

Requests to be Heard

20 December 2022

Council Meeting



Bayside
CITY COUNCIL

Council Meeting

20 December 2022

Requests to be Heard

Item 10.1	For (F) Against (A)
Inter War Heritage Study - Next Steps	
Written Statements	Page 5
1. Mr Graham Robertson	(F)
2. Mrs Marianne Margin	(F)
3. Ms Monica Kerlin	(F)

Item 10.3	For (F) Against (A)
Opportunities for Open Space in Activity Centres - Investigating strategies for the provision of additional open space - project update	
Written Statements	Page 8
1. Mr Craig Joel (on behalf of Kanahoe Nominees Pty Ltd)	(A)
2. Ms Margot Buckley	(A)
3. Mr George Georgiou	(A)
4. Mr Tim Bolton	(A)
5. Mr Stevin Curtis	(A)
6. Mr Zaid Mohseni	(A)

Item 10.6	For (F) Against (A)
Future use of Melrose Street, Sandringham	
Written Statements	Page 15
1. Mr Eric Purcell	(F)
2. Mr Ilias Degrenis	(F)
3. Mr Simon Rankin (on behalf of Sandringham Traders Association Committee)	(F)
Requests to Speak	
1. Mr Andrew Watson (on behalf of Melrose Street Traders)	(A)
2. Mr Chris Voce	(A)
3. Mr Ray Purcell	(F)
4. Dr Vicki Karalis (on behalf of Sandringham Foreshore Association)	(F)

Item 10.8		For (F) Against (A)
Dendy Street Beach erosion mitigation - Update		
Written Statements		Page 20
1.	Mr Michael Caink (on behalf of Brighton Bathing Box Association)	(F)

Item 10.11		For (F) Against (A)
Future use of former Scout Hall at 44 Whyte Street, Brighton		
Requests to Speak		
1.	Mrs Kim Anderson	(F)

Item 10.12		For (F) Against (A)
Proposed Lease to Same Pty Ltd for a new lease at Dendy Street Beach Cafe, Brighton		
Written Statements		Page 22
1.	Dr Peter Snider	(F)
2.	Mr Simon Morgan	(F)
3.	Mr John Dodd	(F)
Requests to Speak		
1.	Mr Andre Salem	(F)

WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Item 10.1 Inter War Heritage Study - Next Steps	For (F) Against (A)
1. Mr Graham Robertson	(F)
<p>As residents of 2/26 Service Street, Hampton, my wife and I support the recommendation to commence the Inter-War Heritage Study. Such a study, and the Heritage Overlay recommendations that would flow from this, will provide another important layer of protection to the beautiful period homes in our neighbourhood, and within Bayside, from this era. Having seen four beautiful homes at 28-34 Service Street, Hampton be demolished by a developer during a contested objection process through Bayside Council and VCAT, and having had an application for Heritage Protection of these homes rejected at the time, highlighted the significant gap in the ability of the community and the Council to protect the essence of our neighbourhood character, streetscape and environment that is fundamental to why people live in Bayside, and in our case, Hampton.</p> <p>Despite Bayside Council's and resident's VCAT win to stop the inappropriate Service Street development, and a very active and prominent community action campaign to stop the demolitions, we lost four beautiful homes due to the gap in protection that would have been afforded by such a Heritage Overlay, and we ended up with a 4 house block piece of vacant land. As important, there was no heritage and existing neighbourhood character that the four demolished homes provided from which the new owner/developer of the vacant land could work with to retain the neighbourhood's character within any new development design proposal.</p> <p>We fully support the holistic approach to assessing and managing heritage through Council's Heritage Action Plan 2020, and in particular the prioritisation and commencement of the Inter-War Heritage study as recommended, and ask Bayside Councillors to adopt this recommendation at their meeting on December 20, 2022.</p> <p>Graham and Sue Robertson.</p>	

The intent of the Inter-War Heritage Study is to identify properties that have potential heritage significance from the Inter War era, which may be under threat of demolition in the future if not protected through the application of a Heritage Overlay.

The preparation of the Study responds to Council's obligations under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 in applying appropriate planning controls to protect places of cultural and / or heritage significance.

