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Members of the Gallery

Your attention is drawn to Section 92 of Council’s Governance Local Law No 1.

Section 92 The Chair’s Duties and Discretions

In addition to other duties and discretions provided in this Local Law, the Chair –

(a) must not accept any motion, question or statement which is derogatory, or
defamatory of any Councillor, member of Council staff, or member of the community;

(b) may demand retraction of any inappropriate statement or unsubstantiated allegation;

(c) must ensure silence is preserved in the public gallery during any meeting;

(d) must call to order any member of the public who approaches the Council or
    Committee table during the meeting, unless invited by the Chair to do so; and

(e) must call to order any person who is disruptive or unruly during any meeting.

An Authorised Officer must, if directed to do so by the Chairman, remove from a meeting any
Councillor or other person who has committed such an offence.

Your cooperation is appreciated

Chairperson of Council
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1. **Prayer**

   O God  
   Bless this City, Bayside,  
   Give us courage, strength and wisdom,  
   So that our deliberations,  
   May be for the good of all,  
   Amen

2. **Acknowledgement of Original Inhabitants**

   We acknowledge that the original inhabitants of this land that we call Bayside were the Boon wurrung people of the Kulin nation.

   They loved this land, they cared for it and considered themselves to be part of it.

   We acknowledge that we have a responsibility to nurture the land, and sustain it for future generations.

3. **Apologies**

4. **Disclosure of any Conflict of Interest of any Councillor**

5. **Adoption and Confirmation of the minutes of previous meeting**

   5.1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Ordinary meeting of Bayside City Council held on 21 May 2019.

6. **Public Question Time**
Petitions to Council

7.1 PETITION: TO REMOVE THE TREE ON NATURE STRIP OUTSIDE 25 SUMMERHILL ROAD, BEAUMARIS

Petition from residents requesting Council to remove the tree on the nature strip outside 25 Summerhill Road, Beaumaris. (21 petitioners – all Bayside residents).

'We the undersigned hereby petition Bayside City Council to remove the dangerous tree on the nature strip outside 25 Summerhill Road, Beaumaris'.

Petition Preamble

1. The Tree is dangerous. The tree has created an issue of public safety.

2. The tree has caused damage to the:
   a) roadway;
   b) kerb;
   c) roadway spoon drains;
   d) pedestrian paving, and
   e) a private property.

3. The tree is likely to cause further damage by its ever increasing root system, as well as the possibility of splitting in a storm, resulting in loss and damage to the roofs and walls of adjoining properties, as well as to vehicles that are normally parked under the tree and across the road on the opposite footpath. Pedestrian and vehicle traffic are also at risk of injury and/or damage. Roots are protruding above ground level which has caused the ground level of the nature strip to be uneven.

4. In November 2018, during a storm and a time of high wind, a large gum tree in Tramway Parade, Beaumaris was uplifted from the ground and fell on the second storey of the house causing substantial damage. There is a possibility of a like event happening if the nature strip outside 25 Summerhill Road, Beaumaris is not removed.

5. On the abovementioned grounds, we the undersigned, petition the Bayside City Council to take urgent action to remove the offending tree to avoid the possibility of it causing loss of life and loss and damage to adjoining properties and we put the Bayside City Council on notice accordingly.

Petition Requirements

The submitted petition containing 21 signatures meets the required format of a petition in accordance with Council’s Governance Local Law No: 1 Clause 65.
Officer Comment
Council’s Street Park and Tree Management Policy (2016) provides the criteria for the management, maintenance and removal of street trees.

Recommendation
That the petition be referred to the Chief Executive Officer for consideration and response.

Support Attachments
Nil
7.2 PETITION: TO DESIGNATE 7 WELL STREET, BRIGHTON AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE WITH CHILDREN'S PLAYGROUND FACILITIES

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/140670

Petition from residents requesting to designate 7 Well Street, Brighton as public open space with children’s playground facilities (310 petitioners).

‘We the undersigned hereby petition Bayside City Council to designate 7 Well Street, Brighton as public open space with children’s playground facilities.’

Petition Requirements
The submitted petition containing 310 signatures meets the required format of a petition in accordance with Council’s Governance Local Law No: 1 Clause 65.

Officer Comment
Council purchased 7 Well Street, Brighton for the purpose of providing additional parking in the Church Street Activity Centre. This property abuts an existing Council car park at 5 Well Street.

Recommendation
That the petition be referred to the Chief Executive Officer for consideration and response.

Support Attachments
Nil
8. Minutes of Advisory Committees

8.1 ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD

Executive summary

Purpose and background
To formally report to Council on the Assembly of Councillors records in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.

Key issues
This report fulfils the requirements of reporting an Assembly of Councillors to the next practical Ordinary Meeting of Council in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.

Recommendation

That Council notes the Assembly of Councillor records submitted as required by the Local Government Act 1989:

- 28 May 2019 Strategic Issues Discussion;
- 4 June 2019 Councillor Briefing; and
- 12 June 2019 CEO and Councillors only Briefing.

Support Attachments

1. Record of Assembly of Councillors - 28 May 2019 Strategic Issues Discussion
2. Record of Assembly of Councillors - 4 June 2019 Councillor Briefing
3. Record of Assembly of Councillors - 12 June 2019 CEO and Councillors only Briefing
Record in accordance with section 80A(1) of the Local Government Act 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Name/Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Matters discussed   | • Strategic approach to advocacy  
|                     | • Bayside City Council’s Electoral Representation Review  
|                     | • 38 Grosvenor Street, Brighton - Interim Heritage Protection |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Councilors | Mayor, Cr Michael Heffernan  
|           | Cr Sonia Castelli  
|           | Cr Alex del Porto  
|           | Cr Laurence Evans  
|           | Cr Rob Grinter  
|           | Cr Clarke Martin |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mick Cummins</td>
<td>Cr James Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Colson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamish Reid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Craggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict of Interest disclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Record of Assembly of Councillors

Record in accordance with section 80A(1) of the Local Government Act 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Name/Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matters discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Future Leasing of Billilla House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposal to redevelop and enter into a 21 year lease at Ricketts Point Tea House, Beaumaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hampton Community Infrastructure Feasibility Assessment and Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Response to Notice of Motion - 278 - Proposed changes to Beaumaris Concours Streetscape Master Plan 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Small Neighbourhood Activity Centre Mandatory Building Height Study (Response to Amendment C126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bayside Mid-Century Modern Heritage Study - Preliminary Assessment finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disability Inclusion Beyond December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay - update on trial initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parking Technology, Church Street Major Activity Centre - Engagement Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Draft Footpath Treatments within The Road Reserve Policy 2019 - Engagement Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Results of the April 2019 Councillor Self Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor, Cr Michael Heffernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Sonia Castelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Alex del Porto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Laurence Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Rob Grinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Clarke Martin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mick Cummins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Colson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamish Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Craggs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chief Executive Officer |
| Director Corporate Services |
| Director Environment, Recreation and Infrastructure |
| Director City Planning and Amenity |
| Director Community and Customer Experience |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr James Long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict of Interest disclosures

Nil
# Record of Assembly of Councillors

Record in accordance with section 80A(1) of the *Local Government Act 1989*

## Meeting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Name/Type</th>
<th>CEO and Councillor only briefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Wednesday 12 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time</td>
<td>6.45 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matters discussed</td>
<td>Matters raised by the CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matters discussed</td>
<td>Matters raised by the Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attendees

| Councillors                  | Mayor, Cr. Michael Heffernan    |
|                            | Cr. Sonia Castelli             |
|                            | Cr. Laurence Evans             |
|                            | Cr. Rob Grinter                |
|                            | Cr. James Long                 |
|                            | Cr. Clarke Martin              |

| Staff                       | Mick Cummins                   |
|                            | Jill Colson                    |
|                            | Bryce Craggs                   |
|                            | Bill Shanahan                  |
|                            | Terry Callant                  |

|                          | Chief Executive Officer        |
|                          | Director Corporate Services    |
|                          | Director Community and Customer Experience |
|                          | Manager Finance                |
|                          | Manager Governance and Corporate Reporting |

## Apologies

| Councillors | Cr. Alex del Porto |

## Conflict of Interest disclosures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter No</th>
<th>Councillor making disclosure</th>
<th>Councillor left meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed June 2012
8.2 MINUTES OF THE 29 MAY 2019 AUDIT & RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

The minutes of the Audit & Risk Management Committee meeting held on 29 May 2019 which forms an attachment are presented in camera in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 Section 89(2)(h) – any other matter which the Council or a Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person.

Should Councillors wish to discuss the content of the minutes it would be appropriate that Council resolves to consider the matter in-camera.

Executive summary

Purpose and background
To advise Council of the business transacted at the Audit & Risk Management Committee held on 29 May 2019.

The Audit & Risk Management Committee is an independent Advisory Committee to Council appointed by Council pursuant to Section 139 of the Local Government Act 1989.

The primary objective of the Audit & Risk Management Committee is to assist Council to fulfil its corporate governance responsibilities through the effective conduct of its responsibilities for accounting and financial reporting practices, management of risk, maintenance of a reliable system of internal controls, operation of good governance and facilitation of sound organisational ethics.

The Audit & Risk Management Committee does not have executive powers or authority to implement actions in areas over which management has responsibility and does not have any delegated financial responsibilities. The Committee does not have any management function and is therefore independent of management.

As part of Council’s governance obligations to its community, the Committee was established to provide the Council with guidance on:

- Internal and external financial reporting;
- Management of financial and other risks;
- Effectiveness of the internal and external audit functions;
- Provision of an effective means of communication between the external auditor, internal auditor, management and Council; and
- Advice and recommendations on various matters within its charter in order to facilitate decision making by Council in relation to the discharge of its responsibilities.

The internal, external auditors and other assurance providers support the Committee by providing independent and objective assurance on internal corporate governance, risk management, internal controls and compliance.
Key issues
The matters discussed at the meeting on 29 May 2019 included:

Chief Executive Officer’s Update
The Chief Executive Officer outlined his report and highlighted the following activities:

Civica Contractual arrangements
Contract arrangements with Civica are currently being finalised.

Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation update
The CEO briefed the Committee on the current status of the Dendy Street Beach Masterplan and the associated contamination of the site and the ongoing action being undertaken to rectify the site in accordance with EPA requirements.

Capital Works and EPMO Update
An update was provided on Capital Works. The CEO indicated that a small number of projects will not be completed due to third party involvement; however, the majority of the 175 projects of the program will be completed.

An update was provided on the implementation of the Enterprise Project Management Office. Council has awarded a contract for a PPM system to be implemented in the first quarter of 2019/20.

Digital Transformation Strategy Presentation
The Manager Customer and Cultural Services gave a presentation on Digital Transformation which highlighted the digital transformation journey to date and the organisation’s investment into the project. Some examples of customer journey and improvements were shared with the Committee. The presentation concluded with a summary of the program moving forward over the next 12 months.

A further update on the Digital Transformation Strategy be provided at a future meeting in 2020.

Procurement Policy Update 2019
The Audit and Risk Management Committee considered the review of the Procurement Policy and recommended to Council that the Policy be adopted.

VAGO – Interim Management Letter for year ending 30 June 2019
The VAGO representative outlined the interim management letter, and highlighted some of the changes to the audit methodology.

March 2019 – Financial Report
The Manager Finance tabled the financial report for the 9 month period to end of March 2019.

Status Report on Statutory compliance reporting for 2018/19 Third Quarter
The Manager Governance & Corporate Reporting presented a status report on the compliance of key statutory obligations.
Internal Audit of Audit Plan for 2019/20
The Internal Auditor presented the draft Internal Audit Plan for 2019/20 having consulted with management and the chairman of the Committee.
The proposed Audit Plan for 2019/20 will consist of the following audits:
- Volunteer Management
- Child Safety Standards
- Social Media
- IT Cyber Security
- Parking Infringement/Ticketing

Internal Audit Review – Payroll Controls
The Internal Auditor presented the Internal Audit report on Payroll Controls and Data Analytics

The objectives of the internal audit were to review:
1. Internal controls designed to prevent fraud and corruption, including management's processes for ensuring the validity/existence of employees, staff appointment, termination and transfers.
2. The process for recording and paying autopay, timesheets, and overtime worked and changes in pay rates.
3. Payroll system controls, including reconciliations, bank accounts, leave balances, clearing accounts and master file changes.
4. The process for the transfer of payroll information between the payroll system and the general ledger.
5. The adequacy of the IT system controls including:
   - system access and profiles (at the application level);
   - key IT processing controls (embedded segregation, reasonableness limits, logic tests);
   - system generated reporting (master file changes, standard reports);
   - administrator access;
   - EFT controls; and
   - editability of payroll data files.
6. Payroll reports, their review and authorisation.
7. The control of PAYG and superannuation payments.
8. The processes for calculating and paying termination payments.
9. The processes for recording and paying employees for leave.
The Internal Auditors also undertook relevant data analytics*, including:
   - testing both transaction and master file details;
   - transaction testing covered the period 1 July 2017 to 31 December 2018; and
   - master file data was assessed as at the date of extraction, (17 January 2019).
* - Undertook some limited follow-up of data analysis anomalies.

The review focussed on the practices and processes maintained by the Payroll Unit, and as such it did not include a detailed review of practices maintained by line departments such as community workers, HACC services, road maintenance, etc.
Overall, the Internal Auditors found that the current controls in place over the relevant payroll controls maintained by Council are generally adequate; however, can be further strengthened.

The internal Audit review identified one High-risk issue and three Low-Risk issues.

**Internal Audit Review – Disaster Recovery Plan**
The Internal Auditor presented the Internal Audit report on Disaster Recovery Plan.

The objectives of the internal audit were to review the adequacy of the processes relating to:

1. DRP development methodology, including the alignment of the DRP and BCP;
2. Business alignment with organisational objectives and directions (including the adaptability of the DRP to the emerging and changing digital environment);
3. DRP content and application; and
4. DRP administration, maintenance, training and testing.

Overall, the Internal Auditors found that the current controls in place over the disaster recovery planning processes maintained by Council are adequate; however, there is an opportunity to further strengthen existing controls.

The internal audit identified a range of controls that, once implemented, should further improve the DRP process at Council. These mainly relate to governance.

The key areas of strength about Council’s DRP are:
- The process is managed by highly qualified and experienced staff;
- Council has implemented an exceptional DR program;
- The DR system is scalable to grow as the organisation’s requirements expand;
- DRP is monitored and testing is undertaken by management on an ongoing basis; and
- The DRP aligns with the BCP requirements – in fact it significantly exceeds the BCP Recovery Point Objective requirements of 15 mins vs 4 hours.

The audit report did not identify any High-risk issues, however three Low-risk issues were identified.

**External Audit Status Report 2018/19 and Shell Set of Financial Statements**
The Manager Finance presented to the Committee a Shell Set of Financial Statements for the 2018/19 Audit.

**Review of the Audit & Risk Management Committee Charter**
The Committee reviewed the Charter and made minor changes to reflect gender diversity in the appointment process for new members to the Committee. Other minor changes were made to the Work Plan to reflect current processes and requirements of the Committee.
**Recommendation**

That the Audit and Risk Management Committee recommends to Council that:

1. Council notes the minutes of the Audit & Risk Management Committee held on 29 May 2019.

2. Adopts the following recommendations of the Audit and Risk Management Committee:

   **Item 9.8.1. – Review of the Audit & Risk Management Committee Charter**

   *That the Audit and Risk Management Committee notes the changes to the Charter are consistent with Council policy and other Charters, and on that basis recommends to Council that the Audit & Risk Management Committee Charter (review date 29 May 2019) as presented to the meeting and attached to the report, be adopted.*

**Support Attachments**

1. Minutes - 29 May 2019 - Audit and Risk Management Committee (separately enclosed) (confidential)
9. Reports by Special Committees


Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/154977

Executive summary

Purpose and background


Key issues
Attached for Council’s information is a copy of the Special Committee of Council minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2019. It is proposed that Council considers the submissions received in conjunction with the report listed as part of this agenda.

Recommendation

Support Attachments
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The Council Plan contains a number of strategic objectives to improve social connectedness and build a stronger community.

Natural Environment
The Council Plan contains a number of environmental strategic objectives to achieve positive environmental outcomes.

Built Environment
The Council Plan contains a number of built environment strategic objectives which assist in protecting and enhancing amenity, liveability and neighbourhood character.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Consultation on the review of the Council Plan and Strategic Resource Plan was undertaken in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989. Four submissions were received and one submitter requested to be heard. A Special Committee of Council was held on 12 June 2019 at 6.30pm to hear the submitter speak in support of their submission.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
The 2019 Review of the 2017-2021 Council Plan has been undertaken in accordance with Section 125 of the Local Government Act 1989. The review of the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20-2022/23 has been undertaken in accordance with Section 126 of the Local Government Act 1989.

Finance
In accordance with legislation, the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20-2022/23 has been prepared which describes the financial and non-financial resources required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Council Plan.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The 2019 Review of the 2017-2021 Council Plan establishes the key strategic direction for Bayside City Council for the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2021 and is the key document within the Council planning framework. The Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20-2022/23 describes both the financial and non-financial resources (including human resources) for at least the next four financial years to achieve the strategic objectives as outlined within the proposed Council Plan.
Special Committee of Council

To hear submissions in relation to:


Council Chambers
Civic Centre, Boxshall St. Brighton

Wednesday 12 June 2019
at 6.30pm

Minutes
PRESENT:

Chairperson: Cr Michael Heffernan (Mayor)

Councillors: Cr Sonia Castelli
Cr Laurence Evans OAM
Cr Rob Grinner (Deputy Mayor)
Cr James Long BM JP
Cr Clarke Martin

Officers: Mick Cummins Chief Executive Officer
Jill Colson Director Corporate Services
Bryce Craggs Director Community and Customer Experience
Bill Shanahan Manager Finance
Terry Callant Manager Governance
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1. **Welcome and opening of the meeting**

The Mayor welcomed Councillors, Council Officers and members of the public to the Special Committee Meeting established to hear submissions in relation to the 2019 Review of the 2017-2021 Council Plan and the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 to 2022/2023.

2. **Apologies**

An apology was received from Cr del Porto

Moved Cr Evans  
Seconded Cr Grinter

That the apology of Cr del Porto be received and leave of absence be granted.

CARRIED

3. **Declarations of any Conflict of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest submitted to the meeting.

4. **Submissions**

In accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, Council must consider any submissions received by the Council following the 28 days after the publication of the public notice. At the closing date of submissions, Council received four written submissions in relation to the 2019 Review of the 2017-2021 Council Plan and Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 to 2022/23.

Of the four submissions received, one submitter requested to be heard in support of their written submission.

1. Mr George Reynolds

The Mayor reminded the speaker that Section 223 (b)(i) of the Local Government Act 1989 indicates that Council must provide the person with the opportunity to be heard in support of their submission and that in accordance with Council’s Governance Local Law No. 1 (2013) submissions in relation to section 223 of the Local Government Act be granted up to 15 minutes to speak in support of their submission. A copy of the submissions received has been circulated to all councillors for their consideration prior to the meeting.
4.1 COUNCIL PLAN 2017-2021 (2019 REVIEW) SUBMISSION - MS RUBY WINGROVE

Corporate Services - Governance  
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/121446

It is recorded that a submission from Ms Ruby Wingrove was received, and Ms Wingrove did not request to be heard in support of her submission.

4.2 COUNCIL PLAN 2017-2021 (2019 REVIEW) SUBMISSION - MS DANIELLE PODOLAK

Corporate Services - Governance  
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/121448

It is recorded that a submission from Ms Danielle Podolak was received, and Ms Podolak did not request to be heard in support of her submission.

4.3 COUNCIL PLAN 2017-2021 (2019 REVIEW) SUBMISSION - MS LISA BERG

Corporate Services - Governance  
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/121451

It is recorded that a submission from Ms Lisa Berg was received, and Ms Berg did not request to be heard in support of her submission.

4.4 PROPOSED STRATEGIC RESOURCES PLAN 2019/20 - 2022/23 SUBMISSION - MR GEORGE REYNOLDS

Corporate Services - Finance  
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/141411

It is recorded that Mr George Reynolds spoke for 11 minutes and 20 seconds in support of his submission.

Moved: Cr Grinter (Deputy Mayor)  
Seconded: Cr Long


CARRIED

Following consideration of Submissions, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6.46pm.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
To note the Minutes of the Special Committee of Council established to hear submissions in relation to the proposed Budget 2019/2020.

Council at its meeting on 23 April 2019 established a Special Committee of Council for the purpose of undertaking the statutory process to hear submissions in relation to the proposed Budget 2019/2020.

Key issues
Attached for Council’s information is a copy of the Special Committee of Council minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2019. It is proposed that Council considers the submissions received in conjunction with the report listed as part of this agenda.

Recommendation
That Council notes the Minutes of the Special Committee of Council held on 12 June 2019 to hear submissions in relation to the proposed Annual Budget 2019/2020.

Support Attachments
1. 12 June 2019 Special Committee of Council Minutes (Proposed Annual Budget 2019/2020) ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The 2019/2020 Proposed Budget will have positive benefits for achievement of Council’s commitment to people in Bayside enjoying a high quality of life and wellbeing.

Natural Environment
There are no natural environmental impact associated with this report.

Built Environment
There are no built environmental impacts associated with this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Consultation on the proposed Budget 2019/2020 was undertaken in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989. Six submissions were received on the proposed Budget. A Special Committee of Council heard presentations from three submitters in relation to the proposed Budget on 12 June 2019 at 7.30pm at the Council Chambers, Brighton.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach of infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
This 2019/20 Proposed Budget was developed in accordance with Sections 127 and 129 of the Local Government Act 1989.

Finance
In accordance with the legislation, an annual budget has been prepared which details the financial resources required to achieve the Council Plan 2017-2021.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The proposed Budget 2019/2020 is directly linked to the Council plan to ensure the strategic objectives can be achieved.
Special Committee of Council

To hear submissions in relation to:

Proposed Annual Budget 2019-2020
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Civic Centre, Boxshall St. Brighton
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5. Requests to be heard in support of submissions
   The following listed people have requested to be heard in support of their submission to Special Committee of Council Meeting.
   1. Ms Michelle Bentley
   2. Mr George Reynolds
   3. Mr Peter Boyle
   4. Mr Kevin Spencer
   5. Mr Stephen Mayne (proxy for Ms Katherine Copsey - on behalf of Alliance for Gambling Reform)
1. **Welcome and opening of the meeting**

   The Mayor welcomed Councillors, Council Officers and members of the public to the Special Committee Meeting established to hear submissions in relation to the Proposed Annual Budget 2019-2020.

2. **Apologies**

   An apology was received from Cr del Porto.

   **Moved Cr Grinter**

   **Seconded Cr Evans**

   That the apology of Cr del Porto be received and leave of absence be granted.

   **CARRIED**

3. **Declarations of any Conflict of Interest**

   There were no conflicts of interest submitted to the meeting.

4. **Submissions**

   In accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, Council must consider any submissions received by the Council following the 28 days after the publication of the public notice. At the closing date of submissions, Council received four written submissions in relation to the Proposed Annual Budget 2019-2020.

   Of the six submissions received, five submitters requested to be heard in support of their written submission:
   1. Ms Michelle Bentley
   2. Mr George Reynolds
   3. Mr Peter Boyle
   4. Mr Kevin Spencer
   5. Mr Stephen Mayne (proxy for Ms Katherine Copsey - on behalf of Alliance for Gambling Reform)

   The Mayor reminded the speakers that Section 223 (b)(i) of the Local Government Act 1989 indicates that Council must provide the person with the opportunity to be heard in support of their submission and that in accordance with Council’s Governance Local Law No: 1 (2013) submissions in relation to section 223 of the Local Government Act be granted up to 15 minutes to speak in support of their submission. A copy of the submissions received has been circulated to all councilors for their consideration prior to the meeting.
4.1 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MS MICHELLE BENTLEY ON BEHALF OF BAYSIDE SENIORS ACTION GROUP - HYDROTHERAPY

Corporate Services - Finance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/132287

It is recorded that Ms Michelle Bentley spoke for 5 minutes and 20 seconds in support of her submission.

4.2 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MR GEORGE REYNOLDS

Corporate Services - Finance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/141437

It is recorded that Mr George Reynolds spoke for 6 minutes and 20 seconds in support of his submission.

4.3 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MS MICHELE ROWSE ON BEHALF OF BLACK ROCK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Corporate Services - Finance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/143594

It is recorded that a submission from Ms Michelle Rowse was received, and Ms Rowse did not request to be heard in support of her submission.

4.4 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MR PETER BOYLE

Corporate Services - Finance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/144251

It is recorded that Mr Peter Boyle spoke for 2 minutes and 50 seconds in support of his submission.
4.5 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MR KEVIN SPENCER

Corporate Services - Finance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/145053

It is recorded that Mr Kevin Spencer was not present at the meeting.

4.6 PROPOSED BUDGET 2019-2020 SUBMISSION - MS KATHERINE COPSEY ON BEHALF OF ALLIANCE FOR GAMBLING REFORM

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure - Open Space, Recreation & Wellbeing
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/132029

It is recorded that Mr Stephen Mayne (proxy for Ms Katherine Copsey) was not present at the meeting.

Moved: Cr Long  Seconded: Cr Castelli

That all submissions received in relation to the Proposed Annual Budget 2019-2020 be noted and further considered as part of Council’s deliberations at the 25 June 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council in relation to the Annual Budget.

CARRIED

Following consideration of Submissions, the Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 7.51pm.
10. Reports by the Organisation


Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/143517

Executive summary

Purpose and background

Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review)
In June 2017, Council adopted the Council Plan for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2021. The Council Plan is a key document that outlines Council’s strategic direction for the four years of the Council term.

The goals of the Council Plan 2017-2021 are aligned to the aspirations articulated in the Bayside Community Plan 2025. The Community Plan was developed through comprehensive community engagement which provided valuable insights that informed the development of the Council Plan 2017-2021.

The Council Plan goals reflect the seven domains of liveability that frame the Community Plan. The Council Plan includes the eighth goal of “Governance” to signify the community’s and Council’s desire to have decision making informed by improved community engagement, and deliver financially sustainable services and facilities that meet the needs of the community, now and into the future.

The following goals of the Council Plan are:

- Goal 1 Infrastructure
- Goal 2 Transport
- Goal 3 Housing and neighbourhoods
- Goal 4 Open space
- Goal 5 Environment
- Goal 6 Local economy and activity centres
- Goal 7 Community health and participation
- Goal 8 Governance

In accordance with Section 125 (7) of the Local Government Act 1989 at least once in each financial year, Council must consider whether the current Council Plan requires any adjustment in respect of the remaining period of the Council Plan.

Council at its meeting on 23 April 2019 resolved to place on exhibition the 2019 review of the Council Plan which includes:

- The removal of some Strategic Objectives where were not aligned to strategies and actions;
- The removal of completed activities;
- Improved Strategic Indicators to measure our success against the Plan. The strategic indicators now reflect the more detailed questions in the customer satisfaction survey; and
- More deliverable actions across all Goals of the Council Plan.

**Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23**

Similar to the Council Plan process, Council at its meeting on 23 April 2019, resolved to place on exhibition the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23 which clearly articulates the plan of resources required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Council Plan.

In accordance with Section 126 of the *Local Government Act 1989*, the Strategic Resource Plan must include at least the next four financial years:

- Financial statements describing the required financial resources.
- Statements describing the required non-financial resources, including human resources.

**Submissions**

Submissions were invited from the community on both the Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) and the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23. As at close of business on 31 May 2019, one submission was received relating to the Strategic Resource Plan and three submissions were received in relation to the review of the Council Plan.

A Special Committee of Council was held on 12 June 2019 to hear the submissions relating to the Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) and Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23. A summary of the submissions and the organisation’s response is attached to this report.

**Key issues**

The submissions have been considered and it is recommended that no changes be made to the Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) and a minor changes be made to the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23 based on the submissions.

The submission to the Council Plan relate to the provision of a Hydrotherapy Pool which a specific activity is included within the Council Plan. Two further submissions relate to Neighbourhood Character and the protection from inappropriate development. These can be addressed through the actions within the Council Plan under Goal 3.

In relation to the Strategic Resource Plan, the submission provides commentary and suggests that the grants and contributions be split to represent grants, contributions, cash and borrowings. This suggestion has been included in the Strategic Resource Plan.

**Additional organisational changes to the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23**

The Four Year Capital Program has been updated in 2020/21 to reflect the transfer of $2.8 million from the “Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes” category to the “Buildings” category to correctly reflect the pavilion included as part of Stage 1 of the Netball project. Capital funding from clubs $0.9 million incorrectly reported under grants are now correctly reflected under capital contributions. These amendments have been reflected throughout the document where appropriate.
Additional organisational changes to the Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review)

Further to the in-principle Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) endorsed by Council at the 23 April 2019 meeting, all additional changes in the below table, relate to the strategic indicators. The changes to the strategic indicators are, in large part, to reflect the recent results of the Annual Community Satisfaction Survey data.

