

MINUTES

COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 24 February 2026
6:00 pm

City Hall
57 Little Malop Street, Geelong 3220

LIVE STREAMED ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE:

www.geelongaustralia.com.au/meetings

COUNCIL:

Cr S Kontelj (Kardinia Ward) - Mayor
Cr R Nelson (Barrabool Hills Ward) - Deputy Mayor
Cr E Sinclair (Charlemont Ward)
Cr M Cadwell (Cheetham Ward)
Cr E Wilkinson (Connewarre Ward)
Cr A Aitken (Corio Ward)
Cr A Katos (Deakin Ward)
Cr E Kontelj (Hamlyn Heights Ward)
Cr T Sullivan (Leopold Ward)
Cr R Story (Murradoc Ward)
Cr C Burson (You Yangs Ward)

1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS.....	4
1.1. Acknowledgement of Country	4
1.2. Apologies	4
1.3. Leaves of Absence	4
1.4. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest	4
1.5. Confirmation of Minutes	4
1.6. Public Question and Submission Time	5
1.7. Petitions	16
2. REPORTS	17
2.1. Community Priority Projects.....	17
2.2. Council to Candidate - State and Federal Election Guidelines	22
2.3. Financial Performance Report for the year to date ended 31 December 2025	26
2.4. Newcombe Street, Drysdale (Waterway Court to No. 60 Newcombe Street) - Intention to Declare report - Special Charge Scheme SRC 377	29
2.5. Proposed Road Discontinuance and Sale of Land at part Kirk Place, Geelong	36
2.6. Council Strategic Risk Profile Update	40
2.7. Revocation of Council Policies.....	43
3. RECORD OF INFORMAL MEETINGS OF COUNCILLORS.....	46
4. CLOSE OF MEETING.....	47

Present: Cr S Kontelj
Cr R Nelson
Cr T Sullivan
Cr A Aitken
Cr E Wilkinson
Cr E Sinclair
Cr A Katos
Cr E Kontelj
Cr M Cadwell
Cr R Story
Cr C Burson

Also Present: A Wastie (Chief Executive Officer), T Edwards (Executive Director, Corporate Services), J Stirton (Interim Executive Director, Growth and Place), A Locke (Acting Executive Director, City Infrastructure), A Basford (Executive Director City Life), A Martin (Chief Governance and Risk Officer) J Douglas (Manager Council & Corporate Governance) E Ryan (Senior Governance Advisor – Council Business) D Pangrazio (Governance Advisor – Council Business).

Opening: The Mayor declared the meeting open at 6.03pm.

1. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

1.1. Acknowledgement of Country

Council acknowledges the Wadawurrung People as the Traditional Owners of the Land, Waterways and Skies. We pay our respects to their Elders, past, present and emerging. We acknowledge all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are part of our Greater Geelong community today.

1.2. Apologies

Cr T Sullivan

1.3. Leaves of Absence

Nil

1.4. Declarations of Conflicts of Interest

Nil

1.5. Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLUTION - Item 1.5.1

Cr A Katos moved, Cr E Kontelj seconded -

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 27 January 2026 be confirmed.

Carried

1.6. Public Question and Submission Time

Question and Submission Time is an opportunity for questions to be addressed to Council and while the minutes record the general content, they do not purport to be a transcript of what was said by individuals. Likewise, Councillor or Officer verbal responses are in summary form only. Views expressed may not be the views of Council.

The following persons submitted questions prior to the Council Meeting and presented them at the Council Meeting, on the following subjects:

- Louis De Koker – Barwon River
- Chrissy Freestone - Barwon River Office Park
- John Winkler – Lara Drainage Upgrade

The following persons submitted questions prior to the Council Meeting but were not in attendance to present them at the Council Meeting, on the following subjects:

- Helen Foord – NBAC Closure
- Josephine Woodburn - Retirement Village Rates (*Present, but presented a petition on the same topic*)
- Joanne - Williams Rd, Mount Duneed
- Jenny Knox - Lara Drainage Upgrade

SUBMITTER 1. HELEN FOORD**Subject: NBAC CLOSURE****Question 1:**

The decision to close the North Bellarine Aquatic Centre for 6-7 months over the winter period to work in with stage 2 construction works appears to have been made with no consultation with the community who use this facility and fought hard first for the pool and then to keep it open during the winter (with the compressed hours making it very busy during the winter. In fact the stage 2 pool committee have confirmed that at a meeting in recent weeks they were told that the pool would only be closed for several weeks at a time. No update was provided to the stage 2 committee before this decision was made. Winter usage is actually very high at the pool during the compressed hours in the winter and the nearest outdoor facility also with compressed winter hours is Kardinia more than a 30 minute drive away and much longer on public transport. What other options were considered before making this decision?

Question 1 Response:

Thank you for your question Helen.

The City acknowledges the community's concern regarding consultation, and recognises the valuable contributions made by the Stage 2 committee through the design phase.

The decision to close the centre was made within current project governance arrangements and was driven by updated construction planning and risk assessments which identified that high-risk stage 2 works could not be safely undertaken while the pool remained operational.

The City also considered the risk that stop-start construction or partial openings would extend the overall works program, potentially delaying completion and causing peak summer closures.

Question 2:

In closing the North Bellarine pool for 6-7 months over the winter why were other options not considered and discussed with the stage 2 committee including reduced hours outside construction times. For example 6-7.30, 4-7pm, weekends to allow access to the community during the winter. We as a community appreciate the works need to be undertaken to open stage 2 but believe other options should be considered and consulted on within the local community who pay rates.

Question 2 Response:

Thank you for your second question Helen.

As part of construction planning, City officers considered options that would allow the pool to remain open during limited hours. These were assessed as not viable due to safety risks with high risk Stage 2 construction activities occurring adjacent to the existing pool and the ability to make the site safe in between live construction.

Completing the works in a single, continuous closure period was assessed as the safest and most efficient approach, despite the acknowledged short term impact on community access.

As project sponsor, the overriding factor for me was to ensure the safety of patrons, staff and workers at the site.

SUBMITTER 2. JOSEPHINE WOODBURN

Subject: RETIREMENT VILLAGE RATES

Submission:

That the City of Greater Geelong Council give consideration to the retirement villages of Geelong and District submission to approve a differential council rate of up to 33% for retirement villages when undertaking their annual rating review for the 2026 - 2027 financial year. A precedent has been set in other local council areas. S161 of the Local Government Act 1989 makes provision for this request. Retirement Village residents make reduced use of council services compared to the broader community. They have positive economic, environmental and social impacts on communities and relieve pressure on councils to provide social services and recreational facilities. Retirees live on fixed or modest incomes, such as the age pension and/or superannuation. Payment of full council rates places a significant financial burden on this vulnerable demographic. On behalf of Armstrong Green Retirement Village

Response

Thank you for your submission Josephine regarding the introduction of a differential council rate for retirement villages.

Council's rating system must ensure all rateable properties contribute fairly to the cost of services and infrastructure across the municipality.