Dear Councillors,

I write to strongly support the completion of the Inter-War Heritage Study and the pursuit of protections for properties within our municipality which are identified as valuable to our understanding of our history, culture and heritage, and thus need to be preserved for the benefit of the suburb and the people who live here.

I currently live in a home which has a protection overlay which is one of the very few properties in Hampton which has a level of protection.

During 2020 and 2021 I was closely involved in the battle to try to save four homes at 28, 30, 32 and 34 Service St. These houses had been identified in 1989 by an Andrew Ward Heritage Study as being of heritage significance. Unfortunately, the recommendation to protect them and many similar homes in Hampton and Sandringham, was never acted upon and the homes were left vulnerable. In spite of three separate studies: The Andrew Ward Study, 1989, A David Helms Report, 2020 and another by Lorraine Huddle of Heritage Intelligence Pty Ltd, 2020, The Planning Minister refused to intervene and protect the homes against demolition because no protections were in place when the properties were acquired for the purpose of re-development. Over 1600 people had signed a petition to protect these homes. The community was united and mobilised in an effort to prevent demolition and the people had the support of our Councillors, but it was all to no avail, and four quality homes and their gardens were demolished. The site is currently a vacant paddock, a testament to a failure of foresight. Local residents were absolutely bereft when these houses were destroyed.

I learned during this process that the only way to prevent a repetition of this sad situation is to look ahead and apply protections well in advance of the purchase of properties to prevent demolition and re-development. I well appreciate that there are many properties which are not precious and are prime for re-development in order to house a growing population, but some properties are worthy of preservation and we must identify these and move to apply appropriate controls.

As a person who currently resides in a protected home, and it was protected when I purchased it in 2001, I can attest that an overlay is not an encumbrance and does not prevent the owner from full use and enjoyment of the property. What it does do is protect the house, the streetscape and the environs for the benefit of the community now and into the future.

Please support the motion to undertake the required study and fight to implement recommendations for the protection of our past for the benefit of future residents of Bayside.

Thank you, Marianne Margin.

My husband and I live in Hampton and are custodians of a hand crafted timber home that is much admired by our community and has been home to many families over the last hundred years. We support the interwar heritage study and urge council to accept the recommendation.

The Arts and Crafts homes and the Californian Bungalows of the interwar period are treasured by our community and deserve protection. They play a big part in our neighbourhood character that attracts people to live here. They allow space for canopy forming trees in large front gardens. Heritage protection and overlays would inform future development in our neighbourhood to be sympathetic to the streetscapes we love to live in.

Item 10.3 Opportunities for Open Space in Activity Centres - Investigating strategies for the provision of additional open space - project update	For (F) Against (A)
1. Mr Craig Joel (on behalf of Kanahoe Nominees Pty Ltd)	(A)
<p>By way of introduction I am a long time Brighton resident and one of the owners of commercial premises at 2-8 Church Street, Brighton.</p> <p>I write in reference to the Bayside City Council Meeting Agenda for this coming Tuesday December 20, 2022, and specifically in reference to Agenda Item 10.3 which deals with opportunities for open space in activity centres.</p> <p>Bayside City Council has engaged a consultant by the name of Lat37 to consider, and recommend the suitability of, certain sites within Bayside for the purpose of creating additional public open spaces.</p> <p>The report prepared by Lat37 provides an assessment and suitability rating for a number of sites based on the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe & accessible • Adaptable • Connected • Cultural & Social • Sustainable • Achievable <p>The report does not however address such important criteria as traffic implications and the impact that the adoption of Lat37’s recommendations may have on the many businesses that form such a vital part of the fabric of the Bayside community.</p> <p>I would like to record my concerns in relation to the proposed closure of Church Street, Brighton between New Street and St Andrews Street. Despite Lat37 giving this concept the very high suitability rating of 81% it will inevitably result in poor traffic outcomes and have a detrimental impact on local trading conditions.</p> <p>It is my view, and a view shared by the many Bayside residents to whom I have spoken in relation to this matter, that Council should promptly dismiss any recommendation concerning the possible closure of the Western end of Church Street.</p> <p>Church Street is a special precinct and the best retail strip in Melbourne. It is a place where Bayside residents and visitors may dine, socialise and shop in a unique village environment however Church Street faces the challenge of increased traffic and inadequate parking. It beggars belief that, rather than seek to improve traffic flow and to bolster the number of available car parking spaces in support of local traders, Council would give consideration to any proposal that results in a contrary outcome.</p> <p>Bayside rightly supports a greener world and we are seeing a greater shift away from carbon emitting vehicles to electric vehicles however Bayside residents will continue to drive and park cars and our Council needs to ensure that these requirements are facilitated.</p>	

