

**Draft Greater Geelong Planning Scheme
Amendment C450ggee
Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan
and Development Contributions Plan**

**Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee
Referral 1 Report - Volume 2**

Planning and Environment Act 1987

20 June 2025

Planning Panels Victoria acknowledges the Wurundjeri Woi Wurrung People as the traditional custodians of the land on which our office is located. We pay our respects to their Elders past and present.

Planning and Environment Act 1987

Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee Referral 1 Report - Volume 2 pursuant to section 151 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*

Draft Greater Geelong Planning Scheme Amendment C450ggee

Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan and Development Contributions Plan

20 June 2025



Lisa Kendal, Chair



Sarah Carlisle, Deputy Chair



Kate Partenio, Member

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary.....	6
1 State infrastructure items	8
1.1 Introduction	8
1.2 Unresolved issues	9
1.3 Can State infrastructure be included?.....	9
1.4 Should this State infrastructure be included?	10
1.5 Design and cost considerations	14
2 Drainage matters affecting 110 Creamery Road.....	15
2.1 Introduction	15
2.2 Unresolved issue.....	15
2.3 Discussion	15
2.4 Finding.....	16
Appendix A Document list.....	17

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 State road infrastructure project costs and apportionment	8

Glossary and abbreviations

Bisinella	Bisinella Developments Project Pty Ltd
Committee	Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee
Council	City of Greater Geelong
Day 1 changes	Council initial proposed changes to the place based plan and DCP (Document 23)
DCP	Creamery Road Development Contributions Plan
DTP Transport Services	Department of Transport and Planning, Transport Services
GAIC	Growth Area Infrastructure Contribution
IN	Intersection
NWGGA	Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas
Precinct	Creamery Road Precinct
PSP	Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan
Submitters 7 and 11	Rosalia and Simon Nardi and Lovely Banks Development and Growland
Villawood	Batesford Developments Project Pty Ltd
Volume 1 Report	Volume 1 of the Committee's Referral 1 Report, dated 21 May 2025
WLRB_[number]	Wetland-retarding basin [number]

Overview

Amendment summary

The draft Amendment	Draft Greater Geelong Planning Scheme Amendment C450ggee
Common name	Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan and Development Contributions Plan
Brief description	Implementation of the Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan (PSP), Development Contributions Plan (DCP) and Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP)
Subject land	Creamery Road Precinct, bounded by the Geelong-Ballarat railway line to the north, the Geelong Ring Road to the east, the Midland Highway to the south, and Geelong-Ballan Road to the west
Planning Authority	City of Greater Geelong

Committee process

The Committee	Lisa Kendal (Chair), Sarah Carlisle (Deputy Chair) and Kate Partenio (Member)
Supported by	Gabrielle Trowse, Project Officer, Planning Panels Victoria
Directions Hearing	14 February 2025, by video conference
Roundtable discussions	7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 April 2025 Wurriki Nyal Civic Centre, Geelong and by video conference
Site inspections	First site inspection: unaccompanied, 6 April 2025 (Members Kendal and Partenio) Second site inspection: unaccompanied (supervised by landowner representatives on private property for safety and access only), 10 April 2025 (all Committee members)
Final submissions received after the roundtable	26 May 2025
Parties to the roundtable discussions	See Appendix C of Volume 1 Report
Citation	Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee Referral 1 [2025] PPV – Volume 2
Date of this report	20 June 2025

Executive Summary

Referral 1 to the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee (Committee) relates to the draft Greater Geelong Planning Scheme Amendment C450ggee. The Minister for Planning requested early advice on whether Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) and Development Contributions Plan (DCP) provide for a balanced development outcome with regard to the extent of developable land and the development infrastructure levy. Volume 1 of the Committee's Referral 1 Report (Volume 1 Report) describes the referral and the Committee's process including the roundtable in more detail.

Volume 1 and 2 Reports

The Volume 1 Report, covering matters discussed at the roundtable, was submitted to the City of Greater Geelong (Council) and the Minister for Planning on 21 May 2025.

