrote to the submitter to note the above and request a written response indicating either a) the submitter is satisfied that no change to the amendment is needed; or b) the submitter requests specific requests a specific change and can provide wording for this. The submitter provided a supplementary response 5/8/26 as follows: <i>"...the amendment satisfactorily addresses issues as raised in GMW's submission dated 27/7/26 and I can confirm that GMW has no specific request for changes to the amendment."</i>

		2. Greater recognition of Clause 14.02-1S (Water Quality), including the role of appropriately vegetated buffer areas and the guideline 50-metre buffer adjacent to waterways	Recommendation: No change requested.
--	--	---	---

* names of private landowners provided but not shown in this summary