Council rates are a property tax, not a user-pays system. Over a lifetime, people rely on Council services at different times, and rates are intended to reflect that broader lifecycle approach.

Residents of retirement villages continue to use Council services and infrastructure, while other residents do not have access to the private facilities provided within retirement villages. Property values within retirement villages are generally lower. This is already reflected in the property valuation-based rating system.

Introducing a lower rate for retirement villages would shift costs onto other ratepayers and create inequities, including for older Geelong ratepayers who choose to live in other types of housing. There is also a risk that any benefit may flow to village owners rather than individual residents. It is also recognised that not all residents within the municipality have the financial means to enter a retirement village.

A retirement village differential has been considered in the past and was not supported, as it was found to be inequitable.

For these reasons, Council must apply its Rating Strategy consistently and fairly across the whole community.

SUBMITTER 3. JOANNE

Subject: WILLIAMS RD, MOUNT DUNEED

Question 1:

Could council please advise when Williams Road, Mount Duneed, between White and Feehans Roads, will have bitumen laid and a dedicated footpath created for school children. The current gravel road has dirt overlaid every month and within days is back to a rutted mess, not to mention the more concerning fact of the risk of safety to school children walking and riding home from school

Question 1 Response

Thank you for your question Joanne.

Council officers are in discussion with the owners of 55 and 75 Williams Road (the land on the east side of Williams Road) in support of a residential rezoning and subdivision permit application. Rezoning land requires a statutory process and takes considerable time to complete, at least 12 months from when the application is lodged.

In anticipation of the rezoning and permit ultimately being issued, the developer will then reconstruct the road and deliver footpaths as part of the housing estate development.

SUBMITTER 4. JENNY KNOX

Subject: PLANNING PERMISSION

Question 1:

Our farmers face increasing costs and difficulties to farm with increasing urbanisation, and inappropriate activities adjacent to their farms, ie domestic dogs attacking sheep, objections to farm activities etc. Can the City please explain why planning permission (PP 309-2025) was granted for a dwelling on 7.5acres in Farm Zone FZ adjoining Drysdale By-Pass? Especially as there is no farm plan or agricultural activities on land contrary to SPP and town planning strategies. This is not in the spirit of the DAL provisions.

Question 1 Response

Thanks for your question Jenny.

The site you are referring to has an area of 3.04ha and is the product of fragmented farming land created when the Drysdale Bypass was constructed.

The adjoining and surrounding properties are more rural lifestyle properties than farming and have no meaningful or growth agricultural production. While there is some limited agricultural use within a 500-metre radius of the site, it is typically for horse keeping (agistment) and seasonal cropping.

The proposed dwelling will be well setback from other property boundaries and along with the single storey scale and natural tones, will not unduly compromise the rural landscape.

A condition on the permit is that an Environmental Management Plan is to be prepared and implemented to control weeds and pests. The management of the land will have a positive effect in the protection of other agricultural uses within the area.

With regard to the information I have just provided, the proposed dwelling was considered a suitable outcome.

SUBMITTER 5. LOUIS DE KOKER

Subject: BARWON RIVER

Question 1:

At the November 2025 Council meeting, I asked what Council and Councillors are doing to ensure that further planned development along the Barwon River banks will be more sensitive than the Balyang Sanctuary office park development. Council responded that the West Fyans/Fyans Street Structure Plan is "currently being reviewed with a community survey undertaken earlier this year" and that community consultation on the draft plan can be expected in early 2026. At the 9 December 2025 meeting, I asked follow-up questions about the 2025 survey: How many residents of Newtown and neighbourhoods with central Geelong Barwon River views, particularly Highton and Belmont, were (i) invited to participate and (ii) participated; and what was asked about the quality of the green Barwon River space they would wish to see preserved or enhanced. Council responded that the survey targeted landowners and occupiers within the West Fyans/Fyans Street Precinct Structure Plan area; that 20 responses were received; and that 6 one-on-one meetings were conducted. While helpful, this did not answer my questions about how many were initially invited or what was asked regarding preserving green Barwon River space. I sought clarification by reiterating my question about the targeted survey population and was promised a written response. I have not received one. What governance processes and controls do the Council have in place to ensure that all public questions are fully answered?

Question 1 Response

Hi Louis,

Thank you for letting us know that you are yet to receive a written response to follow up questions from the December council meeting. Please allow me to answer these for you now.

The community consultation on the Draft West Fyans–Fyans Street Precinct Structure Plan is planned for mid 2026. The draft will be open to the wider Greater Geelong community to review and comment, including Newtown, Highton and Belmont. All project-related information can be found on the project page on the City's website.

At the beginning of this review we ran targeted engagement with owners and occupiers within the precinct to understand precinct specific-issues and opportunities. A detailed consultation summary including survey questions and responses is available on the project page.

As part of the initial review, 717 letters were sent to owners/occupiers inviting participation to understand precinct specific issues and opportunities. From this initial engagement, 20 survey responses were received, 6 one on one meetings were held with major landowners/occupiers, 4 written submissions were received and 25 "pins" were dropped on the interactive map to help identify issues and opportunities in the precinct.

Louis, the City has strong processes in place to manage public question time submissions and responses. We recognise the time for you to receive a response to your follow up questions from December has been outside the usual service level and trust the above has now answered your additional queries.

SUBMITTER 6. CHRISSY FREESTONE

Subject: BARWON RIVER OFFICE PARK

Question 1:

There has been noticeable tree and foliage loss on the northern escarpment of the Barwon River alongside the Rocky Point Heritage Area (HO1617). This vegetation is important because it helps screen and integrate the Barwon River Office Park into the surrounding landscape. The development application for 45–47 & 51–53 Riversdale Road, Newtown specifically referenced the existing tree height as assisting to screen the building when viewed from the Barwon River banks. What steps have Council taken, including creating tree protection zones and ensuring new plantings, to protect the health of trees and vegetation on the northern escarpment adjoining the development site and along its western boundary at the rear of the Rocky Point Heritage Area?

Question 1 Response

Hi Chrissy,

The City notes that the heritage advice provided with the planning permit application for the development at 45–47 & 51–53 Riversdale Road, Newtown acknowledged that the site is included in the Rocky Point Heritage area.

Council as part of its consideration of the planning permit included a permit condition requiring tree protection zones to protect the vegetation on the site to be retained. It is noted the permit applicant is responsible for adhering to this condition.

That said, any trees on the adjoining site are on land managed by CCMA and any removal of these trees is subject to the consent of the land manager.

