

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO QUESTION TIME
TUESDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2011**

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. In this instance, no written responses were provided as issues were adequately addressed at the meeting.

Colin Wallace asked the following questions:

- 1) I refer to Peter Beggs article, 'Panel's effort to keep Farrell inquiry in-house', in the Geelong Advertiser last Friday 9 December. Would the Mayor tell me if there is any explanation for the disclosure in the Advertiser of something that was apparently talked about at last weeks Councillor Briefing, other than that the information was provided to the Advertiser by a Councillor or Council officer?

The Mayor responded that he was not aware of where the information came from.

- 2) Since I did not provide either the 11 page Copenhagen report by Cr Doull dated 2 March 2010 or the 14 page Copenhagen report by Cr Doull dated 2 March 2010 to the Geelong Advertiser, would the Mayor tell me if there is any explanation for the Advertiser apparently having copies of both reports other than that both reports – the 11 page one and the 14 page one – were provided to the Advertiser by one or more Councillors or one or more Council officers?

The Mayor responded that he was not aware of where the information came from.

- 3) In relation to what Cr Abley said in response to my question 1 on 25 October 2011, about Councillors being in attendance at some event going on at the same time as Professor Jan Gehl's 6pm public lecture on 3 October, would she tell me what was the event, where was it and confirm that she was there herself?

Cr Abley responded there were a number of individuals in attendance at North Shore railway station who met the train travelling from Adelaide to Melbourne. Numerous people were in attendance, including myself, Cr Richards and Council officers. Myself and a number of other Councillors met with the Professor in the afternoon and spent a very informative two hours with him.

Cr Richards confirmed he was in attendance.

Cr Doull added there was ample opportunity available to meet with Professor Gehl.

- 4) Mr Mayor were you at this event?

The Mayor responded that he spent a well informed two hours with the CEO and Professor Gehl. I was not in attendance at the railway station event.

Mary Wallace asked the following questions:

- 1) Would Councillors look up the previous design at the end of First Street on your own computer and compare it with what's currently there at the ends of First Street?

The Mayor responded that he will do that and talk to Council's Engineering staff and see if the works there are adequate in comparison to what was there before.

- 2) Seeing I addressed Mayor Mitchell/Clr Abley and other councillors in my question on 25 October 2011, could I ask the Mayor to clarify what is meant by the word Council in "Council would like to reply ..." in the response signed by Mr Van Driel?

The Mayor responded the word 'Council' represents the whole of Council.

- 3) On 25 October 2011 at public question time I informally asked the Mayor to check out the previous design of the end of First Street on Google maps. Has the Mayor done so?

The Mayor responded that he has personally visited First Street on several occasions and has looked up the Google maps.

- 4) To my solitary formal question asked on 25 October 2011, I received two responses, one signed by Mr Van Driel and one signed by Mr Bettess and both dated 7 November 2011:

(a) did Mr Van Driel compose the letter dated 7 November 2011 addressed to me and signed by him?

Gary Van Driel responded he composed the letter.

(b) did Mr Bettess compose the letter dated 7 November 2011, addressed to me and signed by him?

Peter Bettess responded he composed the letter.

- 5) Would Councillors note that I addressed my question of 25 October 2011 to you the Councillors and as yet I haven't received an answer from any of you?

- 6) To my 25 October question, would Councillors also note that I recognised some of the tickery used in the responses both dated 7 November given by Mr Van Driel and Mr Bettess?

The Mayor responded that Council does not use trickery in its responses.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager City Services in the following terms:**

At the public question time on Tuesday 13 December 2011 you asked a series of questions the majority of which were answered by the Mayor on the night.

In response to the question regarding the pedestrians safety I would provide the following comments.

A further inspection of the site you have mentioned at the intersection of Lawton Avenue and First Street, Geelong West has been carried out and found to be operating in a satisfactory manner.

Council does not agree that more cars are entering First Street from Lawton Avenue in a manner that is unsafe for pedestrians. Vehicles were observed to be using the intersection in a safe and satisfactory movement, and pedestrians were not at risk.

Thank you again for your enquiry.

Andrew Fratantaro addressed Council in relation to Motorcycling:

- 1) Recently Motorcycling Australia and the Sporting Motor Cycle Club were involved in a lengthy and complicated VCAT hearing to clarify 'existing usage rights' for motorcycling at McAdam Park, Barrabool and are currently awaiting a decision from VCAT. In a best case scenario for motorcycling, even if existing usage rights are established, is Council aware that new buildings and infrastructure will still require applications for planning permits?

The Mayor responded, yes we are.

