

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND SUBMISSIONS 28 JULY 2026



SUBMITTER 1. KELLI LAVELLE	2
Subject: TRANSPORT	Relevant City Department: Growth & Place 2
SUBMITTER 2. DANIEL ROBERTSON	3
Subject: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT	Relevant City Department: City Infrastructure 3
SUBMITTER 3. DR DAVID PAVIA	5
Subject: FYANSFORD LANDFILL	Relevant City Department: Growth & Place 5
SUBMITTER 4. VANESSA WHITTEM	6
Subject: PEST ANIMAL NUMBERS	Relevant City Department: City Infrastructure 6
SUBMITTER 5. PETER CLAPINSKI	7
Subject: HISTORICAL RESERVE DESIGNATION	Relevant City Department: Growth & Place 7
SUBMITTER 6. JEANNE NEL	8
Subject: URBAN FOREST STRATEGY	Relevant City Department: Growth & Place 8

Subject: TRANSPORT**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place
Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles****Question 1:**

Thank you for taking my questions tonight and I am here as a member of Better Streets Geelong.

The redevelopment of the South Geelong train station has led to the renamed Jubilee street and Amphlett Way becoming one-way streets, with vehicles now travelling at 40km/hour. A wide pedestrian/cycle path has been created which connects the station to Kardinia Park, the Bellarine rail trail, the city, the river, the waterfront, and Waurn Ponds. All these paths are off road and safe to walk and cycle.

As a local resident, I have witnessed so many more people using this path for running, walking and cycling. A clear case of build it and they will come.

COGG commenced community engagement of the Integrated Transport Strategy in 2024 and I have participated in all phases of the engagement. Your website indicates phase 4 of the draft strategy and community consultation will be open in early 2026 and the final strategy will be adopted in mid 2026.

Given that we are now approaching the end of July, my first question tonight is when will phase 4 of the ITS be open, and when will the final strategy be adopted by council?

Question 1 Response:

Thank you for your question Kelli.

The Draft Integrated Transport Strategy is currently being finalised and is expected to be presented to Council in September seeking approval to undertake community consultation. Subject to Council's consideration, community consultation will commence shortly afterwards. Following consultation, community feedback will be reviewed and used to inform any refinements before the strategy is presented back to Council for consideration and potential adoption in late 2026 or early 2027.

Question 2:

The Victorian state government and other LGAs are aiming for 25% of trips to be made by active transport by 2030. The Federal Government has funding available for projects as part of the Victorian Active Transport fund. Unfortunately, I cannot see any projects being funded in Geelong with this federal money and would be happy to know if COGG has applied for funding for local projects.

Bicycle Network is running a campaign asking the Victorian state government for a commitment of 5 % of the transport budget to be allocated to walking and cycling infrastructure. The United Nations recommends 20% of transport budgets be dedicated to active transport.

Question 2 response:

The City has applied for funding opportunities through the Black Spot program in the past financial year, allowing for the design of improvements at several intersections across Geelong, East Geelong and Marshall, with the infrastructure to be delivered in the future. These projects will support a safer, slower road network with improved safety prioritised in their designs.

The City recognises the important role that walking and riding infrastructure plays in creating connected, healthy and accessible communities. We are supportive of any additional funding that will lead to better active travel outcomes for the State and our region. The City will continue to work with State and Federal governments to advocate for funding that addresses local transport needs and supports a balanced and integrated transport network.

We recognise the important role that walking and riding infrastructure plays in creating connected, healthy and accessible communities. We are supportive of any additional funding that will lead to better active travel outcomes for the State and our region. The City will continue to work with State and Federal governments to advocate for funding that addresses local transport needs and supports a balanced and integrated transport network.

Subject: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**Relevant City Department: City Infrastructure
Acting Executive Director Allana Bedggood****Question 1:**

Firstly, I want to raise an issue regarding the intersection at South Valley Rd, Porter Ave, and Bonsey Rd in Highton. I have noticed as drivers approach the intersection some appear to significantly slow down from the 60 km/h speed limit. This presents a hazard to other drivers and pedestrians. Drivers who slow down may be doing so because it reasonably appears to them as a built-up area. There is also increased pedestrian traffic, particularly schoolchildren crossing the road walking to the local pre and primary schools. Many do not use the school crossing further north at the Kennedy Grove intersection. There is an electronic, variable speed limit in the area, however it is approximately 70 metres north of the intersection. So even during school times, the speed limit is still 60 km/h through there. I have had the unfortunate experience of a child stepping out onto the road in front of me there and needing to brake hard to avoid hitting them. While I recognise South Valley Rd is classified as an arterial road and therefore within the jurisdiction of the State Government, local governments have significant advocacy power. I therefore ask Council for its view on the safety of this intersection, and if it will commit to making a submission to the Department of Transport and Planning to lower the speed limit.