The traffic pressure that the closure of the Western end of Church Street will place on St Andrews Street, and particularly on the roundabout at the St Andrews Street / Well Street / New Street intersection, is significant. When coupled with the reduction in car parking spaces, the proposed road closure will inevitably deter visitors to the area.

Council need be aware that any actions resulting in a deterioration of traffic conditions will likely result in a negative impact on trading conditions experienced by our local businesses, and particularly on the trading conditions of those businesses fronting Church Street between New and St Andrews Streets.

I respectfully request that Council reject the concept of closing Church Street and take a more common sense approach to the identification and creation of suitable open space options.

I would like to express my strong concerns on the proposal to close a section of Church Street between New Street and St Andrews Street, Brighton.

In a perfect world we would have ample green, leafy open spaces around every corner. Our reality does not provide for this.

Church Street is a major Activity Centre and as such does rely on good access and car parking.

To cut off this significant entry point to the centre would be ludicrous and threaten the viability of the many Church Street premises.

The 29 car spaces in this sector of the street are almost always fully utilised by visitors to the adjacent and other commercial businesses. This occurs from early in the mornings.

Additional strain would be placed on the roundabout at the intersection of New and Wells Streets which is already often congested and difficult for many people to navigate given its five entry points.

Similar pressures would be increased for the Church and St Andrews Street roundabout. St Andrews Street would be even more congested than is often is now.

I know of many people who do not go to the Hampton Street shopping centre due the the traffic congestion and lack of on street car parking. Do not repeat this problem in Church Street.

If anything additional disabled car parking spaces are required.

Available funds should be focused on improving existing open space areas and if there is an opportunity to lease and improve the adjacent St Andrews church gardens this should be explored. This is already a significant open space with shading trees, now so desired in our sun smart focused world.

Improvements over recent years to improve the visual aspects of the centre with trees in the central median have made a difference however i suggest that most people do not go to the Church Street shopping precinct to sit in a garden but rather to shop, eat at cafes and restaurants and attend gyms, medical centres and other commercial establishments.

To consider a proposal to close this section of Church street simply to address a "wouldn't it be nice if we were greener" premise ignores the many other factors which make the precinct unique, special and sought after by the community. There are already opportunities to improve its open space appearance without being detrimental to its function.

I respectfully request that Council rejects a proposal to close Church and explore other options to enhance this commercial centre.

I am a concerned , interested and local resident in St Andrews Brighton . My family had businesses for many years in Dendy Village , Hampton Street . I went to the local primary school in Wilson St and high school in Marriage Road . My kids went to Wilson Street Primary and to Firbank Grammar and Brighton Grammar Schools . WE are acutely aware of the existing traffic chaos and lack of car parking options in and around Church Street and St Andrews Church .

The traffic pressure that the closure of the Western end of Church Street will place on St Andrews Street, and particularly on the roundabout at the St Andrews Street / Well Street / New Street intersection, is significant. When coupled with the reduction in car parking spaces, the proposed road closure will inevitably deter visitors to the area.

Council need be aware that any actions resulting in a deterioration of traffic conditions will likely result in more traffic chaos on nearby St Andrews Street residents and a negative impact on trading conditions experienced by our local businesses, and particularly on the trading conditions of those businesses fronting Church Street between New and St Andrews Streets.

I respectfully request that Council reject the concept of closing Church Street and take a more common sense approach to the identification and creation of suitable open space options.

I believe the agenda item 10.3 which suggest the closure of Church Street between New Street and St Andrews Street to be extremely shortsighted.

