

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO QUESTION TIME
TUESDAY, 10 AUGUST 2010**

The following questions were addressed to the above meeting. Some questions were adequately responded to at the meeting, however others required a more detailed response in writing.

This document includes both verbal and written responses.

QUESTION TIME:

The Mayor advised the meeting that in view of the numbers present Question Time would be limited to one hour and three questions per person and sought co-operation to give everyone a fair opportunity to ask questions.

Lee Gladwell addressed her question in relation to Cr Kontelj's statement that the consultation process for Section 4C of the Geelong Ring Road was flawed.

Would Cr Kontelj please move a motion that the initial planning and consultation process be repeated from the beginning to ensure it is transparent and to give Grovedale and Waurin Ponds residents a chance to make submissions to a reconvened independent panel.

Cr S Kontelj responded he sent an email response back and had discussions with Cr Katos about the matter as well.

Cr Katos responded he is seeking advice from the officers as to what is the way to proceed.

Ray Gladwell asked if a comprehensive risk assessment has been carried out on the proposed bypass extension 4C? If so, by whom, at what stage and from where can the findings be obtained?

Peter Bettess responded the question is best answered by VicRoads who are the responsible road contractors for this Amendment and added a CD can be viewed by the public at VicRoads Geelong office which outlines such things as Flood Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, Air Quality Screening Assessment, Cultural Heritage Management Plan, Social Impact Assessment, Net Gain and Ecological Assessment, Land Use Impact Assessment and Landscape and Visual Assessment.

John Bromilow asked the following questions:

Re: Armstrong Creek Report presented to the 27 July Council Meeting:

- 1) How many alternative routes were investigated by VicRoads and what were the draft costings for the implementation of each alternative?
- 2) Was the cheapest alternative chosen as the current final route?
- 3) Was Amendment C232 exempt from notification requirements?

Peter Bettess responded the questions would be taken on notice for a written response. Mr Bettess added if the Minister is satisfied of certain criteria he can exempt himself from giving notice to the Amendment.

Re: Positioning of the future road linking the Surf Coast Highway to the Bellarine Highway:

- 1) What is the proposed date for the completion of the Anglesea Road/Surf Coast Highway link?
- 2) What is the proposed date of commencement of the link road east of the Surf Coast Highway?
- 3) What funding commitments have been obtained for the Eastern section of this link road and from whom?
- 4) Who is ultimately responsible for the positioning of Route 4C?

Peter Bettess responded the Planning Authority is the person or organisation who prepared the Planning Scheme Amendment.

The Mayor responded the questions would be taken on notice for a written response.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

I refer to the questions which you asked at the above mentioned Council Meeting.

Firstly, to the question which you have asked in relation to the Independent Panel's position in relation to the Ring Road link to the Surfcoast Highway. For your convenience I have reproduced the entirety of the Panel's position in relation to this, that is, Section 7.6 of the Independent Panel Report.

7.6 Ring Road Link to Surf Coast Highway

The east-west link from the Geelong Ring Road to the Surf Coast Highway, and indeed ultimately to the Bellarine Highway, is proposed to run south of and roughly parallel to the Warrnambool – Geelong Railway. This route is in keeping with VicRoads' investigation area and seems to the Panel to be sensible approach for making a connection from the Ring Road to the Surf Coast Highway.

The Mount Duneed Ring Road Action Group submitted however, that they were concerned that the adoption of the east-west route and the development of the Armstrong Creek area would put pressure on a southern connection between the Anglesea Road (as the extension of the Ring Road) and the Surf Coast Highway along Mount Duneed Road.

They argued that *"the Mount Duneed Road alignment would be unsuitable works to make the existing undulating road suitable would result in problems of property access. It would still deliver traffic to an unsuitable (steep & hidden) intersection with the Surf Coast Highway."* They also expressed concern for the safety of cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians.