- 2) Recently Motorcycling Australia submitted a planning application to Surf Coast Shire for a multi purpose building at McAdam Park to accommodate the needs of the Geelong Motocross Club, as per a current agreement with City of Greater Geelong.

Is Council aware of the extremely strong opposition from Barrabool residents to any development at McAdam Park, which includes opposition to all and any town planning issues such as new buildings and infrastructure?

The Mayor responded, yes we are.

- 3) From the report to Council, August 2009, MX facilities, in the section called 'Risk Assessment', when speaking of the CoGG funding of \$660,000 being committed to McAdam Park at Barrabool, a facility not in a CoGG municipality, it states – *"The key risks with the proposed action is that the financial and town planning issues associated with McAdam Park are unable to be resolved in a satisfactory manner, and that the Geelong Motocross Club remain without a viable local facility"*. The report also says, regarding a possible option for CoGG to abandon funding to Geelong Motocross Club – *"it is likely that over time Council would come under increased pressure to construct a motocross facility. This pressure would increase significantly if the McAdam Park project fails"*.

Given this, if the situation arises that town planning issues are unable to be resolved at McAdam Park, thereby creating a situation making it unviable for CoGG to fulfill its obligation in relocating Geelong Motocross Club to McAdam Park, will CoGG abandon its funding commitment to GMCC?

If CoGG stays committed to securing a new home for the Geelong Motocross Club as originally promised and McAdam Park becomes unviable, will CoGG consider either re-opening the Dandos Road project, or if not, continue investigating other possible sites for motocross in the CoGG municipality?

The Mayor responded that would be a decision of Council.

Peter Bettess responded that where there is a planning permit required the consideration is about the impact of these works. If there is a permit required for works it's only whether the works are appropriate for that site.

Peter Ovens addressed Council also in relation to motorcycling:

In 2009 Avalon airport management were seeking support from CoGG for long term lease for the parcel of land south of Dandos Road and immediately east of the proposed MX facility for possible future expansion of airport operations.

- 1) Has this land yet been leased to the airport, and if so, has the adjacent land that was earmarked for the MC facility also been leased to the airport?

The Chief Executive Officer responded that he would take the question on notice, but was unaware of that taking place.

From the report to Council / August 2009 / MX facilities regarding the proposed MX facility at Dandos Road, Avalon, it states “*thorough process enables us to be confident of being able to develop the facility*”. It also states “*naturally given the regional significance of the airport, officers have negotiated an understanding where the two facilities can co-exist both now and into the future. It is important to note the proposed motocross track is located approximately 1km south and 500m west of the current runway. This is well outside the various air traffic related exclusion zones. Council does not need the airport’s approval for the development. Council has also consulted with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority*”.

- 2) Given this, and a letter dated 15 June 2009 to the CoGG from Avalon airport management, which states the airports conditional acceptance of the proposed MX facility – has CoGG had notification from airport management which would change this situation, purely from the point of view of air traffic control?
- 3) If there is air traffic control issues which would affect the MX facility, are there any plans or documentation which Council can provide to show this is the case?
- 4) If yes, would these restrictions stop the MX project from going ahead?

The Mayor responded that there was an opportunity at that time for that to proceed, but it would be much more difficult to achieve now than in the past.

- 5) If there aren't any air traffic control restrictions, can Council see any other issues that would stop the MX project from going ahead?

The Mayor reiterated the project would be much harder to locate now.

Dean Frost responded that Council was presented with some representatives from Motor Cycle Authorities to support the McAdam Park project, as opposed to Dandos Road, once Council made a decision to support McAdam Park work ceased on the Dandos Road project and that there were a number of issues that are yet to be fully resolved such as securing the land from the State Government, etc.

The Mayor responded that during this whole discussion when this decision was made to open McAdam Park, Dandos Road was off the table and Mc Adam Park was supported for the relocation.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Projects, Recreation & Central Geelong in the following terms:**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting of the City of Greater Geelong (CoGG) on Tuesday 13 December 2011 you sought a response to the following question:

In 2009 Avalon airport management were seeking support from CoGG for long term lease for the parcel of land south of Dandos Road and immediately east of the proposed Motocross facility for possible future expansion of airport operations.

- Has this land yet been leased to the airport, and if so, has the adjacent land that was earmarked for the Motocross facility also been leased to the airport?*

In response to the above question, the site identified at Dandos Road is Crown Land and is directly managed by the Crown. Whilst I am of the understanding this land has not been leased to the airport, you should make enquiries to the Department of Sustainability and Environment on 13 6186 for a definitive response.