

## PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND SUBMISSIONS 25 AUGUST 2026



|                                                                     |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>SUBMITTER 1. MICHELLE RICHARDS DON .....</b>                     | <b>2</b>  |
| Subject: CAT DESEXING .....                                         | 2         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 2. BERNICE DAVIES .....</b>                            | <b>3</b>  |
| Subject: OPEN SPACE .....                                           | 3         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 3. NOEL THOMPSON .....</b>                             | <b>4</b>  |
| Subject: Townsend Road Whittington .....                            | 4         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 4. JOHN WINKLER .....</b>                              | <b>5</b>  |
| Subject: DRAINAGE – LARA .....                                      | 5         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 5. SIMON NARDI .....</b>                               | <b>6</b>  |
| Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN .....                | 6         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 6. BRENDAN O’LOAN .....</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN .....                | 9         |
| <b>SUBMITTER 7. ANTONIO NARDI (PROXY SIMON NARDI) .....</b>         | <b>10</b> |
| Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN .....                | 10        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 8. ANDREW DUGGAN (PROXY MARY HENNESSEY) .....</b>      | <b>11</b> |
| Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN .....                | 11        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 9. ROGER SMITH .....</b>                               | <b>12</b> |
| Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE: .....     | 12        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 10. MARK TRENGROVE .....</b>                           | <b>14</b> |
| Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE: .....     | 14        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 11. CAROLE BARTHOLOMEW .....</b>                       | <b>15</b> |
| Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE .....      | 15        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 12. MICHAEL DRAGT (PROXY CAROLE BARTHOLOMEW) .....</b> | <b>16</b> |
| Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE: .....     | 16        |
| <b>SUBMITTER 13. ALLAN BARTHOLOMEW .....</b>                        | <b>18</b> |
| Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE: .....     | 18        |

## SUBMITTER 1. MICHELLE RICHARSDON

**Subject: CAT DESEXING**

**Relevant City Department: City Life - Acting Executive Director Amie Higgs**

**Question 1:**

Given that cat desexing is legally mandatory for municipal pet registration in Greater Geelong, the low funding caps on free National Desexing Network (NDN) pensioner vouchers create an accidental barrier to legal compliance for vulnerable residents. Will Council commit to increasing the annual voucher funding cap or applying for upcoming state-level Animal Welfare Victoria Cat Desexing Grants to better support low-income pet owners in Lara and the wider municipality? I have submitted a comprehensive letter detailing the financial and community safety benefits of this budget adjustment via the General Enquiry Form for your review.

**Question 1 Response:**

*Thanks Michelle for your question and interest in a subsidised cat desexing program to provide affordable options for our community. We recognise and agree that cat desexing can deliver significant economic, environmental, animal welfare and community benefits.*

*The City has previously funded subsidised desexing programs and supported desexing initiatives delivered through the Geelong Animal Welfare Society and local veterinary clinics. We are also aware of existing desexing programs operating within the region and continue to support these initiatives through promotion and free pet registration offerings.*

*While the City does not currently fund a subsidised desexing program, either independently or through the National Desexing Network, we are committed to re-establishing a desexing program in the coming year. This commitment is noted an action in the Councils Domestic Animal Management Plan 2026-29 and will be further explored in year two of our plan, being 2027.*

*I can confirm the City will be making application for grant funding via the State Animal Welfare Fund Grant Program, if eligible to do so in upcoming funding rounds.*

## SUBMITTER 2. BERNICE DAVIES

**Subject: OPEN SPACE**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

**Question 1:**

Dean Street Plantation Reserve – Public Open Space Could Council please provide an update on the current status of the Dean Street Plantation Reserve at 5A Dean Street, Belmont? Council previously advised that approximately 40% of the site would be retained as public open space, with the location and details of this area to be determined through the concept planning process. Could Council please advise: Whether the approximately 40% public open space allocation has now been determined; and If so, whether the area has been formally identified or allocated on a concept plan, including its proposed location and intended use. If this has not yet been determined, could Council advise when the community can expect further information about the proposed green space? Thank you.

**Question 1 Response:**

Thank you for the question Bernice regarding 5A Dean Street, Belmont.