This Volume 2 Report considers further submissions received after the roundtable, as directed by the Committee, in relation to:

- the appropriateness of including State transport infrastructure in the DCP
- drainage infrastructure on property 41 (110 Creamery Road, Bell Post Hill).

This Volume 2 Report does not repeat the matters or recommendations already covered in the Volume 1 Report. To understand the Committee's full findings and recommendations, both volumes should be read together.

State transport infrastructure

The draft PSP and DCP initially proposed to include the following State transport infrastructure items:

- construction costs of upgrading the intersection of Geelong-Ballan Road with Midland Highway (IN_05)
- setting aside land for the widening of Geelong-Ballan Road between Midland Highway and the railway line, and recovering 100 percent of the land costs through the DCP (LA_02)
- setting aside land for the widening of Midland Highway between Geelong-Ballan Road and the Geelong Ring Road, and recovering 100 percent of the land costs through the DCP (LA_03).

Council proposed Day 1 changes to remove all three projects from the DCP on the basis that they constitute wholly State infrastructure and should be fully funded by the State. The Department of Transport and Planning – Transport Services (DTP Transport Services) objected to the proposed changes, and requested further time to provide a supplementary submission addressing the proposed Day 1 changes.

The supplementary submission from DTP Transport Services referred to transport modelling that demonstrated that trips generated by the Creamery Road Precinct (Precinct) are predicted to account for between 6 and 11 percent of future traffic flows along the Midland Highway. No specific modelling was provided of the proportion of future traffic volumes through IN_05 that are likely to be generated by the Precinct.

While it is legally possible for State infrastructure to be included in a DCP, any infrastructure item included in a DCP must satisfy the principles of needs, nexus and equity. Need, nexus and equity should also inform the apportionment of the costs of any project to the Precinct.

DTP Transport Services has not demonstrated how an 11 percent contribution to future traffic volumes on Midland Highway justifies a 100 percent apportionment of IN_05 or LA_03 to the Precinct. IN_05 (construction costs) should be removed from the DCP, as no information has been provided that enables an appropriate apportionment to be determined. LA_03 should be apportioned in the DCP at no more than 11 percent to the Precinct.

Most of the transport experts agreed that the land required for IN_05 should be set aside in the PSP. The Committee agrees, and further work may need to be undertaken to identify this land. Assuming the intersection upgrades benefit the whole Precinct, the land costs should be included in the draft DCP.

The DCP identifies the land required for widening Geelong-Ballan Road (LA_02) from Creamery Road to the railway line. It is not clear what land is required to deliver intersections with PSP roads, and what land is required for general widening in the mid-block sections. The land requirements should be separately identified and their inclusion and apportionment in the PSP and DCP justified based on need and nexus.

Drainage infrastructure on property 41

The concerns raised by the landowner of property 41 in relation to the potential relocation of wetland-retarding basin WLRB_06 onto their land can be addressed in the further drainage work identified in Chapter 7 in the Volume 1 Report.

Recommended further work

In addition to the recommendations in the Volume 1 Report, the Committee makes the following recommendations for further work before public notice of draft Greater Geelong Planning Scheme Amendment C450ggee is given:

- 1. Amend the Creamery Road Development Contributions Plan to:**
 - a) remove Intersection IN_05 (construction)
 - b) apportion the land costs for the Midland Highway widening (LA_03) at no more than 11 percent to the Creamery Road Precinct (and 89 percent external).
- 2. Identify the land within the Creamery Road Precinct required for the ultimate design of Intersection IN_05. Amend the Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan (including the Precinct boundaries if required) to set the land aside.**
- 3. After completing the further work in Recommendation 2 above and in Recommendation 5 in the Committee's Volume 1 Report, amend the Creamery Road Development Contributions Plan to:**
 - a) include an appropriately apportioned contribution to the land costs for Intersection IN_05
 - b) include an appropriately apportioned contribution to the land costs for LA_02 (Geelong-Ballan Road widening)
 - c) adjust (if necessary) the 11 percent apportionment for LA_03 (Midland Highway widening).

