

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO QUESTION TIME
TUESDAY, 12 AUGUST 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.

Edith Vasle asked Council for a long term solution to the re-routing of Heavy Vehicles travelling along McKillop Street?

The Mayor responded the question would be addressed during debate of the item.

Michael Garvey addressed Council as follows re Heavy Vehicle Restriction Central Geelong:

It is my understanding that Council's long term solution to East/West traffic problems rests on heavy traffic bypass the City Centre to the south. Could Council advise what level of priority it has managed to negotiate with VicRoads for the funding of this project and does the project appear in the priorities the RACV announced today it is presenting to government and opposition as its country priorities?

Gary Van Driel responded that Council is having discussions with VicRoads in relation to the next part of the trial. There are estimates in the order of between \$25-40million for works to identify plans to secure trucks to move south. Funding has not been secured but VicRoads is reviewing costings associated with such works.

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

I refer to your Question Time submission regarding discussions with Vicroads and the long term solution for addressing trucks along McKillop Street.

To provide some background on this important topic, over 100 formal submissions from traders, business owners, freight businesses, residents, shoppers and workers were received regarding the truck restriction trial. The main factors of concern related to the changes in truck volumes, congestion, air quality, noise and general traffic safety.

Council on the 12th August 2014 approved a report on the truck restriction trial considering the current and projected future freight and general traffic demands.

To measure changes in traffic patterns, air and noise results, traffic volume counters and air and dust quality samples were undertaken before and after trial commencement. Air (dust particles) and noise (dBa) sample surveys were undertaken during various times of day prior and during the trial in a number of locations to ascertain any noticeable changes with respect to the increase/decrease of trucks.

Changes in truck volumes were not clearly indicative on the dust or noise sample surveys within the City as weather conditions and the built environment can considerably affect the results. Observations did reveal that trucks were not overwhelmingly noisier than other traffic modes, but poor pavement conditions did increase the sound recordings where trucks crossed over uneven pavement.

The truck restrictions have affected all road users and many roads have experienced traffic volume changes and overleaf a map highlights the pre trial (2013) and post trial (2014) traffic volumes (weekday 24 hours). Some streets have traffic volumes results for an earlier period. The changes in traffic volumes between pre trial and post trial results are highlighted in coloured cells. Red indicates increase in volume, and green indicates a reduction in volume.

Malop Street and Mercer Street have seen a considerable reduction in through movements of trucks. Ryrie Street and Fellmongers Road have experienced an increase in truck volumes since trial commencement. Fellmongers Road has seen the biggest increase proportionally but this can be attributed to changing land use developments in the Breakwater Estate.

Through car movements have largely reduced on Malop, Mercer, Ryrie and McKillop Streets. Drivers have chosen options alternate roads such as Brougham Street, Myers Street and Kilgour Street and this is reflected in the traffic counts.

Accidents or near miss incidents with regards to trucks or long term increased congestion were not reported.

As part of the report resolution, Council shall proceed to undertake the following :-

Action - Short Term	When	Who
40km/h blanket speed limit for Central Geelong	2014/15	City of Greater Geelong
Pavement rehabilitation works – Ryrie St	2014/15	VicRoads
Tree trimming – Ryrie St	2014/15	City of Greater Geelong
Traffic Management Measures – McKillop St east	2014/15	City of Greater Geelong / VicRoads
Linemarking changes – various	2014/15	City of Greater Geelong
East West Freight Linkages Study to inform the 30 year Network Operating Plan	2014/15	VicRoads
Investigate options to introduce weight restrictions on Ryrie St	2014/15	City of Greater Geelong / VicRoads

To further support the outcomes of the Network Operation plan the following Medium term (2-5 years) and long term (5-15 years) actions include:

