Candidate Information Request Register from 28 August 2026 to 28 November 2026

RM number (if known)	Date Request Received	Request type e.g. Councillor / Candidate	Question or information requested	Response provided	Response provided date
RM2906615	21/08/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	The candidate asked: I heard that there is aboriginal heritage significance at the planned data centre site at 585 Berwick Cranbourne Road, Clyde North. Has the site been reviewed for this? If so, could you please share it with me? Also, on Tuesday, I talked with a large group of residents that wanted to attend the ordinary council meeting on Tuesday but couldn't because they hadn't registered. When will council get rid of registration? There were empty seats that they could have come in and watched.	Council recognises the importance of Aboriginal cultural heritage and the role of Traditional Owners. In assessing the planning permit application for the proposed data centre at 585 Berwick-Cranbourne Road, Clyde North, Council officers considered the relevant Aboriginal cultural heritage requirements, including whether a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) is required. The CHMP requirements are set by the State under the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006 and Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2018. Under that framework, a CHMP is required where a high impact activity is proposed in an area of cultural heritage sensitivity, unless an exemption applies. Based on the relevant mapping and statutory requirements, the site is not identified as requiring a CHMP for this proposal. Accordingly, formal Traditional Owner consultation through the CHMP process is not triggered by the planning permit application. This does not alter the applicant's broader obligation to comply with Aboriginal cultural heritage legislation if any Aboriginal cultural heritage is identified during works. With respect to the registration process for attendance at Council Meetings, Council Officers continue to revise the effectiveness of the registration process however will not be removing the process.	2/09/2026
RM2906553	21/08/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	The candidate asked: I am emailing you as I was speaking with someone who lives close to the planned Clyde North data centre site and she believes that the site may have significance for Aboriginal peoples. Do you know if this has been looked into as part of the approval process?	Please refer to Council's response above.	2/09/2026
N/A	8/09/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	The candidate asked: I wanted to follow up regarding an important pedestrian and road safety issue in Clyde North, particularly along Burnbank Parade. Despite Burnbank Parade having two parks and considerable pedestrian and vehicle activity, there are currently no designated pedestrian crossings along the road. Residents, families with children, young people, cyclists and other pedestrians therefore have no clearly designated safe place to cross from one side to the other, including when accessing the parks. I believe Council should consider installing raised pedestrian crossings at appropriate locations along Burnbank Parade, particularly near the parks. A raised pedestrian crossing could provide two important safety benefits at the same time. It would create a clearly identifiable and safer place for pedestrians to cross, while the raised platform or speed hump would also require motorists to physically reduce their speed.	Burnbank Parade is currently classified as a connector road within Council's road hierarchy. Its primary function is to connect local residential streets to the broader road network. The road is located within the Smiths Lane estate and serves as an access route for surrounding residential areas while development of adjacent stages is ongoing. Regarding pedestrian crossing along Burnbank Parade, the parks adjoining the road were designed primarily to serve local residents, and pedestrian movements in these locations are generally dispersed and intermittent in nature rather than concentrated at specific crossing points. To facilitate access across the road, pram crossings have been provided at suitable locations. When assessing new requests for pedestrian-priority treatments such as raised zebra crossings/priority crossings, Council considers a range of factors including pedestrian demand, vehicle volumes, road function, visibility, and compliance with relevant engineering standards and guidelines. Typically, pedestrian-priority crossings are more appropriate in locations that experience high and continuous pedestrian activity throughout the day, such as areas surrounding major commercial centres, public transport hubs, schools, or significant recreational facilities.	23/09/2026
			In my view, the combination of a raised speed platform with traditional white pedestrian crossing markings would be particularly effective. When drivers approach a raised crossing, they are naturally encouraged to slow down and pay greater attention to their surroundings. This gives them more time to identify potential hazards, particularly children, families, cyclists and pedestrians who may be crossing or approaching the road. I would also like to raise a concern regarding some of the existing pedestrian and cyclist crossings on other major local roads, including O'Connor Avenue. Some crossing areas are marked in green, which I believe can be confusing and does not provide motorists with the same immediate visual recognition as a traditional pedestrian crossing. I believe that traditional white pedestrian crossing markings on the black road surface would send a much clearer message to motorists that they are approaching an area where they need to slow down, look carefully and be prepared to stop.	Based on the current land use and observed pedestrian activity along Burnbank Parade, Transport Operations does not presently consider that the installation of additional pedestrian-priority crossings is warranted. However, Council will continue to monitor the area as development within the Smiths Lane estate progresses and travel patterns evolve over time. In relation to your comments regarding the green-coloured crossings, these treatments are generally used to indicate priority across the road to enable cyclists to legally remain mounted while crossing. The crossings along Burnbank Parade form part of the shared user path network within the Smiths Lane development and were designed and constructed in accordance with the standards and practices applicable at the time of their approval and construction. Since the delivery of these crossings, updated standards and guidelines for priority crossings have been introduced which incorporate different pavement colouring, signage and linemarking requirements. While Council acknowledges that some newer developments have implemented these more recent treatments, it is not sustainable to retroactively modify each of these existing crossings to match the most recently updated design guidelines.	
