

## PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND SUBMISSIONS COUNCIL MEETING – 25 JULY 2023

SUBMITTER	SUBJECT
1. Dylan Paskos	Mobile Food Permits
2. John Glazebrook	Declaration of Nuclear Free Zone and Federal Funding of Geelong Public Hospital
3. Dean Hurlston	Cost-Shifting from State Government
4. Jinny	Heavy Vehicle Use in the City
5. Liz Bonner	Social Housing Plan 2020-2041
6. Andy Meddick	Hire of Council owned or managed properties – refusal of bookings
7. Charles Street	Energy from Waste (EfW) incinerator in Lara
8. Bernie Frankie	Public Roads and establishment of Fyansford tip
9. Helen Clarke	C463ggee Balmoral Quay Stage 5
10. Vicki Perrett	Air Pollution & Energy from Waste (EfW) incinerator in Lara
11. Mandy Bridges	Notice of Motion by Councillor Nelson - Library Service Delivery.
12. Mary Larah	Upcoming International Delegate Opportunities
13. Jenna Wade	Response to anti-social / anti-racist behaviour within the City
14. Felicity dales	G21 Subscription
15. Louis de koker	Development Application for 2 Morven Court in Highton
16. Teagan Mitchell	Strategic Planning for the South of the City

SUBMITTER	SUBJECT
17. Simone Tolson	Regional Projects Victoria (RPV) and the RGYC Sailing School buildings
18. Diane Cunningham	Smart Cities

## Submitter 1. Dylan Paskos

**Question 1:**

*My question is about obtaining permits to use food vans or coffee trailers in my instance in the Geelong community. When will this be addressed so the people with businesses can be a part of this community and contribute to this community.*

**Response:**

Thank you for your question to Council,

City Officers provided a direct response to your query upon receipt, which was issued to you on 14 July, which is included below;

The City are aware that there is a growth in the mobile food trading industry, which creates increased demand for roadside trading permits. We are currently reviewing both our Neighbourhood Amenity Local Law and our Roadside Trading policy. Our first round of engagement for the review of the Neighbourhood Amenity Local Law is underway, and we would encourage you to provide your feedback via our Have Your Say page (taking feedback until 5pm 14 July, 2023). If you have any further enquiries on food trading, please contact our Customer service team on 5272 5272 or via [Contactus@geelongcity.vic.gov.au](mailto:Contactus@geelongcity.vic.gov.au).

## Submitter 2. John Glazebrook

**Question 1:**

*Will the City of Geelong declare this city and surrounding region a safe nuclear free zone and make a statement to stand up for the health and safety of all people in this region?*

**Question 2:**

*Will the City of Geelong please call on the Albanese government to spend some of its \$19billion budget surplus on the local Geelong Public Hospital to reduce waiting times for patients?*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, John.

Councillors have heard your concerns in regard to the above, these will taken into consideration in their deliberation when making future decisions. Noting that when Councillors make decisions on behalf of the community, the safety of the public is always considered.

In regard to calling for funding to the state government, the Council continues to work in collaboration with all levels of Government.

## Submitter 3. Dean Hurlston

**Question 1:**

*Can the council please advise the dollar (\$) amount of "cost-shifting from State Government" it (council) estimates it has incurred in the 2022/23 Financial Year? Cost Shifting means COSTS that the State Government has pushed onto the Council (without agreement) that Council believes it is not responsible to fund from its Annual Budget*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Dean.

Council appreciates your concerns in regard to cost-shifting, the Council group have heard your concerns and will consider this in future deliberations.

## Submitter 4. Jinny

### **Question 1:**

*I would like to know how heavy vehicles are permitted to access roads, that have high foot traffic with children, animals, elderly people, are close to parks, nature reserves and the Barwon river. These roads include Barwon Terrace, Fyans St, Yarra St, Kilgore St, McKillop St, Ryrie St and Pakington St. The trucks are significantly impacting the safety and well-being of individuals and are damaging and polluting the environment.*

*The trucks take no consideration to the noise pollution they are causing that is significantly impacting others mental health. When will the trucks be given an alternative route? Why is the industry still remaining in Geelong around beautiful parklands and where people live and work?*

*Why is industry not relocated out of Geelong?*

### **Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Jinny.

The Central Geelong Framework Plan 2023 (Pg 65-75) identifies a long-term plan for vehicle, public transport, pedestrian and bicycle movement through Central Geelong and the surrounding area. The plan identifies the need to create safer streets for people and bicycles and encourage the use of public transport when travelling to Central Geelong. The plan also identifies the need to consider freight and heavy vehicle movement through and around Geelong to service the Bellarine Peninsula.