Action	When	Who
Intersection Upgrade – Ryrie St / Latrobe Tce	Medium Term	VicRoads
Intersection Upgrade – Fyans St / Latrobe Tce	Medium Term	VicRoads
Route Alignment upgrade – Fyans St	Medium Term	VicRoads
Intersection Upgrade – Boundary Rd / Fellmongers Rd	Medium Term	VicRoads
Advocate for Bellarine Link – Ring Road extension	Medium term	VicRoads / City of Greater Geelong
Route Alignment Upgrade – Barwon Heads Road, Settlement Rd to Breakwater	Medium Term	VicRoads

<i>Route Alignment Upgrade – Barwon Heads Road, Breakwater Rd to Mt Duneed Rd</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Construction of Bellarine link</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>

Further information on report and findings can be found here:-

<http://www.geelongaustralia.com.au/council/meetings/>

Greg McHenry asked:

- 1) What will be happening to the disused Alcoa site and associated infrastructure?
We, the public, have not been advised: Will it be restored to its former state? Will there be a clean up of the environment? Will the defunct power pylons between Point Henry and Anglesea be removed?

The Mayor responded the question would be taken on notice and advised Alcoa is presently working on helping those staff who have lost their jobs into securing alternative employment.

Gary Van Driel responded Alcoa are aware of their clean up obligations.

- 2) What is happening with the funds that have been collected from the 'water dispensing' machines that are all around Geelong? I think it is on behalf of Cotton On/Unite Geelong and was/is to be for programs for young people in the northern suburbs?

The Mayor responded he would have the question followed up with Cotton On who has the responsibility for this program and not Council.

Cr Ansett added this is not a Council issue but that of Cotton On.

A subsequent written response was provided by the Manager Customer Services and Councillor Support in the following terms:

Unite Geelong is a fund raising campaign established and managed by Cotton On.

The City of Greater Geelong is supporting Unite Geelong by agreeing to have bottled water vending machines located at several council owned premises where there is not a pre existing commercial arrangement.

Income derived from these machines goes to the Unite Geelong program which has a focus of supporting young people.

On 25 March 2014, Mayor Darryn Lyons represented the City at their launch event where it was announced that Geelong Cats coach Chris Scott would become the official ambassador for the Unite Geelong water campaign.

The Cotton On Foundation is responsible for the installation, service, replenishment and cash handling associated with the Unite Geelong water vending machines.

Information regarding the Unite Geelong campaign is available at: www.unitegeelong.com.au .

Toni Sincock advised her concern that Stage 2 of the truck ban only seeks to restrict trucks on Ryrie and McKillop Streets, leaving Myers Street as the only east west street not planned as part of the ongoing trial. I am bewildered as to why this may be, particularly given the presence of Matthew Flinders High School, St John of God Hospital, Geelong Hospital and residential properties primarily to the east of Swanston Street. We have noticed trucks using Myers Street, and are concerned that any ban on trucks in Ryrie Street and McKillop Street will bring substantial numbers of trucks to Myers Street as it would remain the only option for east west truck traffic other than Fyans Street! Is it deliberate to leave Myers Street open to a significant increase in trucks? Would it not make more sense to extend the ban to Myers Street if the desire was to relocate truck traffic to Fyans Street and the Breakwater Bridge? Council could close Myers Street to trucks without VicRoads consent, why is this not proposed?

Gary Van Driel responded definitely – as part of negotiating Stage 2 we will certainly be ensuring Myers Street is identified and reflected in those discussions in relation to the format we're looking for. In relation to the current trial we are also undertaking quite extensive traffic monitoring including Myers Street. What we are seeing is higher truck numbers probably because of St John of God – we will monitor this.

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

I refer to your Question Time submission regarding measures to address trucks on Myers Street as part of the future proposals for truck restrictions on Ryrie Street.

I can advise that Council will apply to introduce truck restrictions on Myers Street as part of any restrictions to be introduced on Ryrie Street. To provide more information on the trial, please find below of interest.

Council on the 12th August 2014 approved a report on the truck restriction trial considering the current and projected future freight and general traffic demands.

To measure changes in traffic patterns, air and noise results, traffic volume counters and air and dust quality samples were undertaken before and after trial commencement. Air (dust particles) and noise (dBa) sample surveys were undertaken during various times of day prior and during the trial in a number of locations to ascertain any noticeable changes with respect to the increase/decrease of trucks.