At this stage, the approximately 40% public open space component associated with the site has not been formally determined or allocated on a concept plan. The future configuration and location of any public open space is linked to the broader planning and development of the site, including the proposed social housing outcomes.

Further planning and assessment work, including seeking a Social Housing delivery partner is required before these matters can be confirmed.

The community will be informed of opportunities for engagement as the project progresses and additional information becomes available. Further *engagement is likely in early 2027*.

### SUBMITTER 3. NOEL THOMPSON

**Subject: Townsend Road Whittington**

**Relevant City Department: Chief Executive Officer - Ali Wastie**

**Question 1:**

My Question to Council, is Why?? Upon the receipt of a letter (6/8/2026) from Manager Strategic Properties regarding the demolition of the Whittington War Memorial Kindergarten and the sale of the Land.

The letter stated that he would be looking forward for a solution and a meeting to reflect the history and the future of this site. But, when I contacted Manager Strategic Properties, on the 8/8/2026, he said no meeting will be taking place, as it is now in the hands of Council. Why has it resurfaced itself again?

This Land had been Donated and placed in the hands of Council to be Trustee of maintenance and care of the building. It was voted at Council meeting 11/11/2014 (Remembrance Day), to remove this property from potential sale list, and to seek alternative uses to retain the "Living Memorial Land". The Council has let this building become into disrepair, but we still remember and pay our respects to the Fallen Veterans.

This Memorial will still be used, today, tomorrow and for many years to come. The only maintenance, that seems to be done is the mowing of the grass several times a year. This only occurred after I rang them after placing flowers at the Memorial, as I promised my Mother before she passed.

All we want is this site to remain open to the public for public use. This site became a registered Living War Memorial on the 15/8/1951. Reg. Book Vol.6492 Fol.249. Lest We Forget.

**Question 1 Response:**

*Thank you, Noel, for your question and for your ongoing interest in the former Whittington War Memorial Kindergarten site at 17 Townsend Road, Whittington.*

*The City acknowledges the significance of the site to local residents, families and the broader community, particularly the memorial plaques and the history they commemorate. The strong connection many people continue to have with the site and its memorial significance is recognised and appreciated.*

*The City is currently considering the future of the property and, in doing so, there are two distinct matters that need to be considered. The first is the future of the land and buildings. The second is how the memorial significance of the site can continue to be appropriately recognised and respected into the future.*

*The recent correspondence was intended to commence a conversation about the memorial aspect of the site. As part of that process, views were being sought from individuals known to have a longstanding connection to, or interest in, the memorial history of the property, as well as any other individuals or families who may wish to be involved in future discussions.*

*No final decision has been made regarding the preferred future outcome for the property. Any future recommendation will need to consider the condition, safety and long-term viability of the existing buildings, the most appropriate future outcome for the land, and how the memorial history of the site can be appropriately acknowledged and preserved.*

*The City remains committed to ensuring that the memorial significance of the place is carefully considered and respectfully recognised as part of any future decision-making process.*

## SUBMITTER 4. JOHN WINKLER

**Subject: DRAINAGE – LARA**

**Relevant City Department: City Infrastructure - Executive Director James Stirton**

### **Question 1:**

Residents of Kyema Drive Lara are concerned they are being forgotten by council in the absence of the drainage upgrade. Council approved homes built too low in a known flooding area Council routinely cancels the required drainage upgrade. Council has even abandoned the overlays that were needed to protect residents. However, some parts of Council continue to mandate that surrounding developments are built higher, and approve non-permeable fences and barriers that increase risk to existing homes in the low-lying area. And today council officers are even struggling to assist with yet another risk where a new development - in conflict with its endorsed plans - has constructed a fence blocking Kyema Drive from the floodway that council implemented specifically for Kyema Drive in 2014. And the reason given is because there is no overlay. It is unfair on residents to have to constantly track, escalate and continually re-educate council officers on these issues ourselves. Could Council please acknowledge that the Kyema Drive circumstances are exceptional, and establish a mechanism of coordinated support to protect residents until such time as the Kyema Drive drainage upgrade is complete.

