

Project: **Ballarat
North**

ID	Q1. Your name	Q2. Your email	Q3. Your postal address	Q4. You can enter your submission	Q5. You can upload your submission	Date
1406079	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	Submission re Ballarat North Precinct This project requires a lot more consideration and discussion. The following is a very brief precis of voluminous literature. Anything omitted is because of space, not importance. Are people buying housing in this precinct going to be fully informed of all the issues? The land involved is partly a capped landfill site [remember the still current Black Hill tip/landfill site issues], is adjacent to an industrial area, near the growing Ballarat West business zone and is an ecological zone in its own right. It is in the Burrumbeet tributary flood zone. Are the requirements of the Burrumbeet Creek Catchment Local Floodplain Development Plan 2015, including new housing to be sited on the highest ground, being strictly adhered to in these 2025 plans? This plan also notes the significant effects of the 2011 flood on residents of Miners Rest. How would similar flooding affect this area? The area is adjacent to the Central Highlands Water (CHW) Ballarat North waste water treatment plant. If this plant needs to	https://engage.vic.gov.au/dash/project/1771/submission/survey/1406079/attachment/dxbsb2fkojiwmjutmdkmtzumdu6mtq6ndmundu1wg-0-final-submission-re-ballarat-north-precinc1.docx/download	2025-10-20 11:55:08

				be expanded, to cater for increased housing, will CHW be constrained because of this nearby residential area, so have to go to the expense of acquiring other land and having to establish a completely new plant, with all the attendant replications? How will residents impinge on surrounding farmers' right to farm, as they may complain about farm smells, pesticide use etc, as has occurred at a number of sites elsewhere in Victoria and interstate. Australia has not ratified the UN Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage, so the French initiative of legislating to protect such smells and sounds cannot (yet?) eventuate here. Currently, such issues can really only be resolved if both parties can bring goodwill to mediation, or through the costly, and often acrimonious, adversarial tort law in a law court. Previous BCC documents note the importance of having land that contributes to food production. There was a concerning anomaly with timing: why did BCC delegated planning committee have the Ballarat north precinct plan agenda-ed for discussion on 8th October 2025, when both BCC MySay and the state planning authority consultation closing date is today, 20th October 2025? On p11 of the Ballarat North development contribution plan (DCP), part of 3.2 reads: All items in the DCP will be provided as soon as practicable...the development agency's capacities to provide the balance of funds not recoverable by the DCP. The development agency is Ballarat city council (BCC). Isn't this effectively offering the developers a blank cheque of ratepayers' money to provide services the developer(s) are supposed to be contributing?		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				On p11, 3.1 includes road, bridge, intersection, waterways and sports facilities projects: all expensive. Are BCC ratepayers are going to be the ones really funding the large, expensive parts of this development? So many provisions of the documents about this project are superficially mandatory, using 'must' and 'should,' but are followed by 'unless,' or qualified by 'reasonable' and other such difficult to accurately quantify words. A further example of language and definition circularity is in the introduction of the native vegetation precinct plan (NVPP). Eg. Page 1...per the Guidelines, and NVPP...must... The Guidelines also state...must include mechanisms for tracking the removal of native vegetation and corresponding securing of offsets, to ensure this occurs in accordance with the NVPP... ie: the NVPP is to agree with itself, rather than the Guidelines? The precinct structure plan (PSP) at Mt Rowan is split into 'core' and 'expanded.' Precinct planning is for the core area only. What is overlooked, or ignored, in the expanded area? Carbon credits are increasingly seen for what they are: greenwashing. They're cover for a business continuing as usual, without addressing carbon usage. The NVPP notes that the Mt Rowan area is within the Victorian Volcanic Plains bioregion: that decimated land, of which so little of the original vegetation remains. There are approximately 26.6ha of patches of remnant native vegetation identified in the study area (per note p1, NOT the whole area). Why isn't this being protected and incorporated into the precinct and consolidated and strengthened by using this		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				vegetation in the precinct for the tree canopy, wildlife corridors, habitat, and public spaces, with residents encouraged to plant indigenous, not just native? Instead, pp1-2 of the NVPP indulges in 'discussion' of whether, or not, whichever bit of native vegetation requires a permit for removal, or not, and an additional definition of 'remove native vegetation to include '...to destroy and to lop...' Until research is undertaken on the medicinal, agricultural, food and biofuel etc potential of such remnant vegetation, shouldn't its conservation be of utmost priority? This isn't greenwashing. Currently in Australia, there are university and local population led experiments being undertaken to ascertain what local indigenous plants can be used as biofuel. Too many things in all the Ballarat North precinct documents are listed as guidelines, rather than requirements. On pp39 and 58, PSP, there is a section referring to the developers doing a recycled water collection system. Are there any standards for them to adhere to, or is this something that Central Highlands Water, BCC, or the relevant Catchment authority might have to find funds to clean up later? The Ballarat 2040 strategy, p214, is explicit about gathering rainfall from the rooftops of new development sites. Would BCC and VPA be better outlining specific strategies like this, rather than relying on the many very general terms and language used? As noted above, part of this area is old Wendouree tip/landfill area. One part of the report acknowledges watertable issues and the tributary creeks flood. Has the old Wendouree tip/landfill area been properly remediated, or is it another Black Hill tip/landfill		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			area waiting to be repeated, with the complication of flooding and water table issues? We know how well the Black Hill tip site was NOT remediated. Wendouree was closed earlier, so would there be even less current good practice remediation done there? This is additional to all the ecosystem and ecological facets of the tributary creeks and threatened flora and fauna species, water table issues, potential flooding and grass/wild fire issues etc... Previous BCC reports note the deleterious effect of storm water runoff from sealed and unsealed areas, as the storm waters accumulate pollutants and sediments that results in increased volume and rate of runoff causing erosion and degrading the downstream waterway. On p11, it is claimed the Ballarat Town common will be protected. There's hardly any left after the airport and extension and other 'developments'...water issues, so is this of real significance? There is anecdotal comment that Ballarat already has a surfeit of ready to build housing land. Has this been properly and publically quantified? Should these already available and prepared alternatives be used and other greenfields areas, of more degraded land, be assessed for use, before any decision is made about the Mt Rowan land? REFERENCES: Ballarat North Precinct Structure Plan September 2025 Ballarat North Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan Public September 2025		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				Ballarat North Developments Contributions Plan September 2025 Ballarat West Precinct Structure Plan, Final, June 2012 Today Tomorrow Together, the Ballarat strategy our vision for 2040, July 2015 Long term water resource assessment for Southern Victoria Overview report draft 2019 Land currently being prepared for future sale, vic.gpv.au updated 17 September 2017 Burrumbeet Creek Catchment Local Floodplain Development Plan 2015 Incorporated document		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Submission re Ballarat North Precinct