Changes in truck volumes were not clearly indicative on the dust or noise sample surveys within the City as weather conditions and the built environment can considerably affect the results. Observations did reveal that trucks were not overwhelmingly noisier than other traffic modes, but poor pavement conditions did increase the sound recordings where trucks crossed over uneven pavement.

The truck restrictions have affected all road users and many roads have experienced traffic volume changes and overleaf a map highlights the pre trial (2013) and post trial (2014) traffic volumes (weekday 24 hours). Some streets have traffic volumes results for an earlier period. The changes in traffic volumes between pre trial and post trial results are highlighted in coloured cells. Red indicates increase in volume, and green indicates a reduction in volume.

Malop Street and Mercer Street have seen a considerable reduction in through movements of trucks. Ryrie Street and Fellmongers Road have experienced an increase in truck volumes since trial commencement. Fellmongers Road has seen the biggest increase proportionally but this can be attributed to changing land use developments in the Breakwater Estate. Myers Street pre trial volumes were low due to St John of God works.

Through car movements have largely reduced on Malop, Mercer, Ryrie and McKillop Streets. Drivers have chosen options alternate roads such as Brougham Street, Myers Street and Kilgour Street and this is reflected in the traffic counts.

Accidents or near miss incidents with regards to trucks or long term increased congestion were not reported.

As part of the report resolution, Council shall proceed to undertake the following :-

<i>Action - Short Term</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Who</i>
<i>40km/h blanket speed limit for Central Geelong</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>City of Greater Geelong</i>
<i>Pavement rehabilitation works – Ryrie St</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Tree trimming – Ryrie St</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>City of Greater Geelong</i>
<i>Traffic Management Measures – McKillop St east</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>City of Greater Geelong / VicRoads</i>
<i>Linemarking changes – various</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>City of Greater Geelong</i>
<i>East West Freight Linkages Study to inform the 30 year Network Operating Plan</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Investigate options to introduce weight restrictions on Ryrie St</i>	<i>2014/15</i>	<i>City of Greater Geelong / VicRoads</i>

To further support the outcomes of the Network Operation plan the following Medium term (2-5 years) and long term (5-15 years) actions include:

<i>Action</i>	<i>When</i>	<i>Who</i>
<i>Intersection Upgrade – Ryrie St / Latrobe Tce</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Intersection Upgrade – Fyans St / Latrobe Tce</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Route Alignment upgrade – Fyans St</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Intersection Upgrade – Boundary Rd / Fellmongers Rd</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Advocate for Bellarine Link – Ring Road extension</i>	<i>Medium term</i>	<i>VicRoads / City of Greater Geelong</i>
<i>Route Alignment Upgrade – Barwon Heads Road, Settlement Rd to Breakwater</i>	<i>Medium Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Route Alignment Upgrade – Barwon Heads Road, Breakwater Rd to Mt Duneed Rd</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>
<i>Construction of Bellarine link</i>	<i>Long Term</i>	<i>VicRoads</i>

Further information on report and findings can be found here:-

<http://www.geelongaustralia.com.au/council/meetings/>

Geoffrey Kenyon advised he believed Boundary Road was wrongly advertised as Mt Duneed, not Armstrong Creek, in that section of the road. Between Surfcoast Highway and Ghazepoore Road I also believe that the creek to the west behind the caravan park as in my letter, also runs through Armstrong Creek not Mt Duneed as you have replied in your letter I received this morning. Also no correspondence has ever been sent to us on these matters. Listed as adjoining land owners. So where is it, or when will it arrive. These things are like advertising, north, south, east or west, they all have different postcodes. If you are doing something in the east, then advertise it in the west, is that how it works, or vice versa. The Shire should know which suburbs they are talking about. Maybe this is why they only had one submission at the time.

There is still no mention in your letter today about the unsold land which fell over with the developers in the area, or the over valued land rates issues, and do we get a reduction in our rates because of this?. No reply as yet on this matter.