### **Question 1 Response**

*Thank you for your question John.*

*Council acknowledges that the Kyema Drive area has been identified as a flood risk location within our municipality and recognises the concerns of residents who have advocated for many years for improvements to the areas drainage infrastructure.*

*As previously advised, the Kyema-Lipson drainage project has been considered through Council's budget processes. While funding was considered, the project was not ultimately included in recent budgets, with other projects addressing greater flooding pressures and risks across the municipality prioritised at that time. The project remains available for consideration through future budget deliberations.*

*There are no permit triggers for fences in this part of Lara, because there are no overlays. A planning permit has been issued for 32 Kyema Drive for multi-dwellings - PP-1246-2023.*

*The endorsed plans show a fence on the park boundary as a mixture of timber paling fence and metal blades with 25% transparency that provides for passive surveillance of the adjoining park, not for flood waters as no planning controls for flooding are relevant.*

*Given construction has commenced, this could likely relate to the temporary hoarding fence or silt fences to protect the development during construction rather than the final fencing as per the endorsed plans.*

*The City will continue our proactive elevated drainage maintenance, inspections and other mitigation regimes within the area, where assets are within Council's responsibility and control while continuing to assess and advocate for future flood mitigation opportunities across the municipality.*

## SUBMITTER 5. SIMON NARDI

### **Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

#### ***Question 1:***

I am speaking in relation to Report 2.5, Amendment C450ggee and, specifically, the proposed Basin 7 drainage asset affecting our property at 20 Avonlea Road, Bell Post Hill.

I want to make one thing clear from the outset.

We are not arguing that the Creamery Road precinct should proceed without appropriate stormwater infrastructure. Our concern is whether Council has demonstrated that approximately 4,200 square metres of 20 Avonlea Road must be taken for Basin 7 before the final design of that basin has even been completed.

I don't believe the documents before Council demonstrate that.

When this amendment was exhibited, approximately 6,000 square metres of our property was allocated to Basin 7. Our family challenged that design and obtained independent drainage advice.

That challenge was justified.

The drainage experts considered an alternative sediment basin rather than the much larger wetland-retarding basin originally proposed.

The Standing Advisory Committee ultimately concluded that there was "great merit" in redesigning Basin 7 as a sediment basin because doing so would reduce land take and cost, increase developable land, reduce the infrastructure levy and reduce the number of affected properties.

Council accepted that position.

The result was that the land affected at 20 Avonlea Road fell from approximately 6,000 square metres to 4,200 square metres.

Approximately 1,800 square metres of our property was returned to developable land simply because the original design was properly challenged.

That history is important.

It demonstrates that the earlier drainage footprint was not the minimum amount of land required.

My concern is that Council is now being asked to assume that the latest footprint is the minimum.

Yet the documents before Council do not say that.

The Precinct Structure Plan describes the proposed Basin 7 area of approximately 1.603 hectares as "TBC final area". Council's own report says the 1.6 hectares has been set aside to accommodate detailed design refinements at the planning permit stage, including nitrogen treatment.

So the final engineering has not yet established the exact land requirement.

That raises a straightforward question:

Why should private land be permanently designated for public drainage infrastructure before Council has established how much land the infrastructure actually requires?

Basin 7 currently affects two properties.

Our property, 20 Avonlea Road, is only approximately 2.035 hectares in total.

The current proposal takes approximately 0.420 hectares – more than 20 per cent of the entire property.

That is a substantial impact.

The technical process has already shown that Basin 7 can be redesigned while maintaining appropriate drainage outcomes.

I therefore respectfully ask Council not to lock the current Basin 7 footprint over 20 Avonlea Road into this amendment as though it is a settled engineering outcome.

I ask Council to require officers to investigate whether Basin 7 can be:

- redesigned or repositioned so that it does not require land from 20 Avonlea Road;
- accommodated elsewhere within the drainage network or adjoining land; or
- if some land from Property 20 is ultimately demonstrated to be unavoidable, reduced to the absolute minimum area established through completed detailed engineering.

If Council ultimately concludes that land from 20 Avonlea Road is genuinely unavoidable, then we ask Council to provide the technical analysis demonstrating why.