The Panel regards the plans showing a southern link from the Anglesea Road to the Surf Coast Highway along Mount Duneed Road as indicative only. Further work will be necessary to determine the best route however, the Panel shares the view of the Mount Duneed Road Action Group that the existing Mount Duneed Road/Surf Coast Highway intersection is not likely to be a suitable joining point. To maintain the safety and amenity of the existing Mount Duneed Road, the Panel notes that only a short part of the existing alignment nearer to the proposed Anglesea Road deviation would be suitable for the link with the connection road to the Surf Coast Highway perhaps following a route along less undulating terrain to meet the Surf Coast Highway further to the south.

This is a matter for further investigation by VicRoads.

The Independent Panel dealt with the east-west link from the Geelong Ring Road to the Surf Coast Highway (now known as 4C) in the first paragraph. The Panel concluded that this "route is in keeping with the VicRoads' investigation area and seems to the Panel to be sensible approach for making a connection from the Ring Road to the Surf Coast Highway."

The quotations which you referred to in your question relate, not to the Stage 4C link, but to the broader issue of the future road alignments south of Armstrong Creek. In particular, the Independent Panels' position was in response to the Mt Duneed Ring Road Action Group which submitted that the adoption of the east west route and the development of the Armstrong Creek area it would put pressure on a southern connection between Anglesea Road and the Surfcoast Highway along Mt Duneed Road.

The reference to further investigation by VicRoads does not actually relate to Stage 4C but relates to the impact that the overall development of Armstrong Creek will have on Mt Duneed Road as a further route which will be taken by traffic to access the Surfcoast Highway.

It is in this context that I will answer the questions which you formally put to Council.

- 1. How many alternatives routes were investigated by VicRoads and what were the draft costings for the implementation of each alternative?**
- 2. Was the cheapest alternative chosen as the current final route?**

VicRoads is best placed to answer these questions in relation to 4C. VicRoads continues to look at options related to the upgrade of Anglesea Road and or duplication of this road and its implications on Mt Duneed Road as a major connector from Anglesea Road to the Surfcoast

Highway. Specifically, in relation to the Panel's recommendations for these links to be further investigated beyond the growth corridor itself this is work which VicRoads continues to undertake.

Again I emphasise that the investigation of alternatives as recommended by the Independent Panel did not relate to the Surfcoast Highway link (4C) but rather to alternate links to the Surfcoast Highway beyond the growth corridor itself.

3. I also note from this report the procedural Amendment C232 contains the element: Exemption from notification requirements for the construction of the road. Could you please explain the nature of this exemption?

The Planning Scheme Amendment C232 introduces an exemption from the need to apply for a Planning Permit to actually construct the 4C link. Specifically, the Incorporated Document which will form part of the Planning Scheme upon the approval of Planning Scheme Amendment C232 details at Section 4 – Control that no Planning Permit is required for the actual works associated with the construction of the road. I have reproduced this section for your information.

4.0 Control

Despite any provision to the contrary or any inconsistent provision in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, no permit is required for, and nothing in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme operates to prohibit or restrict:

- Development and use of land in the Project Area for a road, including earthworks, associated structures, kerbs, channels, cuttings, batters and fill.
- Bridges
- Roadworks.
- Pedestrian and cycling paths.
- Landscaping.
- Drainage works.

Activities ancillary to above-mentioned matters, included but not limited to:

- Establishment and using lay down areas for construction purposes.
- Construction and use of temporary site workshops, storage, administration and amenities buildings and associated vehicle parking.
- Displaying direction, tourist, construction and business signs.
- Removing, destroying, pruning and lopping trees and removing vegetation.
- Demolishing buildings, structures and works.
- Altering watercourses.
- Constructing fences.
- Constructing or carrying out works to create bunds, mounds and landscaping, excavate land, salvage artefacts and to alter drainage and utilities.
- Constructing temporary access roads and vehicle parking areas.
- Creating or altering access to a road in a road zone.
- Relocating Services
- Subdividing and consolidating land.

This control is subject to the conditions in Clause 5 of this document.