The extension of the Geelong Ring Road through to the Bellarine Peninsula (the Bellarine link') is a critical piece of infrastructure that is required to be constructed to provide an alternative route for trucks and heavy vehicles. The construction of this road is estimated to remove approximately 30% of current truck movements away from Central Geelong. This road will be delivered by the State Government. The timing for delivery of this road is unknown at this stage. Council will continue to advocate for the need to construct the Bellarine Link.

The West Fyans-Fyans Street Precinct Structure Plan 2009, seeks to transition land between the Barwon River, south of West Fyans and Fyans Streets and between Swanston St and Shannon Ave, into residential uses. Whilst that plan does not support the removal of all industrial and employment uses, it would significantly reduce the number in the area. It would be anticipated that over time this change in land use would result in a reduced number of truck movements in the area. This plan is currently being updated by Council. Part of this review will look at what some of the challenges have been to delivering housing in this area over the last 12 years and will also look at improvements to transport modes such as walking and cycling to capitalise on how close the area is to Central Geelong and High Street Belmont. Both these plans can be viewed on Council and State Government websites.

In response to the issues about what roads heavy vehicles are permitted to use, heavy vehicles are permitted to use local roads (that do not have a load restriction) only where required in order to reach their destination. Local roads are not permitted for use as travel through routes. Fyans, McKillop and Ryrie Streets are roads managed by the Department of Transport and Planning and are permitted for heavy vehicle through movements.

## Submitter 5. Liz Bonner

### **Question 1:**

*Real Deal for Geelong are an alliance of community organisations, faith groups, unions and invested community members working to put people and communities at the centre of policy and politics. We have three areas of focus; Secure Housing, Meaningful Work and Affordable Living and, Care and Connection for All. Our questions today relate most directly to housing but the impacts flow into each of these three pillars. What progress has been made against the Social Housing Plan 2020-2041 - Recommended Strategies and Actions?*

### **Question 2:**

*Inclusionary zoning within the Social Housing Plan states "Increase the supply of social housing from the current 3% to 7% of total households by 2031, an estimated increase in supply of 6,000 dwellings and to 10% by 2041 (a further 6,000 dwellings)." – what is the current level being achieved and what is required for new developments?*

### **Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Liz.

The City's Social Housing Plan outlines recommended strategies in Leadership, Planning, Investment and Partnerships. The City has made progress in all of these strategy areas, this includes completing social housing planning requirements for five key strategic planning areas across the region, and negotiating for social and affordable housing contributions as part of new estates and housing projects.

In addition, Council has endorsed the establishment of the Affordable Housing Trust and is currently considering feedback on the potential use of three council owned sites for social housing. We are continuing to advocate collectively with other councils to influence Commonwealth Government policy, particularly the National Housing Accord.

The City are also advocating for mandatory planning controls and an appropriate framework for inclusionary zoning, which would be more effective than the current voluntary system.

The City support the work of the Victorian Government on delivering the Big Housing Build and implementation of the Social Housing Growth Fund and continue working with State Government agencies for urban renewal partnership opportunities.

### **Response Question 2:**

As of March 2022, the City recorded a total of 4,988 social housing dwellings, representing 4% of the total dwellings in the city. This is a 16% increase in social housing since the adoption of the Social Housing Plan.

There are approximately 200 additional dwellings anticipated for Greater Geelong funded by the Big Housing Build. These dwellings are currently in the planning stages and delivery is expected to take place in the next 2-3 years.

There are 12,800 remaining social housing dwellings required to be built to achieve 7% of total dwellings forecasted in 2041. That will require 23.5% of all new dwellings to be delivered as social housing from now until 2041, which is a significant gap to fill.

The City remains committed to the strategies in the Social Housing Plan and will continue to seek the support from the State and Federal Government.