The Annual Community Satisfaction Survey has been undertaken by an external research consultancy that specialises in local government community satisfaction surveys. The survey provides Council with a more accurate understanding of the community’s satisfaction through an improved and more statistically robust methodology. 700 respondents were involved in the survey through randomised face-to-face interviews, and including questions that better align with Council’s activities and provide greater understanding of the reasons behind the community’s perceptions.

The survey provides context comparisons with other councils in the Greater Melbourne and Inner East regions. The survey also categorises the scores into satisfaction levels to assist Council in interpreting and communicating the results.

The following changes to the strategic indicators reflect the most recent survey results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Current indicator</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with libraries (Years 3-4 target, of 8.7 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with libraries (Years 3-4 target, of 9.05 rating scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with recreation facilities (Years 3-4 target of 8.0 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with recreation facilities (Years 3 – 4, target of 7.90 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maintain or improve Increased community satisfaction with public toilets (Year 3-4 target of 7.04 to 7.25 rating)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve Increase community satisfaction with public toilets (Years 3 – 4 target, of 6.92 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with on and off-road bike paths. (Year 3-4 target of 7.49 to 7.75 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with on and off-road bike paths (Years 3 – 4 target, of 7.82 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for bus routes, sufficient commuter parking &amp; developments around train stations. (Year 3 – 4 target, 6.37 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for better bus routes, sufficient commuter parking, developments around train stations (Years 3 – 4 target, of 7.03 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Current indicator</td>
<td>Proposed change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for a planning system that provides certainty for Bayside residents (Years 3 – 4 target, over 6.10 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for a planning system that provides certainty for Bayside residents (Years 3 – 4 target, over 6.90 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with appearance and quality of new developments in their area (Years 3-4 target of 5.64 to over 6.0 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with appearance and quality of new developments in their area (Years 3-4 target of over 6.44 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 &amp; 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction with the guidance available from Council Policies and controls. (Year 3-4 target, from 5.80 to 6.0 rating score)</td>
<td>Increase community satisfaction with the guidance available from Council policies and controls (Years 3 – 4 target, rating to over 6.54 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for increasing the supply of social and affordable housing in Bayside. (Years 3 – 4 target, from 5.76 to over 6.00 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy for increasing the supply of social and affordable housing in Bayside (Years 3 – 4 target, of over 6.6.2 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy protecting Port Phillip Bay and limiting coastal erosion. (Years 3 – 4 target, of 7.10 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s advocacy protecting Port Phillip Bay and limiting coastal erosion. (Years 3 – 4 target of over 7.42 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction that Council is meeting its environmental responsibilities. (Years 3 – 4 target, from 7.30 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Green Waste service (Years 3 – 4 target, of over 8.71 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction that Council is meeting its environmental responsibilities. (Years 3 – 4 target, from 7.30 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain community satisfaction that Council is meeting its environmental responsibilities (Years 2 – 4 target, of over 7.40 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction on the provision and maintenance of street trees (Years 3-4 target of over 8.74 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction on the provision and maintenance of street trees (Years 3-4 target of over 7.25 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with the cleaning of strip shopping centres (Year 3-4 target, 8.68 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with the cleaning of strip shopping centres (Year 3-4 target, of over 7.70 rating score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Current indicator</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve average rating for overall aspects of customer service (Years 3-4 target, of 7.67 to 7.75 rating score)</td>
<td>Improve average rating for overall aspects of customers service (Years 3 – 4 target, of over 7.75 rating score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s reputation lobbying and advocacy (Year 3-4 target of over 6.56 rating score)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve community satisfaction with Council’s reputation lobbying and advocacy (Year 3-4 target of over 6.97 rating score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation

That Council:

1. Having considered the submissions received in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 in relation to the Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) and the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23, adopts:
   
a) The Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) incorporating changes as outlined in the report specifically relating to the strategic indicators; and
   
b) The Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20 - 2022/23 incorporating the changes as outlined in the report specifically relating to the transfer of $2.8m from the “Parks, Open space and Streetscapes” category to the “Buildings” category to correctly reflect the pavilion included as part of Stage 1 of the Netball project.


### Support Attachments

1. Summary of Council Plan and Strategic Resource Plan submissions ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The Council Plan 2017-21 identifies a number of strategies to enhance Bayside’s social environment through improved community infrastructure and services which impact health, participation and wellbeing.

Natural Environment
The Council Plan 2017-21 identifies a number of strategies to protect and enhance the natural environment, while balancing community use with the need to protect natural assets for future generations.

Built Environment
The Council Plan 2017-21 identifies a number of strategies to improve infrastructure, whilst protecting and enhancing neighbourhood character and liveability.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The development of the Council Plan was informed by the aspirations of the Bayside Community Plan 2025 that was developed following extensive consultation. Council at its meeting on 23 April 2019 resolved to adopt in principle the proposed Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) for the purpose of seeking public submissions.

In accordance with the statutory requirement, Council placed a public notice in The Age newspaper on 26 April 2019. A public notice was also placed in the Bayside Leader on the 30 April 2019 and on Council’s website. Submissions closed at 5pm 31 May 2019 providing 28 days for submissions to be received. In addition to statutory requirements, members of the community were invited to attend a community briefing session about the proposed Council Plan 2017-2021 (2019 Review) and Strategic Resource Plan 2019-2023 on the 17 May 2019. At the Special Committee of Council on the 12 June 2019 submitters were able to be heard.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
The annual review of the Council Plan 2017-2021 has been undertaken in accordance with Section 125 of the Local Government Act. The development of the Strategic Resource Plan 2019-2023 has been undertaken in accordance with Section 126 of the Local Government Act 1989.

Finance
In accordance with the legislation the Strategic Resource Plan 2019-2023 has been prepared which describes the financial and non-financial resources required to achieve the strategic objectives of the Council Plan.
Summary of Council Plan and Strategic Resource Plan submissions

Note: The original submissions received were presented to all Councillors in totality at a Special Committee of Council held on 12 June 2019.

1. Ruby Wingrove – Council Plan Submission

- Ms Wingrove is seeking research and investigation into a Seniors Playground to assist the aging population within Bayside.
- Compliments Council on its vision for the city and in particular the commitment to protect and enhance local foreshores, beaches, ecology and biodiversity.
- Congratulates Council for enabling diverse communities, affordable and social housing strategies and actions within the Council Plan.

Officer’s comments

The Council Plan does not include a specific action regarding a Seniors Playground; however, this can be accommodated when considering the playground renewals over the next two years.

2. Danielle Podolak – Council Plan Submission

- Ms Podolak is seeking greater protection of neighbourhood character elements to provide a better outcome to guide future development in the area.
- Seeking Council to place a moratorium on all proposed developments in and around the Church Street Activity Centre until the neighbourhood study is completed.
- Asks what the $100,000 allocated for Neighbourhood Character Study is to be used for.

Officer’s comments

Council is scheduled to undertake a review of the Neighbourhood Character controls across Bayside in 2019/20. This is expected to involve a comprehensive community engagement process and will allow Bayside residents to have a say on character in their local area. The review will afford Council an opportunity to determine the success of the current planning controls and may result in changes to the neighbourhood character policy. The Neighbourhood Character Study review is partly informed by the Housing Strategy review which is currently underway. State Government changes relating to the form and content of the Bayside Planning Scheme have had an impact in the expected commencement of the review.

The budget allocation for the Neighbourhood Character Study will fund the review of the character of all residential zoned land within Bayside, excluding golf courses within the residential zone, to determine the best approach to implement neighbourhood character objectives. All neighbourhood character precinct statements will be reviewed to provide an up to date description of the features that come together to give each precinct its own particular character to inform the future character statement for each precinct. Matters to be considered include: the pattern of development of the neighbourhood; the built form, scale and character of surrounding development including front fencing, architectural typologies and roof styles; and, any other notable features or characteristics of the neighbourhood.
3. Lisa Berg – Council Plan submission

- Ms Berg is seeking greater protection of neighbourhood character elements to provide a better outcome to guide future development in the area.
- Seeking Council to place a moratorium on all prosed developments in and round Church Street Activity Centre until the neighbourhood study is completed.
- Asks what the $100,000 allocated for Neighbourhood Character Study is to be used for.

Officer’s comments

Council is scheduled to undertake a review of the Neighbourhood Character controls across Bayside in 2019/20. This is expected to involve a comprehensive community engagement process and will allow Bayside residents to have a say on character in their local area. The review will afford Council an opportunity to determine the success of the current planning controls and may result in changes to the neighbourhood character policy. The Neighbourhood Character Study review is partly informed by the Housing Strategy review which is currently underway. State Government changes relating to the form and content of the Bayside Planning Scheme have had an impact in the expected commencement of the review.

The budget allocation for the Neighbourhood Character Study will fund the review of the character of all residential zoned land within Bayside, excluding golf courses within the residential zone, to determine the best approach to implement neighbourhood character objectives. All neighbourhood character precinct statements will be reviewed to provide an up to date description of the features that come together to give each precinct its own particular character to inform the future character statement for each precinct. Matters to be considered include: the pattern of development of the neighbourhood; the built form, scale and character of surrounding development including front fencing, architectural typologies and roof styles; and, any other notable features or characteristics of the neighbourhood.

4. George Reynolds – Strategic Resource Plan submission

- Mr Reynolds raises concern over the presentation of the Comprehensive Income Statement on page 6 of the Strategic Resource Plan.
- Is unable to understand the true value and magnitude of the planning surplus referred to on pages 4 and 6 of the SRP.
- Seeks clarification of source of funds for capital works and suggests the documents fail to meet the requirements.
- Expresses the view that surplus revenue is not a valid use to supply capital goods and does not meet the requirements of the Local Government Model Financial Report at Q25 which deals with the recognition of income.
- Attachments to the submission shows limited liability company and municipal council – annual cash flow diagram and Budget 2019/20.
- Summary the submission indicates the following:
  - a) The Plan ignores the requirements that contributions to capital form the operations stream can be provided only from provisions, capital sales and repayment of borrowings.
  - b) The Budget claims an invalid expense of Depreciation and Amortisation.
  - c) Surplus and depreciation cannot be recognised as income.
• d) No attempt to identify assets which provide a special benefit to individual and entities which would need to be funded by Special Rates.
• e) The service of collection and disposal of refuse, does not get a mention in the source of funds documents.
• f) There does not appear to be any intent to repay borrowings. Preparation of an income statement as shown in AAASB 101.103 will correctly avoid some of the non-conformance defects.

**Officer’s comments**

The response below addresses both submissions by Mr George Reynolds on the Proposed 2019/20 Budget (Annual Budget) and the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20-2022/23 (SRP).

Mr Reynolds’ comments are substantially incorrect and appear to be based on a lack of understanding of the relevant Australian Accounting Standards, Local Government (Finance and Reporting) Regulations 2014, and legislation. Council has prepared its Annual Budget in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989, the Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014, Australian Accounting Standards, the new Local Government Amendment (Fair Go Rates) Act 2015 and the Local Government Model Budget and Better Practice Guide. This guide has been provided by Local Government Victoria to assist councils in meeting the mandatory reporting requirements. The model and guide has been prepared by members of Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand, local government practitioners and representatives from major local government sector peak bodies including Finpro and LGPro. Bayside City Council officers responsible for the preparation of the Proposed Budget and the Strategic Resource Plan are appropriately qualified Accountants and have extensive experience in preparing such documents in accordance with best practice guidelines and Australian Accounting Standards.
Executive summary

Purpose and background

Key issues

Budget Submissions
At the close of submissions at 5pm on 31 May 2019, six submissions were received

- Ms Michelle Rowse on behalf of Black Rock Primary School
- Mr Kevin Spencer
- Mr Peter Boyle
- Mr George Reynolds
- Ms Michelle Bentley
- Ms Katherine Copsey on behalf of Alliance for Gambling Reform

A summary of the submissions and the organisation’s response is attached to this report. Following the consideration of the submissions, Councillors did not make any amendments to the budget.

Changes to the proposed budget
The Four Year Capital Program has been updated in 2020/21 to reflect the transfer of $2.8 million from the “Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes” category to the “Buildings” category to correctly reflect the pavilion included as part of Stage 1 of the Netball project. Capital funding from clubs $0.9 million incorrectly reported under grants are now correctly reflected under capital contributions. These amendments have been reflected throughout the document where appropriate.

Long Term Financial Plan 2019/20 - 2028/29
Council’s Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) has been the basis for the preparation of the Strategic Resource Plan and the Annual Budget 2019/20. The LTFP is the key ten-year financial planning document of Council and is governed by a series of financial strategies and accompanying performance indicators.

The key strategies embedded in the LTFP to ensure financial sustainability include:

- Rate increases are set in accordance with the fair go rates framework.
• Continue to review four services each year to ensure services provided to the community provide value and are sustainably funded.
• Identify efficiency gains in the operating budget in order to ensure a financially sustainable operating surplus in a rate cap environment.
• Ensure that service users are making a reasonable contribution to the cost of those services through appropriate fees and charges by maintaining an annual 5% increase in non-statutory fees and charges.
• Identify alternative revenue streams and funding opportunities to take pressure off rate increases.
• Explore greater financial and community returns from Council’s property portfolio.
• Maintain funding for capital renewal and new/upgrade works.
• Ensure that any new debt is based on a sound business case and demonstrated community benefit.
• Continue to manage the extreme nature of Defined benefits superannuation shortfalls by quarantining funds in a reserve with an annual increase of $500k.
• Ensure that any new programs or projects generate specific community value and are funded in a sustainable way.

Key highlights of the 4 year Strategic Resource Plan include:

• Rate increases will be capped in accordance with the rate capping framework set by State Government. Rate dependency for 2019/20 is 71% and will remain high over the LTFP.
• An average operating surplus of $17.8 million per year over the next 4 years.
• Infrastructure renewal requirements identified in asset management plans are fully funded with the delivery of $196.3 million of capital works over the next four years.
• Council will utilise $34 million from a combination of cash reserves and property sales over the next 4 years to fund strategic capital projects while maintaining benchmark liquidity ratios.
• Continue to set aside $0.5 million per annum to smooth out the extreme nature of the Defined Benefits Superannuation Shortfall calls.
• Achievement of key financial sustainability ratios over the LTFP.

Proposed Budget 2019/20

The 2019/20 Proposed Budget reflects a financially sustainable position while achieving Council’s operational objectives. These include the delivery of ongoing services and commitment to new priority and capital projects to meet the existing and growing needs of our community in relation to health, safety, sustainability and infrastructure.

Key highlights of the Budget include:

• Average rates to increase by 2.5% complying with the rate capping framework set by State Government.
• A reduction in the waste charge of 1.7% driven by a reduction in Recycling and Waste services contracts mainly due to lower kerbside recycling waste disposal rates.
• A strong operating surplus of $22.3 million for 2019/20.
• Productivity and efficiency savings of $0.67 million identified in the operating budget.
• An increase of 2.2% for the net cost of services per household.
• New initiatives of $1.85 million.
• Capital budget of $62.2 million in 2019/20.
• Council continuing to be debt free.
• Maintenance of a sound cash position.


**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Having considered submissions received pursuant to Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, adopts the 2019/20 Annual Budget (as attached) for the financial year ending 30 June 2020.
2. Gives public notice of its decision to adopt the Annual Budget in accordance with Section 130 of the Local Government Act 1989.
3. Forwards a copy of the 2019/20 Annual Budget to the Minister in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.
4. Thanks the submitters for their submissions and advises of the reason for the adoption of the 2019/20 Annual Budget.
6. Adopts the Schedule of Discretionary Fees and Charges attached to the 2019/20 Annual Budget.

**Support Attachments**

1. Summary of 2019/20 Proposed Annual Budget submissions ↓
2. Annual Budget 2019/20 (separately enclosed)
3. Long Term Financial Plan 2019/20 - 2028/29 (separately enclosed)
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
There are no social impacts associated with this report.

Natural Environment
There are no natural environmental impacts associated with this report.

Built Environment
There are no built environmental impacts associated with this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There are no impacts to customer service.

A community budget briefing was held on 16 May 2019 to inform the community about the 2019/20 Budget. The public had the opportunity to make a submission on any proposal contained in the Budget within 28 days of publication of the public notice.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
This Proposed Budget and LTFP complies with the principles of sound financial management as detailed in section 136 of the Local Government Act 1989 which includes
- Prudently manage financial risks relating to debt, assets and liabilities;
- Provide reasonable stability in the level of rate burden;
- Consider the financial effects of Council decisions on future generations; and
- Provide full, accurate and timely disclosure of financial information.

In accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 section 127, Council must prepare a budget each financial year and must include budget information containing: financial statements, the funding of major initiatives, services and capital works, rating information and any “special order” for rate cap variation.

Finance
In accordance with the legislation, an Annual Budget has been prepared, which details the financial resources required to achieve the Council Plan 2017-2021.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Summary of 2019/20 Proposed Annual Budget submissions

Note: The original submissions received were presented to all Councillors in totality at a Special Committee of Council held on 12 June 2019.

1. Michelle Bentley – Budget Submission

- Bayside Seniors Action Group thanking Council for including a Hydrotherapy Feasibility Study in the Proposed Budget. The committee requested they be advised of the terms and conditions of the feasibility study prior to its commencement.

The submitter is encouraged to contact Council’s Recreation and Events Coordinator, Ms Sara Townsend on 9599 4444 who will be able to provide further information including the project brief used to engage the consultant undertaking the Feasibility Study.

2. George Reynolds – Budget submission

- In relation to the comprehensive income statement expresses the view that the Comprehensive Income Statements on page 43 of the Budget cannot be accepted by the users of the accounts as a competent income statement.

- In relation to the capital works program (summarised on p65) expressed a view that Council has not shown that a legitimate source of funds is available to meet the requirements of the capital purchase program.

- In relation to the wrongful appropriation of surplus revenue asserts that in the current budget, Council have not made provision for any funds to be sourced from contributions or borrowings. The dominant source of capital funds $60.037M is Council cash. It is difficult to see where such a large amount of money has been accumulated in the form of provisions. It would appear that surplus revenue, together with the improper expense of D&A, has been diverted to Council cash to provide some or all of the required capital. This is, of course, a use of funds not sanctioned by the Local Government Act, the regulations, the Local Government Model Financial Report or the Australian Accounting Standards. If Council is required to follow proper accounting principles, Council staff will be unable to proceed with their (overly) ambitious capital works program.

- Expresses a view that a defect of the Plan is defined by the term “aggregation”. That Council’s source of funds document must show the four possible sources of funds available to each individual asset as: Grants, Contributions Council Cash, and Borrowings. Surplus revenue does not meet the definition of council cash in most, if not all, cases. The source line for each asset must balance with the total application sum, in every year. This means that each asset, individually or in a commonly rated group has an active line in the budget or plan. This situation will arise when provisions have been made or loans repaid. This is in addition to a line shown in the year of asset purchase.
• Expresses a view that Council plan fails to show a legally valid process whereby its spending requirements many be met. In particular, the plan to divert surplus revenue to council cash appears to have no legal merit. Pages 66-72 of the budget document is incorrectly prepared.

Officer’s comments
The response below addresses both submissions by Mr George Reynolds on the Proposed 2019/20 Budget (Annual Budget) and the Strategic Resource Plan 2019/20-2022/23 (SRP).

Mr Reynolds’ comments are substantially incorrect and appear to be based on a lack of understanding of the relevant Australian Accounting Standards, Local Government (Finance and Reporting) Regulations 2014, and legislation. Council has prepared its Annual Budget in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989, the Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014, Australian Accounting Standards, the new Local Government Amendment (Fair Go Rates) Act 2015 and the Local Government Model Budget and Better Practice Guide. This guide has been provided by Local Government Victoria to assist councils in meeting the mandatory reporting requirements. The model and guide has been prepared by members of Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand, local government practitioners and representatives from major local government sector peak bodies including Flapro and LGPro. Bayside City Council officers responsible for the preparation of the Proposed Budget and the Strategic Resource Plan are appropriately qualified Accountants and have extensive experience in preparing such documents in accordance with best practice guidelines and Australian Accounting Standards.

3. Michele Rowse on behalf of Black Rock Primary School - budget submission

RE: New Initiative – Black Rock Primary School Sportsground Upgrade – Design
• School Community and wider community strongly support to proceed with a detailed design for an upgrade to the sportsground.

Officer’s comments
Participation in community sport continues to grow particularly during the winter tenancy period (April to September) where Council’s sportsgrounds are now used in excess of the recommended 25 hours of use. This project will deliver the design for the upgrade of the sportsground at Black Rock Primary school to provide community access outside of school hours. The project design and costs will inform future discussions with the Victorian Schools Building Authority and Black Rock Primary School for development of the site.
4. Peter Boyle – Budget submission

- Expresses view that Council’s accelerated infrastructure program is being paid for by the present generation and that older ratepayers will not be able to benefit from this program.

- Expresses a view that the capital cost of major projects such as sporting pavilions, netball courts, etc., together with their ongoing costs, are funded by the rates paid by the general community or ratepayers while the beneficiaries are largely members of sporting clubs.

- Questioned why the pavilion costs associated with the netball centre have not been correctly recorded under the buildings category in the capital program.

- Questioned the total cost and timing of the completion of all three stages of the netball centre $27.297M as reported at the May 2019 Council meeting and whether the budget would be amended to address this.

- Commented on the total cost of the Dendy St Beach pavilion $10.055M.

- Contends that borrowing for major infrastructure projects should happen now to benefit from low interest rates for borrowing.

- Asserts that holding excess cash funds means current ratepayers are paying now for future projects and that Council should reduce rates to eliminate surplus funds.

- States that Council should sell its properties currently leased to kindergartens and redistribute these funds to the general community.

- Questioned the 6.7% increase in salaries and wages when comparing the 2019/20 budget to the 2018/19 forecast.

- Questioned why the 2019/20 budget for fees and charges has increased by less than the 5% approved in the LTFP strategy.

- Expressed a view that Council is gouging ratepayers to pay the costs of new, major capital works which have a long life span, and surplus cash which no doubt will also be spent mainly on future long life capital works which will benefit future ratepayers at the expense of current ratepayers.

Officer’s comments

Netball

The proposed budget document includes $14.4 million for Stage 1 of the Netball Centre outdoor courts and pavilion over 2019/20 and 2020/21. Stage 1 includes the outdoor courts with a pavilion to support the outside courts. The pavilion $2.8 million will be reallocated from the parks, open space and streetscapes category to buildings in year 2 of the four year program. A project update was provided to Council at the May 2019 Council meeting where Council decided to concurrently build Stages 1 and 2 of the netball centre by August 2021 subject to successfully receiving $4.7 million from the Federal Government’s Regional Development Fund and planning approval. Council is currently
preparing a submission to the Regional Development Fund, to finalise the $4.7 million Federal commitment for stage 2 indoor courts. The increase in project costs, confirmation of the external funding and consideration of the funding shortfall $2.677 million will be referred to and considered as part of the 2020/21 budget process.

Cash and investments
Cash and investments at the end of year four of the strategic resource plan are expected to be $64.6 million which includes restricted, committed and allocated funds of $36.2 million. The balance of unrestricted cash of $28.4 million is required to support Council cash flow cycle throughout the year given Council’s main cash inflow, rates revenue is received either quarterly or in a lump sum in February. It is Council’s strategy to use the surplus from operations, generated primarily from rate revenue to fund its capital program and prioritise the use of cash reserves over borrowings to support any increase in infrastructure investment. There is no requirement to borrow funds to support the current 4 year capital program which is being funded from a $38 million reduction in reserves. Notwithstanding, Council has the capacity to borrow funds in the future to support large infrastructure projects if required.

Kindergartens
Council provides buildings to meet the needs of community members of all ages and abilities such as kindergartens, maternal and child health centres and seniors centres at little or no cost to users. The Council Plan 2017-2021 notes that the Bayside Community values infrastructure that functions seamlessly, is attractively presented and is well maintained. The kindergartens operating from Council buildings are not-for-profit and have parent committees of management. The parents undertake considerable fundraising activities and use these funds to upgrade outdoor areas, contribute to improvements and to purchase equipment.

Council has undertaken extensive community consultation in recent years regarding kindergarten services and the Bayside community has overwhelmingly supported access to sessional kindergarten from Council owned buildings.

Salaries and Wages 2019/20 Budget compared to 2018/19 forecast expenditure
The year-end forecast savings against budget for employee costs reflects the full year impact of vacant positions, staff on extended leave, employment of staff into roles at lower bands, and a reduction in Aged and Disability hours required to service clients. Employee costs for 2019/20 are based on the full staff establishment and an EBA increase of 2.5% and includes a number of new positions proposed in the 2019/20 budget which reflect the organisation’s realignment with the introduction of a new Division, investment in a new procurement model, and in house web development capability.

The additional positions have been absorbed within the increase in the net cost of services per assessment of 2.2%. This has been achieved due to the savings identified across the operating services budget during the budget process.

Fees and Charges 2019/20 Budget compared to 2018/19 forecast expenditure
The 2018/19 forecast for parking fine and parking fee revenue has been positively impacted by increased traffic conditions particularly at beach locations over an extended summer period. The assumptions for the 2019/20 budget have been conservatively based on the previous two years actual results which reflect milder summer conditions. The 2019/20 budget also reflects an expected reduction in planning applications reflecting a downturn in current year forecast as well as a reduction in filming permits. Rental income has been impacted by the loss of the Sandringham Driving Range lease income.
5. Kevin Spencer - budget submission

- A number of statements concerning performance indicators.
- Dissatisfied with the appearance of the Middle Brighton Baths frontage, and Dendy Village Shopping Centre.
- Asserts that Council has made no attempt to cut costs and reduce rates.
- Expresses dissatisfaction with Council’s acquisition of public art.
- Raises the Dendy Beach project having cost Council $2m and concern the project will favour tourists and not the enjoyment of the Bayside community and future residents.
- Expresses his dissatisfaction with Council’s purpose, mission and values.
- Suggests Council encourages healthy exercise yet proper lighting and footpaths are not maintained including overhanging branches.
- In summary the submission suggests that Council spends billions on the likes of sports clubs and cyclists, yet fails to maintain footpaths and lighting.

Officer’s comments

Council notes Mr Spencer’s opinion on various aspects of the proposed 2019/20 Budget. In response to Mr Spencer’s comments regarding public art.

Council undertakes an independent audit of its Arts and Culture collection every 5 years. The last audit was completed in March 2018 and collection at the time was estimated to be valued at $4.813M. The total number of artworks in our current database is 1,953 of which 28 items were added since the last audit was undertaken.

1. Katherine Copsey on behalf of Alliance for Gambling Reform - budget submission

The Alliance is seeking $15,000 from Bayside City Council. In requesting these funds, we invite Council to commence a partnership as a Leadership Council with the Alliance. In 2018/19, 21 Victorian councils (Banyule, Brimbank, Darebin, Frankston, Glen Eira, Greater Dandenong, Hobsons Bay, Hume, Kingston, Knox, Maribyrnong, Maroondah, Melbourne, Mitchell Shire, Monash, Moonee Valley, Moreland, Mornington Peninsula, Whittlesea, Wyndham and Yarra) made financial contributions to the Alliance as Leadership Councils.

These funds enabled the Alliance to offer individual support to councils for activities to prevent harm from gambling and allowed us to continue our ground-breaking work pressuring AFL clubs to get out of the pokies business, putting pressure on Woolworths over their unconscionable operation of more machines than any other company and furthering our campaign for meaningful regulatory reform.
The Alliance is especially keen to commence a partnership with Bayside City Council as we understand that several Mayors have recently been approached by pokies kingpin Bruce Matheson Jnr and David Curry of ALH Group as "part of a campaign for more favourable treatment for gaming venues" (reported in The Age 28/3/2019, "Pokies baron personally lobbies local councils to spruik the upside of gambling"). Given Bayside City Council houses ALH venues the Sandringham Hotel and Milano’s and ALH Group’s overt attempt to influence local decision-makers, it is clear there has never been a better time to join the 21 other Leadership Councils that are taking a stand for their community and against gambling harm with the Alliance.

Officer’s comments

In response to the Alliance for Gambling Reform’s submission request to allocate $15,000 annually to the campaign "The Pokies Play You", Council advises the Alliance to seek financial support through Council’s Community Grants Program.

