

STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION PANEL SUBMISSION

GREATER GEELONG PLANNING SCHEME

AMENDMENT C444ggee - Southeast Lara Residential Growth Area

AMENDMENT C453ggee - Lara Industrial Business Park

Council Submission - Part C Reply

Panel: Michael Ballock (Chair)

Kate Partenio

Date: 16 April 2026

Prepared by: Peter Schembri, Senior Strategic Planner
on behalf of the City of Greater Geelong

PAGE BLANK

Introduction

1. This Part C Closing Submission (and verbal submissions) are made by the City of Greater Geelong (**Council**).
 2. This closing submission is made pursuant to Direction #22.
-

Level crossing active gated control construction timing

3. We have proposed the following addition to DPO48:

A **Staging and Infrastructure Delivery Plan** that shows:

 - the development of the land and infrastructure required, including the staging of the drainage, open space and road infrastructure required to service the stages of development.
 - ~~The plan must address~~ the delivery of any identified new or upgraded off site infrastructure required to support the development to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and any other relevant Authority. The railway level crossing upgrade works must be completed before the first dwelling is occupied.
4. The ALCAM does not stipulate a specific trigger or timing for the works, while the TIA says: *'The timing of these works can be determined through the planning stage of the project.'*
5. The verbal evidence of Mr De Young was definitive that the work should occur early in the residential development. By 'early' he indicated within 0-5 years of development commencing. Mr Furness also said it was important for the works to be completed early.
6. We all agree that the works should be completed early. The question is, what do we mean by 'early'? Mr De Young said in 'typical' circumstances planning controls do not require the delivery of infrastructure as proposed in Council's drafting. When asked for any specific like examples in PSPs, Mr De Young was unable to provide any examples.
7. This is not surprising because this situation is not 'typical'. Future residents who choose to walk or cycle west, to the Lara Lake Primary School for example, have only one option – along Canterbury Road East. Some residents, for whatever reason, may not have that choice if a household car is not available.
8. We do agree that the provision is 'matter-of-fact' and not typical of how timing of infrastructure delivery is generally managed in DCPs or ICPs.
9. Council acknowledges this infrastructure item is a significant cost, albeit an essential one. Although that said, the constraint would have been a known issue for Lara Farms.

We consider the timing proposed is reasonable and provides clarity and certainty for all stakeholders, and indeed, for future lot purchasers.

10. Our position still provides for the completion of the first subdivision stage which usually would consist of 50-60 lots or more. The land can be developed, statement of compliance issued, titles created and sold. Then there would be a period of several months before the first dwelling is constructed and a Certificate of Occupancy issued.
11. We consider that the first stage is likely to be located closest to the level crossing reinforcing the need for earliest possible delivery.
12. Any staging approach without delivery in the first stage of shared paths and the upgraded rail crossing safety would create relatively isolated early stages with poor connectivity to services and community facilities west of the railway line. It is most likely that the full upgrade of Canterbury Road East will commence from the level crossing and head east to provide a practical and pleasant (especially for potential buyers) entry and access into the estate.
13. This is also the first option advised by Barwon Water to service the 'northern catchment' with a Sewer Rising Main along Canterbury Road East (Loetis Infrastructure Servicing Assessment, November 2024). Barwon Water also provide a second potential servicing option for the 'central/ southern' part of the site from the south (Loetis Infrastructure Servicing Assessment, November 2024).
14. We don't agree with the TIA short statement that a decision on the timing of the works should be left to the subdivision permit application process. This risks it not being picked up or not clear to any future developer. We say it needs to be dealt with in the DPO.

DTP panel submission

15. DTP submitted:
 62. DTP submits that:
 - In the absence of a known development proposal to which a specific traffic generation rate can be applied, the industrial traffic generation rate in the combined Transport Impact Assessment be revised to consider all permissible uses of the IN1Z and IN3Z land.
 - The recommendations of the ALCAM assessment prepared by Nelson-Furnell for the Canterbury Road East level crossing must be addressed through the development plan process, and delivered by the developer at no cost to, and to the satisfaction of the Head, TfV.
16. DTP did not suggest a timeframe or process within which the further assessments would be required, considered and applied.