At present, I do not believe that test has been met.

The documents themselves acknowledge that the Basin 7 footprint is still to be confirmed.

The history of this process shows why that matters.

The first design was challenged.

The experts reconsidered it.

The Committee agreed.

Council changed it.

And significant private land was returned to development without compromising the drainage objectives of the precinct.

We are simply asking Council to finish that process before permanently encumbering the remaining 4,200 square metres of our property.

Accordingly, I ask Councillors to amend the recommendation so that Basin 7 is removed from 20 Avonlea Road pending completion of detailed drainage design and consideration of alternatives that avoid Property 20.

Why should private land be permanently designated for public drainage infrastructure before Council has established how much land the infrastructure actually requires?

**Question 1 Response:**

*Thank you for your question Simon.*

*As the matters raised relate directly to an item that is before Council for consideration later this evening, a response will not be provided at this time as doing so may prejudice Council's decision-making process.*

*Councillors will consider the matters raised as part of their deliberations on this item later tonight.*

*The City's Public & Question Time Policy allows questions to be precluded where they relate to a matter to be considered by Council at that meeting and may prejudice the decision-making process – thank you for taking the time to raise your concerns.*

**Question 2:**

Both these questions are in regard to the Creamery roads PSP in particular Property 20 and Basin 7. Can Council confirm that the 1.603-hectare Basin 7 area is still marked 'TBC final area' in the PSP being presented for adoption tonight and if yes can Council explain why Property 20 must contribute 0.420 hectares rather than a smaller amount, or no land at all?

**Question 2 Response:**

*Thank you Simon, the matter will be deliberated by Council tonight.*

## **SUBMITTER 6. BRENDAN O'LOAN**

**Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

**Question 1:**

Regarding the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Strategic Assessment. The land at 165, 195 & 225 Staceys Road (Farming Zone) are identified for Conservation and have been valued at \$125k per hectare. Immediately adjacent is 135 Staceys Road (Urban Growth Zone) is identified for Conservation and valued at \$400k per hectare. No Precinct Structure Plan has been prepared for this area so there is no promise to any landowners that their land has a value beyond the limitations of the UGZ which the planning scheme states is "to provide for the continued non-urban use of the land until urban development in accordance with a PSP occurs". Do the Council think it is fair that all land which is proposed for conservation is valued differently because some land is in the UGZ and other land is outside the UGZ?

**Question 1 Response**

*Thank you Brendan, the matter will be deliberated by Council tonight.*

**Question 2:**

Regarding the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Strategic Assessment. Section 172 of the P&EAct 1987 allows the Minister and RA with special powers to compulsorily acquire land. This power extends to any to any land that is required for the purposes of a planning scheme even if the scheme or an amendment to the scheme has not been approved by the Minister. The land at 165, 195 & 225 Staceys Road is currently in the Planning Scheme as Farming Zone and also has a note at Clause 11.02-2 that the land is for Agriculture- Future Investigation of Conservation. Is Council intending to prepare a planning scheme amendment to rezone or repurpose this land to then allow acquisition?

**Question 2 Response**

*Thank you Brendan, the matter will be deliberated by Council tonight.*

## **SUBMITTER 7. ANTONIO NARDI (PROXY SIMON NARDI)**

**Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

***Question 1:***

This is regards to the Creamery Road PSP, specifically Property 20 and Basin 7. Has Council modelled a Basin 7 configuration wholly on Property 21 or another configuration which removes Property 20, and if so, what was the technical reason for rejecting it?

***Question 1 Response***

*Thank you Simon*

***Question 2:***

Will Council commit that if detailed design reduces Basin 7 below 1.603 hectares, the reduction will first be used to minimise the impact on affected private land, including 20 Avonlea Road?