The Community Grants Program provides financial support (up to $7,500) for not-for-profit and community organisations to support initiatives within the Bayside community. The Community Grant Program aims to:

- establish, extend and improve programs and services that address local needs;
- encourage voluntary activity, community participation and the contribution of local groups and organisations to community life;
- promote sustainable community development and builds social capital; and
- encourage innovative approaches to emerging issues and needs.

Council is scheduled to receive a report on the impacts of gambling in Bayside at its August 2019 Council meeting.
10.3 DECLARATION OF RATES AND CHARGES

Executive summary

The report proposes that Council declare rates and charges for the 12 month rating year from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020.

The increase in the average general rate and municipal charge will be 2.50% in compliance with the rate cap. This is in line with the new Fair Go Rates System (FGRS) which has capped rate increases by Victorian councils to the forecast movement of 2.50% in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

Purpose and background

Council on 23 April 2019 prepared a Budget for the year ending 30 June 2020 and gave public notice in ‘The Age’ on 26 April 2019. Pursuant to Section 158 of the *Local Government Act 1989*, Council must declare the amount to be collected from rates and charges at least once in each financial year and before 31 August 2019. The Declaration of the Rates and Charges will facilitate the commencement of the preparation of the 2019/20 Valuation and Rate Notices.

Key issues

A key decision of Council is to determine the level of rate increase that will address funding levels for capital works and service provision for the municipality and improve Council’s long term financial sustainability.

The increase in the average general rate and municipal charge will be 2.50% in compliance with the rate cap and will raise $84.063 million. This is in line with the new Fair Go Rates System (FGRS) which has capped rate increases by Victorian councils to the forecast movement of 2.50% in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Council has not elected to apply to the Essential Services Commission (ESC) for a variation for 2019/20. In total, Council will raise rates and charges of $97.711 million.

An annual service charge for waste will raise $13.323 million which reflects the direct cost recovery of waste services. Rate revenue declared in accordance with the Cultural and Recreational Lands Act 1963 will raise $0.325 million.

Waste Management Charge

Bayside has a policy of direct cost recovery for waste services.

The standard Waste Charge for 2019/20 will decrease by 1.7% reflecting the cost of providing waste services. The waste management charge will decrease from $324.55 to $319.14 per annum (140 litre bin). The charge for an 80 litre bin will decrease from $246.50 to $242.40 per annum. The charge for a shared 140 litre bin will decrease from $246.50 to $242.40 per annum per property. The contribution for properties with no waste service available will increase from $67.58 to $72.87 per annum. The charge for properties that choose not to utilise Council’s waste service will increase from $67.58 to $72.87 per annum. Total waste revenue is expected to be $13.323 million.

Municipal Charge

The Municipal Charge for 2019/20 is $154.83. Revenue from the municipal charge is anticipated to be $7.105 million in 2019/20. Under Section 159(2) of the *Local Government
Act, up to a maximum of 20% of the total revenue from rates and charges may be levied as a municipal charge. The municipal charge ensures all properties pay an equitable contribution towards the unavoidable fixed costs of Council.

Cultural and Recreational Lands Act
On the basis of cost to Council, it has been calculated that for the purposes of determining the charges payable under the Cultural and Recreation Lands Act (CRLA), (notionally 60% of the rate in the dollar) can be attributable to sporting clubs and other CRLA properties. This percentage was determined following the completion of an allocation of actual Council service costs that are applicable to the CRLA properties.

The charge is calculated by multiplying the “In use” valuation by 60% of the rate in the dollar. “In use” valuations were determined following consultation with Council’s legal representative, Maddocks, and Council’s then contract-valuers, Matheson Stephen Valuations. All CRLA properties have utilised the Public Park and Recreation Zone (PPRZ) valuations. PPRZ recognises areas for public recreation and open space. These valuations are used for consistency and fairness by our valuation contractors. The ‘in use’ valuation is preferred for the following reasons:

- A fairer and more equitable basis for determining valuation according to community benefit;
- Reflects a valuation process that recognises the character of recreational lands role within the community; and
- A methodology that enables minimal discrimination between public & residential zoning from a community benefit perspective.

When the “in use” valuation as assessed by the Valuer General’s current contract valuer is multiplied by the current CRLA rate in the dollar, the resulting charge will become the “deemed” Cultural and Recreational Lands Rate for 2019/20.

Recommendation
That Council formally declare the Rates and Charges for the 2019/20 Rating Year as follows:

1. Amount Intended To be Raised

That an amount of $97,711,335 be declared as the amount which Council intends to raise by General Rates, Municipal Charge, Annual Service Charge and an amount in lieu of General Rates (in accordance with the Cultural and Recreational Lands Act 1963) described later in this Resolution, which amount is calculated as follows:

- General Rates $76,958,754
- Municipal Charge $7,104,839
- Annual Service Charge (Waste) $13,322,922
- Amount in lieu of General Rates in accordance with Cultural and Recreational Lands Act $324,820

TOTAL $97,711,335

2. General Rates
2.1 That a General Rate be applied at a uniform rate of 0.114831 cents for each dollar of Capital Improved Value be declared in respect of the 2019/20 Financial Year.

2.2 That in accordance with the Cultural and Recreational Lands Act 1963, the amounts payable as rates be the amounts set out in the attached "Cultural and Recreational Lands Summary" in respect of the 2019/20 Financial Year for all land to which that Act applies.

3. Municipal Charge

3.1 That a Municipal Charge is declared in respect of the 2019/20 Financial Year.

3.2 That the Municipal Charge is declared for the purpose of covering some of the administrative costs of Council.

3.3 That a Municipal Charge in the sum of $154.83 for each rateable land (or part thereof) in respect of which a municipal charge may be levied is declared in respect to the 2019/20 financial year.

3.4 That it is confirmed that the Municipal Charge is declared in respect of all rateable land within the municipal district in respect of which a Municipal Charge may be levied.

4. Annual Service Charges

4.1 That pursuant to the provisions of Section 162 of the Local Government Act 1989, an Annual Service Charge relating to Waste Management be declared for each rateable property:

4.1.1 The Annual Service Charge is charged on each rateable property (excluding Advertising Signs, Electricity Substations, Telecommunication Towers and Bathing Boxes) in the sum of $319.14 for a 140-litre mobile garbage bin or $242.40 for an 80-litre mobile garbage bin or $242.40 for a shared 140-litre mobile garbage bin.

4.1.2 That an amount of $72.87 be charged as a waste contribution if no waste service is available.

4.1.3 That an amount of $72.87 be charged as a waste availability service charge where no waste service is provided by Council but such a service is available.

4.1.4 That an amount of $233.02 be charged for the second waste bin on each rateable property.

4.1.5 That an amount of $466.04 be charged for the third or subsequent waste bin on each rateable property.

4.1.6 That an amount of $81.51 be charged for the second or subsequent recycling bin on each rateable property.

4.1.7 That an amount of $99.10 be charged for the second or subsequent green waste bin on each rateable property.

4.1.8 The Annual Service Charge is declared in respect of the 2019/20 Financial Year.

4.2 That pursuant to the provisions of Section 221 of the Local Government Act 1989, an Annual Service Charge relating to Waste Management is declared on each non-rateable property where the service is provided:
4.2.1 The Annual Service Charge is levied on each non-rateable property in the sum of $319.14 for a 140-litre mobile garbage bin or $242.40 for an 80-litre mobile garbage bin or $242.40 for a shared 140-litre mobile garbage bin.

4.2.2 That an amount of $233.02 be charged for the second waste bin on each non-rateable property.

4.2.3 That an amount of $466.04 be charged for the third or subsequent waste bin on each non-rateable property.

4.2.4 That an amount of $81.51 be charged for the second or subsequent recycling bin on each non-rateable property, or the first recycling bin if no waste bin is provided.

4.2.5 That an amount of $99.10 be charged for the second or subsequent green waste bin on each non-rateable property, or the first green waste bin if no waste bin is provided.

4.2.6 The Annual Service Charge is declared in respect of the 2019/20 Financial Year.

5. Incentives

An incentive is given at the rate of 0.7 percent discount in relation to the total amount payable for the sum of the Rates, Municipal Charge and Annual Service Charges if full payment is received by 31 August 2019.

6. Rate Payments

6.1 Rates are payable in four instalments due by 30 September 2019, 30 November 2019, 28 February 2020 and 31 May 2020.

6.2 Where no instalment has been paid by 30 September 2019, rates are due in a lump sum and payable by 15 February 2020.

7. Consequential

7.1 It be recorded that Council requires any person to pay interest on any amounts of rates and charges which:

- That person is liable to pay; and
- Have not been paid by the date specified for their payment

7.2 The Revenue Coordinator is authorised to levy and recover the rates, municipal and annual service charges and interest described earlier in this Resolution in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989.

Support Attachments

Nil
Cultural and Recreational Lands Summary (excluding Municipal Charge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2019/20 Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsternwick Park Tennis Centre</td>
<td>3,444.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tiebreak Enterprises Pty Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsternwick Park Sports Club Inc</td>
<td>3,196.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Brighton Yacht Club</td>
<td>10,472.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Brighton Club</td>
<td>8,130.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Croquet Club</td>
<td>3,444.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendy Park Tennis Club</td>
<td>7,106.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Bowling &amp; Sporting Clubs</td>
<td>5,635.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Beach Bowls Club</td>
<td>2,566.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlingham Park Tennis Club</td>
<td>3,799.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Bowls Club</td>
<td>6,252.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Tennis Club</td>
<td>2,273.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Athletic Club Inc.</td>
<td>723.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Youth Club</td>
<td>902.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Angling Club</td>
<td>564.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Club</td>
<td>7,096.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Melbourne Golf Club</td>
<td>103,624.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock Bowling &amp; Tennis Club</td>
<td>5,856.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Bowls Club</td>
<td>3,400.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Football Club Beach Oval</td>
<td>1,901.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Sailing Club</td>
<td>1,343.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Yacht Club</td>
<td>12,208.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Croquet Club</td>
<td>1,880.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock Yacht Club</td>
<td>1,550.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Maris Tennis Club</td>
<td>2,342.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Court Reserve Pty Ltd</td>
<td>964.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Bowls Club</td>
<td>3,605.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>3,503.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club</td>
<td>4,595.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Community Centre Tennis Club</td>
<td>3,131.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Yacht Club</td>
<td>502.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris Motor Yacht Squadron</td>
<td>4,523.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightett Bowls Club</td>
<td>3,086.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightett Tennis Club</td>
<td>878.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Golf Club</td>
<td>1,309.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Melbourne Golf Club</td>
<td>29,626.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Golf Club</td>
<td>54,467.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Golf Club</td>
<td>14,537.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Amateur Football Association</td>
<td>1,216.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basterfield Tennis Club</td>
<td>1,863.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Central Angling Club</td>
<td>285.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>324,820.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Social
There are no social impacts associated with this report.

Natural Environment
There are no natural environmental impacts associated with this report.

Built Environment
There are no built environmental impacts associated with this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There are no impacts to customer service.
A community budget briefing was held on 16 May 2019 to inform the community about the 2019/20 Budget. The public had the opportunity to make a submission on any proposal contained in the Budget within 28 days of publication of the public notice.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
Pursuant to Section 158 of the Local Government Act 1989 Council must at least once in each financial year and before 31 August 2019 declare the amount to be collected from rates and charges.

Finance
The declaration of rates and charges will enable Council to raise rates and charges revenue in accordance with the rates and charges included in the 2019/20 budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The rates and charges are levied in accordance with Council’s Rating Strategy.
10.4 RECONCILIATION ACTION PLAN

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure - Open Space, Recreation & Wellbeing

File No: PSF/19/11 – Doc No: DOC/19/25142

Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to present the Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) (Attachment 1) for endorsement by Council.

A RAP is a strategic document that outlines practical actions that will drive an organisation’s contribution to reconciliation both internally and in the communities in which it operates.

The RAP contributes to advancing the five dimensions of reconciliation by supporting Council to develop respectful relationships and create meaningful opportunities with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

This is a 12 month RAP which allows Council to spend time scoping and developing relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders, deciding on a vision for reconciliation and exploring its sphere of influence, before committing to specific actions or initiatives. This process will help to produce future RAPs that are meaningful, mutually beneficial and sustainable.

Key issues

Engagement undertaken with Indigenous organisations and representatives
Indigenous organisations have been engaged in the development of the draft RAP including:

- **Boon Wurrung Foundation**: represents the traditional people and custodians of the lands from the Werribee River to Wilson Promontory and are members of the Kulin People – the Boonwurrung and Woiwurrung. Staff held a meeting with Gheran Steel (CEO) of the Boon Wurrung Foundation to seek feedback on the development of the RAP.

- **Bunurong Land Council**: represents the traditional owner organisation that represent the Bunurong people of the South-Eastern Kulin Nation. It aims to preserve and protect the sacred lands and waterways of ancestors, their places, traditional cultural practices, and stories. Staff held a meeting with Dan Turnbull (CEO) of the Bunurong Land Council to seek feedback on the development of the RAP.

- **Local Aboriginal Network (LAN)**: is a voluntary community network for Aboriginal people. The LAN brings Aboriginal people together at the local level to: set priorities; develop community plans, improve social cohesion; and empower Aboriginal Victorians to participate in civic and community life. Staff attended two meetings of the Local Aboriginal Network to seek guidance during the development of the draft RAP.

- **Reconciliation Australia**: is an independent, not-for-profit organisation. The purpose of Reconciliation Australia is to inspire and enable all Australians to contribute to the reconciliation of the nation. Reconciliation Australia endorses all RAPs and have provided feedback throughout the development of Council’s draft RAP. They have provided conditional endorsement for Bayside Council’s RAP and will provide endorsement once the RAP has been endorsed by Council.
Feedback received from Indigenous organisations and representatives

All organisations that have been contacted have been very supportive of Council developing a RAP, some of the key feedback provided included:

- Providing events for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to celebrate Indigenous culture;
- Providing employment opportunities for Indigenous people including elders;
- Including acknowledgements in/on buildings; and
- Sharing information on the history of Landcox Park, Brighton East.

Traditional Owners

There is no Registered Aboriginal Party in Bayside. The Bunurong Land Council has asked that the Boon Wurrung/ Bunurong are referred to as the traditional owners.

The LAN recommends that Council continues to only acknowledge the Boon Wurrung as the traditional owners. The City of Port Phillip undertook significant research and investigation regarding the traditional owners and concluded that the Boon Wurrung people are the traditional owners of an area that includes the City of Bayside. This is also consistent with Council’s current acknowledgment of original inhabitants.

It is recommended that Council continues to acknowledge the Boon Wurrung as the traditional owners based on the LAN recommendation and the research undertaken by the City of Port Phillip.

Summary of Actions from the RAP

The RAP includes 19 actions under the following headings:

- Relationships
- Respect
- Opportunities
- Governance and Tracking Progress

Delivery of these actions will require activities across internal Council departments and in collaboration with a range of community organisations.

Recommendation

That Council endorses the Reconciliation Action Plan as shown in Attachment 1.

Support Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Reflect Reconciliation Action Plan 2019
**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**
The RAP will allow Council to better support and celebrate the Indigenous community and culture. The RAP is an investment in the community, which seeks to provide accessible activities and services that strengthen community capacity, increase the overall quality of life, foster community cohesion and meet community needs.

**Natural Environment**
Some of the actions within the RAP may result in environmental benefits to the Bayside community.

**Built Environment**
There are no built environmental implications associated with the proposition contained in this paper.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**

*Engagement undertaken with community*
The draft RAP was exhibited on Council’s Have Your Say page from 3 April to 13 May 2019 and at a community engagement event held on 3 May 2019 at Beaumaris Life Saving Club, Ricketts Point.

The consultation on the draft RAP was promoted in: Let’s Talk Bayside article, Leader newspaper articles, social media posts, flyers and at the monthly Koorie Family Gathering.

Key community members and organisations who were contacted directly to encourage their participation, included:

- Previous members of the Indigenous Affairs Advisory Committee;
- Community Centres and Neighbourhood Houses;
- Community Health Organisations;
- Local Community Groups;
- Southern Melbourne Primary Care Partnership (specifically the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Access Project Officer); and
- Organisations that assisted in the development of the draft RAP.

*Feedback received from community*

Over 290 community members visited Council’s Have Your Say page on the draft RAP and 29 of these provided feedback. In addition, 80 community members attended the community engagement event held at Beaumaris Life Saving Club. Most community members were supportive of Council developing a RAP, some of the key feedback provided included:

- Deliver projects that inform and educate the community about culturally significant areas in Bayside;
- Continue work in Native Indigenous Nursery;
- Celebrate Indigenous culture through events and festivals in Bayside;
- Employment opportunities for Indigenous people; and
- Involvement of local schools and young people in the delivery of the RAP.
Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006. The Charter specifically outlines that: Aboriginal persons hold distinct cultural rights and must not be denied the right, with other members of their community (a) to enjoy their identity and culture; and (b) to maintain and use their language; and (c) to maintain their kinship ties; and (d) to maintain their distinctive spiritual, material and economic relationship with the land and waters and other resources with which they have a connection under traditional laws and customs.

Legal
There are no legal implications associated with the recommendation included in this report.

Finance
The development of the RAP has been accommodated in the existing 2018/19 operational budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The RAP supports the implementation of the:

- Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021, particularly objective 1.2 ‘support opportunities that build social networks and community connections’; and

- Council Plan 2017-2021, particularly the Council Plan strategies to ‘encourage the planting of local indigenous vegetation’ and ‘improve public health and wellbeing’.
Reflect
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Indigenous Introduction and Welcome
As a descendant of Melbourne’s First people, the Boon Wurrung of the greater Kulin Nation, we are pleased to endorse the Reconciliation Action Plan of Bayside City Council.

We believe that it is important for all citizens to understand and appreciate the history and culture of the First People of this region.

This is the traditional country of the Boon Wurrung people, one of the five language groups who made up a larger nation called the Kulin. At the time of the first European settlement, this area was the traditional country of the Yaluk-ut Weelam clan of the Boon Wurrung.

It is over 180 years since Europeans first entered our Country – surrounded by the great Bay, which we called Nairm. What we have learnt from our ancestors achievements still resonates with us. This includes the core values of Learning, Showing Respect, Celebrating Life and Honouring Sacred Ground.

The Importance of Learning – We have always valued a commitment to learning and it has been part of every generation since – and is one of the reasons we are strong today.

Showing Respect – We respect our traditional laws and customs, but also accept the different ways of the Europeans. In this same way, we all share a respect for each other’s culture and religion today.

To Celebrate – We must all remember the celebration of life – the arrival of new children, the coming of the seasons, visiting clans – was an important part of our traditional life. Today we support the celebration through modern Indigenous art and culture. This is our ancestors legacy.

Respecting Sacred Ground – We should all acknowledge the sacred ground on which we stand. Today we are host to many people from different nations and countries – and we call upon you to continue to respect the sacred ground, the history and heritage of our Country.

The struggle to preserve our culture and traditions began with our ancestors in the 1830’s. One of the most important lessons we should take from this struggle is the way they forged an alliance that led to many of the achievements that we take for granted today.

We look forward to the day when we can all celebrate our shared history and pride in our traditional lands and history.

Gheran Steel
Chief Executive Officer
Boon Wurrung Foundation
Bayside City Council's Indigenous Welcome

Bayside acknowledges that the original inhabitants of this land that we call Bayside are the Boon Wurrung people of the Kulin nations, and we pay our respects to their Elders past and present and emerging leaders.

They love this land and care for it and consider themselves to be part of it.

We acknowledge that together we share a responsibility to nurture this land and sustain it for future generations.

Please note:
- Throughout this document, the term 'Indigenous' may be used and is inclusive of both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders have been consulted on the use of this term.
- Differences in interpretation of Bayside cultural heritage exists. The content contained in this document does not wish to confirm one interpretation over another, but aims to reference and consolidate existing information from a variety of sources.
Our Statement of Commitment to Indigenous Australians

Indigenous culture and heritage is respected and appreciated by the Bayside community who will work together to create a better future for all Australians.

Bayside City Council:

- Recognises that the Boon Wurrung people are the traditional inhabitants of the land that now comprises the City of Bayside;
- Acknowledges that this land was colonised without the consent of the original inhabitants;
- Recognises the distinctive relationship that Indigenous people have with local land and waters, including trees, hills and valleys, creeks and foreshore of Bayside;
- Regrets past misunderstandings and injustices experienced by Australia’s Indigenous communities including the confiscation of traditional lands, and the implementation of policies which had the effect of extinguishing indigenous practices, language and culture;
- Supports people of Australia working together for the development of a formal instrument of reconciliation;
- Acknowledges the right of the Indigenous people of Australia to live, subject to Australian law, according to their own values and customs and is committed to respecting indigenous sacred sites and significant places;
- Acknowledges the value, significance, diversity and strength of Indigenous cultures to the heritage of all Australians, and is committed to working with Indigenous people to research local stories and sites of significance to Indigenous people, assisting them to record and present their histories;
- Records its appreciation of the initiatives already undertaken by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in assisting Council and the community to understand and appreciate Indigenous heritage and culture; and
- Commits to consultation on matters of mutual concern with representatives of the Boon Wurrung people and any other legitimately constituted group representing indigenous culture and heritage.

The Ancient Yarra River with Bunjil’s eggs- Sculpture by Glenn Romakis, 2008. Bayside City Council collection. The 6 eggs represent the 6 clans of the Kulin Nations.
Background Information
Reconciliation Australia outlines that a Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) is a strategic document that outlines practical actions that will drive an organisation’s contribution to reconciliation both internally and in the communities in which it operates.

Reconciliation Australia
Reconciliation Australia’s RAP Program contributes to advancing the five dimensions of reconciliation by supporting organisations to develop respectful relationships and create meaningful opportunities with Indigenous Australians. The five dimensions of Reconciliation:

1. **Race Relations**: Positive two-way relationships built on trust and respect exist between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians throughout society.
2. **Equality and Equity**: Indigenous Australians participate equally and equitably in all areas of life and the distinctive individual and collective rights and cultures of Indigenous peoples are universally recognised and respected.
3. **Institutional Integrity**: Political, business and community institutions actively support all dimensions of reconciliation.
4. **Unity**: Indigenous histories, cultures and rights are a valued and recognised part of a shared national identity and, as a result, there is national unity.
5. **Historical Acceptance**: There is widespread acceptance of our nation’s history and agreement that the wrongs of the past will never be repeated — there is truth, justice, healing and historical acceptance.

Council’s RAP has followed the development process outlined by Reconciliation Australia and has utilised the ‘Reflect’ template to demonstrate the start of Council’s journey towards Reconciliation. This focuses on Relationships, Respect and Opportunities.

**Korin Korin Balit-Djak: Aboriginal health, wellbeing and safety strategic plan**

This plan provides an overarching framework for action to improve the health, wellbeing and safety of Aboriginal Victorians now and over the next 10 years to 2027. It sets out the vision and direction for ensuring positive outcomes for Aboriginal Victorians across the breadth and depth of its activities.

Korin Korin Balit-Djak covers five domains:
- Aboriginal community leadership;
- Prioritising Aboriginal culture and community;
- System reform across the health and human services sector;
- Safe, secure, strong families and individuals; and
- Physically, socially and emotionally healthy Aboriginal communities.

Council’s RAP aligns with the domains of the Korin Korin Balit-Djak and describes how Council can contribute to the State vision.
United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
The Declaration sets out how existing human rights standards apply to the recognition and protection of indigenous peoples’ rights internationally. It provides a framework for countries with different histories and circumstances to help reduce levels of disadvantage and discrimination experienced by many of the world’s 370 million Indigenous people. The Australian Government officially endorsed the Declaration on 3 April 2009.

The RAP will be consistent with the General Assembly and principles of the Declaration.

Council Plan 2017-2021
The RAP will assist Council to achieve its vision to work together with the community to ‘make Bayside a better place’. The RAP will specifically assist Council to achieve the following strategic objectives under of the Council Plan:

- Where we are a strong and supportive community and people of all ages are engaged;
- Where the community is healthy, active and feels safe; and
- Where the community engages in advocacy, transparent decision making and is part of the solution.

Bayside Community Plan 2025
The RAP will contribute to achieving the community aspiration ‘By 2025, members of Bayside’s community will feel supported and engaged to live an active and healthy lifestyle regardless of age, geographical location, personal circumstance or physical ability’.

Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021 (WAAA)
The RAP will assist Council to meet objective 1.2 of the WAAA ‘Support opportunities that build social networks and community connections’. The Healthy Community Action Plan which supports the implementation of the WAAA includes an action to “Develop an action plan to recognise and promote the Indigenous culture of Bayside”.
Our Services

Bayside City Council is a Local Government located in Melbourne’s inner-southern suburbs. Council’s vision is to work together with the community to ‘make Bayside a better place’. To achieve this goal, Council provides services across a wide range of areas including:

- Aged care and disability;
- Arts and culture;
- Cleaning and waste;
- Community development;
- Emergency management;
- Environment;
- Family and children;
- Health and safety;
- Local laws and permits;
- Parks and gardens;
- Pets and animals;
- Planning and building;
- Roads and transport;
- Sport and recreation; and
- Youth services.

Council employs an estimated 823 staff members, none of which have self-identified as Indigenous. Council has one main Corporate Centre with various other work locations throughout the municipality including: libraries; maternal and child health centres; Indigenous plant nursery; and activity delivery centres.

The municipal area is an estimated 37 km² with an estimated residential population of 104,030. There are 190 people who have identified as Indigenous within Bayside the last Census (2016).

Our Partnerships and Current Activities

Current activities that Council has in place include:

- Developing the Indigenous cultural trail. This walking trail includes works of contemporary Indigenous artists and is based on stories authored by Boon Wurrung Elder Carolyn Briggs. The trail outlines the close relationship between the Boon Wurrung culture and the coastal environment;
- Acquiring Indigenous artwork (in line with the Bayside Art and Heritage Collection Policy);
- Providing cultural and medicinal information on Indigenous plants through the Bayside Community Nursery and Council’s ‘Friends of’ Environmental Groups;
- Providing opportunities for Indigenous artists and Indigenous works to be displayed in Bayside art venues;
- Providing the Indigenous resource garden which includes information on Indigenous plants and their uses and the local history;
- Celebrating Reconciliation Week with an annual flag raising ceremony and additional events where there is capacity;
- Providing financial support to Koori Kids for NAIDOC week school initiatives;
- Partnering with Indigenous organisations to develop Cultural Heritage Management Plans to manage and protect Aboriginal cultural heritage in the activity area in line with the Aboriginal Heritage Act (2006) and the Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2016; and
- Providing funding for activities that celebrate Indigenous culture through Council’s Community Grants Program.
Our Reconciliation Action Plan

Bayside City Council is committed to developing and implementing a RAP with the aims of:

- Building relationships between Council, the Indigenous community and the broader Bayside community;
- Celebrating and acknowledging the unique Indigenous heritage of Bayside; and
- Improving Council services for Indigenous people.

Partnerships are a key principle of the RAP with a focus on building the capacity of a wide range of sectors, delivering high quality actions, and reducing duplication and fragmentation of effort. Partners included in this action plan include representatives from internal Council services and the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Council Departments</th>
<th>External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>Boon Wurrung Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Bunurong Land Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Connect Health and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Wellbeing</td>
<td>Local Aboriginal Network;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>Star Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Southern Melbourne Primary Care Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aim of the Reconciliation Action Plan

Council’s RAP is aligned with Reconciliation Australia and takes into consideration the Korin Koori Ballt-Djak domains. The RAP focuses on actions which protect and promote Indigenous cultural heritage and the wellbeing of Indigenous people in Bayside.

Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group

A key action of the RAP is to establish a Reconciliation Action Plan Working Group (RAPWG). This will be achieved within the first 12 months of Council endorsing the RAP.

The RAPWG will actively monitor RAP development and implementation of actions, track progress and approve reporting. The RAPWG will be made up of representatives from relevant Council departments, Indigenous people, Indigenous organisations and key stakeholders.
How to Read the Action Plan

- **Actions**: Broad action that includes the objective that Bayside will focus on achieving.
- **Deliverable column**: activities/initiatives that will achieve the objective in the action column.
- **Responsibility and Partners**: This area identifies who will be involved in the delivery of actions either in a lead or supporting role. Council officers are identified with an asterix (*).
- **Timeline**: The estimated start and completion date for each action.

**Measuring Success**

The Reconciliation Action Plan will be reviewed annually and reported to Council, to ensure relevance and to respond to the changing needs of the Bayside community.

Reconciliation Australia is clear that the RAP is just the first step in the reconciliation journey. Reconciliation is an ambitious goal, the journey to reconciliation is a cycle of continuous learning and reviewing.

