From: [redacted]
To: Strategic Planning
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Planning Scheme Amendment C217ball - [redacted]
Date: Friday, 29 May 2026 4:48:22 PM
Attachments: bwlogonotextpx110w_92f6b8e8-8275-4746-b05e-683bd84f8661.png
reconciliationweek2026_73b2af06-5e5b-432c-8b5c-6be61a41ca0c.png
LinkedIn_36670c0b-4210-4dfc-a06c-a581a7de505f.png
Instagram_4131d787-fa5a-40e6-8794-b9c2eb1c95b5.png
191 Cherry Flat Road - Letter C217ball objection.pdf

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.

Good afternoon,

Please find attached our submission on behalf of the landowner at [redacted]

Regards

[redacted]
A Suite 3, 180 Eleanor Drive, Lucas, VIC 3350
W beveridgewilliams.com.au
P 03 5327 2000 M [redacted]



Proudly certified in Victoria and NSW for Quality ISO 9001, Safety ISO 45001 and Environment ISO 14001

Beveridge Williams acknowledges the Traditional Custodians of the land it works on and pays respect to their Elders, past and present

Beveridge Williams

ACN 006 197 235
ABN 38 006 197 235

Ballarat Office
Suite 3
180 Eleanor Drive
Lucas
PO Box 4189
Lucas VIC 3350
Tel: (03) 5327 2000

beveridgewilliams.com.au

Our Ref: 2100577
Permit Ref: PLP/2023/423

29 May 2026

City of Ballarat – Strategic Planning
PO Box 655
Ballarat VIC 3353

strategicplanning@ballarat.vic.gov.au

To: City of Ballarat Strategic Planning

RE: Ballarat Planning Scheme Amendment C217ball – [redacted] – Proposed Flood Overlay Application

I write on behalf of the landowner of [redacted] (the Subject Land) to raise concerns regarding the proposed application of flood-related planning overlays under Ballarat Planning Scheme Amendment C217ball (the Amendment). This submission is lodged pursuant to section 23 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. It identifies a specific and significant concern arising from the interaction between the Amendment and the Ballarat West Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) Drainage Strategy Update (Engeny, December 2024), which we submit has not been adequately addressed in the exhibited material.

The Subject Land is situated between the study areas of the Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek flood mapping studies, both of which form part of the Ballarat 11 Waterways Flood Study underpinning the Amendment. Both Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek discharge to Winter Creek, which in turn flows through the Subject Land before joining the Yarrowee River. Winter Creek is therefore the receiving waterway for the combined flows of both modelled catchments, and the Subject Land sits within a convergence of those flows. Despite this, Winter Creek has been explicitly excluded from the scope of the Ballarat 11 Waterways Flood Study. The consequences of that exclusion for the accuracy of the proposed overlay mapping affecting the Subject Land are the central concern of this submission.

The exclusion of Winter Creek from the flood study is difficult to reconcile with the hydrological significance of that waterway to the catchment system being modelled. Winter Creek has an estimated catchment area of 80 km^2 and receives flows from both the Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek study catchments, along with Chase Waterway. It is not a minor tributary – it is the principal receiving waterway for the western growth corridor of Ballarat, and it passes directly through the Subject Land. The Ballarat West PSP Drainage Strategy Update prepared by Engeny in December 2024 acknowledges this explicitly, noting that its RORB hydrological model was expanded specifically to include the whole Winter Creek catchment in order to properly understand the impact of retarding basins on peak flows within Winter Creek. If Winter Creek warrants full catchment modelling in the context of the PSP drainage strategy, the omission of that same waterway from a concurrent flood study that establishes statutory planning overlays over land it flows through requires clear justification – justification that has not been provided in the exhibited Amendment material.

The practical consequence of Winter Creek's exclusion is that the hydraulic models for both Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek have no representation of the receiving waterway conditions into which their flows discharge. The downstream boundary conditions applied at the outlets of those models – the water levels assumed at the point where each creek meets Winter Creek – will therefore have been set without reference to the concurrent flood levels in Winter Creek itself. During a major flood event, both Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek will likely be in flood simultaneously with Winter Creek, and the elevated water levels in Winter Creek will create backwater effects that could raise or lower flood levels in the tributary streams above what would otherwise be modelled. Where the Subject Land sits at or near the confluence of

these waterways, those backwater effects are directly relevant to the accuracy of any flood extent mapping and the overlay boundaries derived from it. The exhibited mapping cannot account for these effects because the receiving waterway was not modelled or at least cross examined.