***Question 2 Response***

*Thank you Simon on behalf of Tony*

## **SUBMITTER 8. ANDREW DUGGAN (PROXY MARY HENNESSEY)**

**Subject: CREAMERY ROAD PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### **Question 1:**

Council to support a deferral. Officers are asking Councillors proceed despite knowing that Villawood Properties, one Geelong's most significant and experienced developers, has advised that the project will not proceed under the officer-supported position. That is not a minor concern. It goes directly to whether this precinct is deliverable at all. Why have Councillors not been given a clear, point-by-point assessment of Villawood's submissions, including the commercial and feasibility consequences of the proposed DCP and open space outcomes? Why has the recommendation also failed to advise that the Minister for Planning is actively considering intervention in this matter? Councillors are being asked to vote while critical information about feasibility appears not to have been fully put before them.

### **Question 1 Response**

*Thank you Mary, the matter will be deliberated by Council tonight.*

### **Question 2:**

Question 2 The officer report presents a DCP levy of approximately \$802,949.52 per hectare (see DCP) as though it is reliable. Yet officers have indicated further work will occur after Council's decision. Villawood believes that work may result in a materially higher levy than the figure currently disclosed to Councillors. Is it sound governance to determine the future of a major precinct on figures that may change materially after the vote? In these circumstances, deferral is not delay for delay's sake. It is the minimum step to ensure Councillors have the full facts before deciding with lasting consequences for landowners, residents, infrastructure and credibility of the planning process itself.

### **Question 2 Response**

*Thank you, the matter will be deliberated by Council tonight.*

## SUBMITTER 9. ROGER SMITH

**Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE:**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### **Question 1:**

How does Council intend to retain the integrity of Significant Landscape Overlay SLO5 if the proposed expansion of the Bacchus Marsh Grammar at 155 Staughton Vale Road, Staughton Vale proceeds?

The Geelong Planning scheme defines the character of this specific region as follows:

"The eastern edges of the Brisbane Ranges, including the Rowsley Scarp and its foothills, and the granitic and scoria Anakie Hills are visually prominent landscape features affording views of the plains to the east. These locations contain a mix of cleared land contrasted with substantial vegetation cover. The area has a high scenic quality and its visual exposure makes it susceptible to visual intrusion from inappropriate development."

Clause 42.03 Schedule 5 — Section 2.0: Landscape Character Objectives to be Achieved says SLO5 must be maintained as follows:

1. To protect and enhance the visual and natural landscape values of the area.
2. To maintain vegetation as an important element of the landscape.
3. To protect the landscape from visual intrusion from inappropriate buildings and works and their siting, design and/or materials.
4. To maintain the natural skyline of ridge and escarpment areas and avoid obtrusive building silhouettes.
5. To encourage the siting, design and landscaping of buildings and works responsive to the landscape values of the area.

These objectives are unambiguous. The proposal fails to comply with them.

### **Question 1 Response:**

*Thank you Roger, questions on the planning application for the use and development of a primary and secondary school at 155 Staughton Vale Road, Staughton Vale will be grouped together and a single answer provided at the end of question time.*

### **Question 2**

Council provided its response to the BMG's proposal in March this year. Why was the local community not made aware of the proposal until mid July?

Due to the fast-track legislation used by the proponents to apply for a permit it appears that local residents have been sidelined. We are aware that the CoGG Planning Dept was asked - or possibly required - to be involved in communications with the State Dept of Planning. We understand that CoGG's response was delivered to the State in March this year and raised numerous concerns about the proposal. We have no idea what happened after that.

My question relates to the lack of notice or ANY information whatsoever being provided to local residents in a region which has a rough voting population (at the last election) of 340 people where a proposed school will have more students than the population of the town, all of which will be bused in from other locations having a huge impact on the town and region.

We only heard about the proposal by accident in the middle of July when it had been on the books since at least February this year giving us virtually no time to respond. A grave misjustice has occurred here as a result of draconian fast track legislation

***Question 2 Response:***

*Thank you Roger.*

## SUBMITTER 10. MARK TRENGROVE

**Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE:**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### **Question 1:**

These are my two questions for the Council meeting tomorrow. They both relate to the Bacchus Marsh Grammar application to the State for a new planning permit at 155 Staughton Vale Road Staughton Vale.

1. At a public meeting in 2015 Bacchus Marsh Grammar told the Staughton Vale community they intended to create a 60 student a day rural and environmental campus.

