From: [redacted]
To: Strategic Planning
Subject: Ballarat Planning Scheme Amendment C217ball
Date: Tuesday, 19 May 2026 10:42:10 PM

Warning: This message has originated outside the City of Ballarat. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Strategic Planning Manager, City of Ballarat

We write to address the Ballarat Planning Scheme Amendment C217ball and specifically to oppose the inclusion of [redacted] in the LSIO2. The lots to the east and south of that address (Nos 19, 20, 21 to the east and Nos 5, 6, 7 and 8 to the south) are also impacted by the proposed change to some degree and in the same way as our property, but our comments are possibly also relevant to the remaining lots at the western end of the court.

Historical photos and maps show that there was an ephemeral waterway running down what is now the southern side of the court. However, the ground level and natural water flow area have been extensively modified and reshaped as a process of the creation of the subdivision, a process that was completed during 2023.

As a result of the earthworks during the subdivision:

- Fill was used to reshape the ground surface on a number of lots in the court during the subdivision, thereby altering the ground level and altering the natural flow of surface water, diverting it to the new swale drain on the northern side of the road.
- A 9m wide bitumen road with kerb and channelling has been constructed, effectively removing the ephemeral waterway from its original location.
- The swale drain has been constructed with consistent fall and constant width, ensuring that excess surface water in a rain event is removed from the court effectively and efficiently. This drain goes underground at the western end of the court.

We believe the flood studies used to create the modelling for [redacted] do not take into account these changes to the physical landscape and the flow of surface water, but are rather based on historical and out of date research and are therefore no longer relevant. On this basis, we strongly request that the LS102 overlay at [redacted] be reconsidered and [redacted] and other relevant properties be excluded from it.

[redacted]