![Figure 3: RAP life cycle](image)
Reconciliation Action Plan June 2019 – June 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Establish a RAP Working Group | - Form a RAP Working Group that is operational to support the implementation of our RAP, comprising of Indigenous people, community leaders and decision-making staff from across our organisation. | - December 2019 | - Community Wellbeing Coordinator*  
- Governance Manager*  
- Indigenous Organisations |
| 2. Build internal and external relationships | - Develop a list of Indigenous communities and organisations within our local area or sphere of influence that we could approach to connect with on our reconciliation journey.  
- Develop a list of RAP organisations and other like-minded organisations that we could approach to connect with on our reconciliation journey.  
- Ensure attendance at a minimum of four Local Aboriginal Network Meetings | - December 2019  
- December 2019  
- June 2020 | - Community Wellbeing Coordinator*  
- RAP Working Group Chair |
| 3. Participate in and celebrate National Reconciliation Week (NRW) | - Encourage our staff to attend a NRW event.  
- Circulate Reconciliation Australia’s NRW resources and reconciliation materials to our staff.  
- Ensure our RAP Working Group participates in an external event to recognise and celebrate NRW (e.g. flag raising ceremony)  
- Implement the Reconciliation Week bursary competition for students | - 27 May-3 June (annually) | - Governance Manager*  
- Library Services Manager*  
- Open Space Coordinator*  
- Arts and Culture Program Coordinator*  
- Ellen Jose Memorial Foundation  
- Community Wellbeing Coordinator* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Raise internal awareness of our RAP                                | • Develop and implement a plan to raise awareness amongst all staff across the organisation about our RAP commitments.  
• Develop and implement a plan to engage and inform key internal stakeholders of their responsibilities within our RAP.  
• Include information on the RAP within the staff induction process | December 2019     | Community Wellbeing Coordinator*  
Executive Manager People and Strategy*  
RAP Working Group Chair |
|                                                                        |                                                                                                                 | August 2019        |                                                                  |
|                                                                        |                                                                                                                 | December 2019      |                                                                  |
| 5. Consideration of an urban/rural city relationship with an indigenous community or remote art centre | • Investigate opportunities to establish an urban/rural relationship with an indigenous community or remote art centre | June 2020          | Community Wellbeing Coordinator*  
Governance Manager*  
Curator Art and Culture* |
| 6. Raise external awareness of our RAP and build relationships with Indigenous community members | • Investigate opportunity for a celebration event to highlight the development of the RAP | July 2019          | Community Wellbeing Coordinator* |
| 7. Promote positive race relations through anti-discrimination strategies | • Research best practice and policies in areas of race relations and anti-discrimination.  
• Conduct a review of HR policies and procedures to identify existing anti-discrimination provisions, and future needs. | February 2020      | Executive Manager People and Strategy* |
<p>|                                                                        |                                                                                                                 | March 2020         |                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Investigate Indigenous cultural learning and development</td>
<td>• Develop a business case for increasing awareness of Indigenous cultures, histories and achievements within our organisation.</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capture data and measure our staff’s current level of knowledge and understanding of Indigenous cultures, histories and achievements.</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Executive Manager People and Strategy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct a review of cultural awareness training needs within our organisation.</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>RAP Working Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participate in and celebrate NAIDOC Week</td>
<td>• Raise awareness and share information amongst our staff of the meaning of NAIDOC Week which includes information about the local Indigenous people and communities.</td>
<td>First week in July (annually)</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce our staff to NAIDOC Week by promoting community events in our local area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAP Working Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure our RAP Working Group participates in an external NAIDOC Week event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Responsibility and Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Raise internal understanding of Indigenous cultural protocols</strong></td>
<td>• Explore who the Traditional Owners are of the lands and waters in our local area.</td>
<td>• August 2019</td>
<td>• Community Wellbeing Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scope and develop a list of local Traditional Owners of the lands and waters within our organisations sphere of influence.</td>
<td>• August 2019</td>
<td>• Governance Manager*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement a plan to raise awareness and understanding of the meaning and significance behind Acknowledgement of Country and Welcome to Country protocols (including any local cultural protocols).</td>
<td>• December 2019</td>
<td>• RAP Working Group Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide Indigenous Cultural Awareness training to all staff</td>
<td>• February 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop electronic acknowledgment for signatures</td>
<td>• February 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Promote buildings, reserves, pavilions, lanes as a safe place for Indigenous people and to recognise the Traditional Owners of the land</strong></td>
<td>• Investigate appropriate traditional Indigenous names for Council buildings.</td>
<td>• June 2020 (ongoing)</td>
<td>• Governance Manager*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop acknowledgment signage for Council buildings</td>
<td>• June 2020</td>
<td>• Registered Aboriginal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide information on the Indigenous history of Landcox Park</td>
<td>• May 2020</td>
<td>• Open Space Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Investigate Indigenous employment</td>
<td>• Develop a business case for Indigenous employment within our organisation.</td>
<td>• December 2019</td>
<td>• Executive Manager People and Strategy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify current Indigenous staff to inform future employment and development opportunities.</td>
<td>• July 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Investigate Indigenous supplier diversity</td>
<td>• Develop an understanding of the mutual benefits of procurement from Indigenous owned businesses.</td>
<td>• January 2020</td>
<td>• Community Wellbeing Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a business case for procurement from Indigenous owned businesses.</td>
<td>• May 2020</td>
<td>• Procurement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Investigate Indigenous employment pathways (e.g. traineeships or internships)</td>
<td>• Review potential pathways to Indigenous employment and provide recommendations for organisation to consider</td>
<td>• December 2019</td>
<td>• Executive Manager People and Strategy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provide accurate cultural information on the Indigenous heritage of Bayside and links to further resources for Indigenous people</td>
<td>• Review and improve Council's website within Bayside libraries.</td>
<td>• May 2020</td>
<td>• Community Wellbeing Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review the dedicated Indigenous section within Bayside libraries.</td>
<td>• March 2020</td>
<td>• Library Services Manager*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve information and signage for the Indigenous Resource Garden</td>
<td>• May 2020</td>
<td>• Open Space Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Actively encourage Indigenous people to apply for staff positions and for Council</td>
<td>• Vacant positions disseminated to Indigenous Networks.</td>
<td>• December 2019</td>
<td>• Executive Manager People and Strategy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include a sentence encouraging Indigenous people to apply in job advertisements</td>
<td>• October 2019</td>
<td>• Governance Manager*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Promote Reconciliation through the arts</td>
<td>• Establish a triennial visual art award and exhibition for female artists (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) 35 years and under to celebrate reconciliation</td>
<td>• June 2020</td>
<td>• Arts and Culture Program Coordinator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ellen Josa Memorial Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10.4 – Reports by the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance and Tracking Progress</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility and Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Build support for the RAP</td>
<td>• Define resource needs for RAP development and implementation.</td>
<td>• Develop a RAP Impact Measurement Questionnaire and submit to Reconciliation Australia.</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator, RAP Working Group Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Define systems and capability needs to track activities.</td>
<td>• Complete the annual RAP Impact Measurement Questionnaire and submit to Reconciliation Australia.</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator, RAP Working Group Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liaise with Reconciliation Australia to develop a new RAP based on learnings.</td>
<td>• Submit draft RAP to Reconciliation Australia for review.</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator, RAP Working Group Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit draft RAP to Reconciliation Australia for formal endorsement.</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Community Wellbeing Coordinator, RAP Working Group Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact details for public enquiries:

Lauren Waycott
Community Wellbeing Coordinator
(03) 9599-4886
lwaycott@bayside.vic.gov.au
Executive summary

Purpose and background
To re-affirm Council’s commitment to the Victorian Local Government Women’s Charter and endorse a number of activities to demonstrate support to the Charter and the promotion of gender equity, diversity and women’s participation in active citizenship.

In 1996, the Women’s Participation in Local Government Coalition (WPILG) was formed to work towards the equal participation of women and men in local government.

2010 was declared the Australian Local Government Women’s Association (ALGWA) Year of Women in Local Government and the Coalition received funding from the Victorian Government to work with local government to adopt the Victorian Local Government Women’s Charter and create an action plan.

Council in 2010 was one of a number of Victorian Councils that endorsed the Local Government Women’s Charter and supported the Year with focussed activities promoting women in leadership roles hosting a number of lunches for women leaders in the community. At the same time Council also adopted a Statement of Commitment to promote great women’s participation in local government.

In 2019, 76 of Victoria’s 79 local governments had signed on to the Charter with many creating actions plans to implement the three principles.

The Women’s Charter is a significant agreement between three peak bodies which represent the interests of local government namely:

- The Municipal Association of Victoria;
- The Victorian Local Governance Association; and
- The Women’s Participation in Local Government Coalition.

Key issues
Council's adoption of the following Victorian Local Government Women's Charter sends a strong message to the community that its supports the principles of the Charter and will work towards achieving gender equity, diversity and active citizenship.

In addition to the Charter many Councils have also taken a further step in supporting the Women’s Charter by endorsing a statement of commitment. Bayside has also endorsed the Statement of Commitment.

It is proposed that Council reaffirms its support and endorses the Victorian Local Government Women’s Charter and reaffirms its support to the Statement of Commitment.
It is also appropriate that Council endorses the Action Plan attached to this report which provides further opportunities to support the Women’s Charter within local government. Some activities have already occurred during the 2018/19 financial year, with additional activities 2019/20 and 2020/21.

**Victorian Local Government Women’s Charter**

*Recognising the need for increased women’s participation in the key decision making forums in the community in democratic governance, we, the local governments of Victoria, on behalf of our communities support the following principles:*

**Gender Equity**
That women and men have an equal right to be representatives in local government, committees and decision-making positions.

**Diversity**
The inclusion of different experiences and perspectives in local governments and community decision-making strengthens local democratic governance and helps build cohesive communities. Council and communities encourage and welcome the participation of all women.

**Active Citizenship**
Local governments will work with the community to increase the numbers and participation of women in public life, so that decision making more clearly represents and reflects the interests and demographics of communities.

**Statement of Commitment**

“We will work towards increasing the representation of women in local government, both as elected members and as senior managers and professionals. We will undertake ongoing reviews of policies and practices to remove barriers to women’s participation and to engender safe, supportive working and decision making environments that encourage and value a wide range of views.”

**Action Plan**

The Action Plan has been informed by the ‘Best practice guide for gender equity in local government’ developed by Local Government Victoria in July 2018.

Activities outlined in the Action Plan relate specifically to the best practice guide, and will be implemented to create a community and organisational culture that promotes and encourages diversity.

By focusing on challenging the status quo, Bayside City Council aspires to become a sector-leading organisation, fostering creative, inclusive and sustainable practices. Change to our practices will lead to greater diversity of thought and approach, and improved outcomes for our people and our community.

As such, the Action Plan will focus on promoting gender equity in areas where Council has direct oversight and responsibility.
Recommendation
That Council:


2. Endorses the Action Plan as outlined in the report to support the Women’s Charter.

Support Attachments
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Increasing women’s participation in decision making has the potential to strengthen local democracy and improve the quality of community representation. The participation of women in civic life also assists in building more connected and cohesive communities.

Natural Environment
There are natural environment impacts associated with this report.

Built Environment
There are no built environment impacts associated with this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The Action Plan will be widely communicated across the organisation to ensure that the initiatives are implemented and reported annually.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
Whilst there is no legal or statutory requirement to endorse a Women’s Charter, the proposal to re-confirm the Charter and the actions proposed in the action plan are consistent with the Human Rights Charter to provide diversity and access to all in civic life.

Finance
The opportunities identified within the Action Plan can be accommodated within the current financial year budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Council has previously resolved to support the Victorian Local Government Women’s Charter and Statement of Commitment and the recommended opportunities for Council’s consideration are intended to support women and are aligned to the 2017-2021 Council Plan.
Bayside City Council

Women’s Charter Action Plan

Bayside City Council

2018-2020
Purpose
The purpose of the Women’s Charter Action Plan is to promote gender equity, diversity and women’s participation in active citizenship.

Background
The Victorian Government established the Victorian Women’s Charter in 1997. The Charter aims to make a public commitment to advance gender equity, diversity and active citizenship. Bayside City Council (Council) reaffirmed its commitment to the Charter on 27 October 2016.

Gender equity is an extremely important concept for driving gender equality. Equality aims to promote fairness, but it can only work if everyone faces similar challenges. Until the desired state where no gender barriers exist can be achieved, the focus must remain on providing gender equity, and a level playing field for all.

Financial operations, innovation and safety’ (Local Government Victoria, 2018).

In addition to fostering a diverse and inclusive culture, Council has a commitment in the Council Plan to improve gender equity in decision making in the community, and aims to achieve this by implementing the Women’s Chart Action Plan (WCAP) in 2018/19. The WCAP is informed by the ‘Best practice guide for gender equity in local government’ developed by Local Government Victoria in July 2018.

Activities outlined in the WCAP relate specifically to the best practice guide, and will be implemented to create a community, and organisational culture, that promotes and encourages diversity. By focusing on challenging the status quo, Bayside City Council aspires to become a sector-leading organisation, fostering creative, inclusive and sustainable practices. Change to our practices will lead to greater diversity of thought and approach, and improved outcomes for our people and our community.

As such, the WCAP will focus on promoting gender equity in areas where Council has direct oversight and responsibility; through elected councillors and in the workplace.

Development and delivery of the WCAP
Creating sustained gender equity is the key principle of the WCAP, with a focus on educating and promoting the reasoning behind, and benefits of, gender equitable approaches, whilst ensuring that formal structures and mechanisms are in place to support changes to traditional practices.

Activities will be delivered in partnership with elected Council representatives and range of internal and external partners as required.
The Women's Charter Action Plan focus

The WCAP focuses on consolidating many of the strategic initiatives that Council currently undertakes, in addition to identifying new activities that support Council in delivering on the principles associated with the Local Government Women's Charter which are:

**GENE EQUITY**
That women and men have an equal right to be representatives in local governments, committees and decision-making positions.

**DIVERSITY**
The inclusion of different experiences and perspectives in local governments and community decision-making strengthens local democratic governance and helps build cohesive communities. Councils and communities encourage and welcome the participation of all women.

**ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP**
Local governments work with the community to increase the numbers and participation of women in public life, so that decision-making more clearly represents and reflects the interests and varied demographics of communities.

Measuring success

This action plan will be reviewed annually, to ensure its relevance and to respond to the changing needs of the Bayside community.

The progress of activities of the WCAP will be monitored through the separate WCAP Evaluation Plan and will be reported to Council on an annual basis.

---

How to read the Action Plan

**Focus Area:** The specific area of focus outlined in the Local Government Best Practice Guide.

**Actions:** Actions outlined in the Local Government Best Practice Guide.

**Bayside Activity:** the activities that Council and/or partners will undertake to achieve the Local Government Best Practice Guide actions.

**Bayside Activity Overview:** A detailed description of the Bayside Activities that Council and/or partners will undertake to achieve the Local Government Best Practice Guide actions.

**Delivery Timeframe:** The estimated completion date for each action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Brighton Story Pod project is part of a larger partnership with five local</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government areas of the Southern Metropolitan Primary Care Partnership (SMPCP)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catchment area. The project documents and shares stories of people’s everyday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences of challenging the drivers of family violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Days of activism Against Gender-Based Violence is a global campaign</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedicated to raising awareness about the impact of violence, particularly on</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women. 26 Bayside Cafés participated in the 2018 campaign that focused on the</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate actions people can take to challenge the drivers of violence</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against women.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of the number of businesses who engage in activities related to the</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Days of Activism campaign, in addition to the number of social media posts</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated to the campaign in the South East Region.</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 2.1: Leadership Development for Councillors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training in gender equity, unconscious bias and bystander training added into</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in gender equity, unconscious bias and bystander training added into</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>induction and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 2.2: Councillor Candidates

### Reach out to and support potential women candidates - Action 2.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women in Local Democracy Campaign</td>
<td>Opportunities are to be provided to encourage women in the community to be involved in local government, particularly to provide gender diversity for the elected Council. To assist in this process two information sessions for women will be conducted to highlight the benefits of being involved in local democracy and give greater insight into local government.</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing Faces Project: Councillor and Community focus</td>
<td>Bayside will encourage female participation in politics through its Changing Faces: Reframing Women in Local Democracy project. This project aims to raise community awareness of leadership opportunities by replacing the portraits of male Mayors in Council Chambers with portraits of women and girls in Bayside.</td>
<td>October 2019 - Feb 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Celebrate women leaders - Action 2.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women in Democracy Events: Community focus</td>
<td>Host various events celebrating women leaders with keynote speakers providing insights into their personal journey.</td>
<td>May 2019 Completed May 2020 May 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 2.3: Culture and Policies (Council)

### Emulate best practice support for family friendly cultures - Action 2.3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Councillor Support Policy: Councillor focus</td>
<td>Review the Councillor Support Policy to encapsulate family friendly cultures</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emulate best practice in CEO recruitment and performance management - Action 2.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update CEO Employee Matters Committee Charter: Councillor focus</td>
<td>Include gender equity targets in the CEO Employment Matters Committee Charter targeting female candidates</td>
<td>March 2019 Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measure gender equity in Council policies - Action 2.3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a Gender Checklist for policy</td>
<td>Develop a Gender Checklist to be used ongoing as a guide when creating policies and procedures.</td>
<td>July 2018 Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 2.4: Advocacy and Promotion

#### Lead as an organisational and community advocate for gender equity - Action 2.4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase participation of women on club boards across the municipality-Community focus</td>
<td>Club’s to attract and retain 40% representation of women on sports club committees.</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate achievements of women - Action 2.4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Women’s Day Event-Organisational focus</td>
<td>International Women’s Day event to be included as an annual event each year</td>
<td>March 2019 &lt;br&gt;Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop in internal program for recognising women leaders within the organisation-Organisational focus</td>
<td>Nominate women for the IPAA Top 50 Women Awards &lt;br&gt;The IPAA awards recognise established and emerging female leaders in the Public Sector and aim to: &lt;br&gt;• raise the profile of exceptional leaders; &lt;br&gt;• provide a platform of support and encouragement to other women; &lt;br&gt;• highlight their significant work; and &lt;br&gt;• create role models across the public sector in Victoria</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 3.1: Workplace Training and Education

#### Integrate training in gender equity into professional development - Action 3.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Gender Equity training-Organisational focus</td>
<td>Compulsory supervisor training on family violence and gender issues is to be conducted by WHSE. This training complements the voluntary all-staff and community volunteer training.</td>
<td>March 2019 &lt;br&gt;Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Gender Equity Training-Organisational focus</td>
<td>Online gender equity training rolled out to all staff and part of induction e-learning</td>
<td>November 2018- &lt;br&gt;Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 3.2: Recruitment in Local Government

**Integrate gender equity into recruitment practices, set targets and measure progress - Action 3.2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce quota for Gender Equity in leadership positions:</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce quota for Senior Leadership positions (SLT). Quota to be 40% female,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% male and the remaining 20% can be either.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update recruitment practices and support to have a focus on gender equity-</td>
<td>November 2018 - toolkit implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational focus</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Recruitment Policy &amp; Procedure, build a tool kit with a focus on</td>
<td>July 2019 - leadership engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting gender neutral practices, educate, engage leadership in</td>
<td>and education undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation around gender equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 3.3: Organisation Culture and Policies

**Emulate best practice in organisational culture - Action 3.3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Ribbon Accreditation - Organisational focus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Ribbon Accreditation has been achieved and will be maintained on an</td>
<td>Completed and Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual basis</td>
<td>Ongoing Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Flexibility Policy - Organisational focus:</td>
<td>October 2018 Completed and Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Workplace Flexibility Policy and Procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence Leave provisions - Organisational focus:</td>
<td>July 2018 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence leave provisions are included in the Bayside City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Agreement 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Gender Equity Policy and inclusion of Gender Equity</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of a Gender Equity Policy and the inclusion of Gender Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statements into other relevant policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
considerations into other relevant policies - Organisation focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship Program - Organisation focus</td>
<td>Partner with WHISE to deliver a mentorship program that builds gender equity family violence knowledge, skill and capability. Council to partner with the City of Casey as a mentee, meeting monthly.</td>
<td>March 2019 Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 3.4: Leadership Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bayside Activity</th>
<th>Activity Overview</th>
<th>Delivery Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women in Leadership Programs - External Organisational focus</td>
<td>Promote and enable females to attend external women in leadership programs, inclusive of conferences, short-course and long course (6-9 months) development programs</td>
<td>Completed Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Women in Leadership Program - Organisational focus</td>
<td>Design and develop a sector-leading internal ‘Women in Leadership’ program focused on developing current and future leaders within the organisation</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Government Best Practice Guide Focus Area 3.5: Internal Reporting on Gender Equity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set targets and measure progress - Action 3.5.1</th>
<th>People &amp; Capability Quarterly Reporting on gender specific metrics</th>
<th>Completed Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Reporting - Organisational focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is for Council to determine an in-principle position on the electoral representation for Bayside City Council (BCC) in the Electoral Representation Review (ERR) being conducted by the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC).

The Minister for Local Government has given notice that electoral representation reviews for 20 councils must be completed by October 2019 and implemented for the October 2020 elections. Bayside is one of the 20 councils.

The Local Government Act 1989 requires the VEC to review each council before every third general election. Representation reviews occur approximately every 12 years, and the last review for BCC was in 2008. Following the 2008 review, the CEC’s recommendation to the Minister was for BCC to have multi-member wards with 7 Councillors.

The VEC commenced the ERR for Bayside on 19 June 2019, calling for preliminary submissions. A representation review ensures that the electoral structure of a local council provides a fair and equitable representation for all voters. An ERR considers the following:

- Whether a local council has the appropriate number of councillors;
- Whether the local council should be unsubdivided, with Councillors elected from the whole local council, or subdivided into wards; and
- If subdivided, the number of wards, ward boundaries and the number of Councillors per ward.

When the review is completed, the VEC makes a final recommendation to the Minister for Local Government. Any changes to the electoral structure of the council then apply at the next general election.

The ERR will determine the number of wards, the ward boundaries, ward names and the number of councillors for Bayside in time for the Council elections scheduled for October 2020.

Key issues

Summary of the 2008 Review

The last ERR for Bayside took place in 2008. Prior to the review Bayside had nine Councillors elected from nine single-councillor wards.

As a result of the review the VEC’s final recommendation was for Bayside to have three multi-member wards consisting of 7 councillors. The VEC’s recommendation was based on the following considerations:

- In terms of voter numbers, Bayside was the fourth smallest metropolitan municipality;
- Seven councillors is consistent with other similar sized councils;
• There were no special factors identified at Bayside that warranted an increase in the number of Councillors;

• Bayside has limited projected population growth and a small area compared to other metropolitan municipalities;

Current representation

The current electoral structure for Bayside based on seven councillors elected from 3 multi-member wards provided an average of 9,672 voters per elected representative. This was well below the metropolitan average of voters per councillor based at around 11,800 voters.

Since 2008, the municipality’s population has increased and voters have increased. As at May 2019 the current number of voters enrolled in Bayside is 78,937 which equates to 11,276 voters per council based on the current model of seven councillors. This is still below the metropolitan average, and therefore the existing model of seven Councillors is considered appropriate.

However, based upon the analysis of increased voters, the current boundaries Bayside will require extensive changes to ensure compliance with the Local Government Act 1989. To do so, officers will undertake a mapping exercise via the VEC to determine more appropriate ward boundaries that provides a more fair and equitable distribution of voters across the municipality.

When identifying changes to internal ward boundaries, consideration must be given to common interests of concern, sense of identity of local areas, physical barriers and a general sense of connection with a particular area. All of these will be considered when analysing internal boundaries as part of a submission.

Review Timeframe

The VEC has commenced the review process on 19 June 2019, and as shown below it is a very tight timeframe to lodge a preliminary submission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary submissions open</td>
<td>Wednesday 19 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Session</td>
<td>Monday 17 June at the Bayside City Council Corporate Centre 7.00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary submissions close</td>
<td>5.00pm Wednesday 17 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary report released</td>
<td>Wednesday 14 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response submissions close</td>
<td>5.00pm Wednesday 11 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
<td>7.00pm Monday 16 September 2019 at the Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report released</td>
<td>Wednesday 9 October 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to commence the submission process it is proposed to seek Council’s in-principle support for a multi-member ward structure based on 7 councillors as the most suitable structure for effective representation of constituents.

The submission is required to be lodged prior to the July 2019 Ordinary Meeting.
Recommendation

That Council:

1. Resolves to give in-principle support to a multi-ward electoral structure based on seven councillors for Bayside City Council.

2. Lodges a preliminary submission to the Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) as part of the preliminary submission stage of the electoral representation review for Bayside City Council.

Support Attachments

1. Local Council Representation Review - Submission Guide - May 2019 ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The ERR provides the citizens of Bayside with the opportunity to shape the electoral representation for Bayside city Council for the next 12 years.

Natural Environment
There are no natural environment implications associated with this report.

Built Environment
There are no built environment implications associated with this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Much of the information to be provided to the Bayside community on the ERR process will be delivered by the VEC. The VEC has produced a Local Council Representation Review Submission Guide for Bayside City Council. A copy of the guide is attached to this report. The guide outlines the review process and the opportunities for public input, and provides important information about the issues that submissions may address. It also includes specific information about Bayside and sample submissions to help the community prepare their own submission.

Human Rights
There are no implications for rights prescribed in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities anticipated to flow directly as a consequence of this report.

Legal
The Local Government Act 1989 provides that Councillors do not have a conflict of interest in regard to a submission to an electoral representation review, and therefore individual councillors may wish to submit a submission on their own behalf.

Finance
The VEC has advised that the anticipated cost of the ERR is approximately $50,000. This cost has been provided for in the 2019/20 Council Budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The ERR will determine the electoral structure of Bayside for the next 12 years. The electoral structure is fundamental to the future development of a Council Plan to ensure good governance is open transparent, accountable and a fair and equitable decision making process.
Item 10.6 – Reports by the Organisation
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About this guide

This guide contains important information about local council representation and the review process that will help you to make a submission.

This guide should be read in conjunction with the relevant council fact sheet located on the VEC website at vec.vic.gov.au. Direct links are available on the page 4 of this guide.
One vote, one value: why the review matters

The Victorian Electoral Commission (VEC) is committed to the principle of 'one vote, one value', which is enshrined in the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act). This means that every person's vote counts equally. The VEC must undertake a representation review for each local council about every 12 years. Unscheduled reviews can also take place when required.

Representation reviews are an important part of democracy. They aim to ensure that all voters in a local council are fairly and equitably represented. Each local council representation review examines:

- the number of councillors
- whether the electoral structure of the local council should be subdivided into wards or unsubdivided
- if subdivided:
  - the number of wards
  - what the ward boundaries should be
  - the name of each ward
  - how many councillors should be elected for each ward.

Input from members of the public is a valued part of the review process. There are three main opportunities for you to have your say:

1. in a preliminary public submission
2. in a response submission to the preliminary report
3. if you have requested to speak in your response submission, at a public hearing to be held in your local area.

At the end of each review, the VEC submits a final report to the Minister for Local Government with a recommended electoral structure for the local council under review.
Local Council Representation Review - Submission Guide

How recommendations are formed

The VEC is an impartial statutory authority and conducts the representation reviews independently of councils and the State Government.

The VEC’s recommendation is not based on a ‘straw poll’ of the number of submissions supporting a particular option, but holistically takes into account:

- internal research specifically relating to the local council under review, including analysis of statistics collected by the Australian Bureau of Statistics
- the VEC’s experience conducting previous electoral representation reviews of local councils and contributing to redivisions of state electoral districts
- the VEC’s expertise in spatial analysis, demography and local government elections
- careful consideration of all input from the public in written and verbal submissions received during the review
- advice from consultants with extensive experience in local government administration.

Limitations of the review

A representation review cannot deal with the external boundaries of a local council or decide whether a local council should be divided or amalgamated with other local councils.
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Current reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Commencement</th>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Website address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaspe Shire Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Campasperr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Swanhillrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Dandenong City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Dandenongrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Kingstonrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June 2019</td>
<td>Banyule City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Banyuler.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darebin City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Darebinrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2019</td>
<td>Manningham City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Manninghamrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maroondah City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Maroondahrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murrindindi Shire Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Murrindindrr.html</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitehorse City Council</td>
<td>vec.vic.gov.au/reviews/Whitehorser.html</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of submissions

Any person or group, including a council itself, can make a submission to the VEC.

Submissions must be written and can include a map. The VEC accepts submissions at two stages of the review process:

Stage one: preliminary submissions
Preliminary submissions should address the number of councillors and the electoral structure of the local council.