This proposed change to the western end of Church Street will have an extremely detrimental impact on the retail amenity and Church Street traders who are already just recovering from almost 3 years of restricted COVID trading . Church Street is one of the best retail strip shopping precincts in Melbourne and this closure at the western end will have a huge impact on the flow of pedestrian traffic and will effectively 'Block' off the traders west of St Andrews St

In addition it will have a massive impact on the vehicular traffic flow which is already difficult particularly at school pickup/drop off times and will restrict access to car parks for all the traders and their clients particularly when coupled with the reduction in car parking spaces in this section.

I strongly object against this proposed change and you just need to look at the number of vacancies in the Acland Street retail precinct since they closed a section off to vehicular traffic to understand the potential impact any road closures will have on Church Street

I have been a Brighton resident for most of my 62 years.

I strongly object to the proposed closure of the western end of Church St, between New St and St Andrews St.

What nonsense. How much did council spend on this ridiculous 'report'?

They refer to the parking in that section of Church St as "...not an efficient use of space in the current street design". Are they for real? Have they ever lived in Brighton and regularly used Church St? The parking referred to services nearby retail, pharmacy, medical, church and hospital users. The loss of this will simply create unnecessary inconvenience.

The loss of access from New St into Church St will create further inconvenience for Church St users and increase congestion in the already congested side streets.

Did any of the current councillors publish their intention to push for the closure of such an important intersection in their platform prior to the last council election? If not, there is no mandate to do so.

Have the guts to withdraw this absurd proposal and put it to your name prior to the next council election and then you will see if you are really serving your constituents or simply pushing your own utopic agenda.

Stop solving local problems that don't exist.

Stop interfering with the lifestyle which we enjoy in Brighton.

I am against the planned proposal to close the west end of Church Street. We have enough problems with usable car spots and traffic that closing this section will create more traffic on new street and other streets and reduce the limited parking even more. Other than those who can walk to Church St all others will be dissuaded from coming and this may also reduce overall footfall.

Item 10.6 Future use of Melrose Street, Sandringham	For (F) Against (A)
1. Mr Eric Purcell	(F)
<p>I am a resident and a business owner in Melrose Street.</p> <p>I believe the proposed pedestrianisation/ partial closure of Melrose Street will be greatly beneficial to Sandringham, and make it the destination suburb it should be.</p> <p>I know my view is shared with many other community members in Sandringham, and across Bayside. There have been two petitions in favour of pedestrianising Melrose Street over the past 2 years. These petitions have collectively amassed over 700 signatures in support of the pedestrianisation of Melrose Street.</p> <p>Recently Council undertook a "Have Your Say" about the possible partial closure of Melrose street. Whilst being polarised, there are a greater number of people that strongly support the closure as opposed to strongly opposing it. Whilst it may not impact Council's final assessment on the level of support, prior to the "Have your Say", there were 700+ signatures in favour of the partial closure and pedestrianisation of the street. This suggests that many of those that had originally signed the petitions did not take part in this "Have your Say" process. It is also worth noting that Council officers have recommended to Council that Melrose Street should to a 4 month minimum trial at the end of 2023 after consulting with key stakeholders in the Street.</p> <p>The concept of outdoor dining and increased outdoor space has been embraced by the community. The proposed pedestrianisation of Melrose street is also consistent with Bayside Councils 2050 Vision (Theme 2).</p> <p>For too long Sandringham has gone without redevelopment, and is now in need of desperate attention by Council. Many business owners in Sandringham would note that this past winter was extremely difficult. I would also note that this Summer for many businesses has also been underwhelming. The core of this problem is that Sandringham simply does not have a "draw card", and currently does not encourage foot traffic for people to explore Sandringham. Reallocation of road space in Melrose Street would create opportunities for improved local amenity and community connection, pedestrian and cyclist access and safety, potential reduction of the urban heat island effect with the potential addition of green space, and increased foot traffic to businesses improving the local economy.</p> <p>Sandringham is well serviced by public transport. The Train Station along with the Foreshore are key interest points within the Village. There should be a direct connection from the Train Station to the Foreshore. On warmer days when people come to the beach, and walk down Melrose Street from the station there is a buzz that is difficult to rival. However when people walk back up Melrose Street and throughout Sandringham there isn't a space to attract and encourage people to explore the Village. The proposed pedestrianisation of Melrose Street is important as it will not only bring more people in the area to experience the open space, but also encourage visitors to spend more time within the village.</p>	

My name is Ilias Degrenis, and I am a proud Sandringham resident and local business owner of the restaurant, Ammos Greek Tavern.