17. While Council appreciates the further scrutiny of the TIA by DTP, we do not agree that more time and assessment of the TIA is necessary.
18. After several years of work and collaboration with Lara Farms, Council submits that the Amendments can advance without further delays. DTP has been consulted on many occasions throughout the amendment process (including at pre-app stage) and we consider the proposed has appropriately responded to the issues raised.
19. Mr De Young, who provided an independent review of the TIA, said the TIA was completed with a 'significant level of analytical rigour'. As we have said in our previous submissions, Council has accepted the TIA and ALCAM.
20. On the matter of applied industrial traffic generation rates, the experts questioned what an assessment of higher rates would achieve. Both experts were of the opinion that, due to latent capacity, slightly higher traffic volumes would not materially impact on the performance of the road network.
21. Further, our experience with development proposing both residential and industrial uses is that the developments will occur incrementally over a longer period of time, hence a gradual traffic generation increase.

High pressure pipeline issues

22. Council notes the support from Mr Cann and Mr Woodland for the addition of new DPO48 and DDO55 maps solely to show the location and buffer areas of the existing oil and gas pipelines.
23. Adding the maps responds to Clause 19.01-3S strategy: *Recognise existing transmission-pressure gas pipelines in planning schemes and protect from further encroachment by residential development or other sensitive land uses, unless suitable additional protection of pipelines is provided.*
24. We agree with Lara Farms that the Planning Scheme should not confer a Pipeline Licensee with any decision-making role or stipulate that a matter must be done to the satisfaction of a Pipeline Licensee. Council's Day 1 drafting does not apply such terms and seeks to 'engage' or 'consult' with a Pipeline Licensee as part of the Development Plan or planning permit application process.
25. The matter to be resolved is the appropriate drafting of the planning controls. We submitted Day 1 changes and Lara Farms also submitted changes. With the benefit of the evidence and further review, Council will collaborate with Lara Farms to provide the Panel with a final version for the Panel to consider.

DPO and DDO drafting

26. Council submitted its Day 1 version DPO48 and DDO55 and we have made further submissions in our Part B and at the Hearing. We don't think the matters in dispute are significant and will consider any reasonable changes prior to redrafting final versions to submit to the Panel.
27. We are not persuaded by Ms Barich's opinion that DDO55 need not make any specific reference to further reasonably practical stormwater volume reduction investigations at the planning permit application stage. She says the issues are captured in Clause 53.18 *Stormwater Management in Urban Development*.
28. Council propose the following drafting (with a minor change after a query from the Panel Chair):

5.0

Proposed C453ggee

Application requirements

The following application requirements apply to an application for a permit under Clause 43.02, in addition to those specified elsewhere in the scheme and must accompany an application, as appropriate, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority:

- A design response which provides a detailed design statement including an assessment of how the proposed development responds to the requirements outlined in Clause 2.0.
- A Stormwater Volume Management Strategy that assesses how stormwater volume leaving the land can be reduced to the extent reasonably practical (under EPA Publication 1739.1) and includes:
 - Targets for volume reduction, informed by the downstream Limeburners Bay Ramsar biodiversity values
 - Volume reduction measures to be integrated into the detailed design of the subdivision, as well as where reasonably practical and incorporated into lots.
 - Measures proposed within reserves created as part of the subdivision

29. The addition of this provision is in direct response to the C453ggee submission concerns from the Corangamite CMA.
30. Clause 53.18 contains two stormwater management standards relating to EPA Publication 1739.1: one relating to subdivision, and one relating to buildings and works. We don't dispute Ms Barich on this fact.
31. Given the industrial estate drains immediately to a RAMSAR site, a bespoke application requirement is considered appropriate. This will flag and ensure that permit applicants (and the responsible authority) explore stormwater volume reduction opportunities as part of any proposed development.

Conclusion

32. Council will prepare final DPO and DDO versions following close of the Hearing to reflect the submissions set out above.
33. We continue to advocate for the Amendments, which we consider to be strategically justified and informed by the technical reports and evidence.
34. We respectfully seek the support of the Panel.