Mapping submissions using Boundary Builder
The online submission form on the VEC website also includes a mapping tool called Boundary Builder during the preliminary stage. Using the tool, people can create and test their preferred electoral structures and boundaries for the local council with calculations based on current voter numbers. The map created with this tool can be included as part of an online submission.

Stage two: response submissions
Response submissions must address the options proposed by the VEC in the preliminary report. Generally, other electoral structures will not be considered at this stage.

Examples of public submissions made in previous reviews can be found in Annex 2 of this guide. However, it is important to note that your submission can be in any format and address any of the relevant issues in the proposed options.

Public hearing
People who make a response submission can also request to speak at a public hearing in support of their submission.

The public hearing is an opportunity for those who have requested to speak to expand on their views. Each speaker is given 10 minutes to address a panel normally comprising of three VEC staff. The panel usually includes a project officer, an external consultant and either the Electoral Commissioner or Deputy Electoral Commissioner. The panel can ask questions, seek clarification and gather further information from the speakers.

Anyone can attend the public hearing, but only those who have requested to speak in their response submission can speak. Participation in the public hearing is encouraged. The VEC can make special arrangements where necessary to assist people to take part in the public hearing. Requests will be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

The hearing will not be held if there are no requests to speak.
How to make a submission

All submissions, including those sent by post, must be received at the VEC by 5.00 pm on the
day of the submission deadline.

Submission methods

Submissions can be made via:

- the VEC website at vec.vic.gov.au
direct links are available on page 4 of this guide
during the preliminary stage, the Boundary Builder tool is also available online

- email
  refer to the council fact sheet for the council specific email address

- post to:
  Victorian Electoral Commission
  Level 11, 530 Collins Street
  Melbourne VIC 3000

Required information

For your submission to be considered you must include your:

- full name
- postal or residential address.

All submissions will be published on the VEC website at vec.vic.gov.au and made available for
public inspection at the VEC office (Level 11, 530 Collins Street, Melbourne). The VEC will
remove personal information such as address, contact details, and signature from all public
copies. However, the full name and locality of submitters will be published.

Submission Checklist

A submission checklist is included on page 15 of this submission guide and on each council fact
sheet.
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**Issues to consider in your submission**

Your submission may address one or both of the following:

- the number of councillors (between five and 12)
- the electoral structure of the council (subdivided or unsubdivided).

You may make a submission in support of the current number of councillors and/or electoral structure or in support of a different number of councillors and/or electoral structure. It is important that your submission provides reasons for your preferences.

This section provides an overview of issues for you to consider before making your submission.

**Number of councillors**

When making a submission about the number of councillors, there are three important guidelines that you need to keep in mind. These are:

1. **The number of councillors must be between five and 12.**

   The Act prescribes that a local council must have between five and 12 councillors.

2. **A consistent, State-wide approach must be taken to the total number of councillors.**

   As the number of voters in each local council varies significantly, and as populations change over time, the VEC is guided by its comparisons with local councils of a similar size and category (Metropolitan Melbourne; Interface; Regional Centres; and Country Victoria). Local councils that have a larger number of voters generally have a higher number of councillors. Please see the tables in Appendix 1 for information used for this comparison on each local council in Victoria.

   The VEC also considers any special circumstances that may warrant the local council having more or fewer councillors than similar local councils. These might include:

   - the nature and complexity of services provided by the Council
   - geographic size and topography
   - population growth or decline
   - the social diversity of the local council, including:
     - cultural and linguistic diversity
     - socio-economic disparities
     - the number of non-residents
     - the number of communities of interest (see ‘Communities of interest’).
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3. The number of voters represented by each councillor must be fair and equitable across the local council.

If the local council is divided into wards, the number of voters represented by each councillor must be within plus-or-minus 10% of the average number of voters per councillor across the local council. This is required by the Act and ensures the principle of 'one vote, one value'.

**EXAMPLE 1:**

A subdivided local council has 100,000 people eligible to vote and a total of 10 councillors. The ward boundaries for this local council should be structured to ensure that each councillor represents the equivalent number of voters, approximately 10,000 (plus-or-minus 10%).

**EXAMPLE 2:**

A local council is subdivided into two wards, with 21,000 people eligible to vote and a total of seven councillors. Ward A has a voting population of 12,000 and Ward B has a voting population of 9,000. On this basis, Ward A should have four councillors, and Ward B should have three councillors. Each councillor then represents the equivalent number of voters (3,000).

The VEC also takes into account likely population changes to ensure ward boundaries provide equitable representation until the next review (reviews take place approximately every 12 years).

The population forecast for each local council under review is provided in the council fact sheet on the VEC website at vec.vic.gov.au. Direct links are available on page 4 of this guide.
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Electoral structure of the local council

Your submission may also address the electoral structure of the local council, which can be:

- **unsubdivided**, with all councillors elected 'at large' by all the voters in the local council, or

- **subdivided into wards**, with one or more councillors elected by the voters in each ward.

  If the local council is subdivided, your submission may also address:
  - the number of wards
  - where the ward boundaries should be placed
  - the name of each ward
  - how many councillors should be elected for each ward.

This section provides information about the potential advantages and disadvantages of each electoral structure as the VEC has heard from communities through these reviews.

### Unsubdivided councils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential advantages</th>
<th>Potential disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes the concept of a council-wide focus with councillors being elected by, and concerned for, the local council as a whole, rather than parochial interests.</td>
<td>May lead to significant communities of interest and points of view being unrepresented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives residents and ratepayers a choice of councillors to approach with their concerns.</td>
<td>May lead to confusion of responsibilities and duplication of effort on the part of councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each voter has the opportunity to express a preference for every candidate for the Council election.</td>
<td>Large numbers of candidates might be confusing for voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removes the need to define internal ward boundaries.</td>
<td>May lead to councillors being relatively inaccessible for residents in parts of the local council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a councillor resigns or is unable to complete their term, a replacement councillor is elected through a countback system, negating the need for a by-election.</td>
<td>May be difficult for voters to assess the performance of individual councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If only a few candidates contest the general election, the countback system may elect a candidate who only polled a small percentage of the vote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Subdivided councils**

There are three ways to divide a council into wards:

- single-councillor wards with one councillor representing each ward
- multi-councillor wards with several councillors representing each ward
- combinations of the two.

---

**Single-councillor wards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential advantages</th>
<th>Potential disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors are more likely to be truly local representatives, easily accessible to residents and aware of local issues.</td>
<td>Councillors may be elected on minor or parochial issues and lack a council-wide perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major geographical communities of interest are likely to be represented.</td>
<td>Ward boundaries may divide communities of interest and may be difficult to define.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voters may have a restricted choice of candidates in elections for individual wards.

Small populations in each ward may make ward boundaries more susceptible to change as a result of population growth or decline.

Where major groups support candidates in multiple wards, it is possible that one group can dominate the council.
Multi-councillor wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential advantages</th>
<th>Potential disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can accommodate a large community of interest.</td>
<td>Groups may form within the council leading to possible division between councillors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on issues may be broader than in single-councillor wards (though councillors may have a more local focus than in an unsubdivided local council).</td>
<td>Very specific local issues may not be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors may be more accessible than in an unsubdivided local council. Electors have a choice of councillors.</td>
<td>In very large wards, councillors may not be accessible for residents in parts of the ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillors may share workloads more effectively.</td>
<td>Duplication may occur if councillors do not communicate or share their workloads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward boundaries should be easy to identify and less susceptible to change as a result of population growth or decline than in single councillor wards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A combination of multi-councillor and single-councillor wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential advantages</th>
<th>Potential disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A large community of interest can be included within a multi-councillor ward and a smaller community of interest can be included within a single-councillor ward. This structure accommodates differences in population across a local council, and allows small communities to be separately represented.</td>
<td>Electors in single-councillor wards may feel under-represented because they only have one councillor, leading to a perception of unfairness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear ward boundaries are more likely.</td>
<td>Different vote counting systems within the same local council may seem inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different quotes would be required to elect councillors in multi-councillor and single-councillor wards, leading to a perception of inequality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electoral structures and vote counting

According to law, the structure of the council determines the vote counting system. You may wish to consider the impact of these counting systems in making your submission.

In single-councillor wards, the preferential system applies, which means a candidate must achieve an absolute majority (50% plus one) of the formal votes to be elected, otherwise the outcome will be determined based on preferences.

In multi-councillor wards or in unsubdivided local councils, proportional representation applies, and candidates are elected in proportion to their support within the electorate. The required quota of votes is reached by dividing the total number of formal votes by the number of vacancies plus one. Therefore, unlike the preferential vote counting system where only the candidate with the majority of votes is elected, other candidates representing groups or issues that have significant minority support may also be elected.

EXAMPLE:

An unsubdivided local council has seven councillor positions and therefore uses proportional representation. In this local council, any candidate achieving greater than 12.5% of the vote will be elected.

Visit the VEC website at vec.vic.gov.au/Elections/CountingTheVotes.html for more detailed information on the preferential and proportional counting systems.
Communities of interest
Communities of interest are groups of people who share a range of common concerns or aspirations. They are different from ‘interest groups’ or ‘pressure groups’ that identify themselves based on a limited number of issues.

Communities of interest may occur where people are linked to each other geographically (for example, a town or valley) or economically (for example, people working in similar or mutually-dependent industries). Communities of interest may also appear where people share a number of special needs because of similar circumstances, such as newly arrived migrants (who may not have strong English language skills and require assistance with housing and finding employment); particular language or cultural groups; retirees; families or job seekers.

Communities of interest are an important consideration in electoral representation reviews as they have particular needs from their local council. It is important that communities of interest have the opportunity to be fairly represented by their council. There are a number of ways to take account of communities of interest, depending on how they are distributed geographically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If a community of interest...</th>
<th>Then fair representation may be achieved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is in the same geographic area</td>
<td>creating a ward with boundaries reflecting that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for example, a town)</td>
<td>community of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is widespread across the local</td>
<td>creating multi-councillor wards with proportional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>council (for example, job seekers)</td>
<td>representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is one of a number of small</td>
<td>combining the communities of interest via an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities of interest</td>
<td>unsubdivided structure, so that any elected councillor would be responsible to all of these groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ward boundaries

Ward boundaries must ensure that the statutory equality requirement is met. This means the number of voters represented by each councillor must be plus-or-minus 10% of the average number of voters per councillor across the local council.

Because representation reviews are scheduled approximately every 12 years, population growth areas often need to be spread across a number of wards to ensure that the voter-councillor ratios remain acceptable during this time. Fewer wards mean a larger average number of voters per ward and a greater tolerance to population changes.

Boundaries should always take into account communities of interest and follow clear lines (major roads, rivers, significant landmarks and existing locality boundaries) where possible.

If you make a preliminary submission online, you can use the Boundary Builder tool to build your preferred ward boundaries. The tool uses current voter numbers to calculate the deviations from the average number of voters per councillor of each of the wards you make. This means you can make sure your proposed electoral structure meets the requirements of the Act.

Ward names

Ward names are not the focus of the representation review, but they can play an important role in identifying and relating to wards in a subdivided electoral structure.

The VEC welcomes suggestions for ward names. The names must be relevant and specific to the ward to avoid any possible confusion with other wards. Some popular approaches include using:

- place names
- compass directions
- historic buildings
- natural features present in the ward
- names of pioneers and former prominent citizens
- Aboriginal names
- native flora or fauna.

If the community prefers alternative ward names to the current or new names suggested by the VEC, the Act allows ward names to be altered by an Order in Council.
**Submission checklist**

Use this checklist to help make your submission:

### Required information

- Have you included your full name and address?
- Do you understand that your submission will be made public, including your full name and locality?

### Preliminary Submissions

- **If you are making a submission about the number of councillors (see page 7)**
  - Does your submission suggest a number of councillors between five and 12?
  - If the number of councillors you have suggested varies significantly from numbers in similar local councils, have you explained why?

- **If you are making a submission about the electoral structure (see page 9)**
  - Have you indicated whether you want the local council to be subdivided or unsubdivided?
  - Have you explained why your preferred structure would best suit the local council?

- **If you think that the local council should be subdivided into wards (see page 10)**
  - Have you indicated whether you want single-councillor wards, multi-councillor wards or a combination of both?
  - Have you indicated where the ward boundaries should be located and provided reasons for these proposed boundaries?
  - Have you considered the number of voters in the proposed wards?
  - If you have suggested ward names, have you given reasons for those names?

### Response Submission

- Does your submission address the options recommended in the preliminary report?
- Have you indicated whether or not you would like to speak about your submission at the public hearing?
Appendix 1: Electoral structures of all Victorian councils

The tables below are sorted by current estimates of voters in descending order for each category (Metropolitan Melbourne; Interface; Regional Centres; and Country Victoria).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km2)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brimbank City</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>194,319</td>
<td>127,517</td>
<td>135,931</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,357</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroondara City</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>167,231</td>
<td>125,742</td>
<td>133,357</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,355</td>
<td>10 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland City</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>162,558</td>
<td>109,744</td>
<td>132,790</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12,071</td>
<td>1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 four-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash City</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>182,618</td>
<td>120,779</td>
<td>123,696</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,245</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston City</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>151,389</td>
<td>105,316</td>
<td>122,333</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,592</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne City</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>135,950</td>
<td>104,929</td>
<td>119,595</td>
<td>9^</td>
<td>13,288</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox City</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>154,110</td>
<td>116,335</td>
<td>118,678</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,186</td>
<td>9 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehorse City</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>162,078</td>
<td>111,384</td>
<td>117,705</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,770</td>
<td>5 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darebin City</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146,719</td>
<td>96,334</td>
<td>117,201</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston City</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>134,143</td>
<td>95,979</td>
<td>109,662</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,184</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019-20.

^ Councillors other than the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor.
## Metropolitan Melbourne continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen Eira City</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>140,875</td>
<td>97,582</td>
<td>106,440</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Dandenong City *</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>152,050</td>
<td>93,970</td>
<td>101,846</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,258</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward 3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyule City *</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>121,865</td>
<td>90,094</td>
<td>99,158</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14,165</td>
<td>7 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Valley City</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>116,671</td>
<td>88,394</td>
<td>94,682</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,520</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonnington City</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>103,832</td>
<td>77,494</td>
<td>93,754</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,417</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Phillip City</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100,863</td>
<td>85,439</td>
<td>93,106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,345</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham City *</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>116,255</td>
<td>85,748</td>
<td>89,624</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,958</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroondah City *</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>110,376</td>
<td>77,739</td>
<td>87,817</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,757</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra City</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86,657</td>
<td>65,512</td>
<td>81,669</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside City *</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97,087</td>
<td>67,702</td>
<td>78,937</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11,277</td>
<td>2 two-councillor wards 1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobsons Bay City</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88,778</td>
<td>63,363</td>
<td>69,683</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,954</td>
<td>2 two-councillor wards 1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong City</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82,288</td>
<td>52,543</td>
<td>65,202</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,314</td>
<td>2 two-councillor wards 1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019–20.
## Local Council Representation Review - Submission Guide

### Interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casey City *</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>299,301</td>
<td>165,057</td>
<td>212,291</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,299</td>
<td>1 single-councillor ward 5 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mornington Peninsula Shire</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>154,999</td>
<td>153,332</td>
<td>161,497</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14,681</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards 1 two-councillor ward 2 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham City</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>217,122</td>
<td>104,278</td>
<td>151,786</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,788</td>
<td>1 three-councillor ward 2 four-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittlesea City *</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>197,491</td>
<td>110,011</td>
<td>148,487</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,498</td>
<td>1 three-councillor ward 2 four-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume City</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>197,376</td>
<td>112,157</td>
<td>144,959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,178</td>
<td>1 three-councillor ward 2 four-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarra Ranges Shire</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td>149,537</td>
<td>113,596</td>
<td>118,812</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13,201</td>
<td>9 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton Shire</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>135,443</td>
<td>85,682</td>
<td>99,690</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,076</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward 1 three-councillor ward 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinia Shire *</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>94,128</td>
<td>53,794</td>
<td>77,196</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward 1 three-councillor ward 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nillumbik Shire *</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>61,273</td>
<td>45,659</td>
<td>48,969</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,995</td>
<td>7 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Shire *</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>40,918</td>
<td>29,817</td>
<td>33,781</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019–20.
## Regional Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Geelong City</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>233,429</td>
<td>188,585</td>
<td>200,616</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18,237</td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward, 3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Bendigo City</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>110,477</td>
<td>78,399</td>
<td>91,665</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10,185</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat City</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>101,686</td>
<td>77,625</td>
<td>84,783</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>73,257</td>
<td>53,817</td>
<td>58,849</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>1 single-councillor ward, 2 two-councillor wards, 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Shepparton City</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>63,837</td>
<td>44,701</td>
<td>48,359</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildura Rural City</td>
<td>22,330</td>
<td>53,878</td>
<td>39,443</td>
<td>41,305</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wodonga City</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>39,351</td>
<td>29,002</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warangaloo City</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33,655</td>
<td>26,116</td>
<td>27,497</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangaratta Rural City</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>28,310</td>
<td>22,094</td>
<td>23,168</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards, 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsham Rural City</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>19,642</td>
<td>16,048</td>
<td>16,454</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benalla Rural City *</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>13,861</td>
<td>10,934</td>
<td>12,131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ararat Rural City *</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>9,141</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019-20.
### Country Victoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass Coast Shire</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>32,804</td>
<td>42,592</td>
<td>46,280</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,142</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Shire</td>
<td>10,989</td>
<td>42,983</td>
<td>42,355</td>
<td>43,171</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gippsland Shire *</td>
<td>20,931</td>
<td>45,040</td>
<td>38,318</td>
<td>43,123</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baw Baw Shire</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>48,479</td>
<td>37,654</td>
<td>42,184</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedon Ranges Shire</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>46,100</td>
<td>33,175</td>
<td>38,413</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Coast Shire</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>29,397</td>
<td>29,535</td>
<td>34,547</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>1 single-councillor ward, 2 two-councillor wards, 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaspe Shire *</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>37,061</td>
<td>28,118</td>
<td>31,345</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards, 2 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gippsland Shire</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>28,703</td>
<td>27,654</td>
<td>29,505</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>3 three-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorabool Shire</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>31,818</td>
<td>21,487</td>
<td>27,856</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,979</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards, 1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira Shire *</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>29,112</td>
<td>22,307</td>
<td>25,086</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,787</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colac Otway Shire *</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>20,972</td>
<td>19,198</td>
<td>20,750</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Plains Shire *</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>21,688</td>
<td>14,228</td>
<td>18,567</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenelg Shire *</td>
<td>6,212</td>
<td>19,557</td>
<td>16,333</td>
<td>17,570</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Alexander Shire</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>18,761</td>
<td>15,411</td>
<td>16,826</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>4 single-councillor wards, 1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019–20.
### Country Victoria continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Number of voters at last review</th>
<th>Current estimate of voters</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Number of voters per councillor</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepburn Shire *</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>15,330</td>
<td>13,649</td>
<td>15,727</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Hill Rural City *</td>
<td>6,117</td>
<td>29,584</td>
<td>14,386</td>
<td>14,915</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrindindi Shire *</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>13,732</td>
<td>13,727</td>
<td>14,685</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>7 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyne Shire *</td>
<td>5,478</td>
<td>16,495</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo Shire</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>15,952</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>13,725</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corangamite Shire</td>
<td>4,407</td>
<td>18,051</td>
<td>13,397</td>
<td>13,584</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>4 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Grampians Shire*</td>
<td>6,652</td>
<td>15,944</td>
<td>13,151</td>
<td>13,436</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Shire</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>12,337</td>
<td>11,562</td>
<td>11,929</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>Unsubdivided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Goldfields Shire</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>12,995</td>
<td>11,017</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 four-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Grampians Shire*</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>11,439</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>10,882</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>2 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 three-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathbogie Shire</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>10,274</td>
<td>9,268</td>
<td>10,182</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 two-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Shire *</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>8,584</td>
<td>9,429</td>
<td>10,014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>3 single-councillor wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 two-councillor ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019–20.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Council</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Population (2016 Census)</th>
<th>Current number of voters</th>
<th>Current number of councillors</th>
<th>Electoral Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gannawarra Shire</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>10,549</td>
<td>9,031</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Shire</td>
<td>6,694</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>7,619</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrenees Shire</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>7,407</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrambool Shire</td>
<td>7,158</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>6,029</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buloke Shire*</td>
<td>8,064</td>
<td>6,201</td>
<td>6,149</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towong Shire</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>5,885</td>
<td>5,128</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindmarsh Shire</td>
<td>7,527</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>5,013</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenscliff Borough</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wimmera Shire</td>
<td>9,107</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The local council is undergoing an electoral representation review by the VEC during 2019-20.
Appendix 2: Sample submissions

Any person or group can make a submission to the VEC. There are many matters to be considered when determining the electoral structure of a local council and you might like to take all issues into account or just focus on one issue.

The sample submissions below should be considered as examples only to assist you in preparing your own submission. Submissions discussing or proposing ward boundaries can include maps or diagrams, but this is not required. Make sure your submission is limited to the scope of the review and includes reasons for your preferences.

Stage one: preliminary submission samples

Sample 1

The current number of councillors is appropriate for the local council under review, and is sufficient to provide fair and equitable representation for locals. The number of councillors is consistent with comparable regional local councils, and there are no major forecasts in population growth or increased communities of interest that would justify more councillors.

In terms of electoral structure, I strongly support the continuation of the unsubdivided structure. In 2004, before the Council was unsubdivided, there were seven single-member wards. One of the key issues with this structure was a tendency toward there not being a whole-of-Shire development agenda. Having five councillors who look after the needs of the entire Shire has greatly improved strategic planning and development for all areas of the Shire.

Sample 2

The council currently has five councillors, which is not enough to serve the current population—increasing to seven councillors would be more representative. Similarly, an electoral structure that includes multi-wards or is unsubdivided would allow for greater representation for the public. The current structure comprises five single-councillor wards. My experience has been that when a councillor is overworked or not interested in an issue, going to a councillor outside the ward is the only option.
Local Council Representation Review - Submission Guide

Stage two: response submission samples

Sample 1

I support the preferred option outlined in the preliminary report that recommends increasing the number of councillors from seven to nine, and changes the electoral structure to include three wards, each with three councillors. This electoral structure reflects the growing population of the council area, and the three wards will ensure that all voters are fairly represented in the electorate. I don't wish to propose ward name changes. I don't wish to speak at the public hearing.

Sample 2

I do not agree with the preferred option outlined in the preliminary report, which recommends creating two two-councillor wards and one three-councillor ward—rather than the current seven single-councillor wards. I believe this does not accurately reflect the communities of interest in the council area, which are determined largely by location. Each ward represents a unique part of the council area and voters know which councillor to go to. I believe this would be lost under the proposed structure. I would like to speak at the public hearing in support of my submission.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to respond to Council’s resolution on 19 March 2019 to report on the merits of the introduction of a local law banning the use of single-use plastics, similar to the Hobart City Council model.

In response to the Notice of Motion – 277 – Single-Use Plastics Associated with Council Premises presented at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 19 March 2019 Council resolved to:

1. **Implement a combination of:** community education; enhanced environmental conditions in relevant policy, tenders, contracts, leases and guidelines; and raising community awareness regarding the reduction of single-use plastics;

2. **Commit to reduce to zero single-use plastics within the Bayside Corporate Centre and Libraries by the end of 2018/19 financial year and other Council-owned properties (i.e.: community centres, senior citizen centres and other community-leased premises) by the end of financial year 2019/20;**

3. **Note that an amount of $10,000 from the existing operational budget allocations will be re-prioritised to assist Council-owned property community lessees, and corporate centre and libraries to introduce this environmental initiative;**

4. **Issue a media release on this environmental initiative and circulate the media release to all local schools for inclusion in their newsletter to provide awareness for students;**

5. **Receive a report at the June 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council on the merits of the introduction of a local law banning the single-use of plastic similar to the Hobart City Council model; and**

6. **Bring this environmental initiative to the attention of the Association of Bayside Municipalities to encourage other member councils to introduce similar initiatives.**

Key issues

**Why would Council introduce a Local Law banning single use plastics?**

Plastic items that are not disposed to landfill or recycled typically end up as litter. These items do not break down completely and can have devastating effects on wildlife including marine birds and mammals, shellfish and fish. Plastic packaging and materials also contain plastic resin pellets (nurdles), and chemical plasticisers (phthalates) that are known to be hazardous to human health and wildlife.

Council is the custodian of 17km of Port Phillip Bay foreshore. While litter collection is an important action to mitigate the risk of marine pollution, addressing the root cause by reducing the volume of single-use plastics that are purchased, used and incorrectly disposed is a more effective solution.
Local Law Process

Council must comply with the statutory process to introduce a Local Law. The preparation and introduction of a new Local Law to control single-use plastics, or the addition of a new clause, is an extensive and costly process. It includes:

- Informing community on the intent to commence the preparation of a Local Law;
- Developing a community impact statement to assist the community in understanding the proposed Local Law and its intent;
- Establishing a robust engagement process to involve affected parties including public notice, seeking submissions;
- Hearing and considering submissions;
- Reviewing and final drafting of the Local Law;
- Presenting a report to Council for adoption; and
- Implementing and enforcing Local Law.

Council has not allocated resources for the preparation of a Local Law to address this issue in 2019/20.

Council’s current Local Law, Local Law No.1, is due to sunset in April 2022 and its review will commence in late 2020. The preparation and introduction of a new Local Law relating to single-use plastics could be incorporated into the review of the Local Law No.1.

Introduction of a Single-Use Plastics By-Law by Hobart City Council

Hobart City Council proposed its ‘Single-Use Plastics’ by-law in March 2019, and is currently going through a process to ban the use of single-use plastics in retail food businesses. The by-law is proposed to come into force on 1 July 2020.

Under the definition in the by-law, ‘Single-use plastics’ include: plastic cutlery; cups and cup lids; stirrers and straws; sauce sachets and packets; take away hot food containers and lids.

The by-law only applies to businesses that provide or sell food in packaging that can be taken from the premises and consumed.

The by-law will encourage retailers to replace current single-use plastic containers which are smaller than one litre (1L) in volume or an area equivalent to A4 (210 mm by 297 mm) in size. All packaging larger than these dimensions is excluded.

A retailer must not provide to a person any food packaging which is:

(a) wholly or partly comprised of plastic; and
(b) a single-use product.

The penalty for infringement is 2 penalty units.

The by-law does not apply where a retailer provides or sells food in food packaging where:
(a) the food will be consumed at the retailer’s premises; and (b) no food packaging is taken from the retailer’s premises.

The by-law also does not apply to food packaging which has been certified, by the Australasian Bioplastics Association as complying under standards for compostable plastics.

The next step in the Hobart City Council proposal is to submit the proposed by-law and Regulatory impact Statement to the Director of Local Government (Tasmanian State Government) for consideration. If satisfactory, the Director will certify that the Council may commence with public consultation before formally making the by-law.
Implementation of this by-law will be staged in order to maximise business engagement and understanding and strongly root the culture change required to make the by-law effective. It is envisaged that businesses will have six months to a year after the enactment of the by-law to comply with new packaging requirements.

Hard copy information packs or ‘toolkits’ will be provided to all Hobart food businesses – inclusive of replacement product lists. Additionally, educational information sessions for proprietors will be held and one-on-one advice will be available.

**Why is Hobart City Council introducing this by-law?**

The by-law aims to restrict the use of single use plastic takeaway packaging. This is not an expansion of the statewide plastic bag-ban legislation, but a change aimed at achieving a reduction in use as well as a shift away from use of single-use plastics.

There is considerable public momentum for the reduction in availability of plastic products to reduce environmental impact. Takeaway packaging is a major contributor to the litter stream in Tasmania. Data from the Environmental Protection Authority Tasmania indicates that up to 50% of the litter stream is comprised of paper and plastic takeaway rubbish.

Hobart City Council’s research indicates that a third of Hobart's approximately 300 food and beverage businesses already supply some form of compostable packaging. However, compostable packaging is not considered to be a complete solution to litter. Only some of the compostable takeaway packaging currently on the market breaks down quickly in the environment. Solutions to litter lie in effective campaigns that lead to behavioural change which emphasise an overall reduction in packaging distribution and consumption, increased use of reusable packaging and as a final choice, utilising certified compostable packaging.

The initiative is proposed to help Hobart City Council achieve its goal of zero waste to landfill by 2030.

**What is the Victorian Government doing?**

The Victorian Government has announced that it is banning lightweight plastic shopping bags by the end of 2019. Plastic shopping bags less than 35 microns thick will be banned, including degradable, biodegradable and compostable plastic shopping bags. In the lead up to the ban, consumers and retailers will be educated so there is a smooth transition away from plastic shopping bags.