			At key locations, Council could also consider flashing or illuminated pedestrian warning signs. While signage advising motorists to give way to pedestrians and cyclists already exists in some areas, an illuminated or flashing warning system would make the crossing considerably more visible, particularly during periods of poor visibility or heavy traffic. A combination of raised crossings, speed reduction measures, clear white pedestrian markings and illuminated warning signage could therefore achieve more than simply providing a place to cross. It could help change driver behaviour, reduce vehicle speeds and encourage motorists to actively look for pedestrians and potential hazards. This is particularly important around parks and residential areas where we should expect children and families to be able to move safely between different parts of their neighbourhood. I would greatly appreciate it if you could raise these matters with the appropriate Council team and ask whether a pedestrian and traffic safety assessment of Burnbank Parade, together with a review of the existing crossings around O'Connor Avenue, could be undertaken.	The existing priority crossing on O'Connor Avenue was assessed following concerns raised by the community. As a result, the crossing was modified to reflect signage and linemarking consistent with the more recent priority crossing standards and guidelines to improve clarity for all road users. We appreciate the feedback you have provided and your commitment to road safety within the community. Your comments have been noted and will help inform future reviews of the local road and shared path network as development in Clyde North continues.	

N/A	22/09/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	The candidate asked: It has been brought to my attention that the City of Casey are intending to issue glass recycling bins to households at Cranbourne. My questions are: 1. How did we arrive at this decision? 2. Will there be an extra cost to the residents for this extra collection, given that now there is an extra bin, meaning an extra garbage truck per route? 3. Were the public/householders involved in the decision making for this? 4. Given the tough economic climate we are in, is this a wise and necessary expenditure, or has it been implemented to please another party? If you could please forward these questions on to the appropriate people who called on this, so as we can get real answers to pass on to our people. Personally, the householders, or residents, if you may, are now doing the work for our garbage collection companies, that they, the residents, should be receiving a discount on their rates, in Liew of the extra work they are doing. It seems to be an unnecessary expense to "fix" something that wasn't broken.	**1. How did we arrive at this decision?** City of Casey is required to introduce the Glass Recycling Service as it is mandated under State Government Legislation. Below is a timeline of key events leading up to the implementation of the service. 2019: The Victorian recycling system experienced severe disruption in 2019 after China started to enforce "SWORD" legislation aimed at cleaning up imported recycling material received from countries including Australia . Some Australian recycling companies ultimately collapsed, highlighting the vulnerability of the recycling sector. Parliament held an inquiry into recycling and waste management resulting in recommendations across the whole sector including what later became known as the Kerbside Reform with a recommendation for a separate glass bin. 2020, the Victorian Government released Recycling Victoria: A New Economy, which outlines a ten year action plan to develop a circular economy. Kerbside transition reforms form a key component of this plan and require councils to: · Standardise bin lid colours across Victoria (red for general waste, yellow for commingled recycling, lime green for FOGO, and purple for glass recycling); · Standardise acceptable materials for each bin type; · Provide all households with access to a glass collection service by 2027; and · Provide all households with access to a FOGO service by 2030. During this period Casey made submissions directly to State Government, coordinated with MAV and lobbied MPs opposing the introduction of the glass bin service. 2021 The Circular Economy (Waste Reduction and Recycling) Act 2021 enshrined the requirements into law. Recycling Victoria were supposed to deliver the Service Standards that would outline in detail the requirements. October 2022 Casey discontinued campaign opposing the introduction of the glass bin, given it was now mandated. 12 December 2023 The City of Casey Council resolved: That Council endorse the proposed approach to the implementation of the mandated Victorian State Government Kerbside Reforms. 17 September 2024. Evaluation report to award contract to manufacture and deliver lids and bins was signed off under CEO Delegation.	23/09/2026
				2. Will there be an extra cost to the residents for this extra collection, given that now there is an extra bin, meaning an extra garbage truck per route? The cost of providing the glass service has been incorporated into the 26/27 waste budget and is funded by the Waste Services Charge along with other waste and recycling related services. Councillors formally resolved not to increase the Waste Services Charge for 26/27. **3. Were the public/householders involved in the decision making for this?** How community feedback was incorporated into the Kerbside Reforms is a question for State Government. The State Government conducted consultation on the Kerbside reforms including the glass service on the following occasions; Recycling Victoria policy development (2019–2020) · Community and stakeholder input informed the development of Recycling Victoria: A New Economy, released in 2020. · This is when the overall policy direction, including moving toward a standardised 4-bin system, was developed. Consultation on standard recycling lists (22 November 2021 – 12 January 2022) · The Victorian Government sought feedback through Engage Victoria on what materials should be accepted in the: oglass bin oFOGO bin omixed recycling bin · Consultation included public submissions, council engagement and industry workshops.	