Question 2:

The site of the Barwon River Office Park at 45 Riversdale Road (45–47 & 51–53 Riversdale Road, Newtown) is also subject to the Significant Landscape Overlay Schedule 2 (SLO 2). SLO 2 identifies the escarpment on the northern bank of the Barwon River through Newtown as "of particular visual significance from both the river banks and the higher lands on the south bank." For the landscape character to be achieved, SLO2 requires the visual impact of any buildings, structures and works on views from those locations to be minimised. The Rocky Point Heritage Area Design Guidelines similarly require: "Protect the northern escarpment of the Barwon River from visual intrusion that will impact on the Barwon River and its environs by discouraging buildings and works that impede significant views to and from the Barwon River." At the November 2025 Council meeting, the Council representative stated that "the expert urban design images submitted with the application were assessed and were not considered as having an overbearing visual impact on the landscape along the Barwon River." Which views from the northern bank of the Barwon River, especially from the Rocky Point Heritage Area and Balyang, and from the "higher lands on the south bank" were assessed by Council, and if the assessment included site visits to those vantage points, what did they entail?

Question 2 Response

Thanks for your second question Chrissy.

As part of the consideration of the planning application this application included site visits, taking into account off-site impacts. This is noted in the delegate report as part of the assessment.

SUBMITTER 7. JOHN WINKLER

Subject: LARA DRAINAGE UPGRADE

Question 1:

The long-promised NE Lara drainage upgrade is on hold again while Council is considering funding and other priorities. At the same time in contradiction, Council is continuing to exacerbate the situation by mandating that ongoing developments surrounding the area are built with raised floors and driveway heights that are incrementally increasing the barrier to block more floodwater in Kyema Drive. And Council has still not reinstated the abandoned overlays which should be in place to help address these issues. Now under the revised Townhouse and Low Rise Code, Council cannot refuse an application if overlays are not in place, and without overlays even residents are now prevented from raising these issues at VCAT. We now have our second such development issue in 12 months where the plans for 63 McClelland Ave include a sealed concrete barrier along our back fences further adding to the problem of preventing overland flow escaping from the area and we now have both arms tied behind our back. The 2020 Lara Flood Study and its subsequent Peer Review both agreed to undertake the drainage upgrade in stages which should help budgeting and resolve the underlying problem. And both of these were in lockstep agreement in recommending Lipson Drive stage 1.

Can council please confirm Lipson Drive stage 1 is on the table for commencement in 2026-27?

Question 1 Response

Thank you for your question John.

We appreciate the community of Kyema and Lipson Drive have been advocating for many years for investment by the City to upgrade the local drainage.

As part of a new budget process, the City of Greater Geelong Community Panel will collaborate with Council to develop draft recommendations for the 2026/2027 budget. Projects that were previously submitted for consideration in the 2025-26 budget process that were not adopted, including the Lipson-Kyema drainage project will be automatically considered for 2026/2027.

The City has finite funds to allocate towards drainage infrastructure, and the budget is prioritised year on year according to projects that will deliver the greatest community benefit for the investment made.

Question 2.

What is Council doing about implementing the abandoned overlays that should be in place to protect residents?

Question 2 Response

Thank you for your second question John.

Historically Council has been the responsible planning authority to prepare and administer certain flood overlays which were derived through our Stormwater Catchment Studies. In instances such as Lara we were unable to garner support for these planning controls to be recognised in our planning scheme as you are aware.

The adoption of complex flood overlays has been challenging for many local governments in Victoria. In recent times the state has acknowledged the challenges relating to these amendments and adopted the role of the Planning Authority in these instances. The City is now working collaboratively with Corangamite Catchment Management Authority to better understand what this change looks like and more importantly how the state plans to adopt the planning amendments recommended from our studies.

John, we are hopeful through this change that the proposed planning amendments recognised in the Lara study will be recognised in Geelong's Planning Scheme.

1.7. Petitions

Cr A Katos left the meeting at 6.28pm.

Cr A Katos returned to the meeting at 6.30pm.

1. Armstrong Village Green Services – Support of a Differential Rate for Retirement Villages

Josephine Woodburn presented a petition on behalf of residents of Armstrong Green Village Services Inc (AVG). The petition requests that Council consider introducing a differential council rate for retirement villages as part of its review for the 2026–2027 financial year.

The petition contains approximately 132 signatures.

2. Parking in Barton Street, Bell Park

Cr E Kontelj presented a petition on behalf of residents of Barton Street, Bell Park. The petition requests that Council restrict on-street parking in certain areas along Barton Street to address congestion and safety concerns.

The petition contains approximately 80 signatures.

2. REPORTS

2.1. Community Priority Projects

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Purpose

1. To seek Council endorsement of the City of Greater Geelong 4 Tier Priority Projects (Attachment 1), with changes from the previously endorsed *Draft Regional Priority Projects 2025-26* endorsed at the September 2025 Council meeting.
2. To seek Council endorsement of the new Community Infrastructure Priority Projects (Attachment 2) for inclusion in future priority project advocacy.
3. Support to develop a joint Hallmark Regional Transport Priority for a rapid transport corridor between Geelong, Armstrong Creek and Torquay with Surf Coast Shire and
4. Continue to progress advocacy discussions with Victorian Government, relevant agencies and advocacy bodies, Members of Parliament and endorsed election candidates.

Background

5. Close collaboration between all three levels of government is vital for the future of the Greater Geelong community. The City's advocacy to secure funding commitments ahead of the 2026 Victorian Government Election is particularly important in the context of cost-of-living pressures, inflation and rising construction costs.
6. After more than a decade of rate capping, councils' capacity to self-fund major infrastructure has been significantly constrained, while costs and demand continue to rise. Increasing council co-contributions to state and regional projects are financially unsustainable. Councils must advocate for 100 per cent capital funding commitments, through election cycles, for projects driven by state policy and growth. The State must also recognise the full lifecycle costs transferred to councils—planning, operation, maintenance and renewal—to ensure infrastructure investment decisions are financially sustainable over the long term.
7. At the 23 September 2025 Council Meeting, Council endorsed the 2025–26 three-tier *Draft Regional Priority Projects 2025-26*, establishing strategic regional priorities. Since then, several projects have progressed and matured through planning, design and costing processes, making them prime candidates for external investment and in line with the previous council resolution are being proposed to be included.
8. Between July 2025 and February 2026, officers sought extensive feedback from Councillors to inform the development of the assessment criteria, provide strategic direction, and guide the identification of projects proposed for future advocacy.

Key Matters

9. A revised four-tier Priority Projects list is now proposed (Attachment 1), with an additional tier of Community Infrastructure Priority Projects added (Attachment 2). The

revised list will guide the City's advocacy and inform candidates at the 2026 Victorian Government Election of Greater Geelong's regional and community infrastructure needs, shovel-ready projects, and priority policy reforms required to support a sustainable future.