In 2019, a Plastic Pollution Action Plan is being developed to prioritise the most effective actions to reduce other types of plastic pollution. A reference group made up of government, industry, community and environmental representatives is being established to help inform this plan.

**What is Bayside doing?**

Council is implementing initiatives to eliminate single use plastic from the Corporate Centre and Libraries, by 30 June 2019; and other Council-owned properties (i.e.: community centres, senior citizen centres and other community-leased premises) by the end of financial year 2019/20.
Council is developing an education campaign to reduce single use plastics in Bayside. A new Reducing Plastic Waste webpage has been developed with general tips on reducing single-use plastics (see https://www.bayside.vic.gov.au/reducing-plastic-waste). Media releases and communications to Bayside schools have been developed.

The Council Representative has written to the Association of Bayside Municipalities to encourage other member councils to introduce similar initiatives.

The next step in Council's response to single-use plastics is to consider the control of single-use plastics through a Local Law. It is recommended that the review of Local Law No. 1 include consideration of some form of ban on single-use plastics in Bayside. This would include and be consistent with any statewide action to address single-use plastics.

**Recommendation**

That Council considers the introduction of a new local law to reduce Single-Use Plastics as part of the review of the Bayside Local Law No. 1, scheduled to commence in late 2020.

**Support Attachments**

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The reduction of single-use plastic litter in Bayside streets and on beaches will improve the amenity for the Bayside community and visitors.

Reducing the use of plastic products made from oil, plastic resin pellets (nurdles) and chemical plasticisers (phthalates) will benefit the health of people.

A ‘ban’ should not impose a burden (e.g. a fine) on single-use items like plastic straws that assist individuals with special needs.

The term ‘single-use’ plastic raises a potential communication issue as Council’s provision of biodegradable ‘dog poo collection bags’ could be perceived as provision of single-use plastic bags. Similarly, compostable bin caddy liners provided for kitchen food waste could be perceived as single-use plastic bags. Communication to explain that these plastic items are designed to break down in contained systems needs to be provided by Council.

Natural Environment
The reduction of single-use plastic will enhance protection for local wildlife including marine birds and mammals, shellfish and fish. This will also contribute to minimising global carbon emissions used in the production of single-use plastics.

Built Environment
Introducing a by-law as per the Hobart City Council model will mean that food retail premises may need to change their layout or practices to accommodate provision of re-usable containers, or alternative containers to single-use plastics.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
This report has been compiled in collaboration with the Amenity Protection department within Council.

As described in Key Issues section of this report, extensive community engagement is a statutory requirement in the introduction of a Local Law. The community must be informed and affected parties heard, before a law can be drafted and presented to Council for adoption.

Hobart City Council undertook wide ranging consultation on the proposed by-law during the course of 2018. Consultation indicated consumers would welcome a reduction in single-use plastic and support businesses in moving away from non-compostable takeaway items.

A community Your Say Hobart survey conducted between February and March 2018 returned a significant response in favour of reducing the use of single-use plastic.

- Of the 2,962 responses, 96% disagreed when asked “do you think it is appropriate to use single-use plastics?”
- An overwhelming 90% said they were willing to pay more for food and drinks if it meant that sustainable packaging was used.
Survey responses indicated a sensitivity to how much more consumers would be willing to pay, with around two-thirds willing to pay up to 5% extra.

While a state government ban was perceived more favourably, 75% of surveyed participants felt that a local government ban would be an effective or highly effective way of getting more takeaway food businesses to use less single-use packaging.

A ban was perceived to be significantly more effective than the use of support and education.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
The Local Government Act 1989 prescribes the process that Council must undertake for an amendment or review of the Local Law. The implications of introducing a local by-law are detailed in the ‘Key Issues’ section of this report.

Finance
The cost of the process to implement a local law is estimated at approximately $30,000. This includes community consultation, evidence based research and legal advice. Moderate enforcement action would be an incremental cost of approximately $5,000-$10,000 per annum.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The reduction of single-use plastics as part of Council’s operations achieves Goal 5 ‘Environment’ of the Council Plan, states that:

“Council and the Bayside community will be environmental stewards, taking action to protect and enhance the natural environment, while balancing appreciation and use with the need to protect natural assets for future generations”.


The report recommendations are also aligned with the following policies, strategies and plans:

- Procurement Policy 2018
- Sustainable Infrastructure Policy 2017
- Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025
- Biodiversity Action Plan 2018-2027
- Carbon Neutrality Action Plan 2018-20
- Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014
- Recycling and Waste Management Strategy 2018-2027
- Active by the Bay Recreation Strategy 2013-2022
- Recreation and Open Space Asset Management Plan
### Options considered

#### Option 1 (Recommended Option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Align the preparation and introduction of a new local law to reduce Single-Use Plastics with the review of the Bayside Local Law to commence in late 2020.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Aligning the introduction and preparation a new local law to reduce Single Use Plastics with the review of the Bayside Local Law will reduce costs overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waiting until 2020 allows more time to align with any statewide actions developed by the Victorian Government through its Plastic Pollution Plan. The Victorian Government has announced that it is banning lightweight plastic shopping bags from late 2019 to prioritise the most effective actions to reduce other types of plastic pollution in our environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Council has not allocated resources for the preparation of a Local Law to address this issue in the 2019/20 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Local Law is due to sunset in April 2022 and the review of the Local Law will commence in late 2020. The preparation and introduction of a new Local Law can be incorporated into the review of the Local Law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Commence the process to prepare and introduce of a new local by-law to reduce Single-Use Plastics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>A new local law to reduce Single-Use Plastic can be implemented in a 12 - 18 month timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council is seen as a leader by being one of the first Australian Councils to introduce a local law banning single use plastics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Council has not allocated resources for the preparation of a Local Law to address this issue in the 2019/20 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A full review of the Local Law is scheduled to commence in 2020. If there are changes to the current procedure for declaring a Local Law, the new by-law may need to be revisited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Victorian Government may introduce statewide actions through its Plastic Pollution Plan further to legislation on plastic bags. Any statewide legislation would make any local by-law unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>No by-law to reduce single-use plastics to be prepared and implemented.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Avoids the costs of preparing and enforcing a local law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awaits statewide approach to single-use plastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>No enforceable reduction in single use plastics or reduced impacts on the local environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of coordinated statewide approach to reduce single-use plastics is unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose
To present Council with the response to the Council resolution from 21 May 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council in relation to the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan 2017 and its implementation.

That Council:

1. Receives a report at the June Ordinary Council Meeting on the implications and costs associated with the following changes to the streetscape works currently underway at the Beaumaris Concourse:
   a. Removal of the newly laid asphalt footpath (South Concourse - western end - outside the newsagent and any works to the Eastern concourse) and replacement of all proposed asphalt paths shown in the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan to be replaced with granolithic concrete - saw cut into 600 x 600 as per the Small Neighbourhood Activity Centre in the Balcombe and Haydens Road, and Grandview Avenue precinct; and
   b. Deletion of the granitic sand under the seats and the path on the north and the north-easter side of the Village Green shown in the adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan.

2. Notes that the works currently underway to implement the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan will need to be put on hold while this report is prepared.

3. Notes that delays associated with works by the National Broadband Network in the Beaumaris Concourse area will provide the necessary time for the report on the implications and costs associated with the following changes to the streetscape works currently underway at the Beaumaris Concourse to be prepared and considered.

Background
The development of the Masterplan included three stages of engagement with the community in combination with regular dialogue with a reference group with representation of traders, individual members of the community and community groups including the Beaumaris Conservation Society, Beaumaris Rotary and the Beaumaris Arts Group.

The first stage of engagement sought input from the Beaumaris community to establish its most highly regarded qualities and aspirations for the future of the Beaumaris Concourse streetscapes. This early engagement resulted in four key principles used as the basis for concept development for the second and third stages.

The second stage of engagement explored and tested options developed in response to the community’s aspirations from stage one including the central car park, the Concourse ‘Green’ reserve, a small meeting place on the East Concourse, the replacement of existing brick paved areas, a gateway into the Concourse and addressing blank walls in the centre. The approach to testing each option included explaining the trade-offs and impacts that would result from the
various improvements proposed. Feedback provided was used to inform the content of the Draft Masterplan.

The third stage of engagement presented the Draft Streetscape Masterplan to the community for comment.

The Draft Streetscape Masterplan proposed targeted interventions in specific areas that seek to enhance connectivity and access through the precinct, as well as creating usable gathering spaces. It built on the strengths and function from the area. It proposed to retain existing trees within the precinct and supplement canopy cover with additional tree planting where space allows.

The adopted Beaumaris Streetscape Masterplan, included in Attachment 1, reflects Council endorsed changes and informed the preparation of the detailed design and documentation for construction, which has informed the current contract specification. Consultation with traders and the broader community was also undertaken as part of this process. The material presented for comment included the proposed asphalt and concrete mix of footpath materials.

**Key issues**

1. Replacement of all proposed asphalt paths shown in the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan with granolithic concrete - saw cut into 600 x 600 as constructed in Balcombe Park Shopping Centre (Balcombe Road between Haydens Rd and Grandview Avenue)

   The estimated additional cost and additional construction period is summarised below:

   a. Additional project cost to vary the asphalt surface to grey concrete saw cut with 600mm square is $340,153. This is for Council standard 75mm grey saw cut concrete footpath.

   b. Additional project time needed to complete concrete works is 4-6 weeks. This is due to the need for over 10km of saw cuts. Concrete takes longer to install than asphalt and poses increase risk of delays as it cannot be installed when rain/showers are forecasted as it compromises the quality of the finished product.

   c. The replacement of the footpath kerb and channel was not part of the scope of works. The installation of concrete will require the replacement of the kerb and channel which will add additional time to the project. This results in a total additional time for completion of works of 9-11 weeks.

   **Implications to consider include:**

   - Additional time

   The additional construction time results in extended disruption to the trading of the activity centre and added impact to the economic feasibility of the businesses operating in the Beaumaris Concourse resulting in potentially significant loss of revenue. The original project schedule and completion program resulted in the works being completed in September 2019 with the later stages of street furniture installation and soft landscaping being subsequently completed. The original schedule considered busy trading periods and ensured works did not pose an impact on trade and the delivery of key events.

   The additional construction time of 9-11 weeks would see the completion moved to early 2020, which will have an impact on the following community events and key trade times:
- Car Show, Sunday 8 September
- Halloween, Saturday 31 October
- Christmas Event, Sunday 29 November
- Christmas Season trade, Late November to Christmas Eve.

Disruption during these trade period would be detrimental for the economic viability of the centre. The works could be suspended during the events or postponed until 2020 to minimise the economic impact on businesses.

The options described above to reduce impact on trade in the centre do not include additional delays and or costs associated with working around these events. Delaying the works will involve additional costs for the contractor to relocate from the Concourse until early 2020.

The current delays due to the National Broadband Network have an impact on the original schedule; however, if the materials remain unchanged the project can be delivered without significant impact on key events.

- Additional cost

The additional project cost to vary the asphalt surface to grey concrete saw cut with 600mm square is $340,153. The total project cost with asphalt and concrete is $1.6 million. The project cost if the asphalt is replaced with concrete is $1,940,153 or 22% extra.

- Amenity impacts

Grey concrete saw cut footpaths are of high quality; however, when used along long stretches of footpath in high traffic areas the longevity of this works is rapidly compromised for the following reasons:

- Service authority works that dig up the footpath generally do not reinstate saw cut concrete to the same quality installed by Council resulting in a mismatch of materials
- Grey concrete footpaths are prone to showing dirt and stains from the natural environment and high usage.

Whilst these issues could be addressed, the result in an increase cost in the ongoing maintenance and capital budget to ensure the quality of the works is retained through regular reinstatement works.

Asphalt footpaths are easier to match when repairs or reinstatements are required in Activity Centres and easier to maintain. Asphalt footpaths age more gracefully as they hide dirt and do not show stains from the natural environment and high usage.

The asphalt used in streetscape footpaths has addressed the issues highlighted above in recent years. Modern asphalt mix allows for smooth even footpaths to be formed and fit well with the surrounding shop frontages and roadside kerb. As a result, asphalt has been recently seen used more prominently in the delivery of high quality streetscape works throughout Melbourne.
• Longer disruption to business

Along with the extended overall disruption period required to complete the works, if the asphalt is replaced with grey saw cut concrete, more inconvenience for individual shops will result from restricted access and partial closures to allow pouring and saw cutting.

• Other requests by traders

Some members of the Traders Association have requested that Council consider the cost of relaying the redbrick given the reassessment of materials to be applied in the area by Council. This is not supported as the pavers present an ongoing trip hazard risk to Council.

• Future projects

The Sandringham Village Streetscape Masterplan and Black Rock Village Streetscape Masterplan are the next and last projects to be delivered. Design and cost undertaken for these projects include the footpaths as a mix of asphalt and concrete. Future budgets are based on this material mix. If all footpaths are to be constructed in concrete, future budgets would need to be increased by 25%.

• Past projects

The Bay Street, Hampton Street and Martin Street Activity Centre streetscape masterplans have all delivered the asphalt and grey concrete mix. The suite of materials adopted is common practice for footpath works by state and local government. Traders in this areas have not raised any concerns with the footpath materials used.

• Other considerations

The Streetscape masterplan proposed different materials in specific areas to enhance connectivity and access, as well as creating friendly and usable gathering spaces. These areas are defined by a change in material, feature paving (exposed aggregate concrete).

If the asphalt is changed to grey saw cut concrete, the Beaumaris Concourse will have exposed aggregate concrete in the focal points and grey saw cut concrete in all other areas.

2. Deletion of the granitic sand under the seats and the path on the north and the north-eastern side of the Village Green shown in the adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan.

Council has a responsibility to ensure priority access for the disabled wherever possible. The Streetscape masterplan seeks to ensure that all areas of the Beaumaris Concourse are universally accessible.

The proposed gravel path running north-south on the eastern edge of the Green adjacent the carpark allows for ease of access for north-south pedestrian movement providing unhindered access removing the need to walk through the carpark or to push through the grass in the green.

However, given Council’s resolution it is proposed to delete footpaths and use of granitic sand and retain the grass in this location. The changes proposed in the resolution do not impact on project costs or timeframes.
Recommendation

That Council:

1. Retains the mix of asphalt and exposed aggregate concrete as shown in the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan, June 2017.

2. Deletes the granitic sand in the Village Green as shown in the Adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan, June 2017.

3. Notes that the Beaumaris Concourse Masterplan construction has been delayed by five weeks and is now scheduled for completion in November 2019.

Support Attachments

1. Adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan (separately enclosed)
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Similar themes have been used in recently updated centres including Hampton Street, Bay Street and Martin Street, where a mix of asphalt and concrete footpaths have provided focal points within the streetscapes.

Footpaths are concrete exclusively in smaller streetscape areas where the shopping strip does not exceed a block in length.

The Beaumaris Streetscape Masterplan seeks to provide for improvements in both the quality and quantity of space available for meeting and gathering and thereby increasing the opportunities for social interaction in the Concourse.

Natural Environment
The green and leafy nature of Beaumaris was identified as an important character element to be retained and enhanced. The Streetscape Masterplan allows for the provision of planting on corners and in public spaces throughout the Concourse. Details of each species is provided in the design and documentation material presented for comment and provided in the contract for construction. The quality of the greenscape of the Concourse will be enhanced in an appropriate manner in recognition of the existing nature of the Concourse as the centre of an environmentally sensitive area of Bayside.

Built Environment
The footpaths throughout the Concourse are paved with red brick. This material has become unstable and uneven, resulting in trip hazards, maintenance difficulty and is in need of replacement with more stable and even surfaces. The infrastructure will be replaced with contemporary items that comply with present standards and functionality.

The proposed works will result in an improved surface for walking and will introduce planting, trees and furniture that will improve the safe movement of pedestrians, the utility of the public realm and provide the Concourse with a richer more inviting built environment for residents and visitors of all ages and abilities.

The materials to be used on the footpaths as shown in the Streetscape Masterplan are asphalt and exposed aggregate concrete. Recent streetscape upgrades have been constructed using a mix of asphalt and grey saw cut concrete. Feedback provided through the consultation and engagement expressed the need to have a different treatment for the Concourse to reflect the natural character of the area. As a result, the saw cut concrete was replaced with the use of exposed aggregate concrete in the focal points.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The development of the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan was informed by a robust communications and engagement process. The community engagement process involved three stages. Stage 3 included:

- Over 500 letters sent to key stakeholders, residents and property owners;
- Three information sessions, including one session targeted to traders, property owners and occupiers of the concourse;
- Information boards around the concourse; and
An online portal (‘Have your Say’ page) that included the draft Streetscape Masterplan, visual representations of the expected outcome, illustrations and a survey for feedback.

Further engagement took part as the adopted Masterplan progressed into Design and Documentation. An information session was held, with traders, residents and community members where the design plans were presented for comment. The plans provided information in relation to materials and streetscape elements to be constructed. The information was also available at the ‘Have your say’ page and advertised online, through social media and via direct notification to all involved in the development of the Masterplan.

Throughout the community engagement process, people have 4 formal opportunities to contribute and provide comment on all aspects of the Streetscape Masterplan, the use of footpath materials was not raised as an issue.

Human Rights
The implications of this paper have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
The present paving is unstable and becoming more unsuitable especially for the disabled and the aged. The result is a growing risk to safe access throughout the Concourse. The replacement of the bricks with more stable materials will reduce this risk.

Whilst this report does not result in legal implications, Council has entered into a contract for construction and works have commenced and any variations to the contract will result in cost increases. The consideration of variations will need to be carefully managed to avoid any legal consequences.

Finance
The changing of asphalt to saw cut grey concrete as part of the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan will add 22% or $340,153 to the project cost. The additional cost is currently unbudgeted, and will need to be reflected in the 2019/20 budget forecast.

The cost of demobilising construction/managing works so as not to coincide with the activities planned by the Beaumaris Concourse traders in September, October and Christmas is expected to add an additional minimum $12,000. This is also unbudgeted and will need to be reflected in the 2019/20 budget forecast.

The replacement of kerb and channel, if the asphalt is changed to saw cut grey concrete, has not been budgeted within the scope of works. Kerb and channel works have been budgeted as part of Council’s 10 year capital work program and will need to be brought forward. This can be accommodated with minimal implications on the 10 year capital work program.

Council has plans to implement streetscape improvements in Sandringham and Black Rock. The foreshadowed budgets for these projects have been based on using a mix of asphalt and grey saw cut concrete at focal points. If concrete is proposed to be used throughout these projects, the future project budgets would need to increase by at least 25%.

The following table provides an indication of the expected cost variations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Foreshadowed budget</th>
<th>Budget if all concrete</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Village</td>
<td>$2,885,603</td>
<td>$3,607,004</td>
<td>$721,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock</td>
<td>$1,241,000</td>
<td>$1,551,250</td>
<td>$310,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan has been informed by the Concourse Structure Plan and the Bayside Planning Scheme. Numerous strategies including the Place Design Manual, the Council and Community Plans, have also played a key part in the development of the Draft Masterplan.

The Masterplan has been influenced by the Council Plan through an extensive dialogue with the community and by responding to the diverse needs of the community of Beaumaris to enhance its amenity and liveability. The Masterplan provides guidance in how to enrich the public realm to beautify neighbourhood character and urban environments of Beaumaris Concourse and the reserve.

The inherent sense of identity and place exhibited in the Concourse has been reinforced in the proposed outcomes of the Masterplan, while strengthening the local economy by making the public realm safer, more comfortable and attractive.
Options considered

Option 1

| Summary | Retains the mix of asphalt and exposed aggregate as shown in the Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan and deletes the paths and granitic sand in the Village Green as shown in the Adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan, June 2017. |
| Benefits | Delivers the project within budget, whilst minimising economic impact to the centre by avoiding key events and high trading periods. Retains the suit of materials implemented in previous activity centres resulting in no impact to future streetscape works in activity centres. |
| Issues | A small group of the community may not be satisfied with the outcome. |

Option 2

| Summary | Replaces the asphalt with grey concrete saw cut into 600mm x 600mm, retains the exposed aggregate concrete in focal areas and deletes the paths and granitic sand in the Village Green as shown in the Adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan, June 2017. |
| Benefits | Addresses community concerns expressed by a small number of community members. |
| Issues | There are significant impacts in terms of cost and disruptions to the centre. An estimated additional cost of 22% $340,000 has been costed with additional costs expected if demobilisation of works is required to minimise impact during high trade event periods. An additional 9-11 weeks will need to be added to the project schedule resulting in the September completion being moved to December. Council has plans to implement streetscape improvements in Sandringham and Black Rock. The foreshadowed budgets for these projects have been based on using a mix of asphalt and concrete at focal points. If concrete is proposed to be used throughout these projects, the future project budgets would need to increase by 25%. |

Option 3

| Summary | Replaces the asphalt with red brick, retains the exposed aggregate concrete in focal areas and deletes the paths granitic sand in the Village Green as shown in the Adopted Beaumaris Concourse Streetscape Masterplan, June 2017. |
| Benefits | There are no identified benefits with this option. |
| Issues | The pavers present an ongoing trip hazard risk to Council. Further engagement will be recommended as this option was not discussed with the community during the preparation of the streetscape masterplan. |
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to present the Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve Policy 2019 (Attachment 1) following public exhibition of the draft version of the Policy and feedback from the community. The Policy was scheduled for review.

The community and key stakeholders were invited to comment on the draft Policy. The consultation process commenced on 8 May 2019 and ended on 22 May 2019.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 May 2019, Council resolved to:

1. **Ceases consultation activities associated with the draft Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve Policy relating to the following locations shown in Section 6.1:**
   - footpath on the south side of Park Road, Cheltenham – between Cheltenham Park access road and Cheltenham station;
   - footpath on the west side of Reserve Road, Cheltenham – between Balcombe Road and Weatherall Road;
   - shared path on the south side of Cheltenham Road, Cheltenham – between Bluff Road and Reserve Road; and
   - footpath on the west side of Jack Road Cheltenham – between the bus stop opposite 18 Jack Road and Bay Road.

2. **Continues the consultation on the draft Footpath Treatments Within the Road Reserve Policy (with changes to Section 6.1 to delete the proposed footpaths in Park Road, Cheltenham Road, Reserve Road and Jack Road) to inform the Policy to be adopted by Council.**

3. **Receives a report at the June Ordinary Council Meeting on the Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve Policy.**

Key issues
A new policy is required for 2019 – 2022 as the current policy (Attachment 2) has reached the end of its three year period. The new policy includes minor changes from the current policy. There is no change to the intent of the policy.

The only material change is that the use of concrete with exposed aggregate has been removed from item 6.2 – Footpath Materials. The specified material to use is coloured concrete. The reasons for this change are the comparatively high cost of concrete with exposed aggregate compared to coloured concrete, and the difficulty to match an exposed aggregate existing surface treatment (from a visual perspective) when repairs are needed.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 May 2019, Council resolved to cease consultation on the proposal to construct footpaths along sections of Park Road, Reserve Road, Jack Road and Cheltenham Road. These locations were removed from the ‘Have Your Say’ engagement platform on 22 May 2019.
The majority of feedback received was opposed to the proposed construction of footpaths and/or shared paths on Cheltenham, Reserve, Park, and Jack Roads. These proposed paths were included as proposed exceptions to the Policy statement that no new paths are to be constructed south of Bay Road unless exceptions are approved under certain conditions.

Given the response from the engagement and Council’s resolution on 21 May 2019, this Policy and other plans and strategies that reference these four roads shall be amended where they include actions relating to these four sites.

How was the feedback incorporated in the Footpath Treatment with the Road Reserve Policy 2019?

The Policy clause 6.1 relating to the proposed footpaths and/or shared paths to be constructed on Park, Reserve, Cheltenham and Jack Roads, has been removed from the Policy.

How the finalised Policy will impact on the Walking Strategy 2015?

The Policy will impact on the following identified strategy and action listed within the Walking Strategy 2015:

- Strategy 6 – Improve the shared path experience for the whole community.
  - Action 6.4: Explore the feasibility of providing new shared paths on:
    - Reserve Road
    - Cheltenham Road, between Bluff Road and Reserve Road.

The above strategy will not be achieved as a result of the Policy position.

How the finalised Policy will impact on the Pennydale Structure Plan 2018?

The Pennydale Structure Plan was adopted by Council in October 2018 after extensive community engagement.

Objective 10 of Pennydale Structure Plan is to:

*Investigate the feasibility of constructing a shared pedestrian and bicycle path along the southern side of Park Road, providing connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre and Cheltenham Park as well as to the wider bicycle network.*

This plan objective will not be achieved as a result of the Policy position.

How the finalised Policy will impact on the Integrated Transport Strategy 2018?

The finalised Policy will impact on Goal 2 – *improving local accessibility with the strategic direction to improve the pedestrian environment that serves key destination within Bayside,* and its actions:

- Action 9 – Progress the Footpath Connectivity Program to address missing links in the footpath network
- Action 10 – Provide footpath connections between the pedestrian network and public transport stops.

The above actions will not be achieved as a result of the Policy position.
Recommendation

That Council:
1. Adopts the Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve Policy 2019 as shown in Attachment 1.

Support Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Footpath Treatments Within the Road Reserve Policy 2019
2. Attachment 2 - Footpath Treatments Within the Road Reserve Policy 2016 (to be superseded)
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social

Footpaths encourage the use of open spaces and other recreation areas by optimising the walkable access. Footpaths allow pedestrians and cyclists to take more direct routes to and from destinations and provide convenient linkages to public transport, activity centres and local facilities.

Natural Environment

Footpaths allow safe, easily accessible, inclusive and alternative routes for commuters and other residents to partake in physical activity and reduce their effect on the environment, while enhancing Bayside’s liveability. It may reduce the dependence on private vehicles and would have a positive impact on the natural environment through a reduction in vehicle emissions.

Built Environment

Provision of new footpaths will impact on the existing streetscape. New footpaths may result in the loss of nature strip trees and relocation of nature strip assets, dependent on their location. Careful consideration will be given to maintain and improve the existing nature strip assets and trees where possible.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

The consultation process commenced on 8 May 2019 and ceased following the Council meeting on 21 May 2019.

The method of communication includes the following but not limited to ‘Have Your Say’ (HYS) platform and letters to property owners/occupiers residing along:

- Cheltenham Road, between Bluff Road and Reserve Road;
- Jack Road, between Stuart Avenue and Bay Road;
- Reserve Road, between Balcombe Road and Weatherall Road; and
- Park Road, between Reserve Road and Railway Crossing.

As of 22 May 2019, there were 126 responses received via the HYS platform and seven responses received via email and Customer Service Requests. The summary of responses received are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cheltenham Road</th>
<th>Park Road</th>
<th>Reserve Road</th>
<th>Jack Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for the 4 roads listed within the exclusion list</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to the 4 roads listed within the exclusion list</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above, there were 2 feedback emails received suggesting support for the 4 roads listed within the exclusion list, provided the material use for construction is permeable (i.e. granitic sand).
In general, the majority of the responses received are concerning the 4 roads listed within the exclusion list of item 6.1, of the draft Policy. There was no feedback received concerning the general policy position.

Human Rights

The Policy is required to ensure that Council meets its obligation under the *Equal Opportunity Act 2010*. There is a risk that a person with a disability could make a complaint of discrimination if a place used by the public is not accessible to them.

Legal

Refer to ‘Human Rights’ for the identified risk which may result in legal action against Council.

Finance

An allocation of $130,137 has been provided in the draft 2019/20 budget for the footpath connectivity program.

Due to the number of streets within Bayside that present key connectivity gaps in the footpath network, it is expected that this program will be ongoing to support the strategic intent of the Integrated Transport Strategy 2018-2028 and the Walking Strategy 2015.

Future funding would be the subject of future capital budget considerations.

Links to Council policy and strategy

The following actions listed within Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) 2018 - 2028, Bayside Walking Strategy (WS) 2015 and Pennydale Structure Plan (PSP) 2018 relate to the policy:

- Action 1.3 (WS) – Addressing important missing links in the footpath network
- Action 6.4 (WS) – Explore the feasibility of providing new shared paths along Reserve Road
- Action 6.4 (WS) – Explore the feasibility of providing new shared path on Cheltenham Road, between Bluff Road and Reserve Road
- Action 9 (ITS) – Progress the footpath connectivity program to address missing links in the footpath network
- Action 10 (ITS) – Provide footpath connections between the pedestrian network and public transport stops
- Objective 10 (PSP) - Investigate the feasibility of constructing a shared pedestrian and bicycle path along the southern side of Park Road, providing connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre and Cheltenham Park as well as to the wider bicycle network.