1 State infrastructure items

1.1 Introduction

The draft Creamery Road Developer Contributions Plan (DCP) includes transport infrastructure projects along Geelong-Ballan Road and Midland Highway which are both declared State arterial roads. Table 1 includes a summary of State road infrastructure projects in the draft DCP. Intersection IN_05, being the intersection of two State arterial roads, could be described as 'State on State' infrastructure.

Table 1 State road infrastructure project costs and apportionment

Project	Project Description	Apportionment and cost in the draft DCP
IN_01	Geelong-Ballan Road/Connector Road – Signalised Cross-intersection	50%* - \$8,556,500
IN_02	Geelong-Ballan Road/Connector Road – Signalised T-intersection	50%* - \$7,639,000
IN_03	Geelong-Ballan Road/Connector Road – Signalised Cross-intersection	50%* - \$5,491,500
IN_05	Geelong-Ballan Road/Midland Highway – Signalised T-intersection (interim)	50%* - \$12,855,500
LA_02	Land required for Geelong-Ballan Road widening between Creamery Road and IN_05	100% - \$5,838,448
LA_03	Land required for Midland Highway widening	100% - \$1,819,085

* 50 percent attributed to the Creamery Road Precinct, 50 percent attributed to the neighbouring precinct

Source: DTP Transport Services submission to the roundtable discussions (Document 98)

The City of Greater Geelong (Council) submitted Day 1 changes¹ on 7 March 2025 proposing (among other things) to remove IN_05, LA_02 and LA_03, which are wholly State infrastructure projects, from the draft DCP.

On 13 March 2025, the Department of Transport and Planning – Transport Services (DTP Transport Services) wrote to the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas Standing Advisory Committee (Committee) requesting until 12 May 2025 to respond to Council's proposed Day 1 changes.² Following discussions at the roundtable, the Committee agreed to accept a supplementary submission from DTP Transport Services by 12 May 2025.³

Other parties were invited to respond by 26 May 2025. The Committee received responses from:⁴

- Council
- 305 Bat Pty Ltd
- Rosalia and Simon Nardi and Lovely Banks Development and Growland (Submitters 7 and 11)

¹ Document 23

² Document 34

³ Document 179

⁴ Documents 183, 181, 185 and 184 respectively

- Batesford Developments Project Pty Ltd (Villawood), Adbri Limited and Bisinella Developments Project Pty Ltd (Bisinella) jointly.

For the Committee's discussion and findings on transport infrastructure matters other than IN_05, LA_02, and LA_03, see Chapter 6 of the Volume 1 Report.

1.2 Unresolved issues

The unresolved issues are:

- whether State infrastructure can be included in a DCP
- whether projects IN_05, LA_02 and LA_03 should be included the DCP
- if they are included, whether and how they should be apportioned
- design and cost considerations.

1.3 Can State infrastructure be included?

(i) Discussion

The *Ministerial direction on the preparation and content of development contributions plans* and *Ministerial reporting requirements for development contributions plans* allows the following to be funded from a development infrastructure levy:

- acquisition of land for roads and public transport corridors
- construction of roads, including active transport paths and traffic management and control devices.

It does not specify that State roads or transport infrastructure items cannot be included.

The *Development Contributions Guidelines* (June 2003, amended March 2007) state that development contributions are "*one of a number of options for funding infrastructure available to local and State government*", and that a DCP "*may include infrastructure to be provided by a council or State Government agency*" (Committee's emphasis).

The parties and experts generally agreed at the roundtable that while unusual, there is no legislative barrier to State infrastructure (including 'State on State' infrastructure) being included in a DCP. The Committee agrees, noting that the Northern and Western Geelong Growth Areas (NWGGA) DCP Items Principles document⁵ envisages State infrastructure may be funded if need and nexus can be clearly identified.