I, and my business, employ close to 10 individuals, bring patrons to the Sandringham area and we actively contribute to the atmosphere and spirit of Sandringham's Village.

Council put forward the idea of an open space in Melrose Street, in part in response to a community public petition that had its beginnings in supporting the retention of the parklets in Melrose Street. We know, through our campaigning and patron feedback, the public has demonstrated a want for more public open spaces and community activity.

This open space can support local businesses in a number of ways. Unfortunately, for our small business or others in the area, Winter Trade and Spring Trade has been difficult and there is a lack of foot traffic in Sandringham Village.

Spaces and activities that stimulate visitation, walking and staying in the Village should be encouraged. This builds community and the atmosphere of Sandringham Village, but even importantly, it embraces the '20 minute neighbourhoods' concept, where residents have easy, convenient access to places and services they use daily, grocery stores, restaurants, cafes schools and parks, medical, health, work and entertainment without heavily relying on a car.

The health and social benefits of increased public open space, soft landscaping and community activity are well documented and known. Additionally, the economic benefits and increased dollar spend for visitors walking rather than driving are well documented and well known. And, the better utilisation of parking bays for different public uses, are well documented and known

The best trading days have been when there has been activities in and around the Village. These include the Sandy Twilight, the End of the Line Sandy Concert, the SSAP Chalk Fest to name a few.

However, there are 12 businesses in Sandringham Village listed for sale on commercial real estate. There is a concern that if the positive change is not embraced in Sandringham as a Major Activity Centre, we will be left behind as other surrounding Precincts adopt change.

It is the right thing to do as it is within the framework of current public policy, both State and Local, and it sits within the:

- Bayside Councils Municipal Planning Strategy
- Bayside 2050 Community Vision Integrated Transport Strategy 2018-2028 and the under development Parking Sustainability Strategy 2023-2033 that is presently out for Public Consultation

- Climate Emergency Action Plan 2021-2025
- Community Satisfaction Survey 2022- ranks as a top five issue: Environment, sustainability and climate change

People's patterns and behaviours changed during the pandemic. Of note is that for the first time in the 2022 survey concern about car parking was not a top 10 issue.

Sandringham Major Activity and the businesses are there to serve the community. Businesses must respond to what the community want, businesses must take on change, take risks, and grow. To keep doing the same thing, the same way and expecting a different outcome is not a sensible strategy. We need to be proactive, be brave, be the best. Do not set limits on what can be done and provide the opportunity for businesses and the village to thrive.

The few people against the idea around Melrose Street are many of the same people that opposed the introduction and the continuation of the parklets, which is now accepted as one of the positives that came out of the pandemic.

The same argument is put forward and always circles back to the loss of car parking. All policy is directed around reducing the reliance on the car. Decision making around loss of kerbside parking in commercial centres no longer has any substantive weight. Sandringham is also fortunate to be extremely accessible by public transport which is highly utilised.

The answer to this issue:

The outcome of the engagement and traffic impact reports support the option of a trial closure of a section of Melrose street (pg 171 of Councils Papers).

Future plans and communication plan must be addressed throughout a Council led engagement process.

Traffic and parking modelling solutions need to be examined and implemented.

the landscaping and use of the created public space needs to be developed through a Council led engagement process.

The issue of Parking Sustainability needs to be developed through the current Council led engagement Parking Strategy 2023-2033 and implemented as a holistic solution for parking within Sandringham Major Activity Centre.

Possible reduction of the public space area during the trial period to only incorporate the 2 additional parking bays outside 33 Melrose Street. This would only mean a loss of 2 additional spaces over the spaces currently used as Parklets 1 at the Sidebar venue and those at our restaurant (Amnos Greek Tavern).

I sincerely hope you consider strongly my submission, as a local resident who is proud to call Sandringham and the Bayside area my home, but also as a business owner who is seeking to continue operating and serving the community.

3.	Mr Simon Rankin (on behalf of Sandringham Traders Association Committee)	(F)
-----------	---	------------

This submission is made by the elected committee of Sandringham Traders Association (STA).

