

Amendment C151 Latrobe City Signage Strategy

Summary of Submissions and Planning Comment Table

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
1	██████████ ██████████	Request a Change	- Incredible amount of documents for what appears to be a review of 'building signage' - No focus on street signage. Clarity and positioning of street signage is lacking - People go on drives and investigate things based on the visibility of signage - Signage for localities such as Lake Narracan is lacking. This loses money and tourism dollars for the local community	- The submission is considered outside the scope of the Amendment - Under Clause 52.05-10 <i>a permit is not required to construct or put up for display a sign in a road reserve that gives direction or guidance about a tourist attraction...</i> - Council Officers have provided information about grant programs, preferred corporate branding, and township signage to the submitter. - The submitter was contacted via phone on 11 and 12 February 2026, and a follow up email was provided on 13 February 2026 with the above information. - Further information was collected from the Tourism Department on 28 April 2026, aiming to draft an action for works to be completed pertaining to: - Tourism sign inconsistencies; and - Bureaucratic roadblocks between Latrobe City and VicRoads. - The submission is still considered outstanding as the submitter has not responded to the information provided.	Yes - Submission 1 is considered to be 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment. While the submission refers to signs, it does not raise any concerns about the proposed changes to policy or the ACZ schedules.	No	Friday 23 January 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
2	[REDACTED]	Request a Change	- Newborough Yallourn Men's Shed Inc could use some tourist direction signage - A few signs along Yallourn Drive could also help	- The submission is considered outside the scope of the Amendment. - Under Clause 52.05-10 a <i>permit is not required to construct or put up for display a sign in a road reserve that gives direction or guidance about a tourist attraction...</i> - Council Officers provided information to the submitter on 6 February 2026. The information explained how the submitter could apply through the Latrobe City Grants Program for their Mens Shed. - Further information was collected from the Tourism Department on 28 April 2026, aiming to draft an action for works to be completed pertaining to: - Tourism sign inconsistencies; and - Bureaucratic roadblocks between Latrobe City and VicRoads. - The submission is still considered outstanding as the submitter has not responded to the information provided	Yes - Submission 2 is considered to be 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment. While the submission refers to signs, it does not raise any concerns about the proposed changes to policy or the ACZ schedules.	No	Friday 23 January 2026
3	[REDACTED]	Support	There are no concerns or objections to the proposed changes within Amendment C151latr.	Noted	Not Applicable	No	Thursday 5 February 2026
4	[REDACTED]	Support	- The proposed changes have been well researched, are reasonable, provide guidance, consistency and improve social outcome for the LCC environs. - The increased qualitative wording will place onus on Planners to carefully consider planning submissions with due integrity and	Noted	Not Applicable	No	Wednesday 4 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
			assessment balanced with overall impact and purpose.				
5		Request a Change	- Reclassify Bert Christensen Reserve from a Category 4 to Category 3 Signage requirement - This change will allow for an electronic sign to replace the old notice board in the Reserve - This will allow for ease of change and display important township news and emergency services information	- The submission is considered outside the scope of this Amendment. - The Amendment has not proposed to make changes to Schedule to Clause 36.02 and noting that signage categories within the PPRZ are determined by the <i>Recreation Reserves and Facilities Signage Policy</i>, as this change would also be inconsistent with the policy, Latrobe does not intend to reclassify Bert Christensen Reserve as a 'Local Facility' at this point in time. - The Amendment has not introduced Public Open Space as one of the character areas introduced into the <i>Latrobe City Signage Strategy Report (2025)</i> - A 1-1 meeting was held on Tuesday 10 March 2026 to discuss the submission - Alternative sites have been provided for the electronic sign, and the statutory process have been described to the customer. - An email was sent on Tuesday 7 April 2026 which detailed information on how the submitter could apply for a sign planning permit. - Further information was requested from Ausnet to support an alternative placement of signage at the Tyers Community Park on 28 April 2026. Ausnet provided general information on the same date about the available infrastructure which could be utilised for an electronic sign board drawing	Yes - Submission 5 is considered to be 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment. The Amendment is not proposing to change sign categories. Such a change would need to be considered through a separate amendment.	No	Friday 6 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				power from the CFA and Tyers Preschool. Ausnet recommended it not engage themselves, but the submitter should engage an electrician to quote works needing to be completed to install the sign. The submission is still considered outstanding, as a formal follow up email has not yet been provided.			
6	██████████ ██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Support	The ██████████ is satisfied that the proposed amendment will not increase the flood risk and does not object to the proposed amendment.	Noted	Not Applicable	No	Friday 6 February 2026
7	██████████	Request a Change	- Tyers has a manually operated public notice board at Bert Christensen Reserve - Bert Christensen Reserve is zoned as a Category 4 and the intention is to upgrade and modernise the sign to an electronic one - Bert Christensen Reserve should be rezoned as a Category 3 to allow the upgrade to go ahead - It makes sense to upgrade the community noticeboard and use modern electronics a means to advertise - The current site is known to all in the community, and it makes sense to retain it.	- The Amendment has not proposed to make changes to Schedule to Clause 36.02 and noting that signage categories within the PPRZ are determined by the <i>Recreation Reserves and Facilities Signage Policy</i>, as this change would also be inconsistent with the policy, Latrobe does not intend to reclassify Bert Christensen Reserve as a 'Local Facility' at this point in time. - The Amendment has not introduced Public Open Space as one of the character areas introduced into the Latrobe City Signage Strategy Report (2025) - A 1-1 meeting was held on Tuesday 10 March 2026 to discuss the submission (could not attend) email provided. - Alternative sites have been provided, and statutory process have been described to the customer.	Yes - Submission 7 is considered to be 'wholly irrelevant' to the amendment. The Amendment is not proposing to change sign categories. Such a change would need to be considered through a separate amendment.	No	Friday 6 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				- An email was sent on Tuesday 7 April 2026 which detailed information on how the submitter could apply for a sign planning permit. - Further information was requested from Ausnet to support an alternative placement of signage at the Tyers Community Park on 28 April 2026. Ausnet provided general information on the same date about the available infrastructure which could be utilised for an electronic sign board drawing power from the CFA and Tyers Preschool. Ausnet recommended it not engage themselves, but the submitter should engage an electrician to quote works needing to be completed to install the sign. - The submission is still considered outstanding, as a formal follow up email has not yet been provided.			