## Submitter 6. Andy Meddick

### **Question1:**

It has come to both mine and the broader community's notice, that the far right group "My Place" has not only established itself in Geelong, but is attending Council meetings of the various L.G.A's across the region. The groups are well known for their abusive and disruptive behaviour to Councils, Councillors and Council staff, largely based upon their misleading and misplaced conspiracy theories, their hatred, bigotry and transphobia, and their links to the political party Australia One. It has also come to notice that they are using the Newcomb Public Library meeting rooms to hold their regular meetings. Given their history, their exhibited behaviour and platform, all of which are at odds with Council's inclusive policies and platforms, it is abhorrent and would seem in contravention of those same policies to allow them to use any Council managed venue. Will the Councillors resolve to instruct all Council owned or managed properties to refuse bookings for My Place?

### **Response :**

Thanks for the questions, Andy.

Council is committed to inclusive practices and to strongly responding where hatred, bigotry or transphobia occurs in public Council forums. Council has a responsibility to provide public meeting spaces to all and cannot deny a group access on the basis of their political affiliation.

While this enquiry relates to a space managed by the Geelong Regional Library Corporation, we can state that for any hire of Council halls, groups must behave in accordance with the relevant hire conditions and be respectful of the space and the people around them. In the case of any misconduct or disrespectful behaviour shown to other patrons or staff, they would be asked to leave.



## Submitter 7. Charles Street

### Question 1:

*Good evening Councillors, my name is Charles Street, I am a retired biochemist and science teacher, now resident in Lara near my daughter and grandchildren. I refer to the proposal from Prospect Hill International (PHI) to construct and operate an Energy from Waste (EfW) incinerator in Lara. My family is deeply concerned about the potential health risks to ourselves and our community. PHI submitted a development licence application to the EPA for a 400,000 tonnes per annum waste-to-energy facility back in April 2021. I have read the 1900+ of pages in PHI's application and I am far from satisfied that the proponents have addressed the relevant issues. I have emailed you all a copy of our latest submission to the EPA, which outlines the multitude of flaws in the PHI application. Their numbers don't add up. I've calculated that Western Victoria has at most only 110,000 tonnes of realistically available red-top-bin and C&I waste.*

*So where will the other 290,000 tonnes come from ? We fear they may import waste in ships into the Port of Geelong; an abuse of an EPA licence, we suggest. Q1. Has Council seen a proposed contract from the proponents for incineration of waste ? Does Council know if the incinerator business will operate as a franchise, or similar ? Has Council made any undertakings to supply PHI with waste in the future ? Will Council resist any attempt to import waste into our region for incineration ?*

### Question 2:

*Most importantly tonight, I want to make you aware of the research findings of Dr Peter Tait and 10 other Health professionals from the Australian National University. Tait et alia found "a range of adverse health effects were identified, including significant associations with some neoplasia (cancers), congenital anomalies (birth defects), infant deaths and miscarriage. Ingestion (eating contaminated food) was the dominant exposure pathway for the public. Newer incinerator technologies may reduce exposure." They recommended that "new incinerators should be located away from areas of food production" and that "food grown near an incinerator should be avoided." They concluded, "based on a precautionary principle there is insufficient evidence to conclude that any incinerator is safe."*

*The consequences of incinerator contaminated food being produced in the City of Greater Geelong are unthinkable. And yet, the incinerator site is embedded in farming and residential areas. There are 9 childcare centres, 7 schools and 3 aged care residences within 5km of the facility.*

*Q2 As the representative from the Lara Care Group, will Council work with the community to oppose the Prospect Hill incinerator in Lara, and any other Big Incinerator proposals for the City of Greater Geelong? Reference: Tait et al (2020) Australian & New Zealand Journal of Public Health Vol 44, No. 1, pp 40-48. Available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1753-6405.12939>*

### Response:

Thanks for the questions,

We understand the community concerns, however as a referral authority in this process the City is obliged to provide independent advice and feedback regarding the application's consistency with the Planning Scheme. As you would be aware, the planning permit for this application will be determined by the Minister for Planning. We encourage you and any concerned community members to direct your concerns to the Department of Transport and Planning to be considered as part of the process.

## Submitter 8. Bernie Franke

**Question 1:**

*Can you explain how the Fyansford Tip came to be operating without a planning permit and what do you plan to do about it? I will attend the meeting to ask these questions in person.*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Bernie.

The Fyansford landfill is operating under existing use rights. This means it has been operating continuously for a period of at least 15 years, and as a result does not have a planning permit that regulates it. The City is unable to override these rights. The site has a current licence from Victorian Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), which approves the use of the site for a landfill. This licence includes amenity conditions (such as odour, noise and dust), as well as conditions on the type of waste that can be accepted at the site, and how it is managed. Regular auditing and assessment is undertaken by EPA.