Options considered

No other options were considered relevant to this report.
## Council Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council policy title:</th>
<th>Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council policy ref no:</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council policy owner:</td>
<td>Director Environment, Recreation &amp; Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted by:</td>
<td>Bayside City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date adopted:</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled review:</td>
<td>May 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document reference number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

(A Council Policy is a public statement formally resolved by Council, which clearly states Council’s requirements in relation to a particular matter or issue. For the Council policy approval process, refer to Section 10 and Appendix 1 of the Policy Handbook.)

### 1 Policy intent

This policy establishes criteria to determine where new footpaths within the road reserve are to be provided throughout the municipality, the standards for design and construction of new footpaths, and the prioritisation process that Council will apply to allocate funding to provide new footpaths.

This policy has been developed to ensure a consistent, equitable and inclusive approach to consultation, design and implementation of new footpaths within the road reserve, where there is currently no footpath provided.

### 2 Purpose/Objective

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) prioritises walking as a preferred mode of transport for short trips. However there are a number of streets where no footpath exists, which limits opportunities for walking. Council will improve the footpath network throughout the municipality to provide appropriate pedestrian connectivity to public and private facilities with the aim of providing equal access and opportunity to all.

This policy outlines Council’s position in relation to:

- Where new footpaths within the road reserve should be provided;
- The materials used to construct new footpaths; and
- The prioritisation process used to determine when new footpaths should be constructed.
The objectives of this policy are to:

- Ensure that footpaths within the road reserve comply with the guidelines for disability access in the pedestrian environment and the requirements of the Equal Opportunity Act 2010 and the Road Management Act 2004;
- Guide decision making in relation to the allocation of funding for the provision of new footpaths within the road reserve;
- Guide effective community engagement relating to the provision of new footpaths within the road reserve; and
- Ensure that expectations are managed in response to community needs and requests received for the construction of new footpaths within the road reserve.

3 Scope

This policy is applicable to the road reserve of sealed roads within the municipality where no sealed footpath exists.

This policy does not cover:

- Paths through parks and other public land not contained within the road reserve;
- Laneways/walkways; and
- The area adjacent to unconstructed roads.

4 Roles & Responsibilities

The implementation of the policy, and the procedures in respect of the policy, is the responsibility of the Manager, Sustainability and Transport.

The Director Environment, Recreation and Infrastructure Services is responsible for the recommendation of changes to the Policy to Council.

5 Monitoring, evaluation and review

The policy will be reviewed every three years to monitor effectiveness and levels of community satisfaction. Resident and officer feedback collected throughout this period will inform the review. Any variations or alterations to this Policy must be made by resolution of Council.

6 Policy statement

Council recognises that footpaths play a vital role within the community. They provide a means of access to commercial centres, schools, public transport and other key community facilities and services. They also provide a means to improved health and wellbeing through exercise and reduced reliance on private vehicles. Under the Equal Opportunity Act 2010 it is against the law for public places to be inaccessible to people with a disability. Places used by the public include public footpaths and walkways. Any new footpath constructed within the road reserve will need to be accessible to people with a disability.
6.1 Where footpaths will be provided

The need for separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic increases with increasing vehicular volumes and speeds. For this reason, the following hierarchy for footpath provision has been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Footpath provision</th>
<th>Footpath Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Significant through traffic routes</td>
<td>Both sides of the road</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector/Distributor</td>
<td>Local access routes</td>
<td>Both sides of the road*</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Property access</td>
<td>One side of the road**</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Property access</td>
<td>None***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For those roads in areas of low pedestrian demand (less than 70 pedestrians per day) a footpath on one side of the road is appropriate.
** A request for a new footpath that would establish a footpath on both sides of a local road will be determined by the level of support from adjacent residents as outlined within the Procedure (TBA).
*** There is no minimum requirement for a cul-de-sac street to have at least one footpath on one side of the street unless:
- It provides pedestrian connection to another street or access to a public amenity/service; or
- A request for a footpath is received from a resident living in a cul-de-sac street in which case a request will be determined by the level of support from adjacent residents as outlined within the Procedure (TBA).

All streets south of Bay Road that do not have footpaths are to remain the same on the basis of preserving neighbourhood character, unless:

- There is a demonstrated need for a person to have access to a paved footpath because of some form of disability; and
- Residents representing greater than 50% of properties within a street south of Bay Road approach Council seeking a paved footpath.

In such instances, the respective street(s) will be assessed in accordance with the priority criteria set out in the Prioritisation Matrix.

6.2 Footpath materials

Council acknowledges that a footpath within the road reserve needs to be designed, constructed and maintained to allow for a safe, continuous and accessible path of travel so that all users irrespective of their access and mobility needs are able to use it.

Loose surface materials such as gravel, crushed stone and granitic sand are not recommended to be used within the road reserve as the lack of slip resistance causes difficulty for some users and can also impose severe difficulties for people using mobility aids. Loose materials also pose an ongoing maintenance burden on Council due to the increased level of maintenance inspection requirements associated with such materials and their higher lifecycle costs.

Whilst it is recognised that materials used to construct new footpaths within the road reserve will be predominantly concrete or asphalt, some community members and stakeholders may be concerned that the use of such materials may impact the local character of some streets.

To address this issue, a number of areas within the municipality have been designated as ‘areas of sensitivity’ (refer to 6.3) where the use of an alternative material will be permitted.

The alternative material available for use in ‘areas of sensitivity’ is coloured concrete.
6.3 ‘Areas of sensitivity’

Locations identified as ‘areas of sensitivity’ are those areas of the road reserve:
- Adjacent to golf courses; and
- Adjacent to parks and reserves.

6.4 Prioritisation Matrix

A Prioritisation Matrix (presented in Attachment 1) will be used by Council to assess road reserves that currently have no footpath and allocate a priority to these sites for the construction of new footpaths. Prioritisation will occur every 3 years as part of the review of the Footpath Treatment Policy and Procedure. Using the Prioritisation Matrix, a score will be given to each location within the road reserve that does not have a footpath, based on the criterion. The scores of each location will be ranked against each other to determine a prioritised list of sites. Further information regarding this process is outlined in the Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.5 Treatment in Areas of Sensitivity

Where practical, the planting of vegetation, in accordance with Council’s Nature Strip Planting Policy, will be considered where new footpaths are installed in areas of sensitivity, or at locations where significant vegetation existed previously. As part of this process, property owners/residents of the affected street will be consulted to determine the level of support for such planting. The future maintenance associated with any planting that occurs will be the responsibility of the adjacent property owner/resident. This process is outlined in the Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.6 Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Council recognises that some property owners/residents may have concerns regarding the change in the appearance of the nature strip when a new footpath is proposed. Equally, it is also important that property owners/residents balance their own considerations with the needs of other potential footpath users to ensure that the wider community benefits are realised and advocacy of disabled users is addressed.

At the start of the financial year, letters will be mailed to adjacent property owners/residents with information of Council’s intention to construct a new footpath at that location to be scheduled no earlier than the third quarter of that financial year. Any objections relating to the construction of a new footpath will not warrant the removal of a site from the prioritised list of sites. However, Council will work with property owners/residents to coordinate the timing of the installation of the footpath and to address any other issues of concern.

Relevant officers will communicate this process to residents/property owners as part of the community engagement process which is outlined in Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.7 Exceptions to this Policy

In exceptional circumstances where an urgent and significant safety issue arises, which justifies by-passing parts of this process (including a recommendation to move straight to implementation for safety reasons), this will result in the following:
• The location will be immediately addressed with a temporary treatment to ensure public safety by Council’s maintenance service provider;
• The Director Environment, Recreation and Infrastructure Services will inform the CEO;
• The CEO will request a report be prepared for Council; and
• Council will make the final decision.

In the event that factors exist which make the provision of a new footpath more expensive than would otherwise be the case, this will require the development of a business case for consideration as part of Council’s Capital Works budget considerations.

### 7 Related documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Community Engagement Policy (C/POL/17/110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road – Service Driven Asset Management Plan (DOC/16/204333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Management Plan 2017 (DOC/17/76280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 – 2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayside Walking Strategy 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure (TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Definitions & Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Reserve</td>
<td>The full width of any road and accompanying nature strip, from property boundary line on one side of the street to the property boundary line on the opposite side of the street and includes facilities such as roads, footpaths and associated features that may be constructed for public travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Road</td>
<td>Roads whose main function is to form the principal avenue of communication for metropolitan traffic movements not catered for by freeways. These include State Highways and Declared Main Roads and typically carry flows in excess of 15,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector / Distributor Streets</td>
<td>These are non-arterial roads that primarily provide a route between and through residential, industrial and commercial areas and convey traffic to Declared Main Roads. These streets typically carry flows between 2,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>A road, street or court that primarily provides direct access for abutting residential, industrial and commercial properties to their associated nodes. These streets typically carry less than 2,000 vehicles per day. However, some local streets can carry flows up to 5,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac provide only provide direct access to residents, they have no through traffic however some cul-de-sac roads allow cyclists, pedestrians or other non-automotive traffic to pass through connecting easements or paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: This policy is current as at the date of approval. Refer to Council’s website (www.bayside.vic.gov.au) or the staff intranet to ensure this is the latest version.
## Attachment 1 - Footpath Prioritisation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Width</td>
<td>Multi-lane roads and narrow roads are more hazardous to pedestrians. The road width includes shoulders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-lane road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow &lt;6m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 6 - 6.9m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate 7 - 7.9m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wide &gt;8m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed limit</td>
<td>The higher the speed limit the greater the risk to pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic volume</td>
<td>Higher volumes of traffic increase the risk to pedestrians who may be forced to walk on a road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10,001 vpd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001 - 10,000 vpd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001 - 5000 vpd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001 - 3000 vpd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001 - 2000 vpd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501 - 1000 vpd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 500 vpd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight distance</td>
<td>Road geometry can reduce the visibility of pedestrians to drivers. Hazards can include sharp bends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious restrictions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious isolated restrictions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking demand</td>
<td>Parked vehicles can force pedestrians into the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High parking demand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent parked cars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional parked cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal parked cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximity to services/facilities</strong> (only select the two highest scoring services/facilities if the site is within the vicinity of numerous services/facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Including Kindergartens</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>Major Activity Centres &amp; Neighbourhood Activity Centres</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility</td>
<td>E.g., Parks, Community Centre, Scouts Halls</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Development</td>
<td>Large offices, employment sites</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Facility</td>
<td>E.g., Hospital, Medical Centre, Dentist</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ranking</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 400m</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests for footpaths</td>
<td>Have requests been made for a footpath?</td>
<td>10+ requests</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10 requests</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5 requests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3 requests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 request</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from people with mobility aids</td>
<td>Has the path been specifically been requested by someone who uses a mobility aid?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Connectivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would a footpath provide a missing link</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between existing footpaths?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified existing pedestrian desire line</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goat track?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Density</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Footpaths in areas of higher population density will facilitate access for a</td>
<td>0 - 9 persons p/h</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greater number of people</td>
<td>10 - 19 persons p/h</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 - 29 persons p/h</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 - 39 persons p/h</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40+ persons p/h</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Removal</td>
<td>Will vegetation removal be required? The extent and type of vegetation removal</td>
<td>Significant species</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required will result in a number of points being deducted</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council Policy

Council policy title: Footpath Treatments Within the Road Reserve

Council policy ref no: C/POL/16/103
Council policy owner: Director of Infrastructure Services
Adopted by: Bayside City Council
Date adopted: 24 May 2016
Scheduled review: May 2019
Document reference number: DOC/16/123850

(Council Policy is a public statement formally resolved by Council, which clearly states Council’s requirements in relation to a particular matter or issue. For Council policy approval process refer Section 10 and Appendix 1 of the Policy Handbook.)

1 Policy intent
This policy establishes criteria to determine where new footpaths within the road reserve are to be provided throughout the municipality, the standards for design and construction and the prioritisation process that Council will apply to allocate funding to provide new footpaths.

This policy has been developed to ensure a consistent, equitable and inclusive approach to consultation, design and implementation of new footpaths within the road reserve that currently have no footpath provided.

2 Purpose/Objective
The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) prioritises walking as a preferred mode of transport for short trips within the municipality however, there are a number of streets where no footpath exists, which limits opportunities for walking trips. Council will improve the footpath network throughout the municipality to provide appropriate pedestrian connectivity to public and private facilities with the aim of providing equal access and opportunity to all.

This policy outlines Council’s position in relation to:
- Where new footpaths within the road reserve should be provided;
- The materials used to construct new footpaths; and
- The prioritisation process used to determine when new footpaths should be constructed.

The objectives of this policy are to:
- Ensure that footpaths within the road reserve comply with the guidelines for disability access in the pedestrian environment and the requirements of the Equal Opportunity Act 2010 and the Road Management Act 2004;
- Guide decision making in relation to the allocation of funding for the provision of new footpaths within the road reserve;
- Guide effective community engagement relating to the provision of new footpaths within the road reserve; and
- Ensure that expectations are managed in response to community needs for requests received for the construction of new footpaths within the road reserve.

3 Scope
This policy is applicable to the road reserve of sealed roads within the municipality where no sealed footpath exists. This policy does not cover:
- Paths through parks and other public land that is not contained within the road reserve;
- Laneways/walkways; and
- The area adjacent to unconstructed roads.

4 Roles & Responsibilities
The implementation of the Policy and the Procedures in respect of the Policy is the responsibility of the Manager Infrastructure Assets.

The Director Infrastructure Services is responsible for the recommendation of changes to the Policy to Council.

5 Monitoring, evaluation and review
The policy will be reviewed every three years to monitor effectiveness and levels of community satisfaction. Resident and officer feedback collected throughout this period will inform the review. Any variations or alterations to this Policy must be made by resolution of Council.

6 Policy statement
Council recognises that footpaths play a vital role within the community. They provide a means of access to commercial centres, schools, public transport and other key community facilities and services. They also provide a means to improved health and wellbeing through exercise and reduced reliance on private vehicles. Under the Equal Opportunity Act 2010 it is against the law for public places to be inaccessible to people with a disability. Places used by the public include public footpaths and walkways. Any new footpath constructed within the road reserve will need to be accessible to people with a disability.

6.1 Where footpaths will be provided
The need for separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic increases with increasing vehicular volumes and speeds. For this reason, the following hierarchy for footpath provision has been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Type</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Footpath provision</th>
<th>Footpath Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Significant through traffic routes</td>
<td>Both sides of the road</td>
<td>1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector/Distributor</td>
<td>Local access routes</td>
<td>Both sides of the road**</td>
<td>1.8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Property access</td>
<td>One side of the road**</td>
<td>1.2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Property access</td>
<td>None***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For those roads in areas of low pedestrian demand (less than 75 pedestrians per day) a footpath on one side of the road is appropriate.
** A request for a new footpath that would establish a footpath on both sides of a local road will be determined by the level of support from adjacent residents as outlined within the Procedure (PR/INF/347)
*** There is no minimum requirement for a cul-de-sac street to have at least one footpath on one side of the street unless:
- It provides pedestrian connection to another street or access to a public amenity/service; or
- A request for a footpath is received from a resident living in a cul-de-sac street in which case a request will be determined by the level of support from adjacent residents as outlined within the Procedure (PR/INF/347)
All streets south of Bay Road that do not have footpaths to remain the same on the basis of neighbourhood character, unless:

- There is a demonstrated need for a person to have access to a paved footpath because of some form of disability; and
- Residents representing greater than 50% of properties within a street south of Bay Road approach Council seeking a paved footpath.

In such instances, the respective street(s) will be assessed in accordance with the priority criteria set out in the Prioritisation Matrix.

6.2 Footpath materials
A footpath within the road reserve needs to be slip resistant, be able to withstand inclement weather events and allow for a safe, continuous and accessible path of travel so that all users irrespective of their access and mobility needs are able to use it. Loose surface materials such as gravel, crushed stone and granitic sand will not be used within the road reserve as the lack of slip resistance causes difficulty for some users and can also impose severe difficulties for people using mobility aids. Loose materials also pose an ongoing maintenance burden on Council due to the increased level of maintenance inspection requirements associated with such materials and their higher lifecycle costs.

The materials that will be used to construct new footpaths within the road reserve are concrete or asphalt. It is recognised that some community members and stakeholders may be concerned that the use of such materials may impact the local character of some streets. To address this issue, a number of areas within the municipality have been designated as ‘areas of sensitivity’ (refer to 6.3) where the use of an alternative material will be permitted. Alternative materials that will be available for use in ‘areas of sensitivity’ are coloured concrete or concrete with exposed aggregate. Concrete with exposed aggregate consists of a concrete base topped with a fine pebble material of varying colour schemes to provide a natural appearance that blends into the surroundings to simulate the appearance of a gravel path.

Concrete with exposed aggregate will be the only material used for any new footpaths that are constructed south of Bay Road, with the exception of any new footpaths constructed along Reserve Road, Cheltenham Road and Weatherall Road whereby additional footpaths will only be considered if constructed from gravel or granitic sand.

6.3 ‘Areas of sensitivity’
Locations identified as ‘areas of sensitivity’ are those areas of the road reserve:

- Adjacent to golf courses; and
- Adjacent to parks and reserves.

6.4 Prioritisation Matrix
A Prioritisation Matrix will be used by Council (presented in Attachment 1) to assess road reserves that currently have no footpath and allocate a priority to these sites for the construction of new footpaths. Prioritisation will occur every 3 years as part of the review of the Footpath Treatment Policy and Procedure. Using the Prioritisation Matrix a score will be
given to each location within the road reserve that does not have a footpath based on the
criterion. The scores of each location will be ranked against each other to determine a
prioritised list of sites. Further information regarding this process is outlined in the Footpath
Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.5 Treatment in Areas of Sensitivity

Where practical, the planting of vegetation, in accordance with Council’s Nature Strip Planting
Policy, will be considered where new footpaths are installed in areas of sensitivity, or at
locations where significant vegetation existed previously. As part of this process, property
owners/residents of the affected street will be consulted to determine the level of support for
such planting. The future maintenance associated with any planting that occurs will be the
responsibility of the adjacent property owner/resident. This process is outlined in the Footpath
Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.6 Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Council recognises that some property owners/residents may have concerns regarding the
change in the appearance of the nature strip when a new footpath is proposed. Equally it is
also important that property owners/residents balance their own considerations with the needs
of other potential footpath users to ensure that the wider community benefits are realised and
advocacy of disabled users is addressed.

At the start of the financial year letters will be mailed to adjacent property owners/residents
with information of Council’s intention to construct a new footpath at that location to be
scheduled no earlier than the third quarter of that financial year. Any objections relating to the
construction of a new footpath will not warrant the removal of a site from the prioritised list of
sites. However, Council will work with property owners/residents to coordinate the timing of
the installation of the footpath and to address any other issues of concern.

Relevant officers will communicate this process to residents/property owners as part of the
community engagement process which is outlined in Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure.

6.7 Exceptions to this Policy

In exceptional circumstances where the analysis of traffic data reveals an urgent and
significant safety issue which justifies by-passing parts of this process (including a
recommendation to move straight to implementation for safety reasons) will result in the
following:

- The Director Infrastructure Services will inform the CEO;
- The CEO will request a report be prepared for Council; and
- Council will make the final decision.

In the event that factors exist which make the provision of a new footpath more expensive
than would otherwise be the case, this will require the development of a business case for
consideration as part of Council’s Capital Works budget considerations.
7 Related documents

| Policies | Community Engagement Policy (C/POL/EXE/016)  
          | Road Asset Management Plan Service-Driven Policy (C/POL/INF/010)  
          | Road Management Plan 2013 |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Strategies | Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy, Bayside Walking Strategy |
| Procedures | Footpath Treatment Policy Procedure (PR/AM/XXXX) |
| Guidelines | |

8 Definitions & Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Reserve</td>
<td>The full width of any road and accompanying nature strip, from property boundary line on one side of the street to the property boundary line on the opposite side of the street and includes facilities such as roads, footpaths and associated features that maybe constructed for public travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Road</td>
<td>Roads whose main function is to form the principal avenue of communication for metropolitan traffic movements not catered for by freeways. These include State Highways and Declared Main Roads and typically carry flows in excess of 15,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector/Distributor Streets</td>
<td>These are non-arterial roads that primarily provide a route between and through residential, industrial and commercial areas and convey traffic to Declared Main Roads. These streets typically carry flows between 2,000 and 20,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>A road, street or court that primarily provides direct access for abutting residential, industrial and commercial properties to their associated nodes. These streets typically carry less than 2,000 vehicles per day. However, some local streets can carry flows up to 5,000 vehicles per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local: Cul-de-sac</td>
<td>Cul-de-sac provide only provide direct access to residents, they have no through traffic however some cul-de-sac roads allow cyclists, pedestrians or other non-automotive traffic to pass through connecting easements or paths.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: This policy is current as at the date of approval. Refer to Council’s website (www.bayside.vic.gov.au) or staff intranet to ensure this is the latest version.
### Attachment 1 - Footpath Prioritisation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Safety</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Width</strong></td>
<td>Multi-lane roads and narrow roads are more hazardous to pedestrians. The road width includes shoulders</td>
<td>Multi-lane road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow &lt;6m</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 6 - 6.9m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate 7 - 7.9m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wide &gt;8m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speed limit</strong></td>
<td>The higher the speed limit the greater the risk to pedestrians</td>
<td>70km/h</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60km/h</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50km/h</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic volume</strong></td>
<td>Higher volumes of traffic increase the risk to pedestrians who may be forced to walk on a road</td>
<td>&gt;10,000 vpd</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5001 - 10,000 vpd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3001 - 5000 vpd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001 - 3000 vpd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1001 - 2000 vpd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501 - 1000 vpd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 500 vpd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sight distance</strong></td>
<td>Road geometry can reduce the visibility of pedestrians to drivers. Hazards can include sharp bends</td>
<td>Serious restrictions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious isolated restrictions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Few restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking demand</strong></td>
<td>Parked vehicles can force pedestrians into the road</td>
<td>High parking demand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequent parked cars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasional parked cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal parked cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proximity to services/facilities (only select the two highest scoring services/facilities if the site is within the vicinity of numerous services/facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facility</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Development</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Facility</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>0 - 800m</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop</td>
<td>0 - 400m</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Social Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requests for footpaths</td>
<td>10+ requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10 requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 5 requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 3 requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request from people with mobility-aid</td>
<td>Has the path been specifically been requested by someone who uses a mobility aid?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pedestrian Connectivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would a footpath provide a missing link</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between existing footpaths?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified existing pedestrian desire line/</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goa/track?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footpaths in areas of higher population</td>
<td>density will facilitate access for a greater number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Environmental Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Removal</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Significant species</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will vegetation</td>
<td>removal be required? The extent and type of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removal required</td>
<td>vegetation removal required will result in a number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being deducted</td>
<td>of points being deducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Version 1**  
May 2016
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the main outcomes of public consultation and engagement for the Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve (EPNR) Masterplan, summarise the key themes and to provide an update of other Masterplan related tasks already underway or completed.

EPNR covers the area of land previously known as Elsternwick Park Golf Course. It is on the boundary of three local government areas (Bayside, Port Phillip and Glen Eira). Melbourne Water is also a key stakeholder in the project as the Elster Creek runs through the southern section of EPNR.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 19 February 2019, it was resolved that Council:

1. Endorses the community engagement approach as set out in Attachment No.1 for the Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve subject to the existing Community Reference Panel continuing their work, noting that all stakeholders will have the opportunity to participate in the community engagement process;
2. Receives a report detailing the outcomes of the community engagement on the Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve at the 25 June 2019 Council meeting; and
3. Prepares a detailed Project Plan aimed at commencing construction work on the Melbourne Water flood mitigation and landscaping works by August 2020 for discussion with the Community Reference Panel.

A summary of the main outcomes of the community engagement and other relevant EPNR Masterplan related tasks is outlined below.

Key issues

Outcomes of Community Engagement

The community engagement period ran from 12 March 2019 until the end of April 2019.

It consisted of four drop-in sessions; two mid-week sessions (from 4-6pm and 5-7pm) and two weekend mornings (Saturday and Sunday), designed to accommodate as many people as possible.

A public ‘Ideas Board’ was also available on Council’s ‘Have your Say’ page for the project, for people to share their aspirations for EPNR. This included the opportunity for people to load photographs of other innovative ideas and designs they had seen or liked for sharing in the public realm.

The community engagement exercise aimed to gather information and ideas from the community and key stakeholders to inform the future Masterplan. The engagement exercise also raised the profile of the project.
Consultation and engagement focussed on how the four endorsed priority principles; environment, water quality, flood mitigation and public amenity could be achieved within EPNR. The feedback received during engagement will contribute towards a future decision on how each principle will be incorporated into the Masterplan.

The overwhelming responses have interpreted the environmental priority as supporting the natural environment that is plants, animals and habitat. This includes the creation of an environment that supports biodiversity and conserves what is already there.

Further, and in regards to the amenity priority, responses also illustrated that being able to access, appreciate and understand the ‘natural environment’ was important and the opportunity for the community to be involved in supporting this is desired.

It should be noted that further external technical expertise will be required to understand how EPNR can achieve the priorities regarding environment, water quality and flood mitigation; however the ‘amenity’ priority will be directly influenced by the results of community engagement.

A high level summary of feedback from the community engagement activity is outlined below:

- Council’s ‘Have Your Say’ page received 2916 visits (4910 views) with 344 contributions;
- A total of 134 people contributed across four drop in sessions (however, this number is not a true reflection as staff noted that not every attendee signed in and some people attended more than one session);
- Most contributors listed their address as Elwood or Brighton. Elsternwick was the third most popular location;
- Popular activities people would like to do in EPNR are: walking, passive recreation, and picnics; and
- Popular additions people would like to see in EPNR are: native vegetation, shade trees, wildlife-attracting plant species, and boardwalks.

An executive summary of all data captured during the community consultation and engagement exercises can be found in Attachment 1.

A previous report to Council on 19 February 2019 highlighted that during consultation there could be some conflict between individuals and groups with different interests and aspirations for EPNR. In particular, balancing interests of dog owners, immediate neighbours of EPNR and environmentally focussed groups.

To mitigate this and ensure the consultation and engagement events were positive experiences for all involved, specific techniques were developed prior to public consultation to reduce direct and immediate conflict between interest groups.

This pre-planning had the desired effect and the face-to-face engagement events were subsequently well received by all attendees. This approach is recommended for consideration when completing community engagement that may present similar conflicts of interest.

**Project Plan**

Council staff have been working with the EPNR Community Reference Panel to draft a Project Plan that all parties agree is achievable and can therefore endorse and work towards. At the most recent Community Reference Panel meeting (15 May 2019) the Project Plan was discussed and endorsed pending minor amendments.

The Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve Project Plan Summary endorsed by the Community Reference Panel is shown in Attachment 2.
Technical Works
Consultants have been engaged to complete a Flora and Habitat Strategy and a Water Quality and Water Recycling Options Assessment.

The Flora and Habitat Strategy will build on the work completed by Council and the Community Reference Panel to identify target and icon species EPNR to be considered as part of the Masterplan development.

The Water Quality and Water Recycling Options Assessment will inform what water quality and recycling works are feasible within EPNR.

An external consultant has been appointed to investigate the level of flood mitigation that can be achieved within EPNR without impacting its ability to also provide passive open space to a wide variety of stakeholders. The outcomes of this investigation will be used by Melbourne Water to inform the design of flood mitigation options.

Council staff will continue to liaise with neighbouring local government authorities and Melbourne Water.

Works by volunteer groups
Council has worked with the Elsternwick Park Association (EPA) to develop an endorsed Action Plan for the EPNR, similar to other action plans for ‘Friends of’ groups in Bayside.

The agreed Action Plan enables the EPA to complete tasks such as litter removal, species surveys and regular working bees to plant some vegetation and remove weed species with EPNR.

Recommendation
That Council:

1. Notes the outcomes of community engagement for Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve as outlined in Attachment 1.


Support Attachments
1. Attachment 1 - Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve - Community Engagement Executive Summary ↓
2. Attachment 2 - Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve - Project Plan Summary ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Returning 14 hectares of open space to community for passive recreation use will provide greater opportunities for social connections for residents and visitors to EPNR.

The final Masterplan also has potential to realise a wide variety of community and environmental benefits including flood mitigation, increased biodiversity, improved quality for waters entering the Bay and numerous health and wellbeing benefits.

Natural Environment
EPNR will be an environmentally themed area of passive open space. The focus will be an environmental refuge for plants and animals in an otherwise urban area as well as an area that will contribute towards localised flood mitigation.

In parallel to the development of the Masterplan, the natural environment is being managed to improve biodiversity though the installation of species specific nesting boxes.