(ii) Finding

The Committee finds:

- It is legally possible for State infrastructure to be included in a DCP.

⁵ Document 22a

1.4 Should this State infrastructure be included?

(i) Submissions and evidence

Council's position on whether projects IN_05, LA_02 and LA_03 should be included in the draft DCP was succinctly put in its Day 1 changes:⁶

DCP (developers) should not be paying for acquisition of DCP land for planned State projects.

The traffic experts considered these three projects in the traffic expert meeting before the roundtable. Most agreed:

- construction costs for IN_05 should be excluded from the draft DCP (and funded by the State)
- the land for the ultimate intersection including flaring should be set aside in the draft PSP (which it is currently not)
- LA_03 may not be required, as the existing 41 metre road reservation for Midland Highway to accommodate a six lane duplicated highway was "*sufficient for the delivery of the PSP*".⁷

DTP Transport Services explained at the roundtable that it had proceeded on the basis that all three projects would be fully funded by the DCP, and Council's Day 1 position represented a significant change made without its agreement. It referred to other DCPs in the Greater Geelong municipality that include State transport infrastructure, citing examples of intersections along the Surf Coast Highway in the Armstrong Creek growth area.

The supplementary submission from DTP Transport Services (D179) referred to transport modelling that demonstrated that trips generated by the Creamery Road Precinct (Precinct) are predicted to account for between 6 and 11 percent of future traffic flows along Midland Highway.

DTP Transport Services submitted IN_05 should be retained in the draft DCP with 100 percent apportionment to the Precinct because:

- the Midland Highway upgrades (a broader State project being undertaken by DTP) do not include the upgrade of this intersection
- the need to upgrade IN_05 is generated by the development in Creamery Road and surrounding PSPs
- development in the Precinct would "*trigger*" the need for IN_05 to be upgraded.

DTP Transport Services' supplementary submission did not present figures for the proportion of draft PSP generated traffic predicted to use IN_05.

Villawood initially supported inclusion of a scaled down version of IN_05 in the draft DCP on the basis that the intersection would need to be upgraded to service lots in the Precinct in the later stages of its development. Villawood revised its position in light of the modelling provided in D179. In a joint submission with Bisinella and Adbri, Villawood stated:⁸

- as a matter of principle, an arterial-to-arterial intersection should be funded by the State
- IN_05 should be removed altogether from the draft DCP

⁶ Document 23

⁷ Document 93

⁸ Document 184

- if it is included, it should be apportioned to reflect the very minor contribution the Precinct will make to the need for the intersection upgrade.

Regarding LA_02 (the proposed widening of Geelong-Ballan Road) DTP Transport Services submitted it has no plans to duplicate Geelong-Ballan Road, therefore LA_02 should remain 100 percent funded by the draft DCP.

Regarding LA_03 (the proposed widening of Midland Highway) DTP Transport Services reassessed the land requirements based on a DTP concept design that had regard to the updated modelling, and concluded that more land will be required than provided for in the draft DCP. It submitted that because development of the Precinct directly impacts the need to widen the Highway, it is not appropriate to allocate 100 percent of the funding for the land to the State.

(ii) Discussion

Any infrastructure item included in a DCP must satisfy the principles of needs, nexus and equity. As noted in the Committee's Volume 1 Report, need, nexus and equity should also inform the apportionment of the costs of any project to the Precinct.

In the Committee's experience, it is unusual for State infrastructure (particularly 'State on State' intersections) to be included in a DCP. These are generally funded by the State, and the Committee notes the several examples of this pointed to in the Villawood joint submission. That said, those examples are all in metropolitan Melbourne, where the Growth Area Infrastructure Contribution (GAIC) applies. GAIC provides an alternative source of funding for State infrastructure that is not available in regional areas such as Greater Geelong.

The absence of GAIC funding in regional areas does not justify a departure from the need, nexus and equity principles when considering whether State infrastructure items should be included in a DCP.