10. Projects endorsed at the 23 September 2025 remain unchanged, with the exception of Stormwater Management (Attachment 3) and Kindergarten Reform (Attachment 4). These projects have been updated in response to officer feedback and are included in this report for re-endorsement.
11. An additional Hallmark Regional Priority Project is also proposed for Council consideration (Attachment 5), following the progress of the Geelong Regional Tennis Centre in Armstrong Creek, which has Tennis Victoria's strategic support.
12. Two additional Regional Advocacy Projects that will address basketball court shortage across the region, given surging demand and growing participation, are being proposed for Council consideration. These are Lara Giants Basketball Indoor Community Courts at Beckley Park Corio (Attachment 6) and the Bellarine Peninsula Basketball Association Basketball expansion at Bellarine Secondary College (Attachment 7).
13. An additional Hallmark Regional Transport Priority Project is being proposed to be developed in conjunction with Surf Coast Shire for a rapid transport corridor between Geelong, Armstrong Creek and Torquay.
14. All Community Infrastructure Priority Projects meet the following criteria:
 - 14.1. City of Greater Geelong is the delivery authority;
 - 14.2. An endorsed Masterplan or Facility Development Plan exists;
 - 14.3. Shovel-ready, with prepared designs or advanced planning; and
 - 14.4. Meet Victorian Government Funding Criteria.
15. To ensure equitable distribution and alignment with Victorian electorates across Greater Geelong, projects have been assigned to one of four electorates of: Bellarine, Geelong, Lara and South Barwon.
16. The City of Greater Geelong 4 Tier Priority Project (Attachment 1) is proposed to supersede the previously endorsed Draft Regional Priority Projects 2025-26 from the 23 September 2025 council meeting and includes the additions and changes highlighted in Attachments 2-7.
17. This proposed document will form the basis of the City's advocacy for the 2026 Victorian State Election, including using these to draft submissions and motions to the Victorian Government and peak advocacy bodies and reporting annually on outcomes achieved.

Recommendation

Cr E Kontelj moved, Cr R Nelson seconded -

That Council:

1. Endorses the *City of Greater Geelong 4 Tier Priority Projects (Attachment 1)*, to replace the *Draft Regional Priority Projects 2025-26* endorsed at the September 2025 Council meeting;
2. Endorses the Community Infrastructure Priority Projects (Attachment 2) for advocacy to the Victorian Government, Members of Parliament and endorsed local candidates;
3. Supports the development of a joint Hallmark Regional Transport Priority for a rapid transport corridor between Geelong, Armstrong Creek and Torquay with Surf Coast Shire and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise agreed scope with Surf Coast Shire Chief Executive Officer, and;
4. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to progress advocacy discussions with Victorian Government, relevant agencies and advocacy bodies, Members of Parliament and endorsed election candidates.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.1

Amendment

Cr A Aitken moved, Cr A Katos seconded -

That Council:

1. Endorses the *City of Greater Geelong 4 Tier Priority Projects (Attachment 1)*, to replace the *Draft Regional Priority Projects 2025-26* endorsed at the September 2025 Council meeting;
2. Endorses the Community Infrastructure Priority Projects (Attachment 2) for advocacy to the Victorian Government, Members of Parliament and endorsed local candidates;
3. Supports the development of a joint Hallmark Regional Transport Priority for a rapid transport corridor between Geelong, Armstrong Creek and Torquay with Surf Coast Shire and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to finalise agreed scope with Surf Coast Shire Chief Executive Officer, and;
4. Authorises **the Mayor and** the Chief Executive Officer to progress advocacy discussions with Victorian Government, relevant agencies and advocacy bodies, Members of Parliament and endorsed election candidates, **and;**
5. **Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to add the Norlane West Scout Hall to the City's Priority Projects.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

18. Endorsement of the Priority Projects advocacy list will support the identification and pursuit of external funding opportunities, helping to leverage investment and reduce reliance on Council's own funding for infrastructure delivery.
19. Where projects are not fully funded through external sources, Council may be required to consider future budget allocations to support their delivery, subject to Council's financial capacity and prioritisation processes.
20. New and upgraded infrastructure assets will have ongoing operational and maintenance cost implications, which will need to be considered as part of Council's long-term financial planning and asset management frameworks.

Community Engagement

21. Community engagement and consultation were undertaken as part of the facility development plan and master plan processes.

Social Equity and Sustainability

22. The delivery of new and improved infrastructure will enhance access to health services, employment, transport and sport facilities and benefit all demographics across the Greater Geelong community. Investment which enables housing and industrial precinct growth will address the demand for more affordable housing and support jobs and economic growth.

Gender Equality – Gender+ Impact Assessment

23. The suite of community infrastructure projects included in this report has been assessed for their potential gender impacts, ensuring they support equitable access, participation and safety for people of all genders.
24. Many of the proposed projects directly address long-standing barriers experienced by women, girls and gender-diverse people by delivering inclusive changerooms, improved lighting, accessible pathways, and safer public spaces.
25. Investments in community hubs, sports facilities and youth spaces have been designed to enhance social connection, provide gender-responsive amenities, and reduce participation gaps that disproportionately affect women and gender-diverse community members.
26. Collectively, these projects contribute to a more inclusive built environment and advance Council's obligations under the Gender Equality Act 2020 to promote gender equity, prevent discrimination, and improve wellbeing outcomes for all.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

27. The endorsement of the City's Priority Projects advocacy pack exemplifies transparency and delivers on community expectations, in line with the Local Government Act 2020.

28. The Priority Projects listed align with the Council Plan 2025-29 and external investment in these projects will enable Council to achieve the community's expectations and long-term vision for Greater Geelong's Clever and Creative future.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

29. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority:
Economic Development
30. This report aligns with the Community led 30-year Vision, "Greater Geelong: A Clever and Creative Future" community aspiration:
A destination that attracts local and international visitors.

Conflict of Interest

31. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

32. Council is proactively managing future asset demand which deliver community value through planned advocacy rather than reactive delivery, consistent with a balanced appetite for assets management. The Community Priority Project list is distributed across electorates supporting equitable resources allocation as directing by its balanced appetite. Seeking external investment for shovel-ready projects limits Council's financial exposure while positioning the organisation to leverage funding opportunities, aligning with a cautious financial appetite. Criteria for inclusion of projects in the report are explicit and consistently applied, reducing perception of bias and aligning with an appetite fostering transparency in decision-making.

Environmental Sustainability

33. Projects included have considered environmental sustainability principles.

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - 4 Tier Priority Projects [2.1.1 - 75 pages]
2. Attachment 2 - Community Infrastructure Priority Projects [2.1.2 - 33 pages]
3. Attachment 3 - Stormwater Management [2.1.3 - 1 page]
4. Attachment 4 - Early Years Service Delivery Review [2.1.4 - 2 pages]
5. Attachment 5 - Geelong Regional Tennis Centre [2.1.5 - 1 page]
6. Attachment 6 - Lara Giants Stadium [2.1.6 - 1 page]
7. Attachment 7 - Bellarine Sports Centre expansion [2.1.7 - 1 page]

2.2. Council to Candidate - State and Federal Election Guidelines

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement of the Councillor Candidate Guidelines – State and Federal Elections (the Guidelines) (**Attachment 1**).
2. The Guidelines provide governance and best-practice guidance for Councillors who nominate, or are prospective candidates, in State or Federal elections, to support integrity, transparency, and public confidence in Council decision-making.