STA encourages activities and actions that stimulate commercial activity and improve amenity within Sandringham Village.

STA encourages all traders to take an interest in matters concerning Sandringham Village. STA recognises that traders will have different views on matters and that it is important that traders take the opportunity to participate in any consultation process that relates to Sandringham Village.

Pedestrianisation of Melrose Street

STA has not taken and does not take a position on the possible pedestrianisation of a section of the road in Melrose Street, Sandringham, but does make the following observations:

Bayside City Council undertook a consultation process on two new ideas for Sandringham Village:

- Pedestrianising a section of Melrose Street
- Allocating an underground carpark for trader permit parking.

The reported results of that consultation process identified that survey participants (online and at pop-ups) were polarised about a partial closure of Melrose Street. In regard to businesses in Melrose Street, seven Melrose Street businesses/traders strongly opposed the closure with three strongly supporting it.

Melrose Street traders are key stakeholders in the future of Melrose Street. Melrose Street traders should continue to be consulted around any consideration by Council as part of pedestrianising a section of Melrose Street. It is noted that at this stage no information has been provided concerning the final design and use of any space in Melrose Street.

Trader Parking Permit Scheme

Participants in the consultation were more supportive of a trader parking permit scheme at the underground carpark at 122 Beach Road with 57% supportive and 28% opposed.

As part of Council's investigations, it was identified that this was well utilised with utilisation being very high during business hours with a spike in demand that occurs around 9:00 am, indicating that the majority of parking demand is from traders. STA agrees with this analysis.

This carpark has never been well frequented by visitors to the precinct and has, for a long time, been used by traders. When the carpark was developed, STA understands that there was a levy raised on local property owners to fund the development. There is an argument therefore that this area is held on trust for those property owners and their tenants, i.e., business operators.

The difficulty with the carpark as operated at the moment is that in effect traders using the carpark move their vehicles at lunchtime and do a 'shuffle' around the carpark increasing pollutants in the carpark unnecessarily. With no designated carparking around the Village available for traders, this practice will continue. The best use of this carpark is an unlimited time carpark for traders under a trader parking permit scheme. This is strongly supported by STA.

STA considers that a trader permit parking scheme is appropriate as part of Bayside City Council Parking Strategy. Parking within Sandringham Village Precinct must be reviewed in a holistic way with considerations being given to:

- a) Changing parking mix/times.
- b) Adding new parks that are achievable, e.g. angle parking.

- c) Returning to traders the original traders only parking underneath 122 Beach Road by way of a trader permit parking system.
- d) Trader parking permits in suitable areas around the Village Precinct.

Committee
Sandringham Traders Association.

Item 10.8 Dendy Street Beach erosion mitigation - Update		For (F) Against (A)
1.	Mr Michael Caink (on behalf of Brighton Bathing Box Association)	(F)
<p>The Brighton Bathing Box Association (BBBA) sets out the following brief submission to Council in relation to the consideration of Item 10.8 “DENDY STREET BEACH EROSION MITIGATION – UPDATE” at the Council meeting on 20 December 2022.</p> <p>We note that the matters to be resolved by Council (as recommended to Council) for Item 10.8 have been expressed as follows:</p> <p>That Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. undertakes further investigation into the long-term option presented by The Nature Conservancy to address erosion at Dendy Street Beach 2. receives a report at a future Council meeting comparing all options. <p>The BBBA supports these recommendations and believes that they should be adopted by Council.</p> <p>The BBBA’s support for these recommendations is based on the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report forming part of the Council meeting agenda for Item 10.8 (Item 10.8 Report) makes express reference to the preliminary submission made by the BBBA to Council Officers on 24 October 2022 and identifies it as “Doc/22/328773”. In that submission, the BBBA commented on each of the options that had been presented by Council Officers for comment. • As indicated in the BBBA submission (Doc/22/328773) the BBBA is open to a fully informed analysis and assessment of all potential options that have been (or may be) developed with the appropriate independent and objective technical expertise and experience in respect of a coastal environment consistent with (and relevant to) the specific Dendy Street beach coastal conditions. <p>Therefore, the BBBA welcomes investigation of the long-term option presented by The Nature Conservancy in the context of an objective and expert appraisal of its merits, efficacy, risks, cost and any other advantages and disadvantages by reference to (and in comparison with) each other long-term option for mitigation of erosion at Dendy Street beach that is proposed by marine experts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted in the above submission, the Dendy Street precinct is an historically significant location, enhanced by the combination of its natural features and characteristics. The BBBA is sensitive to the natural environment within which the bathing boxes are located and is conscious of the essential need to preserve and protect the heritage, natural features (in particular, the sand dunes) and the historical, 		

environmental and cultural characteristics of the broader Dendy Street Beach precinct.