They applied for a 1300 student campus at Staughton Vale. This was strongly opposed by SV Action Group and denied by CoGG, with a permit issued for a 60 student a day campus. BMG chose not to challenge the decision at VCAT. SVAG took the permit to VCAT seeking additional changes and were successful. The application failed at both Council and VCAT because it was not in keeping with the Planning Scheme or the Council and State strategic plans. It was the wrong site.

BMG principal Andrew Neil declared in the Geelong Advertiser that the City were 'closed for business' and 'if we had our time again we'd buy our land outside of Geelong'. BMG should have considered their options instead of buying relatively cheap land nowhere near growth areas.

Now BMG are applying again to establish a full-scale campus. This time they are fast tracking the application to the State, thus bypassing our ability to challenge any decision at VCAT. There has been no change to the Planning Scheme or G21. This is still very much the wrong place for this school.

We ask that Council support the community by advising the Minister for Planning that Council does not support this proposal.

### **Question 1 Response**

*Thank you Mark*

### **Question 2:**

The submitted BMG ecology report assess only direct footprint related impacts and concludes that there are no impacts for threatened species or implications for Clause 52.17 Native Vegetation

Independent expert traffic analysis indicates an addition entrance turning lane would be required. The submitted BMG traffic report fails to address this issue. It is evident that an addition turning lane would require the removal of significant native vegetation including large old habitat trees which would require a permit under the State FFG Act.

Additional bus, car and truck traffic will impact native wildlife including critically endangered species such as the Swift Parrot which utilise the old growth Yellow Gum trees located on these roadsides. Previous CoGG mapping and DEECA habitat importance mapping show the high significance of these trees for Swift Parrots and other native species.

Has the CoGG Environment Department considered the indirect impacts to native vegetation or to threatened species. If they were to consider these issues, would they refer this proposal to DEECA and DCCEEW for assessment?

### **Question 2 Response**

*Thank you.*

## **SUBMITTER 11. CAROLE BARTHOLOMEW**

**Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### ***Question 1:***

In your recently adopted Geelong Plan for Nature 2026-36, Council designated the Koala as the Key Species for the Northern Uplands landscape around Staughton Vale.

The Plan specifically identifies loss of high-value roadside vegetation, pest animals and vehicle strikes as urgent threats, while highlighting wildlife habitat protection as core opportunities.

The proposed overdevelopment on this site and the huge increase of buses and traffic directly contradicts these objectives by escalating habitat fragmentation, deaths on the roads and increasing threats to an already declining local koala population. Under Goal 2 of the Plan, Council commits to prioritizing protection and leveraging partnerships like KCF and embedding biodiversity considerations across all planning and operational processes.

Given that this overdevelopment severely degrades a critical habitat stronghold, will council strongly object to the permit?

If it is approved what specific planning mechanisms or overlays will Council enforce on this site to uphold its commitment to protect the koalas as the key species in Staughton Vale area?

### **REFERENCES:**

Geelong Plan for Nature: [https://yoursay.geelongaustralia.com.au/download\\_file/view/11681/127](https://yoursay.geelongaustralia.com.au/download_file/view/11681/127)

Page 36 (attached jpg) Northern Uplands

KEY SPECIES: Koala

### ***Question 1 Response***

*Thank you Carole.*

## **SUBMITTER 12. MICHAEL DRAGT (PROXY CAROLE BARTHOLOMEW)**

**Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE:**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### ***Question 1:***

In 2015 BMG's Agricultural and Land Management Plan identified an available 75 hectares of this site for agricultural use (proposing 60ha for beef cattle grazing and 15ha for lucerne hay production).

Neither of these agricultural pursuits have been initiated in the 10 years of BMG's Ownership.

The current application acknowledges that existing agricultural activities are focused on agricultural learnings, about 10 times per week, and a small amount of Horticulture, however it states that 50ha is available for agriculture.

Based on BMG's figures that is a loss of 25ha of agricultural land since their ownership. Additionally of the 50ha available approx. 40ha is currently not used for agriculture, representing an actual loss of 65ha of agricultural land for the current footprint.