IN_05

There may be cases where State infrastructure meets the need, nexus and equity principles, and it is appropriate to include at least some proportion of the cost of State infrastructure in a DCP. However in this case DTP has not justified how a 6 percent contribution from the Precinct to future traffic volumes in Midland Highway justifies a 100 percent apportionment of the costs of upgrading IN_05 to the Precinct.

The Committee's findings on funding shared infrastructure in Chapter 5.2 the Volume 1 Report included:

- External usage should be taken into consideration in determining appropriate apportionment.
- The draft Amendment and supporting documents should include sufficient information to clearly understand the basis for proposed apportionment of shared infrastructure items across the Precinct and wider NWGGA.

DTP's position on IN_05 does not accord with these principles, or the principles of need, nexus and equity.

The Precinct will no doubt generate traffic movements through IN_05, but apportioning 100 percent of IN_05 to Creamery Road (or 50 percent to Creamery Road and 50 percent to Batesford North) cannot be justified as it fails to take account of external usage.

While the modelling referred to in D179 indicated the Creamery Road Precinct is likely to contribute somewhere between 6 and 11 percent to traffic using Midland Highway, this modelling is not sufficient to justify retaining IN_05 in the DCP, even with a lower apportionment. This is because DTP Transport Services has not:

- presented analysis of proportional traffic volumes expected to use IN_05 (as opposed to Midland Highway)
- provided the details of the traffic modelling (for Midland Highway), making it very difficult to assess the validity of the modelling.

The construction costs of IN_05 should therefore be removed from the DCP. If DTP intends to pursue inclusion of the construction costs for IN_05 through the next stage of the draft Amendment process, it will need comprehensive modelling that demonstrates the proportion of traffic expected to use IN_05 that is generated by the Precinct, and the construction costs will need to be apportioned accordingly.

Experts had differing opinions on whether it is appropriate to include the land required for IN_05 (in its ultimate design) in the draft PSP and draft DCP. Most of the traffic experts who considered this issue thought the land should be included. Traffic expert Mr Humphreys and DCP experts Mr Bursill and Mr Black disagreed, and thought that if the intersection (construction) is not included then nor should the land costs be included.

The Committee accepts the position expressed by Ms Marshall in her response to the DTP submission:⁹

If the land is not set aside during the development of the PSP, then the State would have to compulsorily acquire the land at a future date, resulting in significantly higher costs to the department and State.

The Committee therefore concludes the draft PSP should set aside the land within the Precinct (on the east side of Geelong-Ballan Road and the north side of the Midland Highway) that is required for the ultimate intersection design, including flaring and turn lanes. This has not yet been identified, and may require adjustment of the precinct boundaries.

The draft DCP contains no land costs for IN_05. Assuming the upgraded intersection will benefit the whole Precinct (as opposed to the particular parcel(s) of land in which the land is located), land costs should be included in the draft DCP. This will allow the costs to be shared across the Precinct rather than being effectively born solely by the affected landowners. Any land costs for IN_05 included in the draft DCP should be apportioned to reflect the proportion of need generated for the upgraded intersection by the Precinct.

LA_02

The draft PSP and DCP identify the land required for widening Geelong-Ballan Road (LA_02) from Creamery Road to the railway line. It is not clear what land is required to deliver intersections with Precinct roads, and what land is required for general widening in the mid-block sections. The land requirements should be separately identified in the draft PSP and DCP and their inclusion justified based on need and nexus. Land costs for LA_02 should be apportioned to reflect the proportion of need for the upgraded intersections and mid-block sections that is generated by the Precinct.

⁹ Document 181

LA_03

Regarding the Midland Highway widening (LA_03), the Committee notes the experts' view that Midland Highway can be widened within the existing 41 metre road reservation sufficient for the delivery of the Precinct. There is therefore some doubt as to whether the development of the Precinct generates a need for Midland Highway to be widened. This should be explored through the next stage of the draft Amendment process.

