

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO QUESTION TIME
TUESDAY, 25 FEBRUARY 2014**

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.

Georgina Alford asked the following in relation to Amendment C300:

- 1) In relation to the item regarding the C300 New Residential Zoning Amendment could Council please amend submitter 2 so that it reads Margaret and Georgina Alford, rather than just Margaret Alford?

The Chief Executive Officer advised that Council would adjust the Appendix, which is now reflected in this Minute document.

- 2) Could Council please explain why parts of Geelong West such as Lawton Avenue have not been considered in the same way as this area of Newtown? I would like Council to explain how the distinction has been made based on the definitions of the C300 Proposed Zones and the Local Planning Policies. Could Council please respond to this question in writing?
- 3) What do these proposed changes mean in practical terms? How will they be applied? In relation to the setback being behind the roof ridge-line of heritage buildings – which heritage buildings does this refer to? Does it mean the heritage buildings on either side of the property, the street or the heritage area in general? It is not clear and I would appreciate Council explaining the application of these proposed “Design Objectives” to me. I would appreciate Council responding to this question in writing?

Peter Bettess responded the decision tonight is not final, just a step towards having those points addressed. A response will be forwarded in writing.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your questions asked at the above Council meeting.

Question 1

The Council has amended its record of submitters to Amendment C300 to now read Margaret and Georgina Alford.

Question 2

Parts of Geelong West have not been considered for the General Residential Zone Schedule 2 due to the proximity to the Pakington Street activity area. A balance needs to be struck between objectives for residential growth and preserving the character of areas. The Council's reasoning on applying the zones will be tested at the Independent Panel.

Question 3

In practical terms, these provisions mean that new development respects the character of adjoining areas and does not provide for abrupt changes in character between Increase Housing Diversity Areas and other residential areas. It also provides for new development, above one storey, to be set back behind the roof ridge-line of the heritage buildings. This provision relates to the site proposed for the new development. In considering the appropriateness of the development the adjoining heritage buildings and the heritage area generally will be considered.

Helen Lyth asked the following:

Portland, Oregon, with a population of over ½ million currently has over 6% of workers commuting by bicycle. Portland's projected target for 2030 is that ¼ of all trips within the city will be made by bicycle. With the annual Australian bike count happening next Tuesday morning, CoGG will have current data on cyclist numbers in our municipality. Does the City of Greater Geelong have a per capita target for cycling? If so, what is it? What is the projected date for 5% of all trips of less than 10 kilometres to be made by bicycle?

Cr Andy Richards indicated he would respond to the questions in writing, however agreed Portland, Oregon is a fantastic City, but does not believe Geelong is quite there yet. He added that Council is working with Bike Safe to improve the bicycle network throughout the City.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
Cr Andy Richards in the following terms:**

Thank you for your question posed at the Ordinary Council meeting of the Geelong City Council on 25th February 2014 regarding cycling rates in Geelong.

Council participates in the Bicycle Network Super Tuesday counts which are undertaken in March each year. Between 2011 and 2013, counts have been undertaken at common sites to provide baseline data for cycling. The trend between 2011 and 2013 shows a 9% increase in bicycle trips across the count sites. Overall count numbers across the 22 sites increased from 756 in 2011 to 824 in 2013.

The City of Greater Geelong does not have defined timeframes for achieving thresholds for percentage of trips made by bicycle at this stage. Census data for trips to work by bicycle indicates a steady trend between 2006 and 2011, with 1% of trips to work in Geelong made by bicycle. This is slightly under rates within Greater Melbourne, which is at 1.3% based on census data.

The provision of improved cycling facilities is the catalyst for increased rates of cycling, especially for commuter cyclists. Council is identifying opportunities to upgrade bicycle facilities throughout the municipality to ensure that a safe, connected network is provided for all cyclists.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, please contact Jake McMinn, Senior Recreation Development Officer on 5272 4968.

Cr Heagney added the recent Central Geelong Transport Links Study by VicRoads and the Department of Transport identified a road usage hierarchy.

Jamie Baensch asked:

From 2006 to 2011 the CoGG has grown at a steady 0.9% pa -

- 1) What is the population growth target for CoGG?
- 2) The G21 aspirational population target is 500,000 for 2050 – what is the data to support this target?

Peter Bettess responded that he believes the figure to be around 1.3%. Council uses a couple of different sources, ABS for projections and also ID for forecasts. These can be viewed via Council's website.

The Mayor suggested Mr Baensch make an appointment with a Council Officer to address these issues in more detail.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I refer to your questions at the above meeting and our subsequent discussion.

The growth rate for the City of Greater Geelong (CoGG) from 2006 to 2011 is around 1.4%.

The Council does not have an actual population target. The Municipal Strategic Statement refers to a need to accommodate an additional 63,000 persons to 2031. The Council has adopted the G21 Regional Growth Plan which plans for 500,000 people in the G21 region to 2051. CoGG has historically accounted for around 75-79% of the region's growth.

The date is derived from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and id consulting.

I am still pursuing the other data you requested in our subsequent meeting.

Philip and Louise King asked:

- 1) As Geelong is a commuter hub of Melbourne, with huge demand for rail access, why is so little growth zone proposed around the South Geelong, Marshall and the proposed Grovedale stations? Given that there is the option to designate a growth zone of either 400 or 800 metre radius around activity centres depending on whether they are small or large, why was an 800 metre radius not designation around these stations?