The Mayor took the questions on notice and was prepared to set up a meeting with the Mayor and Peter Bettess, General Manager Planning and Tourism.

**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.

The Armstrong Creek Growth Area was planned with a number of precincts, two of which are named Armstrong Creek East and Armstrong Creek West. These names were used to describe the areas for precinct planning purposes prior to any development. As development occurs in these areas it is necessary to name the suburbs that will result from this development. The map I provided in response to your question at the 22 July Council meeting shows the new suburb boundaries. The area west of the Surf Coast Highway that was planned as the Armstrong Creek West Precinct is now generally within the suburb of Mount Duneed and the area east of the Surf Coast Highway that was planned as the Armstrong Creek East Precinct is generally within the suburb of Armstrong Creek. Armstrong Creek (the creek) flows through the suburbs of Mount Duneed and Armstrong Creek.

Where a report says that “notice has been given to adjoining land owners” it means notice was given to the owners of the allotments immediately adjoining the allotment on which the development is occurring. It does not mean that notice was given to all landowners in the adjoining planning precinct or suburb.

Council rates are levied as a rate in the dollar on property values. Properties are re-valued every two years. A decrease in property value does not automatically result in decreased rates as the amount to be paid is also dependent on the rate in the dollar that is set in the Council’s annual budget. The Council’s 2014-2015 Rating Strategy published as part of the Council Budget explains the rating methodology.

Developers often take an option to purchase land at a future date rather than purchasing land at the outset. The lapsing of options is a normal occurrence in developing areas. There are a variety of reasons why options are not exercised, usually related to the developer’s business plans at the time. Land values are determined by actual sales rather than options.

Your letters cannot be considered as indefinite submissions. Submissions need to be made to the specific proposal such as a Planning Scheme Amendment or permit application. The Development Contributions Plan for the Armstrong Creek West Precinct is part of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme and must be complied with when land is developed.

If you feel that I have not adequately answered your questions, I’m happy to meet with you to discuss your concerns.

Jan Pearce addressed Council as follows in relation to the Geelong West Bowling Club:

At the Council Meeting of 22 July the site of the Geelong West Bowling Club was rezoned from General Residential Zone 1 to Residential Growth Zone 2, thus allowing more intensive larger scale building when the site is sold as proposed by the Club:

1) Why was the site rezoned?

Peter Bettess responded the land was rezoned and was actually contrary to what the officer's recommended. Main reason was to give greater certainty as to what happened to the land.

- 2) Before any sale is finalised, would Council initiate a public discussion about the use of the land? This land was originally a public asset, and one option still possible would be to retain it for use as parkland through, for example, a State Government purchase?

Peter Bettess advised the land is privately owned by the Bowling Club and not a matter Council can dictate as to how or what they do with the land.

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

Thank you for your questions submitted at our last Council meeting regarding the Geelong West Bowls Club. The following are my responses on behalf of Council.

Question One: Why was the site rezoned?

Response: The Greater Geelong Planning Scheme was amended in accordance with the State Government new residential zones. Cr Heagney proposed an alternate recommendation that requested the Minister for Planning to prepare, adopt and approve a planning scheme amendment to introduce a Design and Development Overlay per attachment 2.

Question Two: Before and sale is finalised would Council initiate a public discussion about the use of the land?

Response: The land is privately owned by the Bowling Club. The public will be able to lodge submissions in respect to the future proposed use of the land, as part of the planning process. Letters will be sent to residents within a 2km radius which will outline the planning process for submissions when the development is presented to Council.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Helen Tinning asked the following in relation to the Geelong West Bowling Club – Removal of Covenant:

We feel very alienated from our Council and very concerned about the way in which the rezoning of the Bowling Club land has taken place.

We are also concerned about the lift of the covenant over this land. The original land for the Bowling Club land was purchased between 1911 and 1913 by donations from residents and the Geelong West Council. Presumably the covenant was placed over the land sold by the Council to the Club in 1986 because the sale for \$48,000 was greater under value.