				Service Standard Framework consultation (September – October 2022) · Government consulted on the proposed framework for the new household waste and recycling service standards. · More than 250 submissions were received from councils, industry and the public. Draft Regulations and Service Standard consultation (18 June – 14 August 2024) · DEECA conducted formal public consultation on: othe proposed Household Waste and Recycling Service Standard, oaccompanying regulations, and othe Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS). · This consultation focused on how the reforms would be implemented rather than whether the 4-bin system should exist. The City of Casey conducted Community engagement on the following occasions · As part of deliberative engagement and Know Your Council sessions before the report of December 2023. ol t was always clear that the reforms were mandated by the State and that the Council engagement "will be to inform the community of the changes and when they can expect the changes to occur." · Further community engagement from Casey occurred after the report from 15 July to 16 September 2024 oThe engagement did not mislead respondents into thinking Council could choose not to provide the service as it was mandated, rather it was about preferences in the service that was being delivered. oThe majority of the 3,621 respondents preferred an 80L bin collected monthly. These results supported the Council report and have informed the program. · Further engagement occurred on Councils Kerbside Policy Review and closed on 8 April 2026. oThe Kerbside Policy operationalises councils waste services including the changes brought in through the Kerbside Reforms.	
				4.Given the tough economic climate we are in, is this a wise and necessary expenditure, or has it been implemented to please another party? The kerbside reform has been implemented as per requirements to comply with State Government Legislation. Councillors questioned the viability of the glass service and explored the merits of abandoning the scheme. Casey has entered contracts and is well into delivering the glass bins. Abandonment would breach contracts already entered, incur financial costs which would be borne by the community and leave Casey in non-compliance with State Legislation.	

CIR0000002	21/10/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	I am hoping you can please provide me with some clarity on an issue that was brought up at a recent Narre Warren North Community Association meeting (5/10/26) related to some parkland in the area that may be sold. As it was the first time I had heard about the issue, I thought I would see if I could please obtain the name of the parkland and see if there was an update on the concerns raised. Thank you	Thank you for your enquiry. The parcel of land referred to at the Narre Warren North Community Association meeting on 5 October 2026 was the A'Beckett Road Reserve, at 2l Old Abeckett Road in Narre Warren North. Council is not considering the sale of this land at this time. Following the meeting, Council also provided written confirmation of this position to the Association.	26/10/2026
CIR0000003	9/10/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	Dear Mayor and Councillors, I formally request that the City of Casey ask the Minister for Planning to determine the proposed Clyde North data-centre application PA26-0190 under section 97C of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, before Council makes its decision. Casey has called for stronger statewide data-centre planning controls and community consultation. The Victorian Government has since announced stronger safeguards, recognising the need to protect communities. Clyde North deserves no less, but the Government says the proposed new controls will not apply to applications already under assessment. This application remains undecided. I am separately calling on the Minister to use the call-in power under section 97B and asking local MPs to support that action. Council should now formally consider whether responsibility for this significant proposal should rest with the State Government, which announced the new policy and controls. A ministerial call-in would not itself change the law applying to the application; it would, however, require the State Government to address the assessment and explain how the newly recognised protections will be considered. I also request that Council publish, to the extent legally permitted, relevant information about prior meetings, planning work, agreements or commitments concerning this proposal. The Hampton Park waste transfer station experience has shown why communities need the full picture before major planning decisions, not after them. I make no allegation that the two projects are connected. If Council decides not to seek ministerial determination, residents deserve a clear public explanation of that decision. With the state election approaching, this issue should not be lost in referrals and delay. Please consider this request urgently and provide a response by Friday 16 October 2026.	