Peter Bettess advised 400 has been chosen based primarily around convenience. This issue is something which could be raised with the Panel.

- 2) There appears to be no impact assessment of the proposed zoning on, e.g. transport access (especially rail), infrastructure, traffic, parking, safety, aged care and public housing. What impact assessments were done, against what underlying strategies/plans and with what results?

Peter Bettess responded there is no impact assessment as such and referred to the Implementation Plan in the 'Background' of the report which addresses the types of facilities that are needed to support the growth.

- 3) Only three small areas have been nominated as Neighbourhood Residential Zones, with almost all of Geelong being classified as General Residential or Growth zones.

So why has CoGG chosen to apply the state guidelines so brutally given that Geelong is only about 1/20 the size of Melbourne? Is Council determined to reduce all of Geelong to the lowest common denominator, rather than promoting suburban character and diversity?

Peter Bettess responded that what we are trying to do is tie up Geelong's future housing needs. The Panel will either agree or advise us otherwise.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your questions at the above meeting.

Question 1 – Rail Access

400 metres was chosen around activity centres as this is accepted as the 5 minute walkable catchment distance. This provision has existed in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme since January 2010.

Question 2 – Application of the neighbourhood Residential Zone

The zones have been applied in Geelong based on the Minister for Planning's guidelines. There is no desire by the Council to replicate Melbourne or reduce Geelong to the lowest common denominator. The Independent Panel will examine whether the approach taken by the Council in applying the zones is an appropriate one.

Question 3 – Underlying Research

The Housing Diversity strategy (2007) and its associated background report by the Swinburne Institute for Social Research provides a detailed investigation into housing needs and the demand for aged care and public housing. The G21 Regional Growth Plan Implementation Report provides further research on the infrastructure needs to accommodate a regional population of 500,000 by 2051.

Anne Morrell asked if Council was aware that the previous panel report Amendment C129 June 2008, outlined significant deficiencies in Council's approach to managing development within the heritage overlay areas page 76 and 77 of the report made the observation that "ignoring overlays in the identification of these areas can only be described as incompetent" and recommended "amending the strategies in the MSS to clarify expectation around the level of development appropriate in IHD areas" and "support low scale medium density development in all residential areas consistent with character of these areas". How does Council propose to address the concern raised by the panel which is still relevant with this new proposal?

Peter Bettess responded that the panel did not say the Council is incompetent and suggested the preamble to the report be read. This Council is going through a full public process.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your questions at the above meeting.

As I pointed out at the meeting, the quote you have in your question does not include the hypothetical proposition that the IHD areas were intended as "substantial change" areas. The "substantial change" areas were part of residential zones proposed by the Government of the day that never proceeded to be implemented. The Council never intended the IHD areas to be "substantial change" areas, so the passage you quoted is irrelevant.

Joe Crosbie asked:

The Belmont Heights subdivision has a majority of single dwelling covenants attached to the lots – why has the planning department applied the residential growth zone when due to the covenant mandating a single dwelling it is not possible to increase density?

Peter Bettess responded that in the case of areas where there are covenants the covenant will govern what can happen on those sites unless the covenants are removed. The point we are at is the opportunity to make a submission and that should be a matter to be raised.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your questions at the above meeting.

The zones have been applied according the Housing Diversity Strategy. The single dwelling covenant will limit development unless it is removed in the future. If the covenant was removed the area meets the criteria for the residential growth zone. The independent panel will review whether the Council's proposal is appropriate.

Tim Boyd asked if Council is aware it has proposed one of the highest uses of Residential Growth Zones when compared to other municipalities who have already implemented these zones. What is the reason for this?

Peter Bettess responded that the zones are applied in line with the Housing Diversity Strategy. The other Councils have handled in a much more lenient way, but they are not approved and remain as just proposals.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your questions at the above meeting.

The Council has applied the Residential Growth zone according to the Housing Diversity Strategy (2007). The Minister for Planning has made it clear to Councils that he will not accept the new residential zones being applied selectively and without a proper basis. The Independent Panel will review whether the approach taken in Geelong is appropriate.

Geoff Kenyon presented a series of statements in relation to Agenda Item 10 – Revocation of Flood Prone Area Designation of New Lots at Mount Duneed.

A response to these issues will be provided in writing.

The Mayor also indicated the issues would be discussed during debate of the item.

**A subsequent written response was provided by the
General Manager Planning and Tourism in the following terms:**

I am replying to your question at the above meeting.

The Armstrong Creek area is being developed from a rural catchment to an urban catchment. The developers are building and upgrading the drainage infrastructure in the area to deal with the increased runoff according to current engineering standards. The agenda item before the last council meeting was to remove the Special Building overlay over land that has been developed with upgraded drainage. Flooding in the creek should decrease as the drainage infrastructure is developed.

Mary Wallace asked:

- 1) Does Council consider that Section 7f of the Ropeworks Planning Permit has been satisfied?

Peter Bettess responded, "yes".

- 2) If the answer to Question 1 is yes, on which date was Section 7f of the Ropeworks Planning Permit signed off?

The Chief Executive Officer responded questions in relation to the Ropeworks has been discussed extensively, and as advised in recent correspondence, this matter will not be discussed further.

Peter Bettess provided Mrs Wallace with a copy of correspondence in relation to Section 7f.