8(a)		Request a Change	- Requesting that Yinnar have some event signage poles added at the entry points of the town - Morwell has examples of these already and I attach a picture of those on this submission	- The submission is considered outside the scope of the Amendment. - Although outside the scope of the Amendment, the submitter can apply for a planning permit for signage in the preferred location. - An online meeting was held on Tuesday 31 March 2026 to discuss the submission. - An email was sent on Tuesday 7 April 2026 which detailed information on how the submitter could apply for a sign planning permit.	Not Applicable, due to submission being withdrawn.	No	Friday 13 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				The submission is still considered outstanding, as a formal follow up email has not yet been provided.			
8(b)	██████████	Withdrawn			Not Applicable	No	Monday 13 April 2026
9(a)	██████████	Request a Change	- This submission is made on behalf of Tyers Fire Brigade in support of an amendment to Planning Scheme Amendment C151latr – Signage Strategy. - Tyers Fire Brigade requests that the Signage Strategy be updated to include signage provisions at Bert Christensen Reserve, located on Main Road, Tyers - The existing community sign is situated on land zoned Public Park and Recreation Zone (PPRZ), which is currently classified as a Category 4 – Sensitive Area under Clause 52.05. As a result, signage opportunities at this important community location are limited. - We request that the Schedule to the PPRZ be amended to include Bert Christensen Reserve, Main Road, Tyers, within the list of Local Facilities. - The provision of an electronic sign at this location would significantly enhance the ability to communicate emergency warnings, fire safety information, and critical community messages in a timely and effective manner. - Tyers Fire Brigade strongly supports this amendment and considers it an important	- The submission is considered outside the scope of this Amendment. - The Amendment has not proposed to make changes to Schedule to Clause 36.02 and noting that signage categories within the PPRZ are determined by the <i>Recreation Reserves and Facilities Signage Policy</i>, as this change would also be inconsistent with the policy, Latrobe does not intend to reclassify Bert Christensen Reserve as a 'Local Facility' at this point in time. - The Amendment has not introduced Public Open Space as one of the character areas introduced into the <i>Latrobe City Signage Strategy Report (2025)</i> - A 1-1 meeting was held on Tuesday 10 March 2026 to discuss the submission - Alternative sites have been provided for the electronic sign, and the statutory process have been described to the customer. - An acknowledgement of reply and withdraw was received on 7 April 2026.	Not Applicable, due to the submission being withdrawn.	No	Saturday 14 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
			improvement to local emergency communication infrastructure.				
9(b)		Withdrawn			Not Applicable	No	Tuesday 7 April 2026.
10		Object	- Believe C151 is an overreach of the planning instrument - Businesses need to erect their signs to match what they are wishing to achieve. Veranda signs are needed as people walking down the street will not see a veranda edge sign unless they walk onto the road - Why do front windows need to have visibility into the premises. Parapet signs need to be within the building line, why? Not even signs between the pillars of the windows? - Council approved a GAWK sign on the corner of Hotham and Franklin Street, it goes above the build line, is illuminated and is a distraction to people who drive through the roundabout. The sign does not even represent the business who occupies the building - When Council starts paying the rent and rates, then the Council can start requesting what signage they would like - Putting constraints on signage advertising, that they (businesses) desperately need, and more Red Tape in the way is not assisting the cause.	- A meeting to discuss the submission was held on Thursday 12 March 2026. - A response to the submission was sent on 15 April 2026. The response addressed the following issues raised by the submitter: - A permit was issued for the major promotion and electronic sign at Franklin and Hotham Street, Traralgon. The Amendment does not make changes to permit triggers Clause 52.05, but provides guidance on what is discouraged/encouraged through new policy in Clause 15.01 Signs. - NSW has a more prescriptive system compared to VIC. Victoria's system allows for discretion based on the assessor's interpretation of the Scheme, deeming it often, a longer processing time for sign applications. - Challenging times make it more difficult for businesses to afford a planning permit, however, information was provided to show, for the most part, in the Traralgon Activity Centre Zone (ACZ1), a planning permit is not required provided the conditions are met under Category 1 and Category 2 Signs.	No	No	Tuesday 17 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				- Officers note that barber whirls were considered a 'business identification sign' and generally did not require a planning permit under the ACZ1 Category 1 and Category 2. - Officers note, although below and above verandah signs are discouraged in the new character areas in the <i>Latrobe Signage Strategy (2025)</i>, they are not prohibited under Clause 52.05. - Officers note the Decision Guidelines in Clause 52.05-08 Signs are assessed by Officers on a case-by-case basis and businesses similar to Officeworks will be assessed on an individual basis. - Council officers are currently awaiting a response as to whether this satisfies the concerns raised.			
11		Request a Change	- The restriction on digital, illuminated and electronic signs in Clause 15.01-1L-01 is ambiguously drafted, insufficiently targeted and fails to give adequate weight to the legitimate commercial character of Precinct 2 (Princess Highway and Traralgon Station Corridor) as a designated gateway and commercial corridor. - The 1-kilometre major promotion sign separation sign requirement is an arbitrary numerical metric unsupported by any identified evidence base, and is	- A meeting to discuss the submission was held on Wednesday 22 April 2026. - A response to the submission included the below comments from Officers: - Amend: Restrict digital, illuminated and electronic signs in urban areas that do not impact on amenity to say: Avoid digital, illuminated and electronic signs in urban areas that impact on amenity. - Move to Strategy from Policy guideline:	No	Yes	Monday 23 February 2026