I have attached also for your information a complete copy of the Incorporated Document which forms part of Amendment C232.

In short, what this exemption means is that the actual physical works associated with building the road which may have required a Planning Permit are exempt from the need for a Planning Permit in the event that the Amendment (C232) is adopted.

1. What is the proposed date for the completion of the Anglesea Rd/Surf Coast Hwy link?

VicRoads has not published a construction timetable for the 4C link and as such I am not in a position to provide an informed answer as to the completion of the Anglesea Road/Surfcoast link. I suggest that this is a matter that you may take up directly with VicRoads.

2. What is the proposed date of the commencement of the link road east of the Surf Coast Hwy?

3. What funding commitments have been obtained for the Eastern section of this link road and from whom?

The east west link road east of the Surfcoast Hwy is subject to a different approach than on the west side of the Surfcoast Hwy.

On the west side of the Surfcoast Hwy (4C) this is a completely publicly funded process with VicRoads responsible for the acquisition of land and for the entirety of construction costs associated with the delivery of the arterial road link from Anglesea Road to the Surfcoast Hwy. On the east side of the Surfcoast Hwy, the regime for delivery of the east west connection road through to the Barwon River is completely different. The Precinct Structure Plans which are to be completed for the precincts east of the Surfcoast Hwy, namely, the Horseshoe Bend Precinct, the Marshall Precinct and the North East Industrial Precinct are required to provide for a road reservation in accordance with VicRoads' requirements from the Surfcoast Hwy to a point immediately west of the Barwon River. The land is to be set aside for this arterial road link at no cost to VicRoads and the developers across these precincts are responsible for the construction of a local road, that is, a single carriageway in each direction (two lane road).

At a point in time where the traffic volumes are projected to require it VicRoads will then take over the road reserve provided via the precinct structure planning process (and ultimately the subdivision process of individual lots through these precincts) at no cost. That is, VicRoads will not be required to purchase the road reserve it will be provided for via the developers who undertake development in the above mentioned precincts.

VicRoads will be responsible for all costs associated in developing the east west arterial from a local road status (that is the single lane in either direction originally provided) to upgrade it to an arterial road to meet the requirements ultimately envisaged for a link through the growth area, a further river crossing, and a link to the east towards Bellarine Hwy.

There are no funding commitments from VicRoads at this point in time for any section of the east west link road east of the Surfcoast Hwy.

In the North East Industrial Precinct a Developer Contribution Plan has been developed such that all land owners within that precinct will be responsible for the establishment of the east west arterial immediately adjacent this precinct and for the construction of the initial local road with a traffic lane in either direction.

4. Who is ultimately responsible for the positioning of Route 4C?

Amendment C138 as a Planning Scheme Amendment has been responsible for establishing the general alignment of the east west arterial between Anglesea Road and the Surfcoast Hwy. This amendment was initiated by the City of Greater Geelong and VicRoads supported the alignment as detailed within Amendment C138. The Planning Scheme Amendment (C138) was the subject of an Independent Panel which again supported the alignment as exhibited (as I have detailed above), and ultimately the Minister for Planning approved this amendment to formally establish this planning direction within the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

Amendment C232 which is currently on exhibition is the amendment which will formalise the acquisition of land to ultimately establish the east west arterial (4C) between Anglesea Road and the Surfcoast Hwy.

In short, there have been a number of parties involved in the establishment of the planning directions which are now within the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme defining the proposed route for the east west arterial (4C).

The actual acquisition of land and construction of 4C is the responsibility of VicRoads as I have detailed above, with Amendment C232 being the formal legal process which will enable VicRoads to undertake the purchase of land for this road and to ultimately undertake the construction accordingly.

Conclusion

I trust that the above responses have appropriately addressed the questions which you formally submitted to Council at its meeting of the 10th of August 2010.