Thank you for your letter to the Mayor and Councillors dated 9 October 2026, which requested that Council write to the Minister for Planning asking the Minister to decide the planning permit application for a data centre at 585 Berwick-Cranbourne Road, Clyde North (Permit App. No.: PA26-0190). Officers are responding on behalf of the Mayor and Councillors because your letter relates to a live planning permit application that has been called in by the Council. We acknowledge there is significant community interest in this application. As your letter recognises, the Victorian Government's Sustainable Data Centre Action Plan, released in September 2026, does not apply to this application. Regardless of whether Council or the Minister is the decisionmaker, this policy will not apply to the application. As the level of government closest to our community, Council believes it is best placed to assess and decide the application, with our community's interests at the forefront of the assessment process. In recognising this, Councillors have called in this application and will consider a decision at the December Council Meeting. This ensures the application, and the rationale for the officer recommendation, will be presented and discussed transparently for the community to view. On this basis, Council has not sought Ministerial determination of the application. Thank you again for sharing your concerns.	3/11/2026
CIR0000003	30/10/2026	Candidate (via a City of Casey Councillor)	I am writing regarding the proposed data centre at 585 Berwick-Cranbourne Road, Clyde North. Given the scale of the development, community concerns and the State Government's recently announced data centre guidelines, I am seeking clarification on the financial and planning considerations associated with the application. Could council please advise: 1. What is the estimated value of developer contributions under the Croskell Infrastructure Contributions Plan, and when would these become payable? 2. Have any additional contributions, infrastructure works, parkland improvements or community benefits been proposed or discussed with the developer? 3. Are any agreements, including a Section 173 agreement, being considered? 4. Has council assessed the potential financial benefits of the development, including future rates revenue? 5. Where does council draw the line between the financial benefits of a development and the potential impacts on the surrounding community? How is that balance assessed? 6. Further to my previous correspondence requesting that council consider seeking intervention by the Minister for Planning, has council given this matter further consideration in light of the State Government's recently announced data centre guidelines? I understand that developer contributions are a normal part of the planning process and can provide important infrastructure for our growing communities. However, if significant financial contributions or future revenue are involved, I believe it is fair to ask whether retaining the application for council determination could be a financial consideration in deciding whether to seek ministerial intervention. I am not suggesting that this has occurred, but the community deserves to understand the process and have confidence that decisions are being made in their best interests, and in the instance of the Veolia Waste Transfer Station, a section of the community potentially pays a long term price to enable a development to proceed. I also appreciate that some information may be commercially sensitive, but would expect as much transparency as possible.	Officers have addressed each of the points you have raised below. 1. New development creates additional demands on infrastructure. Victorian planning laws require developers to pay infrastructure contributions to help fund infrastructure for new development in growth areas. The proposed development is expected to generate approximately $7.58 million in transport infrastructure contributions under the Croskell (Employment) Infrastructure Contributions Plan. If Council issues a permit for the proposed development, these contributions would be paid prior to the commencement of construction. The law requires infrastructure contributions collected by Council to be spent on transport infrastructure identified in the Croskell (Employment) ICP like roads, intersections and shared paths. 2. If a permit issues, the developer would be required to undertake infrastructure works, including roads and drainage. As the assessment of the permit application is yet to be completed, Council cannot comment further on this question. The officer recommendation on the application, including any additional contributions, infrastructure works, parkland improvements and community benefits will be uploaded to Council's website on Thursday 3 December, ahead of the December Council meeting. 3. Agreements, including Section 173 agreements, are commonly used in the planning permit process. As the assessment of the permit application is yet to be completed, Council cannot comment on this question. 4. As with all permit applications in Casey, this proposal is assessed against the Casey Planning Scheme. Potential financial benefits, including future rates revenue, has no bearing on the assessment or decision on a permit application. 5. A key focus of the assessment of the permit application has been the potential for adverse impacts on the surrounding community and whether these impacts can be managed. The financial benefits of a development are neither relevant, nor weighed against these impacts. 6. Council reiterates its previous response to you on this question. As the level of government closest to our community, Council believes it is best placed to assess and decide the application, with our community's interests at the forefront of the assessment process. In recognising this, Councillors have called in this application and will consider a decision at the December Council Meeting. This ensures the application, and the rationale for the officer recommendation, will be presented and discussed transparently for the community to view. On this basis, Council has not sought Ministerial determination of the application.	23/11/2026