

Submission re Bannockburn Growth Plan

1. First of all, glad VPA is assisting with this.
2. You note on page 21 that 80% of Bannockburn working population travel to Geelong for employment and this trend is expected to continue. It never ceases to amaze me that there is no consistency or overall interaction between municipalities. For instance, the Greater Geelong City Council Amendment C395 proposes closing part of Fyansford-Gheringhap Road, a MAJOR thoroughfare for Golden Plains residents who travel to Geelong for work. This proposal is so inconsistent with the BB Growth Plan. The proposed connections in the BB Growth Plan do nothing to address this, or improve travel into Geelong. All traffic will have to go via Midland Highway into at least the Ring Road intersection. Midland Highway is bumper to bumper now in peak hours.
3. Reinstatement of the train line and a light rail to Geelong would be amazing, less traffic congestion and pollution.
4. On page 39 you talk about affordable and social housing. Lane is hardly affordable in Bannockburn. A small block is around \$400K, then you have to put a house on it, so up to \$1M in total. You fail to consider in this assessment that Geelong wages are one half or less than Melbourne wages, but you probably didn't know that. In addition, we have among the highest municipal rates in the State (if not the highest). People are doing it tough in Golden Plains, have no doubt about that. But who can afford to move!
5. Bannockburn is desperately in need of infrastructure guidance. But when you have an extremely high percentage of Council budget on wages (I think it was around 90%?), little funding goes elsewhere.
6. Bannockburn's infrastructure has changed very little, if at all, in the past 20 years, despite the huge increase in housing estates and population.
7. You talk about increasing industrial land in Bannockburn – the existing industrial estate has struggled since inception to get tenants, and continues to do so. There is definitely no need for more industrial estates.
8. I agree agricultural uses need to be considered, BUT they should be balanced with the growth of towns in the Shire. On the one hand you have Council approving new estates, producing growth plans and rezoning formerly farming/rural land for residential use, and on the other hand they continue to approve, for example, such 'agricultural' uses as the dead animal carcass fertiliser plant very close to Teesdale, all the while under the guise of calling it "Bannockburn" because it is alongside the Bannockburn/Teesdale town boundary but actually nowhere near Bannockburn township, it is approximately 1 kilometre (or perhaps even less) from a proposed new estate at Teesdale (this would be known to Council so why approve it without consideration of its proximity to the next town). This shows a lack of consistency, common sense and planning for the future, not to mention amenity, health and safety considerations for residents (in this instance for Teesdale residents). More consideration therefore needs to be given to agricultural uses – not on their own but how they will affect local towns if the intention is to expand those towns within Golden Plains Shire.