Peter Wilkin directed his question to Cr Andy Richards:

At what point during the development of the train station at Waurnd Ponds, as it involves Rossack Drive (a Council asset), does the City of Greater Geelong intend to provide the residents with comprehensive planning details. Does Council intend on commissioning any sensitivity testing on Rossack Drive in relation to the dramatic increase in traffic in the advent of a 1200 car carpark, public transport interchange and train station on the southern side of the railway line.

Cr Richards suggested the Mayor write back and set up an appointment with Council Officers to go through the process in relation to this issue. Cr Richards did not believe there was enough space for 1200 cars and would be more likely 500-600.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

I refer to your questions raised at Council Meetings on 27th July and 10th August 2010.

Firstly, following on from the verbal response provided by Cr Richards on the evening of Council meeting on 10th August 2010, I extend the invitation for you to have Officers of the Armstrong Creek Team within the City of Greater Geelong meet with you and discuss this matter in more detail. I have asked Terry Demeo the Manager of Planning Strategy & Economic Development to contact you and make an appointment at a mutually convenient time.

Your concern that a 1200 space carpark is to be located on the north side of the railway line with access to Rossack Drive, I refer you to Clause 3.2.2 – Facilities on page 14 of the documents which have been placed on exhibition as part of amendment C232. I have reproduced the paragraph for your information and it is as follows:-

“Facilities

The proposed railway station will have two platforms with provision for two passenger tracks and a third freight bypass track. Up to 2,500 car spaces are to be ultimately provided at Armstrong Creek Railway Station. Of these car spaces, approximately 1,800 will be on the southern side of the railway line.

The car parking will also serve commercial and community developments which are part of a town centre / local activity centre planned for the site as part of the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Area. There is also provision at the railway station for a bus interchange and ‘kiss and ride’ drop off area.”

The above details that a maximum of 700 spaces would be provided in the northern carpark. However, I do point out that a further planning process will have to be undertaken in relation to rail station facilities, in particular the ingress and egress from the carparks, and an analysis of the impact on adjacent road network.

This is not a matter which is the subject of a current Planning Scheme Amendment, however in light of your concerns I have taken the opportunity to write to the Secretary of the Department of Transport to again highlight your concerns in relation to this matter, I have attached a copy of your letter/question to Council and a copy of the response which I have now provided. As you will note from my attached letter to the Department Secretary I have requested that they do liaise with you in due course in respect to this matter.

I trust that I have addressed the question which you have raised to Council.

Kent Fuller asked if it was true that the Armstrong Creek developers are funding 4C Link East of Surf Coast Highway?

Peter Bettess responded , yes, some are.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

I refer specifically to the question which you put to Council at the Council Meeting of the 10th of August 2010.

Your question has been recorded as follows:

Is it true that the Council and the Armstrong Creek developer have struck a deal as to the location of the 4C link west of Torquay Road on the proviso that they the developers will fund the road east of Surf Coast Hwy.

Is it true that the Armstrong Creek developers are funding 4C link east of Surf Coast Hwy.

It is not true that the location of the 4C link was struck on the basis of developers funding the road east of the Surf Coast Highway. The location of the 4C link was determined as part of the planning process for the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan. There are a number of factors that were considered in defining the alignment. These factors included:

- Access to the Geelong Ring Road section 4B (Anglesea Rd)*
- Southern access to the future Armstrong Creek West Railway Station car park (i.e. future car park between the link road and the railway line)*
- The 4C link follows the existing rail corridor as much as possible to avoid the creation of two transport corridors within the growth area (consolidating these two transport corridors minimises their impacts)*
- The future crossing of the Barwon River. The Barwon River floodplain has a pinch point just south of the 220Kv transmission lines that cross the river, which provides an appropriate crossing point for the future Bellarine Link. This would reduced a) construction costs due to less bridge works, b) environmental impacts due to the proximity to Reedy Lake and c) changes / impacts to the Barwon River floodplain.*
- The future grade separation of the Geelong-Warrnambool railway line and the Surf Coast Highway. Locating the 4C link close to the railway line allows for a single overpass if future grade separation was to occur.*