If the land is to remain set aside in the draft PSP and land costs included in the draft DCP, the costs should be appropriately apportioned. The modelling in D179 indicates that no more than 11 percent of traffic volumes expected on Midland Highway will be generated by the Precinct. As noted above, the details of the traffic modelling have not been provided and it is very difficult to assess the validity of the modelling. However, given the modelling represents the best available information at this point, the draft DCP should be amended to apportion no more than 11 percent of the land costs for LA_03 to the Precinct. Whether this apportionment is appropriate can be tested through consultation on the draft Amendment.

(iii) Findings and recommended further work

The Committee finds:

- Regarding IN_05:
 - The construction costs should be removed from the draft DCP.
 - The land required for the ultimate intersection design including flaring should be identified and set aside in the draft PSP.
 - If the land is set aside in the draft PSP, land costs should be included in the draft DCP so that costs are effectively shared across the Precinct rather than being born solely by the affected landowners.
 - Land costs (if included in the draft DCP) should be adequately justified and appropriately apportioned.
- Regarding LA_02:
 - The land required for intersection upgrades and the land required for widening mid-block sections should be separately identified.
 - The land should be set aside in the draft PSP only if the need for the upgrade or widening results from development of the Precinct.
 - Land costs in the draft DCP should be adequately justified and appropriately apportioned.
- Regarding LA_03:
 - The land required should remain set aside in the draft PSP at this stage, but the need for it should be tested through the next stage of the draft Amendment process.
 - Land costs in the DCP should be adequately justified and appropriately apportioned. Based on the modelling in D179 (which is the best available information at this point), no more than 11 percent of the land costs should be included in the DCP.

The Committee recommends the following further work before the draft Amendment is finalised and public notice is given:

1. **Amend the Creamery Road Development Contributions Plan to:**
 - a) **remove Intersection IN_05 (construction)**
 - b) **apportion the land costs for the Midland Highway widening (LA_03) at no more than 11 percent to the Creamery Road Precinct (and 89 percent external).**

- 2. Identify the land within the Creamery Road Precinct required for the ultimate design of Intersection IN_05. Amend the Creamery Road Precinct Structure Plan (including the Precinct boundaries if required) to set the land aside.**
- 3. After completing the further work in Recommendation 2 above and in Recommendation 5 in the Committee's Volume 1 Report, amend the Creamery Road Development Contributions Plan to:**
 - a) include an appropriately apportioned contribution to the land costs for Intersection IN_05**
 - b) include an appropriately apportioned contribution to the land costs for LA_02 (Geelong-Ballan Road widening)**
 - c) adjust (if necessary) the 11 percent apportionment for LA_03 (Midland Highway widening).**

1.5 Design and cost considerations

Villawood proposed an alternative design for IN_05 prepared by OneMileGrid dated 14 March 2025,¹⁰ which it had costed at \$12.95 million (rather than the \$25.71 million in the draft DCP). It submitted IN_05 was overengineered in the draft DCP, and that if it is included in the DCP, it should be developed and costed according to the more efficient OneMileGrid design.

Based on the Committee's recommendation in the previous subchapter that IN_05 be removed from the DCP altogether, this is a moot point. However if DTP Transport Services wishes to pursue the inclusion of IN_05 in the DCP (on an appropriately apportioned basis), the OneMileGrid design (and costings) may warrant further investigation through the next stage of the draft Amendment process.

¹⁰ Document 52

2 Drainage matters affecting 110 Creamery Road

2.1 Introduction

The draft PSP identifies wetland-retarding basin WLRB_06 as being located within property 45 to the south of Bingley Court, in the southeast corner of the precinct. In its Day 1 changes Council proposed to consolidate WLRB_06 with WLRB_07 in the northeast corner of the Precinct, removing WLRB_06 from property 45.¹¹

The drainage experts agreed that consolidating WLRB_06 with WLRB_07 would not provide an improved outcome, and the assets should remain separate. However, experts agreed the outfall arrangements and location of WLRB_06 require further investigation and consideration. They considered WLRB_06 could potentially be relocated within property 45 but closer to Midland Highway, or to the north of Bingley Court (into properties 41 and 42) or other locations. See Chapter 7 in the Volume 1 Report for more detail.