## Submitter 9. Helen Clarke

**Question 1:**

*The Minister for Planning has been asked to authorise Amendment C463ggee, which is the combined amendment and planning permit application for Balmoral Quay Stage 5, however the authorisation has not yet been granted and is still being considered by the Minister and the Department of Transport and Planning. This amendment seeks, among other matters, to increase the permissible building height from the currently approved 13.5 metres to 28.2 metres, enabling the provision of 84 apartments. It also seeks to reduce the number of carparks. There will be considerable impact on the local residents and on the Rippleside community more broadly arising from, for example, a significant and untenable increase in traffic; loss of amenity; distortion of heritage values, and overshadowing. Could Council please advise whether the Minister for Planning has now approved the release of the Proposed Amendment and if so, the timing for public Exhibition?*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Helen.

Council was advised yesterday of the official authorisation of this amendment by the Minister and the Department of Transport and Planning. Officers will now work on a timeline for exhibition.

## Submitter 10. Vicki Perrett

### Question 1:

Good evening Councillors, My name is Vicki Perrett.

Tonight I'm representing Geelong Sustainability members, who are very concerned about the massive incinerator proposed by Prospect Hill International in Lara.

Tonight I want to focus on the facility's toxic air pollution. According to the World Health Organization, air pollution is one of the greatest environmental risks to public health. All waste incinerators, regardless of technology, produce pollution. It cannot be eliminated, only managed by extensive air pollution controls and regular maintenance. Some of the gases that PHI expects the facility will produce include: Carbon Monoxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, Ozone, Sulphur Dioxide, Coarse and Fine Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5), Dioxins, Furans and heavy metals. Some of these chemicals have no safe exposure thresholds. Data prepared by the Centre for Air Pollution, Energy and Health Research shows that Lara and Greater Geelong regions already experience high levels of fine PM2.5 air pollution. Lara's average annual PM2.5 rating is 8 while the WHO safe level is 5 or below.

Exposure to Fine Particulate Matter increases the risk of lung diseases, cancer, pneumonia, stroke and neurological diseases. It's linked to adverse birth outcomes and it has worse impacts on children as they breathe more rapidly than adults.

Q1. Are Councillors aware that many suburbs in Geelong including Lara already have air pollution above the safe limits set by the World Health Organisation?

### Question 2:

My second question relates to the lack of social licence within our community for this or any incineration project in our region. PHI does not have a social licence with affected communities. They have only held one community meeting on 13 July 2021. Covid is no longer an excuse. The community wants zero waste solutions. This inferior waste management approach would entrench a linear economy and take our region in totally the wrong direction. The European Commission now classifies waste incineration in the same category as nuclear and coal energy. It's removed all renewable energy subsidies and recommends old incinerators be decommissioned and no new ones built. Around the state (and the nation), communities are pushing back against a rush of incineration projects. If the state government is serious about transitioning to a zero-waste circular economy, it should not impose huge incinerators on communities that do not want or need them. The ACT has listened to community concerns and has banned incineration. In NSW, the Bayside and Randwick City Councils listened to community concerns and facilitated a successful campaign which has seen the NSW government ban a proposed 165,000 tonne facility at Matraville.

Q2. Will Council work with the community to oppose the Prospect Hill incinerator in Lara? Will the City help organise a similar community campaign to the NSW councils to stop incineration projects? Ref:

<https://www.bayside.nsw.gov.au/community/matraville-incinerator>

### Response:

Thank you for your questions and bringing this issue to Council's attention Vicki.

The City understand the community concerns, however as a referral authority in this process the City is obliged to provide independent advice and feedback regarding the application's consistency with the Planning Scheme. As you would be aware, the planning permit for this application will be determined by the Minister for Planning. We encourage you and any concerned community members to direct your concerns to the Department of Transport and Planning to be considered as part of the process.