The east west link road east of the Surfcoast Hwy is being provided, in part, by the developers. The Precinct Structure Plans which are to be completed for the precincts east of the Surfcoast Hwy, namely, the Horseshoe Bend Precinct, the Marshall Precinct and the North East Industrial Precinct are required to provide for a road reservation in accordance with VicRoads requirements from the Surfcoast Hwy to a point immediately west of the Barwon River. The land is to be set aside for this arterial road link at no cost to VicRoads and the developers across these precincts are responsible for the construction of a local road, that is, a single carriageway in each direction (two lane road).

At a point in time where the traffic volumes are projected to require it VicRoads will then take over the road reserve provided via the precinct structure planning process (and ultimately the subdivision process of individual lots through these precincts) at no cost. That is, VicRoads will not be required to purchase the road reserve it will be provided for via the developers who undertake development in the above mentioned precincts.

VicRoads will be responsible for all costs associated in developing the east west arterial from a local road status (that is the single lane in either direction originally provided) to upgrade it to an arterial road to meet the requirements ultimately envisaged for a link through the growth area, a further river crossing, and a link to the east towards Bellarine Hwy.

There are no funding commitments from VicRoads at this point in time for any section of the east west link road east of the Surfcoast Hwy.

On the west side of the Surfcoast Hwy (4C) VicRoads is responsible for the acquisition of land and for the entirety of construction costs associated with the delivery of the arterial road link from Anglesea Road to the Surfcoast Hwy.

I trust that the above addresses your question in relation to the different planning approaches for the planning and development of the east west arterial road link, with a publicly funded approach on the west side of Surfcoast Hwy and obviously a land use planning process as described above for the east side of the Surfcoast Hwy.

Jackie Myers asked the following question in relating to Amendment C228 – Norlane Redevelopment Precincts:

- 1) Following up on the movements presented at the meeting on 27 July 2010, has Council prepared and sent a submission to the Department of Planning and Community Development advocating Council's increased involvement in the redevelopment project and regarding the other 6 points made at the last meeting?
- 2) Have you received a response to the submission?

Peter Bettess responded that Council has lodged a submission but as yet has not received a response.

- 3) Are we able to see that response?

Peter Bettess responded 'yes'.

- 4) Are Council aware of any notices that have been sent out to these people since the last Council Meeting?

The Chief Executive Officer advised it was his understanding that there would be a further community letter box distribution, but will not occur for a couple of weeks. Council will monitor that this occurs, but it is the Department of Planning and Community Development that is responsible.

Colin Wallace asked:

- 1) Would Councillors note that I have not received a response to my question 1a or 1b from last Council Meeting and that in the response I did receive in the mail today, referring to my question 2, the key statements are falsehoods?
- 2) Would Councillors note that I was given the fourteen page version of Cr Doull's Copenhagen report by Council at City Hall on Tuesday 20 April this year and the eleven page version of Cr Doull's Copenhagen report by email from the Geelong Advertiser on Wednesday 21 April this year and anyone who says or suggests that I was given or in any way obtained a copy of either version of the report on any other occasion than those just specified is lying or passing on a lie?
- 3) Would Councillors note that the opening salvo in the attack by the Geelong Advertiser on Cr Doull's Copenhagen report was on pages 1 and 4 of the Saturday 17 April 2010 edition and occasions on which I was given the 14 page report and the 11 page report were 20 April 2010 and 21 April 2010, respectively?

The Mayor noted the above questions.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

Thank you for your questions at the Council Meetings on 27th July and 10th August 2010 regarding the Ropeworks development.

The public is entitled to view any document submitted as part of a planning permit application until the application is decided. If a permit is issued the public is entitled to view the permit, plans and document endorsed as part of a permit condition.

Only the Findings and Recommendations of the Road Safety Audit by Bob Citroen of JPT were endorsed pursuant to Condition 16 of permit 1628/2004. I cannot locate a full copy of the report in the Council's records.