- 1) Will you reconsider your vote at the last Council meeting to label this section of land in a Heritage Overlay Area to allow 10.5 metre buildings despite assurances in a Councillor's delivered letter, Councillors and Council officers at public meetings and despite the fact that the panel, Council officers and your own motion on March 25 stated that development in Heritage Overlay area should not exceed 9 metres in height?

Also, are you prepared to facilitate a proper community consultation with the residents directly involved to discuss what has happened and the future use of this land including ways in which we could all work together to save this green space for future community use?

Cr Heagney responded that the report relates to the removal of a covenant from the land which is privately owned by the Bowling Club. The covenant does not apply to the whole Bowling site.

The Mayor took the questions on notice.

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

Thank you for your questions submitted at our last Council meeting regarding the Geelong West Bowls Club. Please find my responses on behalf of Council.

Question One: Will you reconsider your vote at the last Council meeting to label this section of land in a Heritage Overlay Area to allow 10.5 metre buildings despite assurances in a Councillor's delivered letter, Councillors and Council Officers at public meetings and despite the fact that the Panel, Council Officers and your own motion on March 25 stated that development in Heritage Overlay areas should not exceed 9 metres in height?

Response: Please find enclosed a copy of the resolution carried in respect to the Geelong West Bowling Club – Removal of Covenant report together with attachments 1, 2 and 3. As Cr Heagney stated on the night the covenant does not apply to the whole site. Cr Heagney proposed an alternate recommendation that requested the Minister for Planning to prepare, adopt and approve a planning scheme amendment to introduce a Design and Development Overlay per attachment 2.

Question Two: Also, are you prepared to facilitate a proper community consultation with the residents directly involved to discuss what has happened and the future use of this land including ways in which we could all work together to save this green space for future community use?

Response: The land is privately owned by the Bowling Club. The public will be able to lodge submissions in respect to the future proposed use of the land, as part of the planning process. Letters will be sent to residents within a 2km radius which will outline the planning process for submissions when the development is presented to Council.

Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Sam Tucker asked Council to not remove the covenant, and resolve not to take any further action on the site until Council has conducted a comprehensive public submissions process, engaging all interested parties on the future of this site including future usage of the site, and all potential means of supporting of potential options including support from State and Federal Governments?

If the covenant is removed this evening, that Council conduct a comprehensive public submissions process, engaging all in interested parties on the future of this site before any planning process is undertaken, and that the deadline for the Expression of Interest be extended until at least 26 September 2014, to allow this to happened and give time for the proper consideration of all options?

The Mayor responded the questions will be addressed during debate of the item.

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

Thank you for your questions submitted at our last Council meeting regarding the Geelong West Bowls Club. The following are my responses on behalf of Council.

Question One: *Will Council consider not removing the covenant, and resolve not to take any further action on the site until Council has conducted a comprehensive Public Submissions Process, engaging all interest parties on the future of this site including future usage of the site, and all potential means of supporting of potential options including support from State and Federal Governments?*

Response: *Please find enclosed a copy of the resolution carried in respect to the Geelong West Bowling Club – Removal of Covenant report together with attachments 1, 2 and 3. As Cr Heagney stated on the night, the Geelong West Bowling Club would likely succeed in having the covenant removed if legal proceedings were initiated. Cr Heagney proposed an alternate recommendation that requested the Minister for Planning to prepare, adopt and approve a planning scheme amendment to introduce a Design and Development Overlay per attachment 2.*

Question Two: *If the covenant is removed this evening, that Council conduct a comprehensive Public Submissions Process, engaging all interested parties on the future of this site before any planning process is undertaken, and that the deadline for the Expression of Interest be extended until at least September 26th 2014, to allow this to happen and give time for the proper consideration of all options?*

Response: *The public will be able to lodge submissions in respect to the future proposed use of the land, as part of the planning process. Letters will be sent to residents within a 2km radius which will outline the planning process for submissions when the development is presented to Council.*

Thank you for your interest in this matter.