## Submitter 11. Mandy Bridges

**Question 1:**

*At the meeting of Council on 27 June 2023 a Notice of Motion was put by Councillor Nelson Item 3.1 Library Service Delivery. The resolution was moved by Cr Nelson and seconded by Cr Kontelj.*

*Question 1. What measures have been taken by Cr Nelson and Cr Kontelj since the Council meeting of 27 June 2023 to ensure that the intent of the Motion has been acted on?*

**Question 2:**

*Have the Mayor and Acting Chief Executive Officer written to the local Members of Parliament, Darren Cheeseman, Ella George, Christine Couzens and Alison Marchant as outlined in the Motion?*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Mandy.

As the first question is directed to the Councillors, Councillor Nelson, or Councillor Kontelj, may wish to provide a response.

In regard to your second question, the Mayor and Acting CEO wrote to State MPs (Darren Cheeseman, Alison Marchant, Ella George, Christine Couzens, Gayle Tierney & Jacinta Ermacora) on 6 July, requesting support to advocate to the State Govt in accordance with the NoM;

## Submitter 12. Mary Larah

**Question 1:**

*Why does the Mayor think it is appropriate to travel overseas when our community services have been cut back due to budget constraints- does he think that this is a good use of funding? I can believe he would put himself first before the community.*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Mary.

As this matter forms part of the Council Meeting Agenda for decision this evening, Council are unable to provide a response.

## Submitter 13. Jenna Wade

### **Question 1:**

*In response to recent media coverage of negative/racist actions in Geelong our Norlane community members decided to take action to promote a safe, welcoming and inclusive community by painting banners and gathering together at the City Hall steps. However, acknowledgement of racism by leaders at every level, from community groups and representatives of local government is essential and necessary. With consistent and timely messaging around the council's support for social justice, equity and inclusion we can ensure that all community members feel safe and welcome.*

*At a 'meet your councillor' event in Norlane, community members suggested that council respond to the negative/racist actions with a poster campaign to promote social justice, equity and inclusion. We want to see a strong and timely response from Geelong Council to support our voices of unity and solidarity for all community members.*

*Will the City of Greater Geelong's elected representatives listen to the voices of the community and prioritise a timely response to racism in Geelong? Thank you.*

### **Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Jenna.

Our response over the past week has been to proactively highlight Geelong's strong multicultural community with positive messages, rather than responding to or amplifying the voice of a very small minority.

The City issued a media release on Monday night (17 July) highlighting the 82 new Australian citizens we had just welcomed via a citizenship ceremony at City Hall, and we also shared those photos on our social media channels. All up we have now conferred close to 900 new Australian citizens so far this year – and we're proud to have welcomed all of those people as valued members of the Geelong community.

On Wednesday, at the Mayor's instigation, we arranged a photo on the steps of City Hall featuring councillors with community leaders and members from several different cultural groups. We shared this via our social media channels with positive messages of the benefits of multiculturalism.

We have absolutely no hesitation in saying that Geelong is a place where people of all cultural backgrounds are welcome and included.

Around 50,000 Greater Geelong residents were born overseas and our cultural diversity is one of our community's great strengths.

New arrivals to our region contribute individually to our community in a variety of ways, and collectively, add to the rich cultural fabric of our city.

This is something we value so much and will continue to foster and support.

You can read more about our support of cultural diversity via our Multicultural Action Plan, which is available on our website and currently under review. With regard to your suggestion of a poster campaign, this is an initiative the City will investigate internally.

## Submitter 14. Felicity Dales

**Question 1:**

*THE COGG membership of G21 is due to expire in April 2024, with the decision not to continue. My understanding is that it is a \$500k subscription annually. Can you please outline what the ROI (return on investment) has been for this annual subscription since 2000, and what you consider to be successful from this expenditure along with what you wouldn't consider a great outcome for that investment?*

**Question 2:**

*What would you do differently knowing what you know now? Why have you decided not to continue? Are you redirecting those funds to something else?*

**Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Felicity.

As this matter is confidential in nature I am unable to provide further details in relation to your questions this evening. All allocations of funding are clearly articulated within the Councils Budget which is published to our website.