Question 1 Response:

Thank you for your question Daniel.

The City has received community feedback from residents expressing concerns regarding safety, congestion and the operation of the intersection, particularly during peak travel periods.

In response to this community feedback and the growing demands on the local road network, the City is advocating to the Department of Transport and Planning to undertake a detailed assessment of the intersection and consider appropriate safety and capacity improvements.

Question 2:

Secondly, regarding the Queen's Park Bridge, it is becoming increasingly apparent the current voluntary yield system is not effective at managing the flow of traffic. Currently, there is a non-standard informational sign on both sides of the bridge asking drivers to give way to waiting vehicles. Many do not. When drivers do not yield, traffic subsequently banks up further on the opposing side. During peak times, traffic will bank up 350 metres past Melville Ave on the Newtown side, and well past the golf course turn-off on the Highton side. The issue is further compounded given that drivers on the Highton side have an obstructed view of the bridge. Most weeks I go fishing beside the bridge, so I have a first-hand view of what occurs. There are often moments where vehicles from opposing sides will attempt to cross simultaneously. Drivers must then precariously reverse along the narrow bridge. I occasionally see broken glass on the road and the footpath below which I suspect is due to this. But there are also occasionally standoffs between drivers. On one occasion I witnessed and recorded a video of two drivers stopped on the bridge, one of whom exited their vehicle, verbally abusing each other over who had the right-of-way. Further pressure has been put on the bridge with the population increase of nearby suburbs in and around the Barrabool Hills area. Residents who live there understandably will not go out of their way to use the bridge between Shannon Ave and Barrabool Rd to cross the Barwon River. Data from the Department of Transport and Planning reveals that in 2019 an estimated 3,936 vehicles crossed the bridge each day. Although I was unable to find more recent data, extrapolating what is available reveals the current traffic volume is likely more than 4,800 vehicles per day. This may mean the single-lane bridge no longer complies with road traffic capacity guidelines and standards. Despite the bridge being within the purview of the State Government, Council is responsible for the residential growth which is contributing to the traffic volume and the subsequent issues. I therefore ask Council for its view on traffic management across the bridge, and if it will commit to making a submission to the Department to initiate a review to improve it. I would suggest installing traffic lights.

Question 2 Response:

Thanks for your second question Daniel.

As the Queen's Park Bridge forms part of the arterial road network managed by the Department of Transport and Planning, decisions regarding traffic management measures, operational changes and potential infrastructure upgrades are the responsibility of the State Government.

In response to the concerns raised, the City will write to the Department of Transport and Planning to advocate for a review of the bridge and its current traffic management arrangements, including consideration of traffic volumes, safety, operational performance and any potential improvement opportunities.

Subject: FYANSFORD LANDFILL**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place
Acting Executive Director Jaquie Randles****Question 1:**

My wife and I have obtained a planning permit to build a new home at 55 Lower Paper Mills Road, Fyansford, adjacent to the Southeast corner of the Fyansford Landfill. We currently live next door at 65 Lower Paper Mills Road and are aware of the history of the landfill. We must shortly decide whether to enter into a building contract to build our new home and commit to a substantial financial investment. That decision depends on understanding the future operation of the landfill and the planning controls that apply to the site. Question 1 What evidence has Council relied upon to conclude that existing use rights extend to the southeast corner of the landfill, given that the land comprises separate titles and historical aerial photography appears to show little or no landfill activity there for many years? In *Wellington & Ors v Surf Coast SC* [2011] VCAT 2317, the Tribunal found that existing use rights extended only to those lots supported by sufficient evidence of continuous use. How does Council distinguish its position from that decision, and has it obtained any formal planning or legal advice on this issue?

Question 1 Response:

Thank you David for your questions.

Council has considered whether existing use rights extend to the southeast corner of the land and has formed the view that the existing use rights extend to the southeast corner.

In doing so, Council considered historical approvals for the landfill (such as Planning Permit 837, Works Approvals and Licences issued by the Environment Protection Authority), the provisions of the planning scheme and available information regarding landfill operations.

Council has formed the view that the site operates as one integrated area for the purpose of a landfill.

Question 2:

Given that the Landfill operators own website states "Once a landfill, the site is now evolving into a state-of-the-art recovery and sorting facility that processes more than 150 tonnes of material per day." What is Council's current understanding of the future operation of the Fyansford Landfill, including any intention to recommence waste picking, expand waste transfer or recycling activities, or utilise the southeast corner for landfill or associated operations? What planning approvals and compliance processes would be required before any such activities could lawfully commence?