Background

3. Under Australia's electoral framework, Councillors are eligible to nominate as candidates in State or Federal elections. When doing so, a Councillor continues to hold public office at the local government level and remains subject to the Local Government Act 2020 (the Act), the Model Councillor Code of Conduct, and Council's governance framework.
4. The dual status of serving Councillor and electoral candidate can give rise to heightened governance risks, including actual or perceived conflicts of interest, misuse of position or resources, and community confusion between Council responsibilities and campaign activities. While legislative obligations already apply, there is benefit in providing clear, consistent guidance to support Councillors to manage these risks appropriately.
5. The Guidelines have been developed to complement existing legislative and Code of Conduct obligations. They do not create new statutory requirements or expand Council's enforcement powers, but instead articulate expectations and best practice measures consistent with sector practice and contemporary governance standards.
6. The Guidelines apply to all Councillors and are of general application. They focus on maintaining a clear separation between Council business and electoral activity, supporting ethical conduct and protecting the integrity and reputation of Council.

Key Matters

7. In considering this report, Councillors should note that:
 - 7.1. The Guidelines are non-statutory and operate alongside existing legislative obligations, including the *Local Government Act 2020*, the Model Councillor Code of Conduct, and relevant electoral legislation.
 - 7.2. The Guidelines apply to all Councillors, not only those who are candidates, and do not confer a personal benefit or detriment on any individual Councillor.
 - 7.3. The Guidelines are consistent with Municipal Association of Victoria's (MAV) guidance and emphasise best-practice governance, including transparency,

appropriate management of conflicts of interest, and the clear separation of Council duties from campaign activities.

- 7.4. The Guidelines strongly encourage, but do not mandate, certain measures (such as leave of absence) to manage real or perceived conflicts and to support public confidence.
- 7.5. Endorsement of the Guidelines provides clarity for Councillors, staff, the community, and supports consistent handling of candidate-related governance matters ahead of State or Federal elections.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.2

Cr E Wilkinson moved, Cr E Kontelj seconded -

That Council:

- 1. Endorses the Councillor Candidate Guidelines – State and Federal Elections (Attachment 1); and**
- 2. Notes that the Guidelines operate alongside, and do not replace, existing legislative requirements, the Model Councillor Code of Conduct, and Council governance policies.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

8. There are no direct financial implications arising from the endorsement of the Guidelines. The Guidelines rely on existing governance frameworks, systems, and resources.

Community Engagement

9. Community engagement was not necessary in the development of these guidelines.
10. The Guidelines are an administrative and educative document that consolidate existing legislative, regulatory, and governance obligations.

Social Equity and Sustainability

11. The Guidelines promote transparency, integrity, and accountability in Council operations during election periods. Clear guidance supports community trust by reinforcing that Council resources, decisions, and communications are not used, or perceived to be used, to support electoral campaigns.

Gender Equality – Gender+ Impact Assessment

12. A Gender+ Impact Assessment was not required for the development of these guidelines.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

13. The Guidelines are not a statutory instrument and do not create new legal obligations or enforcement powers for Council.
14. The Guidelines operate alongside existing legislative requirements under the Local Government Act 2020, the Model Councillor Code of Conduct, and relevant State and Commonwealth electoral legislation.
15. Councillors who are prospective or nominated candidates remain bound by these legislative frameworks at all times. Adoption of the Guidelines provides clarity and guidance but does not alter Council's statutory powers or obligations.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

16. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority:
Governance and Integrity

Conflict of Interest

17. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

18. The Guidelines support strong governance by clearly articulating expectations for managing actual and perceived conflicts of interest arising when a Councillor stands for higher office.
19. By reinforcing the separation between Council responsibilities and electoral activity, the Guidelines assist in mitigating governance, reputational, and integrity risks, and support public confidence in Council decision-making.

20. Failure to provide clear guidance in this area may increase the risk of inconsistent practices, community confusion, or perceptions of misuse of position or Council resources.

Environmental Sustainability

21. There were no environmental sustainability requirements applicable to the development of these guidelines.

Attachments

1. Councillor to Candidate - State and Federal Election Guidelines [2.2.1 - 12 pages]

2.3. Financial Performance Report for the year to date ended 31 December 2025

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Purpose

1. To endorse the Financial Performance Report Year to Date Ended 31 December 2025.

Background

2. On 24 June 2025 the 2025-26 budget was adopted with an underlying operating surplus of \$509,000, underpinned by an operating efficiency target of \$16.6 million.
3. Following adoption, a detailed efficiency program identified specific actions to achieve this target, replacing broad-based assumptions with targeted measures across departments.
4. Financial performance reports will be presented to Council on a quarterly basis, with this report representing quarter 2 for the 2025-26 financial year (FY26).
5. Further to the performance, the report provides the forward full year forecast for FY26.

Key Matters

6. The recurrent operating result to 31 December 2025 is a deficit of \$3.0 million, being \$1.5 million favourable to the year-to-date budget. This is primarily driven by timing-related underspends in Materials & Services and higher than anticipated interest from cash term deposits, partially offset by reduced supplementary rates and increased depreciation from FY25 asset revaluations.
7. The forecast operating position is a deficit of \$20.2 million and is (\$20.7 million) unfavourable to the full year budget. The forecast variance is driven by timing impacts from the early receipt of 50% of the FY26 Financial Assistance Grant funding recognised in the FY25, increased depreciation from FY25 asset revaluations, and lower-than-budget revenues from fees, charges and rates, partly offset by favourable Materials and Services underspends.
8. Capital works expenditure to 31 December 2025 is \$6.2 million favourable to the year-to-date budget primarily driven primarily by timing variances across the program of work. A summary of the year-to-date variances is provided in the attachment.
9. The forecast capital works expenditure position is \$31.9 million favourable to the full year budget. The variance is driven by project rephasing, with several large projects being rephased for delivery in the 2026-27 financial year.
10. Cash and investment balance as at 31 December 2025 of \$218.4 million, is \$29.4million favourable to the year-to-date budget. The favourable cash variance is primarily driven by a higher opening cash balance from FY25 capital delays, deferral of FY26 capital expenditure into FY27, and underspends in materials and services. This

is partly offset by the early receipt of 50% of the FY26 Financial Assistance Grant funding in FY25 and lower-than-expected developer contributions and fees.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.3

Cr A Katos moved, Cr A Aitken seconded -

That Council:

- 1. Endorses the Financial Performance Report Year to Date Ended 31 December 2025.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

11. As detailed in the attached Financial Performance Report Year to Date Ended 31 December 2025.

Community Engagement

12. Community engagement was undertaken during the development of the 2025-26 budget. Internal consultation has occurred with managers on the development of the full year forecast. Project managers have been consulted and provided the latest project updates which have been factored into this report.

Social Equity and Sustainability

13. Incomes and expenditures of the City's social equity programs are included in the attached Financial Performance Report Year to Date Ended 31 December 2025.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

14. The report is provided in accordance with the requirements under section 97 of the *Local Government Act 2020*.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

15. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority:
Governance and Integrity
16. This report aligns with the Community led 30-year Vision, "Greater Geelong: A Clever and Creative Future" community aspiration:
A prosperous economy that supports jobs and education opportunities.