(see attached land use map)

The current application seeks: a "change of use" for the site, cancellation of the Agricultural Permit, and a new non-agricultural permit for a permanent "Primary and Secondary School".

Further intensification of this site will continue to reduce the productive potential of the site and provide the "footprint" for BMG to reactivate their previously stated "Master Plan" for a 1300 student campus.

I object strongly to this.

Aside from the initial objections now documented in the "RFI & Objections document" what actions are CoGG taking, or will take, to ensure: protection of agricultural land, transparency on the proposal, and to ensure a "Piecemeal Approach" is NOT approved in this application?

### ***Question 1 Response:***

*Thank you.*

### ***Question 2:***

There is an irregularity between the provided Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) and the proposed student catchment zones.

The current proposal targets potential student populations in the Greater Geelong Growth areas. These areas are 40 – 70 kms from the proposed Staughton Vale School site.

The application states that all students will travel by bus, and specify only one travel route, that being Maddingley campus – Granite Road – Staughton Vale campus

Yet the Planning document states: "Students from the Woodlea and Maddingley campuses are currently transported to and from the site via bus, ....."

This arrangement is proposed to continue with students proposed to travel to and from the site via bus, via the existing campuses and from the Greater Geelong, Surf Coast, Golden Plains and Moorabool regions

As a condition of permit the bus management plan should be required to be prepared to encompass the primary school component of the site”.

It is unclear as to the proposed transport modes, routes and transport impacts, and how a “Green Travel Plan” could be implemented for such a remote site.

There is no:

- recent traffic assessment to measure the impacts of all travel modes and routes.
- assessment of the broader road networks
- upgrades planned at the entry to the school which could lead to ramping of vehicles outside the gate.
- The current one-way access to the site has not been sufficiently accessed

Has CoGG requested more specific information be provided to clarify these arrangements - if not can council please do it NOW?

**Question 2 Response:**

*Thank you Carole*

## SUBMITTER 13. ALLAN BARTHOLOMEW

**Subject: PLANNING – 155 STAUGHTON VALE RD STAUGHTON VALE:**

**Relevant City Department: Growth & Place - Acting Executive Director Jacquie Randles**

### **Question 1:**

This fast-tracked development application proposes to “Shelter in Place” approximately 800 people in buildings built to BAL 12.5 with no active fire protection measures. It fails to demonstrate a scientifically sound understanding of wildfire behaviour, safe evacuation routes, or adequate structural bushfire protection so it would normally trigger rigorous assessment mechanisms under the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

Under Clause 53.02 (Bushfire) and recent state planning amendments (such as Amendment VC248), any planning application that results in large numbers of people congregating in a Bushfire Prone Area (BPA) or Bushfire Management Overlay (BMO) faces strict scrutiny. Considering:

- Large numbers of YOUNG students.
- Wrong site for an urban school,
- An Isolated site lacking important infrastructure and services
- Property is in a known bushfire area which has previously been burnt
- Long term forecast of high fuel loads after wet/warm winter & spring
- Recent forecast with large El Nino already being experienced
- Recent global experience with unprecedented wildfire and drought

What actions is the CoGG taking to ensure that this proposal is rejected and that “Prioritisation of Human Life” is forefront?

### **Question 1 Response:**

*Thank you everyone for your questions and concerns to the planning application for the use and development of a primary and secondary school at 155 Staughton Vale Road, Staughton Vale.*

*While Council was not a referral for this application being considered by DTP, we did provide an objection under 52(1)(b) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 - being the notice provisions.*

*The City advised the Department of Transport and Planning in writing that it did not support the granting of a planning permit for the proposal.*

*The City's concerns included that the proposed intensification of the use was inconsistent with the purpose of the Farming Zone, and that the scale of the proposal extended beyond an education use associated with agriculture. The increase from an existing allowance of 150 day-trip students to an additional 300 full-time primary school students represents a substantial intensification of a non-agricultural use within the Farming Zone.*

*One of the City's key concerns is that the intensification of the use is considered inconsistent with the planning policy framework for land uses in the Farming Zone.*

*Thank you again, the City will be taking the issue up directly with the Local Member, Minister for Planning & also the Minister for Education.*