

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

23 November 2021

COUNCIL

MEETING

Item 10.3
Dendy Street Beach
- Erosion Mitigation Update

1. Mr Andrew Monotti (on behalf of Brighton Bathing Box Association)

This submission of the Brighton Bathing Box Association supplements our submission for the Council Meeting held on 14 September 2021 and our subsequent correspondence with Council Officers.

The Association supports the recommendation for the Council meeting to be held on 23 November 2021; namely, that Council:

- 1 endorses the short-term mitigation measures, specifically beach renourishment and targeted sandbagging and allocates \$245,000 in the 2021–22 budget to undertake these works;
- 2 endorses the use of sand from the adjacent, northern beach for the purposes of beach renourishment, if approved by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, if this is not approved then the sand will be sourced from a suitable quarry;
- 3 considers the allocation of funding for beach renourishment in subsequent Council budgets while planning and approvals are sought for long term mitigation measures; and
- 4 receives a report at a future Council meeting detailing the outcomes of investigations into long-term mitigation options.

Needless to say, the extent of the erosion at the southern end of Dendy Street beach is now chronic and the above short-term measures must be implemented unconditionally as a matter of urgency. The accelerating adverse effects on the environment and on the significant heritage value of this area cannot be overstated and must be arrested.

The research, investigation and examination undertaken by the independent experts and the Council Officers has been painstaking and exhaustive. In the Association's submission, their advice and recommendations must be endorsed and acted upon without any further delay.

2. Mr Michael Caink

Dear Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Councillors,

Further to previous correspondence to council relating to the erosion at Dendy St beach, I have reviewed and offer support to the recommendation provided in item 10.3 Dendy Street Beach – Erosion Mitigation update November 2021.

Trust councillors will support the motion and council officers in bringing these works forward to prevent further impact to the dunes, beach, vegetation and bathing boxes.

Also important to acknowledge the work done by council officers in closing out actions from the previous council meeting (14 September 2021) and thank them for their continued work and engagement on this important matter.

Many thanks and look forward to the council's support to preserve the iconic Dendy St beach.

Regards,
Michael Caink

Item 10.12

2021-22 1st Quarter Performance Report

1. Mr George Reynolds (on behalf of Bayside Residents Group - Ratepayers Victoria Inc.)

The report is, as usual, full of hyperbole and short on verifiable fact. Section 4 (p287 of the Notice Paper) is remarkably confused and confusing. It purports to be a Comprehensive Income statement but mixes income with capital, shows balance sheet valuation adjustments as cash expenditures, It aggregates all three rates and charges functions, together with two Own-source Revenue functions into a meaningless conglomeration.

It is clearly the function of the Quarterly Report to compare the actual operating activity with that anticipated in the approved budget. I remind councillors that the Victorian Ombudsman, in a 2018 report into the Waste Service Charge at Wodonga Shire Council, stated that it is wrong to spend money raised for the waste service charge on anything that is not part of the waste service function. Similarly, the accounting standard AASB 101.29 requires that financial statements be presented separately by both function and nature. Accordingly, I have prepared an Adjusted Comprehensive Income Statement, shown in file bccracc2022, attached. The adjustment shows that a considerable amount of information is missing. Both the budget statement and the Quarterly statement fail to show information that is required by S.R. 117/2020.

Missing information shown as pp+PP is required by s8(5)(c) of SR 117/2020, and

Missing information shown as QQ+qq is required by s8(5)(j) of SR 117/2020 and

Missing information shown as rtr+RR is required by s8(5)(m) of SR 117/2020 and

Missing information shown as YYYY is required to be shown in s14(b) of SR 117/2020

Missing information entered as XXXX supplies the source of capital funds known as Council Cash. It seems to be well short of the \$71million called for in the budget.

Councillors, much more work needs to be done before you have an acceptable group of financial statements and an acceptable Quarterly Report.

George Reynolds.

CIS segregated by Function and Nature. In \$'000	Bayside City Council – Budget for 2021 – 22.				Format adjusted to comply with AASB 101.29.		
	Entry \ Source of Revenue	General Rates	Municipal Charge	Waste Charge	Own Source Revenue	TOTAL INCOME	CAPITAL WORKS VALUATION CHANGE
Revenue.							
Rates & Charges	81,416	7,487	14,654		103,557		
Statutory Fees & Fines				8,404			
User fees				8,381			
Grants – Operating				11,157			
Grants – Capital						2,971	
Contributions - Monetary- Operating				110			
Contributions - Monetary – Capital						2,750	
Contributions - non-Monetary Capital							12,000
Rental Income				3,951			
Interest Income				1,200			
Other Income				<u>1,767</u>		<u>34,970</u>	
TOTAL INCOME	81416	7487	14654	34970		138,527	
Expenses							
Employee costs	PPPP	QQQQ	RRRR	SSSS		(49,173)	TTTT
Materials and services	pppp	qqqq	rrrr	ssss		(52,190)	tttt
Depreciation							(21,381)
Amortisation – intangibles							(685)
Amortisation – right of use assets							(808)
Bad and doubtful debts							
Finance costs – leases				(839)			
Other expenses				(61)			
TOTAL EXPENSES				(482)			
SURPLUS REVENUE	pp+PP	QQ+qq	rr+RR	SS+ss		(102,745)	tt+TT
EARNINGS BEFORE TAX	YYYY	YYYY	YYYY	XXXX		TOTAL MARGIN) 35,782	YYYY

File bccracc2022.