Conflict of Interest

17. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment

18. There are no high or extreme risks arising from the subject of this report.

Environmental Sustainability

19. Incomes, expenditure, and investments focus on the preservation and enhancement of the City's commitment to environmental strategies and targets.

Attachments

1. Financial Management Report Year to Date Ended 31 December 2025 [2.3.1 - 23 pages]

2.4. Newcombe Street, Drysdale (Waterway Court to No. 60 Newcombe Street) - Intention to Declare report - Special Charge Scheme SRC 377

Source: City Infrastructure
Executive Director: Amanda Locke

Purpose

1. This report seeks a resolution by Council of its Intention to Declare a Special Charge Scheme (SRC) to partially fund the road construction and sealing of Newcombe Street, Drysdale from Waterway Court to No. 60 Newcombe Street.

Background

2. The proposed road construction and sealing works have been developed in response to complaints and a petition received from residents requesting to seal the road. Sealing the road will improve the service level provided by the road through addressing the impacts from dust, mud, and stone scatter to the adjacent properties as well as providing a consistent all-weather surface.
3. Newcombe Street demonstrated further support in a recent consultation phase in November 2025 where design cost estimates and apportionment were provided to the property owners. The majority support garnered through this exercise was done to enable each property owner to clearly understand their contribution costs.

Key Matters

4. The total scheme cost is estimated at \$203,429.00 with property owners contributing \$152,571.75 (75%) and a contribution from the City of \$50,857.25 (25%) in recognition of the community benefit. The estimated cost and apportionment are shown in **Attachment 3 – Schedule C**.
5. There are 11 properties which abut the proposed road upgrade, owned by 8 property owners. 4 of the 11 properties are owned by a social housing agency. We have not been able to contact the social housing agency, nor did they participate in the original petition, presenting a potential unknown risk.
6. Of the remaining 7 property owners we received responses from 4, with the remaining 3 property owners not offering a response. Of the 4 that responded, 3 are in support of upgrading this road under an SRC scheme (75% respondents) and 1 is not.
7. The majority, 2 out of 3 properties, preferred the equal share apportionment method outlined in Option E. This aligns with previous declared schemes, including Newcombe Street, Drysdale (Princess Street to The Glen) SRC 373 and Elgin Street, Drysdale SRC 376.
8. The scheme has been prepared in accordance with the Special Rate and Charge provisions of the *Local Government Act 1989*, and Council's Special Rates and Charges Policy and procedures.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.4**Cr R Story moved, Cr E Wilkinson seconded -****That Council:**

- 1. Gives notice of its Intention to Declare a Special Charge Scheme in accordance with section 163(A) of the *Local Government Act 1989* (the Act), as follows:**
- 1.1. The special charge is declared for a period of five years commencing on the date on which construction commences.**
- 1.2. The special charge be declared for the purpose of defraying expenses incurred by the City in relation to road sealing at Newcombe Street, Drysdale (between Waterway Court and No. 60 Newcombe Street).**
 - 1.2.1. Council considers the works will be a special benefit to those persons required to pay the special charge (and who are described in succeeding parts of the Resolution); and**
 - 1.2.2. The scheme arises out of Council's function for planning for and providing infrastructure for property owners.**
- 1.3. The total cost of the scheme be recorded as \$203,429.00, refer Attachment 1 – Schedule A.**
- 1.4. It be recorded that, for the purpose of section 163(2A) of the Act, (refer to Attachment 2, Schedule B) the special charge proceeds will not exceed the amount calculated in accordance with the prescribed formula ($R \times C = S$), where:**
- 1.4.1. 'Benefit ratio' (R) is calculated at 1 represents the special benefits to all persons liable to pay the special charge.**
- 1.4.2. 'Total cost' (C) of performing the function described in part 1.2 of this resolution based on estimated cost be recorded as \$203,429.00.**
- 1.4.3. 'Maximum levy' (S) be recorded as \$152,571.75.**
- 1.5. The following be specified as the area for which the special charge is declared.**
 - 1.5.1. The area with municipal district of Council highlighted in the plan in Attachment 4.**
- 1.6. The following be specified as the criteria which forms the basis of the special charge so declared:**
 - 1.6.1. Land within the area shown on the plan at attachment 4.**
- 1.7. The following be specified as the criteria which form the basis of the special charge so declared:**

- 3. Notes an allocation equal to the total project cost to fund the construction under this scheme needs to be made within Council's 2026-27 financial year budget if the scheme is declared at a future council meeting.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

9. Proposed cost for the road upgrade is \$203,429.00.
10. The City will fund \$50,857.25 (25%) and property owners will fund \$152,571.75 (75%) if this Special Charge Scheme is declared.
11. An allocation equal to the total project cost to fund the construction under this scheme needs to be made within Council's 2026-27 financial year budget if the scheme progresses.
12. Special charges are a key source of revenue for Council's civil infrastructure construction programs which enable the timely delivery of community requested infrastructure that provides a higher level of service than currently available and deliverable with existing capital budgets.
13. It is recognised that significant hardship can be experienced by members of our community. The City will consider an application for financial hardship relief confidentially and objectively based on the information provided by the person or business in the application and will advise of its decision in writing after receiving the application and all supporting information.
<https://cityweb.geelongcity.vic.gov.au/common/documents/8d7ea7f5b2c42c8-financialhardshipapplication.docx>
14. The cost apportionment method used for this scheme is 'equal share'. The cost apportionment methods considered have been provided in **Attachment 6**.

Community Engagement

15. To develop the scheme to an intention to declare stage, an engagement took place in response to a petition received in April 2025 with 5 of the 8 property owners showing support for the road upgrade under a Special Rate and Charge Scheme.
16. In response to the petition, we engaged with the identified benefitting property owners from 6 November to 4 December 2025. We provided information on the Special Rate and Charge Scheme process, designs and costs apportioned to properties to seal the road with a concrete edge strip.
17. There are 11 properties (8 property owners) abutting the proposed road sealing work that will receive a special benefit. Responses have been received from 4 of the 8 property owners (4 of 11 properties) contacted. 3 support the road sealing under a Special Charge Scheme and 1 does not.
18. Property owners were informed of the survey outcome in December 2025 and are aware that this report is going before Council for a decision to proceed to the next stage.
19. Further correspondence will be sent to all benefitting property owners should Council resolve to make its intention to declare the Special Charge Scheme.
20. The Special Charge Scheme process is described in **Attachment 5**. This submission relates to the stage 'Intention to Declare Scheme'.

Social Equity and Sustainability

21. The provision of properly sealed and drained roadways is aligned to the Council Plan and provides improved amenity, connectivity and safety, through consistency of surface conditions, for motorists and pedestrians.
22. Costs have been apportioned based on an equal share approach as supported by the majority of survey respondents.
23. Council is not required to levy a special rate and charge on any or every property that will receive a special benefit. A property with a special benefit may be excluded from the scheme for any of the following reasons:
 - 23.1 Council is unable to levy a special charge on the property.
 - 23.2 The owner of the property has already contributed to the costs of the works through a development levy.
 - 23.3 Council considers that there are advantages for the municipality in excluding the property from the scheme.
 - 23.4 Council considers that the special benefits for the property are marginal and would not warrant including the property in the scheme; or
 - 23.5 Any other reason that Council considers appropriate.