A copy of the part of the report that was endorsed to safety condition 16 is attached for your information.

Margarita Kumnick asked questions in relation to Geelong Ring Road – Section 4C:

1) Are you going to continue to ignore us as was done in 2006?

The Mayor responded as he said on Pulse radio, the City has administered its statutory right in the consultation process.

2) We are told that C232 is not about the location of the road. But C232 is only about the location of the road, as its main purpose is for a recommendation to be sent to the Minister for him to pass a regulation so that the land can be acquired next to the railway line?

Peter Bettess indicated it is a VicRoads Amendment, not a Council Amendment and any submissions should be lodged with VicRoads for its consideration.

Further questions were taken on notice for a written response.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

I refer to your questions to Council at the Council Meeting of the 10th of August 2010.

For the readability of this response I have not reproduced your questions in full, I have simply labelled my responses 1 through to 7 as you have numbered the questions in your written document submitted to the Council Meeting.

Question 1

In answering your question as to the position of the Council in relation to the location of the east west arterial, I can only advise that Council has considered the history of the earlier amendment at the meeting of the 27th of July 2010, and further at this meeting determined the formal submission of Council to the current Amendment C232. I have attached the formal resolutions adopted by Council in relation to these two reports as Attachment 1.

For full copies of these reports I provide the following link to Council's website www.geelongaustralia.com.au

Question 2

The Amendment C232 has a number of elements to it with the Explanatory Report describing these specific components of the amendment as follows:

What the amendment does.

The amendment:

- Introduces a Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO3, Clause 45.01) to identify and reserve land for acquisition by VicRoads for the construction of the Section 4C of the Geelong Ring Road.
- Introduces a Public Acquisition Overlay (PAO9, Clause 45.01) to identify and reserve the land for acquisition by the Director of Public Transport for the southern section of the Armstrong Creek Railway Station.
- Inserts an incorporated document titled *Geelong Ring Road – Section 4C Incorporated Document, June 2010* in the Schedule to Clause 52.03 and the Schedule to Clause 81.01.
- Deletes Schedule 8 to the Development Plan Overlay (Clause 43.04).
- Amends Maps 65DPO and 66DPO of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme to remove Development Plan Overlay Schedule 8.
- Amends Maps 65PAO and 66PAO of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme to show the PAO3 for Section 4C of the Geelong Ring Road and to show PAO9 for the Armstrong Creek Railway Station.

In reviewing the Amendment material it does not seek to revisit Amendment C138 which provides the strategic directions in relation to the location of the arterial road link between Anglesea Road and the Surfcoast Hwy.

That said, any party is able to make any submission that they see fit to VicRoads which will ultimately be considered by the Minister for Planning in determining a position on this amendment. Specifically any party who wishes to make a submission in relation to the alteration to the alignment of the arterial road link between Anglesea Road and Surfcoast Hwy is able to do so through this amendment process.

Whilst I am not privy to the advice which you have been given in relation to what matters can be covered in a submission, I do advise that it would be appropriate to not confine a submission to the location of the arterial road link (4C) but also to cover issues of noise attenuation, visual treatments and the like, so as VicRoads, in responding to the submissions, and ultimately the Minister for Planning, is informed of all relevant issues and concerns which individuals have in relation to the current Planning Scheme Amendment.

Question 3

Council is aware of the traffic implications of the proposed arterial road link (4C) as detailed within Amendment C232. As you will note from the submission which Council has lodged with VicRoads as part of their consultation process, Council has recommended the construction of the southern carriageways first as part of the ultimate construction of the 4C link to ensure that the intersection with the Surfcoast Hwy is as far south as practicable from the railway line to provide for appropriate queuing distances and minimise the potential for conflict in this area.

Specifically in relation to the speed limit proposed at 80km and your question as to why it is not planned at 70km, I suggest that this is a matter which should be the basis of a submission to VicRoads. My understanding of their process is that the road will ultimately be the subject of a number of road safety audits which will determine the appropriate speed limit for this arterial road link.