## Submitter 15. Louis De Koker

### Question 1:

*The CoGG is considering a development application for 2 Morven Court (known locally as Frog Hollow) in Highton. When the previous application was considered the CoGG was provided with evidence of the presence of growling grass frogs at the property. Further evidence, including evidence from a herpetologist at the University of Melbourne, was provided during the subsequent VCAT hearing. Can the CoGG advise: (a) What steps the CoGG has taken to date in relation to that information? (b) Any steps the CoGG may propose to take, also in conjunction with State authorities; and (c) Any steps that can be taken to ensure the humane relocation of the frog colonies of Frog Hollow, should the property be developed?*

### Questions 2:

*The CoGG is considering a development application for 2 Morven Court in Highton. The extensive property, especially the current vegetation and dam on the property, mitigate some of the increasing flooding risks in old Highton. The proposed development will add hard surfaces and fill in the dam. Flooding risks are linked to a portions of the old Highton drainage system that are aging and have limited capacity to deal with flooding during storm events. Flooding occurred in 2016 and 2022. While SBOs imposed in 2015 on affected properties require new dwellings to be built higher, existing home owners are exposed to increasing risks. The CoGG engineers confirmed that they did not have accurate and reliable rainfall data for Highton. Applications for developments in Highton furthermore continue to use the now dated 2014 report on the Highton Drainage/Flood Study commissioned by the CoGG. The loss of permeable areas and the increase in hard surfaces in the area due to infill developments since that date have increased the volume and velocity of water during storm events. Given the lack of reliable data it is challenging to ensure that development of 2 Morven Court does not increase risks of flooding. What rights of recourse will affected residents of existing dwellings have if the storm water management conditions related to the development turn out to be insufficient and damage is suffered?*

### Response:

Thanks for the questions, Louis.

### Response Question 1:

The information provided to COGG and VCAT on the growling grass frog was not considered expert evidence. In accordance with the previous VCAT decision for the planning permit application at 2 Morven Court, VCAT made clear that If the growling grass frog is located on the site then the obligations under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act 1988 and the federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act 1999 (EPBC Act) both come in to play. These, however, are obligations the applicant needs to address regardless of the planning consideration under the planning scheme. (for reference this detail is referred to at paragraph 123-127 & 130 of the VCAT decision)

Based on VCATs direction, Council notes that the responsibility is on the applicant to ensure they are complying with their obligations under the Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act.

### Response Question 2:

An updated flood impact report and stormwater management strategy was submitted with the recent planning application. These reports have been reviewed by Council's Drainage Engineers and assessed by an external third-party engineer. Both of these reports have been deemed accurate and acceptable and the documents were then made available through the public notice period of the planning application (Planning application number PP-9-2023).

In terms of evidence, the flood impact report has determined through flood modelling the proposed development can occur without creating impacts on the neighbouring properties or creating any flood hazards.

The report also found that the development would be capable of conveying stormwater runoff generated through a flood event, including the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP).

## Submitter 16. Teagan Mitchell

### **Question 1:**

*As shown in your “The Northern And Western Geelong Growth Areas Framework Plan, August 2020.” The report highlights growth and areas that the council needs to work on to ensure a clever and connected community. While this report focuses on Northern and Western growth, with Armstrong creek having 5 mentions (2 in a map), North- 544 times and Western - 236 times, while your OUR COMMUNITY PLAN 2021–25 shows that the South suburbs (Armstrong Creek, Mount Duneed and Claremont) are actually going to be the top three growth areas between now and 2041. Yet the Armstrong creek area has only two council capital programs and developments running at this point, and our community feel that some key services are missing. If you have the North covered, is the South going to see similar development and long-term planning from the council, if there is planning, where is it and when can we see the south corridor get the same community focus as the North with the same opportunity for community design and feedback for development.*

### **Question 2:**

*Following my first question, Will we see the Three Multi-Purpose community centres that incorporate a neighbourhood house, flexible community meeting spaces and community gardens continuing to be funded, to a level that suits the community need and will there be more funding for them in the future given the last budget? Is the South going to continue to be left in the dark for their own community centre?*

### **Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Teagan.

The Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan sets the high-level vision for the development in Armstrong Creek like the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Area Framework Plan does for the new growth areas.

In accordance with the detailed plans for Armstrong Creek, Council has so far delivered the Armstrong Creek East Community Hub on Central Boulevard in 2019 and the Poa Banyul Community Hub on Unity Drive in Mount Duneed – 2023. The Armstrong Creek Library and Community Hub is under construction and will open in 2024 in the town centre. The total investment in these projects is around \$40 million with funding coming from developers, state Government and council.

The Horseshoe Bend Community Hub in Precinct Rd, Charlemont is the next hub that will be delivered in the Armstrong Creek growth area. It is planned to open in 2027. Planning and construction is funded in Council’s budget. Community engagement on the planning for the Horseshoe Bend Hub will occur later in 2023.