Gender Equality – Gender+ Impact Assessment

24. A Gender Impact Assessment was not required for this report.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

25. The scheme has been prepared in accordance with the Special Rate and Charge provisions of the *Local Government Act 1989*, consultation requirements of the *Local Government Act 2020* and Council's Special Rates and Charges Policy and procedures.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

26. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority:
Core and Critical Infrastructure
27. This report aligns with the community led 30-year vision, "Greater Geelong: A Clever and Creative Future" community aspiration:
A fast, reliable and connected transport network.

Conflict of Interest

28. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

29. Sealing the unsealed section of Newcombe Street, Drysdale between Waterway Court and No. 60 Newcombe Street will provide an enhanced level of service to residents compared to the level of service provided by a gravel road.

30. In making its intention to declare the scheme, Council is subject to the submissions process made under section 223 of the *Local Government Act 1989* and potential for the scheme to subsequently be referred to VCAT (Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal) in making a final determination.
31. The properties subject to the special charge have been identified in compliance with the Special Rate and Charge provisions outlined in the *Local Government Act 1989*, the consultation requirements established by the *Local Government Act 2020*, and the policies and procedures of the Council regarding Special Rates and Charges.
32. The tender evaluation process will involve the assessment of work, health and safety policies, procedures, and risk assessment documents. Any other risks associated with the acceptance of this tender will be managed through the contract conditions.

Environmental Sustainability

33. The road infrastructure proposal provides sealed access and improved amenity as dust, mud and stone scatter concerns are mitigated.
34. There will be no significant vegetation removal to complete this project.

Attachments

1. Attachment 1 Schedule A Cost Estimate Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC377 Intention to Declar [2.4.1 - 1 page]
2. Attachment 2 Schedule B Benefit Cost Ratio Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC377 Intention to D [2.4.2 - 1 page]
3. Attachment 3 Schedule C Proposed special charge Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC377 Intention [2.4.3 - 1 page]
4. Attachment 4 Plan Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC377 Intention to Declare D25 618733 [2.4.4 - 1 page]
5. Attachment 5 Scheme Process Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC377 Intention to Declare D25 6187 [2.4.5 - 1 page]
6. Attachment 6 Cost Apportionment Methods Newcombe Street Drysdale SRC 377 Intention to Dec [2.4.6 - 1 page]

2.5. Proposed Road Discontinuance and Sale of Land at part Kirk Place, Geelong

Source: Office of the Chief Executive
Chief Executive Officer: Ali Wastie

Purpose

1. To advise Council of the outcome from the community engagement relating to the proposed road discontinuance and sale of a portion of Kirk Place at the rear of 160-176 Malop Street, Geelong.

Background

2. The owners of 160-176 Malop Street and 2 Powell Place, Geelong request to purchase approximately 172m² of road reserve at the rear of and adjacent to their properties in Kirk Place (Attachment 1).
3. Council approved the commencement of the statutory process in accordance with section 223 of the *Local Government Act 1989* and section 114 of the *Local Government Act 2020* and its Community Engagement Policy at the Council meeting on 9 December 2025.

Key Matters

4. Community engagement on the proposed discontinuance and sale of part of Kirk Place was undertaken from 12 December 2025 to 12 January 2026, with one submission received which was supportive of the proposal.
5. The Minister for the Department of Transport issued a planning permit to the owners for their future Malop Street development incorporating retail and residential spaces.
6. If the road is discontinued and sold, the land will be consolidated with the owner's adjoining properties to accommodate the future development.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.5

Cr C Burson moved, Cr M Cadwell seconded -

That Council:

- 1. Notes the outcome of the community engagement process in accordance with Section 233 of the Local Government Act 1989 and the City's Community Engagement Policy;**
- 2. Approves the road discontinuance and sale of approximately 172m² of part Kirk Place, Geelong;**
- 3. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer or delegate to publish a notice in the Victorian Government Gazette detailing the road discontinuance; and**
- 4. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer or delegate to sign documents to complete the sale of land.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

- 7. The City will be reimbursed for all legal and marketing costs incurred for the road discontinuance and the sale of the land by the purchaser.
- 8. If sold, a register valuer will determine the value of the land.

Community Engagement

- 9. Community engagement was undertaken on the Have Your Say page and a notice published in the local newspapers on the proposal to discontinue and sell the land.
- 10. Submissions were invited and one submission received, that submitter did not wish to be heard.
- 11. A summary of the submission:

Key Themes	Officer’s Response
Encouraged any initiative to clean up and utilize undesired land and make it useful.	This feedback was passed on to the owners of the adjoining properties.

Social Equity and Sustainability

- 12. There is no adverse social equity issues created as a result of this proposed road discontinuance and sale of land.
- 13. The proposed road discontinuance and sale of part of Kirk Place will strengthen the owner’s development project and benefit the wider Geelong community by offering more retail space and residential accommodation.

Gender Equality – Gender+ Impact Assessment

- 14. An assessment was not completed on the proposed road discontinuance and sale of part Kirk Place, Geelong as it does not relate to the criteria of when an assessment is required, being an existing or developing service, program or policy.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

- 15. Council has the authority to discontinue a road under Clause 3 of Schedule 10 of the *Local Government Act 1989* by notice published in the Government Gazette.
- 16. A person may make a submission in accordance with Section 223 of the *Local Government Act 1989* on the proposed exercise of power to discontinue a road.
- 17. Section 114 of the *Local Government Act 2020* applies to the sale of land.

Alignment to Community Plan and Vision

- 18. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority: Economic Development.
- 19. This report aligns with the Community led 30-year Vision, “Greater Geelong: A Clever and Creative Future” community aspiration:

Sustainable development that supports population growth and protects the natural environment.

Conflict of Interest

20. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

21. Internal consultation with Civil Infrastructure Planning (Drainage and Stormwater) and Civil Infrastructure (Transport) were completed with both departments supporting a road discontinuance and sale of the land.
22. The planning permit issued by the Minister for the Department of Transport went through an extensive internal and external referral process acknowledging all stakeholders' and their recommendations.
23. There are no other risks associated with the implementation of the recommendation.

Environmental Sustainability

24. There are no environmental sustainability implications associated with this report.

Attachments

1. Kirk Place Gazettal Plan [2.5.1 - 1 page]

2.6. Council Strategic Risk Profile Update

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Purpose

1. To provide a report to Council on the updated strategic risk profile.

Background

2. As per the definition contained in the Enterprise Risk Management Framework (Framework), strategic risks are “risks with potential to materially affect delivery of Council’s strategic objectives or the organisation strategy, which can have long-term or organisation wide impact or be ongoing”.
3. In accordance with the Framework, Council strategic risks are reviewed in collaboration with Senior Management every four years to ensure alignment with Council’s strategic objectives and plans.
4. With the Organisation Strategy 2024-29 underway and the Council Plan 2025-29 established, a review of Council strategic risks was undertaken in 2025.