This project requires a lot more consideration and discussion. The following is a very brief precis of voluminous literature. Anything omitted is because of space, not importance.

Are people buying housing in this precinct going to be fully informed of all the issues?

The land involved is partly a capped landfill site [remember the still current Black Hill tip/landfill site issues], is adjacent to an industrial area, near the growing Ballarat West business zone and is an ecological zone in its own right.

It is in the Burrumbeet tributary flood zone. Are the requirements of the Burrumbeet Creek Catchment Local Floodplain Development Plan 2015, including new housing to be sited on the highest ground, being strictly adhered to in these 2025 plans?

This plan also notes the significant effects of the 2011 flood on residents of Miners Rest. How would similar flooding affect this area?

The area is adjacent to the Central Highlands Water (CHW) Ballarat North waste water treatment plant. If this plant needs to be expanded, to cater for increased housing, will CHW be constrained because of this nearby residential area, so have to go to the expense of acquiring other land and having to establish a completely new plant, with all the attendant replications?

How will residents impinge on surrounding farmers' right to farm, as they may complain about farm smells, pesticide use etc, as has occurred at a number of sites elsewhere in Victoria and interstate. Australia has not ratified the UN Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage, so the French initiative of legislating to protect such smells and sounds cannot (yet?) eventuate here. Currently, such issues can really only be resolved if both parties can bring goodwill to mediation, or through the costly, and often acrimonious, adversarial tort law in a law court. Previous BCC documents note the importance of having land that contributes to food production.

There was a concerning anomaly with timing: why did BCC delegated planning committee have the Ballarat north precinct plan agenda-ed for discussion on 8th October 2025, when both BCC MySay and the state planning authority consultation closing date is today, 20th October 2025?

On p11 of the Ballarat North development contribution plan (DCP), part of 3.2 reads: All items in the DCP will be provided as soon as practicable...the development agency's capacities to provide the balance of funds not recoverable by the DCP.

The development agency is Ballarat city council (BCC).