Additional Community Hubs are planned over the coming decade, to be located in Whites Road, Mt Duneed, Warralily Boulevard and Burvilles Road both in Armstrong Creek. Funding for design of these hubs is included in Councils 2022/23 – 2026/27 Budget.

## Submitter 17. Simone Tolson

### **Question 1:**

*In relation to questions raised a number of meetings ago on the South Geelong to Waurn Ponds Duplication project (in particular the Fyans St/Carr St rail bridge), the following was provided by council: The City has regular meetings with RPV and the Alliance about the Waurn Ponds to South Geelong Rail Duplication. Officers have reviewed the traffic models and reports regarding the impacts to local traffic. The City is still completing design reviews and continues to advocate for a good outcome for our community. I currently am awaiting my FOI request package from RPV but they are well over time in completing. Could you clarify where COGG is at with providing the information sought by RPV in relation to the request, and where COGG is at with the Integrated Comprehensive Transport Plan (and who now has carriage of this with the dropping of G21 involvement).*

### **Question 2:**

*Question 2: Why has there not been commencement of the Sailing School buildings at the RGYC, considering funding was assigned over 2 years ago, and how does this equate with the resources set aside for the completion of a Soccer Strategy and the nearly \$2million purchase of a soccer club in Batesford (completed in the current budget)? What is the reason that the sailing school project has not been furthered?*

### **Response:**

Thanks for the questions, Simone.

### **Response Question 1:**

The City is unable to provide an update on a Freedom of Information request from another agency. Your query should be redirected to the agency managing this request.

### **Response Question 2:**

The redevelopment of the Sailing School Building is part of the Geelong Waterfront Safe Harbour Precinct project. The Safe Harbour project is jointly funded by the Federal Government, State Government, Council and the Royal Geelong Yacht Club.

The City's funding contribution (\$3m) to the Safe Harbour project was specifically allocated to the public realm aspects of the project, namely Wangim Walk and improvements to the footpath along Eastern Beach Road.

Wangim Walk was opened to the public in December 2020.

The Sailing School Building development is directly managed by the Yacht Club with funding from the State Government and the Yacht Club. The club is working with the State Government and other stakeholders to commence the building works as soon as possible.

The Safe Harbour project has no impact on the resources set aside for Soccer.

## Submitter 18. Diane Cunningham

### Question 1:

*I recently attended a COGG 'Smart City' Forum, which was organized by the 'Smart City' Representative - Adam Mowlam, in response to many questions from Community Groups in the COGG who are very concerned about this Global initiative and its ties with the World Economic Forum (WEF). This initiative can also be known as '15min/20min' cities. The Mayor Trent Sullivan and other Council officials were also in attendance. Many concerns were raised and have also been raised many times at Council meetings since earlier in the year. A major point that came up twice on the evening was the lack of knowledge most of the residents of COGG have of this Initiative. A petition a small group ran on the subject revealed that 95% of those approached had never heard of the initiative. There needs to be more transparency from the Council, given this has the potential to impact the community in many ways going forward.*

*I would like to ask the following: -*

- 1. What council propose to do to raise the awareness within the community about this initiative?*
- 2. Will council also communicate progress by informing the Community regularly of steps/stages & timelines, including what has already been implemented?*

### Response:

Thanks for the questions, Diane.

### Response Question 1:

This is a really good question.

The Smart City Program being misrepresented has a range of negative consequences both for residents and council. In response to raising awareness, the Council has undertaken the following:

- The Smart City Information Session was aimed at providing factual information about the program and address some of the concerns.
- The Smart City Department is the smallest in council and have completed four media releases in the last two months.
- Updated smart city information across the corporate website, social media and actively seeking promotional opportunities for current projects.

Lastly it should be noted that urban innovation crosses many council department areas, and the awareness of smart cities is often tied up within a broader project such as the use of mobile apps to identify tree hollows or the use of data to inform parking in the Geelong CBD. And this best represents the Geelong vision of using data and technology to improve the liveability, sustainability and economic prosperity of Greater Geelong.

### Response Question 2:

The formal progress report will be delivered (approximately) two years after the strategy adoption, and is included in the Smart City Department Plan for 2023/24. The progress report will cover all activities and initiatives that are part of the work program, which is outlined in the Smart City Implementation Plan, that can be viewed on the corporate website.