- The BBBA has been most impressed with the professional approach of Council Officers that has been evident in the investigations taken so far; they have been considered, rational, objective, consultative and inclusive. Their recommendations for Item 10.8 are consistent with this approach.

- The Item 10.8 Report includes a section “Considerations and implications of recommendation, Finance”, in which it is stated:

“The Four Year Capital Works Program includes \$3 million for this project which should be adequate but will be confirmed as design works progress.”

The BBBA emphasises that this funding must be sustained and applied only for, and dedicated to, the purpose for which it is approved (erosion mitigation) and is not diverted other projects.

Finally, although not part of Item 10.8, it is essential that the benefits of the short-term works carried out by Council earlier this year are preserved by annual renourishment of sand during the period of development, consultation, approval and delivery of the preferred long-term option.

The BBBA looks forward to further discussions and is committed to continue working with Council and Council Officers to support this project.

Item 10.12 Proposed Lease to Same Pty Ltd for a new lease at Dendy Street Beach Cafe, Brighton	For (F) Against (A)
1. Dr Peter Snider	(F)
<p>I wish to support the application already approved by tender of Same Pty Ltd for the development of the Dendy St cafe proposal. I have been eating at the North Point cafe run by Same Pty Ltd for several years now and more frequently since moving into the local area. The business is a very popular one, and very busy. The food comes out promptly and is of good quality and reasonably priced, the staff are pleasant and courteous and the stable management group are easy to talk to and they manage the place and the staff without rancour. The place caters to all levels of clients from bike riders to families to young couples and older people. Its a very easy going pleasant environment to eat in. I believe that Same Pty Ltd would be ideally placed and suited to run the cafe at the Dendy St beach front. They have vast experience in running the successful and busy cafe environment at the North Point cafe, and I think that this concept would be easily brought by them to the site at Dendy St. Thank you for the opportunity to make my comments.</p>	

I could not be happier at the thought of having a new cafe on our iconic Brighton beach. I walk along the beach front at least 3 times a week and feel that a new cafe would be a welcome addition to this section of Brighton beach for the many locals, walkers and sightseers that take in our world famous beach and bathing boxes. As a regular at Northpoint Cafe I feel that the Salem's are the ideal people to operate this cafe - they are friendly, professional and are always accommodating to all patrons of Northpoint Cafe. I live locally and during the Covid lockdowns I would go every day to get a takeaway coffee & quite often have takeaway brekkie or lunch and this would be the highlight of my day to see the amazing staff and owners who adapted so quickly and easily to operating a takeaway only business.

I look forward to seeing what they can do with this business as I believe they provide exceptional coffee & food in addition to their amazing staff who make the dining experience next level. We feel at home every time we go and are greeted with a smile and familiarity that is rare these days.

I am fully in favour of the current lessees at Northpoint Cafe being awarded the lease for the new Dendy St Cafe. I have lived in Brighton/Bayside area for over 40 years and have patronised the Northpoint Cafe (Ex North Road Lifesaving Club) almost daily for all the time that it has been resurrected as a cafe. The current lessees (Same Pty Ltd) improved the establishment from the day that they took over and have kept a high standard ever since. They have always listened to their clientele and have striven to make the daily visits there memorable. The family are fastidious in their health and safety concerns and with their prior experience owning and operating similar establishments they have the expertise and knowledge to make the new cafe a great and memorable venue.

The family have empathy for running a food business since they have been engaged in the cafe industry successfully over a long period of time.

We have got to know many members of staff over the years and they always speak highly of the family.

I strongly recommend that their application be approved and my wife and I look forward to visiting this new venue and enjoy being looked after by the Same family.