Isn't this effectively offering the developers a blank cheque of ratepayers' money to provide services the developer(s) are supposed to be contributing?

On p11, 3.1 includes road, bridge, intersection, waterways and sports facilities projects: all expensive.

Are BCC ratepayers are going to be the ones really funding the large, expensive parts of this development?

So many provisions of the documents about this project are superficially mandatory, using 'must' and 'should,' but are followed by 'unless,' or qualified by 'reasonable' and other such difficult to accurately quantify words.

A further example of language and definition circularity is in the introduction of the native vegetation precinct plan (NVPP).

Eg. Page 1...per the Guidelines, and NVPP...must...

The Guidelines also state...*must include mechanisms for tracking the removal of native vegetation and corresponding securing of offsets, to ensure this occurs in accordance with the NVPP*... ie: the NVPP is to agree with itself, rather than the Guidelines?

The precinct structure plan (PSP) at Mt Rowan is split into 'core' and 'expanded.' Precinct planning is for the core area only. What is overlooked, or ignored, in the expanded area?

Carbon credits are increasingly seen for what they are: greenwashing. They're cover for a business continuing as usual, without addressing carbon usage.

The NVPP notes that the Mt Rowan area is within the Victorian Volcanic Plains bioregion: that decimated land, of which so little of the original vegetation remains.

There are approximately 26.6ha of patches of remnant native vegetation identified in the study area (per note p1, NOT the whole area). Why isn't this being protected and incorporated into the precinct and consolidated and strengthened by using this vegetation in the precinct for the tree canopy, wildlife corridors, habitat, and public spaces, with residents encouraged to plant indigenous, not just native?

Instead, pp1-2 of the NVPP indulges in 'discussion' of whether, or not, whichever bit of native vegetation requires a permit for removal, or not, and an additional definition of 'remove native vegetation to include '...to destroy and to lop...'

Until research is undertaken on the medicinal, agricultural, food and biofuel etc potential of such remnant vegetation, shouldn't its conservation be of utmost priority? This isn't greenwashing. Currently in Australia, there are university and local population led experiments being undertaken to ascertain what local indigenous plants can be used as biofuel.

Too many things in all the Ballarat North precinct documents are listed as guidelines, rather than requirements.

On pp39 and 58, PSP, there is a section referring to the developers doing a recycled water collection system. Are there any standards for them to adhere to, or is this something that Central Highlands Water, BCC, or the relevant Catchment authority might have to find funds to clean up later? The Ballarat 2040 strategy, p214, is explicit about gathering rainfall from the rooftops of new development sites. Would BCC and VPA be better outlining specific strategies like this, rather than relying on the many very general terms and language used?

As noted above, part of this area is old Wendouree tip/landfill area. One part of the report acknowledges watertable issues and the tributary creeks flood. Has the old Wendouree tip/landfill area been properly remediated, or is it another Black Hill tip/landfill area waiting to be repeated, with the complication of flooding and water table issues? We know how well the Black Hill tip site was NOT

remediated. Wendouree was closed earlier, so would there be even less current good practice remediation done there?

This is additional to all the ecosystem and ecological facets of the tributary creeks and threatened flora and fauna species, water table issues, potential flooding and grass/wild fire issues etc...

Previous BCC reports note the deleterious effect of storm water runoff from sealed and unsealed areas, as the storm waters accumulate pollutants and sediments that results in increased volume and rate of runoff causing erosion and degrading the downstream waterway.

On p11, it is claimed the Ballarat Town common will be protected. There's hardly any left after the airport and extension and other 'developments'...water issues, so is this of real significance?

There is anecdotal comment that Ballarat already has a surfeit of ready to build housing land. Has this been properly and publically quantified? Should these already available and prepared alternatives be used and other greenfields areas, of more degraded land, be assessed for use, before any decision is made about the Mt Rowan land?

REFERENCES:

Ballarat North Precinct Structure Plan September 2025

Ballarat North Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan Public September 2025

Ballarat North Developments Contributions Plan September 2025

Ballarat West Precinct Structure Plan, Final, June 2012

Today Tomorrow Together, the Ballarat strategy our vision for 2040, July 2015

Long term water resource assessment for Southern Victoria Overview report draft 2019

Land currently being prepared for future sale, vic.gpv.au updated 17 September 2017

Burrumbeet Creek Catchment Local Floodplain Development Plan 2015 Incorporated document