Key Matters

5. The review of Council strategic risks involved a series of workshops with Senior Leaders from each Directorate. The Organisation Strategy 2024-29 and the Council Plan 2025-29 in addition to sector risk publications were referenced during the process. This was to ensure Council’s strategic risk profile links to its current strategic objectives and challenges.
6. Existing risks were validated to confirm their relevance, and new risks were identified and assessed. Key changes from the previous strategic risk profile are outlined below:
 - 6.1. Four additional risks have been recognised, each directly associated with emerging initiatives or priority areas outlined in the Organisation Strategy and Council Plan:
 - 6.1.1. IT Modernisation
 - 6.1.2. Strategic Asset Management
 - 6.1.3. Natural Environment
 - 6.1.4. Heritage & Culture
 - 6.2. Five risks that were previously identified as strategic have now been reclassified as operational risks. Although these risks remain significant at the organisational level, their potential consequences are expected to affect daily operations in the short term, rather than influence the long-term strategic direction and priorities of the organisation.
 - 6.2.1. Child Safety

- 6.2.2. Fraud & Corruption
 - 6.2.3. Corporate Emergency
 - 6.2.4. Employee Safety
 - 6.2.5. Corporate Records.
- 6.3. The previously identified risk of 'Council Overcommitment' has now been integrated into the 'Financial Sustainability' risk, rather than being treated as a separate risk. This change reflects the significant overlap between these two areas, as strategic decisions made by Council often have a direct impact on budgeting and financial outcomes.
- 6.4. The previously reported risk on 'Organisational Strategy' is no longer a standalone risk. It is captured across the other thirteen risks, which link to the City's current strategic priorities.
- 6.5. The updated strategic risk profile was presented to the Executive Leadership Team in September 2025 and to the Audit & Risk Committee in December 2025.
7. The strategic risk profile and a summary of the strategic risks is available in Attachment 1.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.6

Cr A Katos moved, Cr R Nelson seconded -

That Council:

- 1. Notes Council strategic risk profile as contained in Attachment 1.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

8. Financial sustainability is one of the strategic risks to Council. It is currently rated high and is subject to a mitigation plan focusing on strengthening governance, monitoring financial position, and achieving efficiencies and savings.

Community Engagement

9. No community engagement occurred for this report.

Social Equity and Sustainability

10. Equitable access to Council's run health, well-being and social services is a strategic risk to Council. Various strategies are in place however further work is required to embed social equity principles into planning and decision making, to ensure community equity remains a priority.

Gender Equality – Gender+ Impact Assessment

11. There is a no gender equality impact assessment required with this report.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

12. There are no legal implications involved with this report.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

13. This report identifies the risks that could hinder achievement of Council strategic objectives as set in the Council Plan 2025-29.

Conflict of Interest

14. No officer involved in the preparation of this report declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

15. This report meets the requirements of the Enterprise Risk Management Framework by presenting an updated strategic risk profile aligned with the strategic objectives of the Council Plan.

Environmental Sustainability

16. Council's failure to prevent or contribute to environmental degradation is identified as a strategic risk. With significant municipal growth occurring across the region, the protection of Geelong's surrounding natural environment will become increasingly critical. Ongoing advocacy is required to raise awareness of the local context, particularly during planning processes, alongside continual monitoring of areas of concern.

Attachments

1. Appendix 1 Council strategic risk profile [2.6.1 - 2 pages]

2.7. Revocation of Council Policies

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Purpose

1. For Council to approve the revocation of the following Council Policies:
 - 1.1. Asset Management Policy
 - 1.2. Unauthorised Occupation and Use of Council Land Policy

Background

2. Council-endorsed policies set out the elected Council's position on specific issues, providing a framework for decision-making and the exercise of authority.
3. These policies typically impact the community and may be mandated by legislation, often relating to goods, services, or activities delivered by or to the Council.
4. Council policies are formally established through Council resolution. Each endorsed Council policy is subject to a regular review process to ensure it remains current, accurately reflects Council or City standards, and complies with relevant legislation.
5. While under review, a policy remains in effect until the Council, as the approval authority, either adopts a revised version or formally revokes it.

Key Matters

6. A recent view of the portfolio of Council policies has identified a number that ready for review.
7. After consulting with the Responsible Officer, it was determined that several policies could be revoked to prevent duplication and remove outdated concepts
8. Details of the Council policies recommended for revocation, and their reasons for revocation, are set out below:

Name of Council Policy	Basis for Revocation
Asset Management Policy	Has been replaced by a Management Policy endorsed on 14 August 2024.
Unauthorised Occupation and Use of Council Land Policy	Provisions dealing with the unauthorised use and occupation of Council land are contained in the Neighbourhood Amenity Local Law 2024.

RESOLUTION - Item 2.7

Cr E Sinclair moved, Cr E Wilkinson seconded -

That Council:

- 1. Revoke the following policies:**
 - 1.1. Asset Management Policy, and;**
 - 1.2. Unauthorised Occupation and Use of Council Land Policy.**

Carried

Financial Sustainability

9. There are no budgetary impacts in relation to the content of this report.

Community Engagement

10. No community engagement has been undertaken in relation to this report.

Social Equity and Sustainability

11. There are no social equity issues in connection with this report.

Relevant Law/Policy/Legal Implications

12. Maintaining overdue and outdated policies exposes the City to significant risks, including legal and compliance vulnerabilities, misalignment with current strategic objectives and the potential for incorrect decision making by City Officers.

Alignment to Council Plan and Vision

13. This report aligns with the Council Plan 2025-29 strategic priority: Governance and Integrity.

Conflict of Interest

14. No officer involved in the preparation of this report has declared a general or material conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment and Risk Appetite Statement

15. Maintaining overdue and outdated policies exposes the City to significant risks, including legal and compliance vulnerabilities, misalignment with current strategic objectives and the potential for incorrect decision making by City Officers.

Environmental Sustainability

16. There are no environmental sustainability issues in relation to the content of this report.

Attachments

Nil

3. RECORD OF INFORMAL MEETINGS OF COUNCILLORS

Source: Corporate Services
Executive Director: Troy Edwards

Summary

1. The Governance Rules of the City of Greater Geelong require the tabling of records of informal meetings of Councillors at the next convenient Council meeting and that their record be included in the minutes of that Council meeting.
2. A summary of the informal meetings of Councillors is attached.

RESOLUTION - Item 3.1

Cr A Katos moved, Cr R Nelson seconded -

That Council receive the summary of the informal meetings of Councillors for the period to 24 February 2026.

Carried

4. CLOSE OF MEETING

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 7.16pm on Tuesday 24 February 2026.

Signed: _____

Cr Stretch Kontelj (Mayor)

Date: _____