Question 2 Response:

The landowner has not informed Council of its future intentions after landfill operations cease. Landfill operations, including in the southeast corner, are lawful and can continue. Once operations cease the owner has responsibilities to rehabilitate the land. We also note the City has received separate correspondence from yourself over the weekend which will also be responded to.

Subject: PEST ANIMAL NUMBERS**Relevant City Department: City Infrastructure
Acting Executive Director Allana Bedggood****Question 1:**

I note that the City of Greater Geelong Plan for Nature is to be approved at tonight's Council meeting. In the City of Greater Geelong Draft Plan for Nature, Under Goal 3: Connections and Restoration, the 10 year targets include: Pest animal numbers reduced within City managed reserves and roadsides. Under the Action Plan in the Draft Plan for Nature, the only Action listed for the next 2 years regarding pest animals is: 27) Review and expand the Rabbit Action Plan to include other pest animals such as foxes, deer and feral cats. My questions: 1) What is the current estimate of pest animal numbers (rabbits, foxes, feral cats and deer) on City managed reserves and roadsides?

Question 1 Response

Thank you for your question Vanessa.

The City does not currently hold definitive pest animal population numbers across Council managed reserves and roadsides.

Most pest animal management focuses on rabbits, with control programs delivered in line with the Rabbit Control Plan 2021–2026. Rabbit populations are monitored before and after control programs using spotlight surveys, and drone surveys have recently been trialled.

The City has also recently commenced a deer control program at Sparrovale Wetlands – Ngubij Yoorree. Baseline population data of 150 Fallow Deer was established through a Parks Victoria study of the Connewarre Complex prior to the commencement of control activities. All deer removed through the program are recorded. In 2027 the City will initiate discussions with Parks Victoria to undertake another mapping exercise to measure deer numbers to determine whether our baseline data has changed.

Question 2:

How did the City calculate these numbers?

Question 2 Response:

The data for deer numbers was provided by Parks Victoria.

The Geelong Plan for Nature 2026-2036 action will enable the City to review our pest animal management program and incorporate new species such as Indian Myna. It will also allow us to review our monitoring and reporting program to measure the effectiveness of control activities and better understand their impact.

Subject: HISTORICAL RESERVE DESIGNATION**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place
Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles****Question 1:**

Application Number: PP-416-2026 Address: 168-176 Portarlington Road Newcomb The City recently legislated and acquired ownership of a 1 272 square meter strip of land on the corner of Portarlington Road and Coppards Road Newcomb. This land is currently a designated Tree Planting Reserve. Given the Council has an urban tree strategy, and will vote on a plan that better protects Nature, it is incongruous that Statutory Planning has surreptitiously applied to remove the existing designation with a resulting loss of a rare urban green space. 1. What is the rationale for the Statutory Planning Department's internal application to remove the Tree Planting Reserve?

Question 1 Response:

Thank you for your question, Peter.

The application lodged by the City's Property Unit and currently under assessment by the City's Statutory Planning Unit seeks to remove a historical "Plantation Reserve" designation contained within the Plan of Subdivision under the Subdivision Act 1988 for land at 166-176 Portarlington Road, Newcomb. The application remains under consideration, and no decision has been made.

The rationale for the application is to ensure that historical subdivision controls are reviewed against the contemporary planning and statutory framework applying to the land. The land is zoned Low Density Residential and is not zoned Public Park and Recreation Zone.

The planning application relates only to the historical reserve designation and does not itself determine the future use of the land. Any future decision regarding the land would be subject to separate consideration and any applicable legislative and public consultation requirements.

Question 2:

What are the benefits to the community and to the environment of removing the existing designation?

Question 2 Response:

The application itself is not proposing any physical change to the land, removal of vegetation, development, or alteration of public access. Its purpose is to clarify the land's historical designation and ensure future decisions, if any, can be considered through the appropriate legislative and public consultation processes.

Subject: URBAN FOREST STRATEGY**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place
Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles****Question 1:**

Congratulations on completing the Draft Urban Forest Strategy: Healthy Country 2026-2036 with a view to public consultation. The Strategy relies on underlying research and associated reports. QUESTION: Can the Council confirm that any research and reports that the Strategy relies on will be made available prior to the four-week period of community consultation? In particular, will the research and reports be included in the material published on the Have Your Say page for the consultation?

Question 1 Response:

Public consultation is expected to begin in early August 2026. The Have Your Say page will include the Draft Strategy and the supporting documents that informed its development, where these can be publicly released, thank you for this suggestion.

This information will be available for the community to read and consider when providing feedback during the consultation period.