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
			disproportionate in its application to a compact activity centre such as Traralgon - The integration and subordination requirements are expressed at a level of generality that privies no guidance to implementation, creates uncertainty for applicants and decision makers and does not distinguish between commercial contexts where larger format signage is appropriate and those where it is not - The signage provisions in Clause 15.01-1L-01 are, on significant respect, redundant with the comprehensive framework already established by Clause 52.05 and the ACZ1 Schedule. This redundancy creates interpretive uncertainty, risks using a broad local policy to transcend the deliberate calibration of the sign category system and imposes compliance costs on applicants without correspondence benefits.	- Support digital, illuminated and electronic signs in urban areas that: - Maintain views and vistas along the streetscapes; - Minimise visual distraction and saturation of advertising in public areas; - Retain trees and high quality landscaping; - Retain architectural elements and features; - Minimise disturbance and impacts on places of heritage significance; - Sighted away from CBD gateways, town gateways and/or tourism gateways. - Council officers note that Clause 15.01 applies to all signage types, not just the Activity Centre Zone, as such, it is appropriate that similar strategies appear in in Clause 15.01 and Clause 37.01 ACZ Schedule 1 (ACZ1). - Amend: Support a minimum of one kilometre separation between major promotion signs to say: - Provide a minimum of 800 metre separation between			

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				major promotion signs on the same road; and - Support major promotion signs within 800m on the same street if they are within regional and sub-regional centres and activate an existing blank wall, provided they are fixed to a building, wholly within the built form and do not project outside of the building footprint; - Amend Clause 37.08 ACZ Precinct Requirements, The scale and location of signage should be subordinate to built form and site features to say: <i>The scale and location of signage should be complementary to built form and site features.</i> - Amend Clause 15.01-1L Signs, Sign structures should be designed in a manner to not dominate to the surrounding area or detract from the host or site building to say: <i>Encourage the appearance, size, illumination, and other aspects of signs to complement the building, or site on which they are displayed and not detract from the character of the surrounds.</i> - Officers note that changes and the deletion of new policy should not be deleted entirely as there are unique characters in Latrobe City which require specific sign guidelines.			

Sub No.	Name / Organisation	Support / Objection	Summary of Issues	Planning Comment	Is the Submission considered to be 'frivolous, vexatious' or 'wholly irrelevant' to the Amendment? (s23)	Changes to Plan Required? Yes / No	Date submission received
				Officers also note the Amendment does not make changes to the State Clause 52.05, and therefore planning permit triggers cannot be amended.			