Question 4

The alignment of the east west arterial road link from Anglesea Road to Surfcoast Hwy was the subject of a number Council reports as part of the development of the overall Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan (Amendment C138), this was ultimately reviewed by an independent panel of planning experts (Independent Panels Victoria which was Chaired by Kathy Mitchell who is the Chair of Independent Panels Victoria), and the amendment was ultimately signed off by the Minister for Planning. In short, there have been numerous parties which have reviewed the Armstrong Creek Growth Plan inclusive of the alignment of the east west arterial road link.

I understand that you have attended the two information sessions which were manned by members of Council and the Department of Planning and Community Development's

Armstrong Creek Team. In the event that you have not had the discussions with this team in relation to the rationale for the alignment of the east west road link as detailed within Amendment C138, it maybe appropriate for you to meet with members of this team to enable them to explain the rationale behind the original planning. You may wish to make an appointment with the Armstrong Creek Team, and suggest you contact Terry Demeo, Manager Planning Strategy and Economic Development on direct line 03 5272 4905 to make a mutually convenient appointment time.

Question 5

I am happy to make the 119 submissions to C138 available for your review and again if you make an appointment with Terry Demeo as detailed above he can take you through the originals of these submissions held in hard copy with the City.

Question 6

The Urban Growth Plan at page 110 and 111 describes the east west link road and further describes the bypass to Surfcoast Hwy link. You will note that the east west link road describes what is now on exhibition as part of Amendment C232.

The Geelong bypass to Surfcoast Hwy link refers to the traffic links beyond the growth corridor. This was a matter which was discussed in some detail within the Amendment C138 where the Panel determined that the east west link road was appropriately located, and suggested further work needed to be undertaken in relation to the Anglesea Road Mt Duneed Road linkages to the Surfcoast Hwy beyond the growth corridor.

For your convenience I have attached the extract in full from Page 110 and 111 from the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan – Volume 1 (Attachment 2) and also the extract from the C138 Independent Panel Report (Attachment 3) which provides the commentary of the Panel in relation to the east west link road and road connections required beyond the growth corridor for access from Anglesea Road to the Surfcoast Hwy.

I trust that this resolves any uncertainty from your perspective in respect to this issue.

Question 7

As I have detailed earlier the Council has formed a view in relation to Amendment C232 and has formally lodged a submission in relation to this amendment.

The Council has not indicated any desire to review Amendment C138, or more specifically the alignment of the east west arterial link – stage 4C.

Conclusion

Again, I extend the invitation for you to make an appointment with Terry Demeo the Manager of Planning Strategy and Economic Development in relation to this matter in the event that you wish to discuss the specific rationale for the original planning for the alignment of the east west arterial or review the original submissions to C138. Further if you have any other queries you wish to discuss please call Terry Demeo directly on 03 5272 4905.

Mary Wallace asked:

- 1) Why did you, Mr Mayor, not refer Colin Wallace's question 1a to Mr Bettess at the last Council Meeting on 27 July 2010, the question being: 'When a road safety audit is required by a condition of a planning permit, is the public entitled to have access to the audit report'?

The Mayor responded that as Chair of the Meeting it is his call and on that particular night he thought it best to take on notice.

- 2) Why, Mr Mayor, even after Colin insisted you refer his question1a to Mr Bettess and read out Council Meeting Procedures Local law 4.12(1) which makes it clear that a bona fide attempt must be made to answer a question at the meeting, why, Mr Mayor, did you refuse to refer Colin's question to Mr Bettess at the 27 July 2010 Council Meeting?

The Mayor indicated he had already answered the question.

- 3) When a road safety audit is required by a condition of a planning permit, is the public entitled to have access to the road safety audit report?

The Mayor responded the question would be taken on notice for a written response.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

Thank you for your questions at the Council Meeting on 10th August 2010.