A further concern relates to the calibration of the flood models and Winter Creek's role in that process. Because there are no stream gauges within the Kensington Creek or Bonshaw Creek catchments, neither flood model could be calibrated against locally observed flows. Instead, both models adopted rainfall loss parameters – an initial loss of 25 mm and a continuing loss of 2.0 mm/hr – that were derived from a separate calibration of the Yarrowee River. The Yarrowee River is the waterway that Winter Creek flows into, meaning Winter Creek's flows are part of the measured data that the Yarrowee calibration was built from. Engeny's Drainage Strategy confirms the same starting point, noting that it also relied on Water Technology's Yarrowee River model for calibration purposes.

Winter Creek therefore sits at the heart of the calibration chain on which both studies depend – yet it has not been flood-mapped and no hydraulic model of its behaviour has been produced. This creates a tangible gap in the modelling framework: the flood levels, flow velocities, and inundation extents along Winter Creek as it passes through the Subject Land are unknown. Without that information, the design parameters for retarding basin RB14 – which is intended to manage flows that ultimately discharge to Winter Creek – cannot be confidently established. If the assumed downstream conditions in Winter Creek prove to be materially different from actual flood behaviour once properly modelled, the sizing, configuration, and cost of RB14 may need to be revised. The landowner should not be exposed to that cost uncertainty while the waterway that governs those design conditions remains unmodelled.

The Amendment and the Ballarat West PSP Drainage Strategy also raise a specific concern about consistency of climate change scenario application across the two planning instruments. The flood overlay boundaries proposed under the Amendment are derived exclusively from the RCP 8.5 climate change scenario – the most extreme of three scenarios modelled. The Ballarat West PSP Drainage Strategy Update (Engeny, December 2024) includes its own climate change assessment, the results of which are reported in Table 3.8 of that report. However, the Drainage Strategy does not clearly identify which RCP scenario was adopted for its climate change assessment. This creates a material uncertainty: the wetland and retarding basin infrastructure sized and costed under the PSP and DCP – infrastructure that directly manages stormwater flows into Winter Creek – may need to be designed to a climate change scenario that is inconsistent with the extreme RCP 8.5 scenario now proposed as the basis for the Amendment's flood overlays.

This inconsistency is consequential. The wetlands and retarding basins in the Ballarat West PSP are sized to attenuate peak flows from the development catchment before they enter Winter Creek. Their design capacity determines how much flow Winter Creek receives during a design flood event – which in turn affects flood levels on and past the Subject Land. If those assets were designed to a moderate climate scenario while the Amendment's overlays are drawn from an extreme scenario, the infrastructure is undersized relative to the flows the overlays assume. Conversely, if the PSP assets were designed to RCP 8.5 but the Amendment used a different methodology to derive the same scenario's rainfall intensities, the two models may predict different volumes of flow entering Winter Creek from the same development catchment, producing inconsistent assessments of risk at the Subject Land. Neither possibility has been addressed in the exhibited material, and the absence of a clear statement of the climate change scenario adopted in the Drainage Strategy makes it impossible for the landowner to assess consistency without further disclosure and appropriate cost corrections to the DCP.

For the reasons set out above, we request that the City of Ballarat and any appointed Panel address the following matters before the Amendment proceeds in relation to land affected by Winter Creek:

1. The City of Ballarat should provide a clear and documented justification for the exclusion of Winter Creek from the Ballarat 11 Waterways Flood Study, specifically addressing the adequacy of the downstream boundary conditions applied to the Kensington Creek and Bonshaw Creek models at their Winter Creek confluence, and whether backwater effects from coincident Winter Creek flooding were considered.

2. The Ballarat West PSP Drainage Strategy Update should be required to confirm the specific climate change scenario (including RCP number and design year) adopted for its climate change assessment in Table 3.8, and Water Technology should be required to confirm the corresponding scenario applied to the Bonshaw Creek and Kensington Creek hydraulic models, so that consistency between the two instruments can be assessed.

3. If those two scenarios are found to be inconsistent, the land owner reserve the right to defer in part of full, revised flood modelling, design and delivery of RB14, to Council.

The concerns raised in this submission are not raised in opposition to appropriate flood risk management. They are raised because the exhibited mapping creates uncertainty to the effects on the Subject Land derived from models that exclude the principal waterway flowing through that land, and whose climate change assumptions may not be consistent with the concurrent planning instrument governing the catchment infrastructure that determines flows into that waterway. Statutory flood overlays should be founded on a complete and consistent picture of the catchment system. On the current evidence, that picture is incomplete.

Should you wish to discuss any aspect of this submission, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

BEVERIDGE WILLIAMS