The landowner of property 41 (110 Creamery Road, Bell Post Hill) was invited to take part in the Committee's process and chose not to participate, but asked to be kept informed. Due to an administrative error, the landowner did not receive correspondence during the Committee's process.

On 15 April 2025, the landowner requested and was provided with copies of documents relating to drainage that were tabled during the roundtable discussions. On 6 May 2025, the landowner requested to make a late submission to the Committee on the basis that the documents showed a proposed change affecting property 41.

The Committee accepted a late written submission from the landowner on 17 May 2025.¹² Other parties were invited to respond to any new matters raised by 26 May 2025. Responses were received from Council and 305 Bat Pty Ltd (landowner of property 45).¹³

2.2 Unresolved issue

The unresolved issue is the location of wetland-retarding basin WLRB_06 and its outfall.

2.3 Discussion

The landowner of property 41 submitted that WLRB_06 should be retained within property 45 as:

- water naturally pools on property 45 being a low lying area
- the relocation of WLRB_06 into properties 41 and 42 would be an unreasonable burden on these small properties
- property 41 is unlikely to be redeveloped in the medium to long term.

305 Bat Pty Ltd (landowner of property 45) submitted:

The Draft PSP also needs to allow for sufficient flexibility to ensure that alternative locations and interim drainage solutions associated with construction or relocation of the WLRB_06

¹¹ Document 23

¹² Documents 180 and 180a

¹³ Documents 183 and 182 respectively

can be considered and implemented that ensure the 305 Bat Land can be developed with as little impact to its net developable area (NDA) as possible.

305 Bat understands the concerns of [the landowner of property 41]. Equally, 305 Bat does not want the intentions (and rights) of [the landowner of property 41] to not develop his land to prevent the development potential of 305 Bat's Land. Accordingly, 305 Bat is not ultimately opposed to the retention of WLRB_06 on the 305 Bat Land, but we submit that further technical work must be undertaken to ensure it is in the most appropriate and feasible location and that the Draft PSP has the necessary flexibility to enable the future drainage of the 305 Bat Land to be undertaken with as little impact as possible to the NDA of 305 Bat's Land¹⁴.

Council submitted that:

- it is committed to reviewing the drainage strategy
- deliverability of the asset is a relevant consideration
- once the further work is advanced interested parties will have an opportunity to comment on the changes.

The Committee notes the concerns of the landowner of property 41. These should be taken into account in the further work identified in Chapter 7 of the Volume 1 Report.

For the Committee's full discussion and findings on drainage and water issues other than relating to property 41, see Chapter 7 of the Volume 1 Report.

2.4 Finding

The Committee finds:

- The concerns raised by the landowner of property 41 can be addressed in the further work identified in Chapter 7 in the Volume 1 Report.

¹⁴ Document 182

Appendix A Document list

For details of Documents 1 to 177 and a list of referred materials, refer to Appendix D in the Volume 1 Report.

No	Date	Description	Presented by
2025			
178	9 May	Letter regarding late submission from owner of 110 Creamery Road	PPV
179	12 May	Supplementary submission, enclosing attachments: a) Land requirement comparison b) Land requirement comparison (detail) c) Concept intersection design, Midland Highway and Geelong-Ballan Road	DTP Transport Services
180	17 May	Submission regarding 110 Creamery Road, enclosing attachment: a) Video	Landowner of property 41
181	26 May	Response to DTP Transport Services supplementary submission	305 Bat Pty Ltd
182	26 May	Response to 110 Creamery Road submission	305 Bat Pty Ltd
183	26 May	Response to DTP Transport Services supplementary submission and 110 Creamery Road submission	Council
184	26 May	Response to DTP Transport Services supplementary submission	Villawood, Adbri Limited and Bisinella Developments
185	26 May	Response to DTP Transport Services supplementary submission	Submitters 7 and 11