The Mayor, being the Chair of the Council Meeting, has the prerogative to rule on how a question will be answered at the Council Meeting.

At the 27th July 2010 meeting when Mr Wallace asked his question I looked to the Mayor. The Mayor was aware that I would have no prior knowledge of the matters raised by Mr Wallace as I only commenced employment with the Council on 15th April 2010.

I have been unable to locate a full copy of Bob Citroen's report as only the Findings and Recommendations were endorsed as part of the Ropeworks planning permit 1628/2004. The public is entitled to have access to that part of the report endorsed pursuant to Condition 16. A copy is attached for your information.

I also enclose for your information and for Mr Wallace a copy of the post completion traffic review by the Traffix Group dated July 2009.

If you or Mr Wallace wish to meet to discuss any details please telephone me on 5272 4983 and I will arrange for appropriate officers to meet with you.

Elizabeth Jess asked questions in relation to C228 – Norlane Redevelopment Precincts:

- 1) Who would we speak to, to extend the submission against the re-development deadline from 27 August, so a full community consultation can be made?

The Chief Executive Officer responded the original date was 31 July, but was extended to 27 August.

- 2) Would Council advocate for this extension?

The Chief Executive Officer responded the process through the Department of Planning is not a Council process. Council can only ask for an extension of time. If there are further issues I am happy for the ward councillor to advocate to extend this.

The Mayor added Cr Fisher does an extraordinary amount of work advocating on behalf of the community, and will continue to do so.

Cr Abley encouraged advocating through the local state member.

A subsequent written response was provided by the Chief Executive Officer

At the recent Council meeting of 10 August 2010 you addressed Council during question time as to the possibility of Council advocating for an extension of time for the consultation period beyond 27 August 2010 regarding the Norlane Redevelopment Precincts.

Since that time I have contacted Ms Kate Craft (Department of Planning and Community Development) who declined the request to extend the consultation period as this would be a second extension of time for this process.

I also contacted Ms Christine Fergusson (Regional Co-ordinator Neighbourhood Renewal) who has offered her support for you to develop a submission to the process within the given timeframes. The help would be in the form of a locally based Department Officer who would replicate your views through a submission.

If you wish to take up the offer of preparing a submission, please contact Ms Christine Fergusson on (03) 5226 4463 or mobile 0419 540 308 at your convenience. I would encourage you to submit your ideas to the submission process so that your views can be considered as part of the planning process for this development.

I am also available if you require any further assistance in contacting the appropriate staff within the Department of Human Services, or the Department of Planning and Community Development.

Petra Wilke asked the following in relation to Geelong Ring Road, Section 4C:

- 1) Valley Estate Subdivision was not informed of railway station on plan dated 5 November 2007?

The Mayor responded the question would be taken on notice for a written response.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the General Manager
Economic Development, Planning and Tourism**

Part one of your question put to the Council Meeting of the 10th of August 2010 was recorded as follows:

Valley Estate subdivision was not informed of railway station on plan dated 5/11/2007.

We are responding to your question regarding the Valley Estate under the assumption that the plan you are referring to is a proposed Plan of Subdivision dated the 5/11/2007.

During mid 2007 the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan was exhibited for public comment. This plan included the location of a proposed Armstrong Creek West Railway Station, located at the southern end of Rossack Drive straddling the Geelong-Warrnambool Railway Line. This plan was approved and gazetted on the 4th December 2008.

Following on from this the Department of Transport has commenced concept design for this future station and advanced a planning process of acquiring the required land for the rail station and car parks to be located on both the north and south side of the Geelong-Warrnambool Railway Line.

Councillor Richards answered the second part of your question at the Council meeting.

- 2) Conflict of interest with Andy Richards comment re: opinion that the road cannot be moved?

Cr Richards advised that if the matter comes before Council he will consider whether there are any conflict of interest issues.

Several other residents also raised issues in relation to the proposed 4C, but did not lodge questions.