Built Environment
There are no known built environment implications associated with the proposition in this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The community engagement approach for EPNR was developed in line with Council’s Community and Stakeholder Engagement Policy 2017 and adopted by Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 19 February 2019.

In order to gain an understanding of possible benefits in line with the themes identified by Council (environment, public amenity, flood mitigation and water quality), Council staff were asked to gather high level information from the community and a Community Reference Panel was established. This panel is currently made up of representatives from local wildlife groups, resident groups and stakeholders such as the City of Port Phillip and Melbourne Water.

The Panel does not have formal decision-making authority. Its function is to provide advice and contribute to the development of longer term strategies for the Reserve and be a resource to test Reserve development ideas.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
There are no known legal implications associated with the proposition in this report.

Finance
The implementation of the community engagement plan has been accommodated within the 2018/19 budget. Council’s 2020/21 budget has an allocation to implement the Masterplan and Melbourne Water is responsible for flood mitigation works.

Future budget allocations will need to be considered in line with the recommendations based on the final Masterplan.
Links to Council policy and strategy
Returning the land to public open space will allow Council to achieve the principles outlined in Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012.

The development of the EPNR Masterplan will also contribute towards the following areas of the Council Plan 2017-2021:

**Goal 4: Open Space**
Gain access to increased quality open space to meet the needs of the wider community.

**Goal 5: Environment**
Council and the Bayside Community will be environmental stewards, taking action to protect and enhance the natural environment, while balancing appreciation and use with the need to protect natural assets for future generations.

The works outlined in this report will also contribute towards Goal 2 of the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy (WAAA) 2017-2021. Goal 2 is designed to ‘achieve a healthy and active community’ by ‘improving physical activity opportunities.’
Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve

Community Engagement Executive Summary

Project Goal
The council has resolved to create an environmentally focussed reserve with four key priorities (Environment, Water quality, Flood mitigation, and Public amenity) within Elsternwick Park.

While there has been much consultation that has informed the council decision, the goal of this engagement was to understand how the community would like to see the council’s strategy for an environmentally focussed reserve, and the four endorsed priorities, reflected within the future design of EPNR:

As per the engagement scope endorsed by council, the engagement was specifically not going to seek or consider feedback that was inconsistent with the council’s strategy and resolutions.

Project Methodology
A range of activities were conducted and the level of engagement and interest from the community was very high. The activities included:

- Have Your Say page
- On site, drop in style sessions
- Hard copy surveys, email/written submissions

The feedback from these sessions was then summarised and results outside the scope of the engagement removed.

These results will inform the design of the scope and brief for the draft masterplan.
Results

Global Interpretations

What is meant by environmental

The council resolved to create an “environmentally” focussed reserve. Environmental could have a very wide understanding and potentially include activities as diverse as recycling, swap meets, and composting through promoting use of sustainable living and greenhouse gas reduction to supporting the “natural environment”.

The overwhelming major of respondents have interpreted environmental as supporting the natural environment, that is plants, animals and habitat. This includes the creation of this environment, the conservation of what is already there. Further, it also includes being able to access, appreciate and understand this “natural environment” and the opportunity for the community to be involved in supporting this.

Feedback at different levels

The community provided feedback at different levels. At the central level was feedback about the reserve features; what it should include, what its focus should be. The next level was, given those features, how the community wanted to interact with the reserve. The outer level was overall considerations for the reserve, these are things that should be considered in the design of the reserve, somewhat independent of the reserve features themselves.
Emerging Themes

Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve

Features
- Nature
- Environment/Conservation
- Indigenous Connections
- Infrastructure/Landscape

Interactions
- Education
- Community Involvement
- Recreation
- Access

Considerations
- Cycling
- Running
- Don’t dos

Bubble sizes reflect weighting of the response themes.
Features

Nature

› Wildlife sanctuary
  including:
  • Some areas of minimal disturbance (people, dogs)
  • Management of pest species
› Locally indigenous flora
› Planting
  including:
  • More trees
  • Bushes
  • Flowering plants
  • Urban forest feel
› Extensive Wetlands

Environment / Conservation

› Natural environment
  including:
  • Adequate space
  • Maintained
  • Protected
  • Restored
› Flood prevention and mitigation
› Water quality
  including:
  • Improvement
  • Catchment to trap rubbish
  • Water features to purify
› Lake biodiversity/facilitate a healthy environment
› preserve what is currently in place (63 votes)

Infrastructure/landscape

› Lighting to support cycling, running activities
› Variety of different spaces
› Seating
› Drinking Fountains
› Toilets

Indigenous Connections

› Reflecting traditional land ownership and use with park features
Interactions

Education

- Indigenous culture
  - Learning about the history of the area
  - Traditional land management/ownership
- Observation points and information stations explaining Fauna and Flora
- Environmental learning programs
  - Environmental centre
  - Indoor and/or outdoor classroom spaces
  - Partnership with organisations (e.g. Sacred Heart Mission) to establish low cost programs/volunteer opportunities
- Educational shop within reserve
  - Selling native seedlings
  - Artwork/merchandise/reserve maps

Community Involvement

- Planting/volunteering
- Community gardens
- Café
- Meeting places for social gatherings

Recreation

- Access
  - Installation of boardwalks and observation points
  - Access to southern park areas
    - Footbridge(s)
    - Existing footway
    - Closing Bent Ave
  - Restricting access at night
    - Wildlife respite
    - Personal safety
- More entries to reserve
  - Combined with pedestrian crossings
- Disabled access
- Paths to provide access to areas around reserve
  - Natural and permeable materials
  - Providing access to different areas
  - Avoiding ‘goat tracks’/minimising impact on habitat
  - Separation of cycle and pedestrian traffic
  - Minimal paths
- Allow for multiple uses

Picnic areas
Considerations

Cycling

- Bike riding on bike paths, specifically providing commuter access and connecting with existing paths including along Elster Creek
  - Strong preference for paths around reserve (rather than through)

Running

- Running tracks around perimeter

Don’t do’s

- No sporting venues/facilities/ovals
- No dogs (on-lead) permitted in park
- No artificial structures/playgrounds
- No drones to be used (22 votes)

Key Insights

Intended Activities

Feedback was gained through a number of different channels, including online survey and a drop-in centre survey.

*After walking, passive recreational use, learning about nature, dog walking and picnics were the most popular activities.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog walking (on leash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Planting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancements

The main suggestion for enhancement of the reserve centred around having wildlife attracting species and native/indigenous trees. Shade trees was also a popular feature for consideration in the design of the reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 7 Enhancements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife attracting species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Indigenous species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Path ways

Paths made from permeable materials that do not impact on natural habitats or flora was the most suggested design consideration for paths in the reserve. A loop around the perimeter was also suggested (mainly for cycling and running). Multiple suggestions centred around linking paths with existing external paths – particularly for bicycles – to make an interconnected system for the area.
Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve - Project Plan Summary

Phase 1: Needs Analysis
- Meeting
- Melb. Water
- Initial Engineering Report
- Fauna Strategy
- Habitat & Flora Strategy
- Water Quality & Recycling Options
- Public Consultation
- Needs Analysis Consolidation
- Masterplan Scoping
- Masterplan RFQ (incl. Panel review of shortlisted tenders)
- Parallel Activities
- Community Engagement & Reserve Naming (involving local indigenous representative)
- Funding agreements finalised with funding partners

Phase 2: Detailed Masterplanning
- Briefing
- Flood Mitigation
- Environment
- Water Quality
- Public Amenity
- 4 Goals for Reserve

Phase 3: Delivery
- Meeting
- Council Updates
- Likely staged construction, forecast commencement of Stage 1 construction - June 2020
- Baseline Flora and Fauna Surveys

2018
A S O N D J F M A M J J A

2019
J J A S O N D J F M A M J J A

2020
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Executive summary

Purpose and background

To present Council with the outcome of the mid-century modern heritage voluntary inclusion process, and the completion of the preliminary heritage assessment following the nomination stage.

The mid-century modern heritage voluntary inclusion process was introduced following Council’s resolution at its 24 April 2018 Ordinary Meeting to pursue an approach that strikes a balance between protection and inclusion of properties within a Heritage Overlay and opposition from property owners about being potentially subjected to a Heritage Overlay.

In response to Council’s resolution, a voluntary nomination process was undertaken where property owners of mid-century modern properties in Black Rock and Beaumaris were invited to voluntarily nominate their property to be assessed for heritage significance.

Key issues

The voluntary nomination period commenced in November 2018 and was finalised on 31 March 2019. During this period, 28 enquiries were received to discuss the process and 14 property owners nominated their properties to be assessed for heritage significance. As part of the nomination, property owners also consented to having a Heritage Overlay placed on their property should the assessment identify their property as having heritage significance.

During the voluntary nomination period, Council promoted the mid-century modern voluntary inclusion process by:

- Sending informative brochures and letters to over 6,500 property owners within Black Rock and Beaumaris whose homes were constructed between 1945-1975 to advise them of Council’s process, clarify what mid-century architecture is, and outline the voluntary nomination process;
- Providing information of the mid-century modern heritage voluntary inclusion process on the Council website;
- Publishing two advertisements regarding the voluntary nomination process in the Bayside Leader which is then distributed around Bayside;
- Publishing an article in the February/March 2019 edition of Let’s Talk Bayside;
- Sending a reminder email and letter to property owners who were subject to Amendments C158 and C159 in March 2019, alerting them to the closing date for voluntary nominations; and
- Ongoing targeted advertising on social media (Facebook) to further promote to residents to nominate their properties, receiving 16,330 impressions.

Preliminary Assessment

Following the end of the voluntary nomination period, property owners were advised that the heritage assessment would commence as a three stage process:
- preliminary assessment,
- detailed assessment and citation of the identified properties; and
- Planning scheme amendment process.

The preliminary assessment (refer Attachment 1) included an individual desktop assessment of each property and the findings for each place outlined, including reasoning why it should or should not proceed to a more detailed assessment.

The preliminary assessment recommends that Council proceed with a detailed assessment of 11 of the 14 nominated properties. The findings of all nominated properties are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property address</th>
<th>Recommended for Detailed Assessment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 55 Hayden’s Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 33 Clonmore Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 17 Coronet Grove, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 14 Gramatan Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 7 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 153 Tramway Parade, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 10 Valmont Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 7 Coreen Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 113 Dalgetty Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 14 Emily Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 384 Balcombe Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 397 Beach Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 8 Stevens Parade, Black Rock</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 23 Third Street, Black Rock</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Council owned properties

Council has undertaken a desktop review of all Council owned buildings within Black Rock and Beaumaris to consider the sites that may be of potential heritage significance. The review (refer Attachment 2) provides information on previous building work, as well as any future works proposed as part of Council’s various Infrastructure Plans. An assessment on the future function and use of these buildings was undertaken to understand implications on service delivery if a Heritage Overlay was to be implemented, noting that Council is responsible for ensuring its buildings are fit for purpose and service delivery meets needs, in addition to its heritage obligations. There are 14 Council owned properties recommended for further investigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Recommended for preliminary assessment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 28B Bodley Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>MCH centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 28A Bodley Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Olive Phillips Kindergarten</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 45 Martin Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Beaumaris Bowls Club</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Martin Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Cath Wild Girl Guide Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2 Bodley Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Sea Scouts Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 55 Bluff Road Black Rock</td>
<td>Black Rock Kindergarten</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 80 Wells Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Beaumaris East Stan Hawkins Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 574-576 Balcombe Road, Black Rock</td>
<td>Black Rock Hall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 24 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Beaumaris Playhouse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 26 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Jack and Jill Kindergarten</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 36-38 Bonanza Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Men’s Shed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>U3A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Library/Community Centre</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps

For the privately owned properties that have been recommended for a detailed heritage assessment, a citation will be prepared to outline the reasons for heritage protection. The citations will inform the strategic justification for the preparation of a planning scheme
amendment to apply the Heritage Overlay to the identified properties. For the properties where a detailed heritage assessment has not been recommended, property owners will be advised of this outcome.

For Council owned properties that have been recommended for further assessment, Council will liaise with a consultant to undertake a preliminary assessment before a report is presented to Council to consider.

**Beaumaris War Memorial**

Community members of Beaumaris have advocated to Council to ensure that the small cenotaph located in the community grounds on Reserve Road is considered for heritage protection.

The war memorial is included in the Victorian War Heritage Inventory. Council officers have started discussions with Heritage Victoria to investigate the potential inclusion of the cenotaph into the Heritage Overlay to ensure it is protected for future generations.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Undertakes the detailed assessment and preparation of citations for the 11 private properties assessed as being of potential heritage significance.

2. Undertakes a preliminary assessment of the 14 Council owned buildings outlined in this report for potential heritage significance.

3. Receives a further report with the final citations at or before its 19 November 2019 Ordinary Meeting.

**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Preliminary Assessment Report
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
This project will enable Council to protect buildings of the mid-century modern era that contribute to Bayside’s liveability, character and community cohesion. This is consistent with the Bayside community’s desire to see neighbourhoods and amenity protected, with development sympathetic or responsive to the natural and built environment.

Natural Environment
It is not considered that the natural environment is impacted by this project, as it aims to protect the heritage significance of the building and properties.

Built Environment
The mid-century modern heritage voluntary inclusion process and assessment has identified and documented and buildings of potential heritage significance within Beaumaris and Black Rock. The process is consistent with the need for Council to implement the objective of section 4(1)(d) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to ‘conserve and enhance buildings, areas and other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historic interest, or otherwise of special cultural value’.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

To promote the voluntary nomination process, a flyer was distributed to over 6,000 households in Beaumaris and Black Rock constructed between 1945 and 1975. The process was also promoted within the February-March 2019 ‘Let’s Talk Bayside’ magazine, distributed to approximately 40,000 households. Advertisements were placed in the Bayside Leader which also included an editorial. A purchased social media campaign resulted in a reach of 16,330 Facebook users within Beaumaris and Black Rock, with 1,864 post engagements. There were 369 unique page views to the project web page between 1 November 2018 and 31 March 2019.

This resulted in Council receiving 28 enquiries about the process throughout the nomination period. Property owners were invited to discuss their property in person with Council officers. These meetings provided residents with the opportunity to understand the process and implications, and presented an opportunity for the owners to provide Council with any relevant information and photographs in relation to their property. Residents that were supportive of the process agreed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to allow for commencement of the heritage assessment to identify whether the property has heritage significance.

At the conclusion of the nomination process, 14 property owners signed MoUs and supported their homes being assessed for potential heritage significance.

Following on from the finalisation of the nomination period, a survey was sent to those residents who expressed interest in the process and decided not nominate their property.
The survey aimed to provide insight and feedback on the overall voluntary nomination process and Council’s effort in providing information and assisting with enquiries.

Given the 11 land owners have consented to inclusion in the Heritage Overlay, it is considered that any future planning scheme amendment process can proceed without the requirement for public notice.

**Human Rights**

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**

Council has a responsibility for heritage preservation, consistent with the objective identified in Section 4(1)(d) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* to ‘conserv[e] and enhance those buildings, areas or other places which are of scientific, aesthetic, architectural or historical interest, or otherwise of special cultural value’.

**Finance**

The allocated budget of $40,000 to fund the commencement of the mid-century modern heritage study has been re-designated to the voluntary inclusion process. No further budget is currently required. However, if the voluntary nomination process is ongoing, further assessments may be required in the future to effectively assess the significance of mid-century modern heritage places.

Council can accommodate the future costs associated with a Ministerial planning scheme amendment as part of its operating budget.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

**The Heritage Action Plan**

Initiative H2 identifies that a mid-century modern heritage study should be completed to assist in closing gaps in Council’s knowledge of this era and to ensure that significant properties are protected. Whilst the study has been substituted by the voluntary inclusion process, Council’s intentions have remained, to ensure heritage significant buildings of the mid-century era and aesthetic are protected.

**Community Plan 2025**

This project delivers the ‘Council Output’ by advocating the voluntary nomination of properties and encouraging the ongoing protection of the mid-century modern aesthetic in Bayside.
20 May 2019

Rachael Hudson
Strategic Planner
Bayside City Council
PO Box 27
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191

Dear Rachael,

Stage 1 review of Mid-Century Modern Heritage Study nominations

This letter and attached report provides a Stage 1 assessment of the 14 houses that have been voluntarily nominated by their owners for inclusion within the Mid-century Modern Heritage Study (the MCM study).

The purpose of this Stage 1 assessment is to determine the houses that warrant progression to Stage 2 (detailed assessment) of the MCM study and those that should not. The objective is not to determine absolutely whether the house is significant, but rather whether it has strong potential for significance.

The attached report provides the methodology, analysis and rationale for this Stage 1 assessment. The table in Attachment A to the report provides the findings and recommendations for each of the nominated houses and a summary of the findings is provided below.

Summary of findings

Of the 14 nominated houses, 11 are recommended for assessment in Stage 2. They include:

➤ The Grutzner House, 55 Hayden’s Road, Beaumaris, which the City of Bayside Inter-War and Post War Heritage Study 2008 has already assessed to be of local significance. The existing heritage citation requires only a brief review to confirm this assessment, note any changes since 2008 and to clarify whether later additions designed by architect John Baird contribute to the significance of the place.

➤ Six houses that have strong potential for local significance as good examples of individually designed houses, most designed by architects (including some architect/designer’s own residences) in the MCM style (the Grutzner House also fits into this category). Potential significance against Hercon Criteria A, D & E, and possibly H:
  o Randall House, 33 Clonmore Street, Beaumaris.
  o Johnson House, 17 Coronet Grove, Beaumaris.
  o Bell House, 14 Gramatan Avenue, Beaumaris.
  o Phipot House, 7 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris.
  o Monsborough House, 153 Tramway Parade, Beaumaris.
  o Lyon House, 10 Vailmont Avenue, Beaumaris.

➤ Three houses that are good examples of MCM style project or ‘off the shelf’ houses. These have potential for individual significance, or may form part of a ‘serial’ listing of these places (Hercon Criteria A & D). They are:
  o 7 Coreen Avenue, Beaumaris.
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- 113 Daigety Road, Beaumaris.
- 14 Emily Street, Beaumaris.

One house at 384 Balcombe Road, Beaumaris that also warrants further analysis. However, the potential for local significance is lower, as it is a relatively late example that does not appear to have been designed by an architect and does not fit within the category of the small "off the shelf" or project homes.

There are three houses that are not recommended for Stage 2 assessment, as they are not examples of the MCM style and/or have been altered:

- 307 Beach Road, Beaumaris.
- 8 Stevens Parade, Black Rock.
- 23 Third Street, Black Rock.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Fond regards

David Helms
Mid-century Modern Heritage Study – Stage 1 assessment

1. Purpose

This report has been prepared for the City of Bayside and provides a Stage 1 assessment of the 14 houses that have been voluntarily nominated by their owners for inclusion within the Mid-century Modern Heritage Study (the MCM study).

The purpose of this Stage 1 assessment is to determine the houses that warrant progression to Stage 2 (detailed assessment) and those that should not. The objective is not to determine absolutely whether the house is significant, but rather whether it has strong potential for significance.

The table in Attachment A provides the findings and recommendations for each of the nominated houses. The letter that precedes this report provides a summary of the findings.

2. Methodology

This heritage review has been prepared in accordance with the Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, 2013 (the Burra Charter) and its guidelines, and in accordance with relevant guidelines including Planning Practice Note 1: Applying the heritage overlay (PPN1) and the Victorian Heritage Register Criteria and Threshold Guidelines 2019 (the Threshold Guidelines), prepared by Heritage Victoria. All terminology is consistent with the Burra Charter.

This review has been undertaken as a ‘desktop’ exercise. That is, no site inspections were undertaken and only limited research has been carried out, as noted below.

In preparing this review I have:

- Reviewed information about each nominated place provided by the City of Bayside. For most places, this includes original building permits and plans held by the City of Bayside, further information submitted by the owner, and at least one image.
- Reviewed relevant heritage studies including the City of Bayside Inter-War & Post-War Heritage Study (Heritage Alliance, 2008) and the Survey of Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria: Stage One (Heritage Alliance, 2008, for Heritage Victoria).
- Reviewed recent Heritage Victoria assessments of mid-century modern houses, including one house in Beaumaris.
- Reviewed information about mid-century houses and architecture contained in the Beaumaris Modern (BM), Built Heritage (BH) and Modernist Australia (MA) websites.
- Undertaken limited historical research using online resources such as Sands & McDougall Directories (SM), Property Sewerage Plans (PSF) etc., as required.

3. Existing heritage listings and assessments

None of the nominated places is currently included in the heritage overlay or any other statutory heritage register (e.g., Victorian Heritage Register) or heritage list (e.g., National Trust).

The City of Bayside Inter-War & Post-War Heritage Study 2008 assessed the house at 55 Haydens Road, Beaumaris to be of local significance and prepared a heritage citation for the place. The same study also identified 10 Valmont Avenue, Beaumaris as being of potential individual significance.
4. Historic context

The post-World War Two period in Melbourne was a time of unprecedented transformation, which saw the population double between 1947 and 1971. As Graeme Davison has noted:

Between 1950 and 1970, Melbourne became — for the first time since the 1880s — the fastest growing city in Australia. Perhaps more than any other Australian city, it exemplified the Fordist paradigm of urban growth — high investment in manufacturing, especially of protected consumer products such as cars and electrical goods, high levels of immigration, high levels of car and home ownership and high levels of government intervention in the provision of infrastructure. Melbourne became the main beachhead of American economic and cultural influence, and the leading centre of modernist innovation in art, architecture and design.¹

Modern architecture in Bayside

The City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study 2006 identified several new or revised themes in the historic development of the municipality. These include:

► The emergence of the Modern House (1935-1945)
► The development of the Modern House (1945-1975)

The following text is quoted directly from that study (Volume 1, pp. 19-22).

The emergence of the Modern House (1935-1945)

The emergence of modern residential architecture in what is now the City of Bayside can be traced back to the early 1930s — namely, the completion of the celebrated George Stocke house in Halifax Street, Brighton, in 1934. This house, with its flat roof and stark painted brick walls, was lauded at the time as the first truly Modern house in Melbourne’s suburbs. It was the work of architects Roy Grounds and Geoffrey Mewton, who became the leading exponents of this new progressive style of architecture in the Melbourne of the 1930s. Mewton himself later settled in the former City of Sandringham, designing a house for himself at 207 Bluff Road (1940), where he lived for almost two decades thence.

The work of many other leading modern architects of the late 1930s and early 1940s is also represented in the City of Bayside, including such practitioners as Seabrook & Fildes, Oakley & Parkes, Percy Everett, Best Overend, Leslie Perrott and Esmond Dorney. Stand-out examples include a block of modern flats in Cola Street, Elwood (1938), which remain as Best Overend’s most distinguished project after his celebrated Cairo Flats in Fitzroy, and another at 4 Bay Street, Brighton, by Esmond Dorney, unfortunate since demolished.

It is certainly no coincidence that all of these architects mentioned above actually lived in the area themselves. Residents of Brighton (in some cases, in houses of their own design) included Messrs Everett, Seabrook, Perrott, Oakley, Parkes and Overend, while Geoffrey Mewton, as already mentioned, lived in Sandringham, as did Esmond Dorney. Norman Seabrook’s partner, Alan Fildes, was an early resident of Beaumaris, and the flat-roofed modern house that he designed for himself at 457 Beach Road (since demolished) in 1942 was cited as the building that ‘started in Beaumaris the vogue for modern ideas’.

Although mostly associated with residential buildings, this emerging strain of Modernism was also manifest in a number of civic buildings. The City of Bayside is indeed fortunate in that it contains examples of both the modernist fire stations of Seabrook & Fildes and the modernist
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courthouses of Percy Everett, as well as a rare and remarkable modernist infant welfare centre in Black Rock. Another example of this Functionalist tradition, the municipal bath building on the Brighton beachfront, is a fine example of the work of the leading firm of Oakley & Parks, which served as official architects to the City of Brighton.

The development of the Modern House (1945-1975)
The pattern of emerging modern architecture that had begun in the mid-1930s continued on an even greater scale in the post-war period. By that time, however, the epicentre for such development had shifted further south and east from the established suburbs of Brighton and Sandringham into the previously under-developed areas of Brighton East and Beaumaris. The latter, in particular, would become an important centre for post-war architectural ideas.

This came about because a large part of the suburb – some 180 acres – had been purchased by the Dunlop-Perdieu Company in the 1930s as the proposed site for their new rubber factory. The development, however, did not proceed, and the land began to be sold off in the early 1950s. By that time, it represented one of the last substantial pockets of undeveloped land in the inner suburbs, and attracted the attention of both architects and prospective homeowners alike.

Following the lead of Alan Fildes, many leading architects designed houses for themselves in Beaumaris in the post-war period, including James Spears, David Godsell, David Brunton, Ken Atkins, T J Karasinski, Ian Freeland, John Gates (of Yuncken, Freeman Brothers, Griffiths & Simpson), Lindsay Bunnett (of Plottel, Bunnet & Alsoop) and Eric Lyon (of Smith, Tracey & Lyon).

However, not all of the new modern houses in Beaumaris represented the work of well-known architects designing for private clients, or indeed for themselves. Another important sub-theme was the emergence of off-the-shelf project housing. One of the first companies in Melbourne to offer this service was Contemporary Homes Pty Ltd, which was founded in Beaumaris. Its flagship design, the so-called Peninsula House, was designed by Robin Boyd, and many examples are said to have been erected in the area. Other project housing companies became active in the Beaumaris area, including E. McLean & Company and Consolidated Home Industries. In these two cases, the managing directors actually lived in Beaumaris themselves, in houses that were designed and built by their respective companies. A parallel development was the Small Homes Service of the RYIA, which offered a range of low-cost but carefully considered architect-designed housing options. Although the service was active across the entire state, Philip Goad points out that Beaumaris was part of an identifiable “belt” of housing that extended from Balwyn, Bulleen, Doncaster to Moorabbin. Such was the association with the coastal suburb that the Small Homes Service even offered one suitably unconventional house design under the name ‘Beaumaris Casual’.

The significance of Beaumaris as an epicentre for modern residential architecture in the post-war period has been acknowledged by many. It was mentioned by Robin Boyd in several of his publications, discussed by Neil Cerehan in his regular newspaper columns, and acknowledged in a contemporary guide to Melbourne architecture published in 1956. More recently, it has been subject to scholarly analysis by Dr Philip Goad who, incidentally, himself grew up in a modern architect-designed house in Beaumaris.

Another notable centre for modern residential architecture in the City of Bayside was the hitherto underdeveloped area of Brighton East, where the impact of European émigré architects represents an interesting sub-theme. In the years leading up to and just after the Second World War, the influx of Jewish immigrants to Australia included a number of architects who had trained and/or worked in some of the important centres of modern design in Europe. Many of these architects settled in Melbourne’s inner south-eastern suburbs of St Kilda East, Caulfield and Elsternwick, where they designed houses for their compatriots as well as other community buildings such as synagogues. Their sphere of influence also spread to the nearby portions of what is now the City of Bayside, and Brighton East in particular. Houses, more often than not commissioned by Jewish clients,
were designed by architects such as Herbert Tisher, Kurt Popper, Dr Ernest Focke, Bernard Slavik, Harry Ernest, and Anatol Kagan. This sub-theme is also demonstrated by a single example of a modern synagogue, in Maribyrnong Road, which was designed by Abraham Weinstock in 1965.

In Brighton proper, there were (and are) some fine individual examples of architect-designed modern houses built in the post-war period, but these remain as individual specimens rather than larger precincts as seen in Beaumaris and (to a lesser extent) Cheltenham. An interesting exception was the development that followed the demolition of the former Melbourne Orphan Asylum in Brighton in the mid-1960s, which made available a substantial tract of land in the centre of this well-established suburb. Like the former Dunlop factory site in Beaumaris, this land became highly sought-after, and was promptly subdivided to create Lynch Crescent and environs. The sites developed with some fine modern houses, including examples by architects such as Chancellor & Patrick, Clive Freadman and Max Chester.

Fittingly, this recurring theme of fine modern houses within the City of Bayside becomes even clearer when one considers the number of individual examples that have achieved success through the annual RAIA architectural awards. This was most evident in the period from 1968 to 1976, which saw two houses in Brighton and Beaumaris awarded the Bronze Medal for the House of the Year, respectively, in 1972 and 1976. Moreover, no fewer than six other examples in Brighton, Beaumaris and Hampton received citations in the domestic architecture category during that same period.

Place history
The houses nominated for this study are situated in Beaumaris (12) and Black Rock (2) and were constructed from c.1946 to the early 1970s. Please refer to the table in Attachment 1 for further details.

5. Criteria for significance
As noted in the introduction, the purpose of this Stage 1 assessment is not to determine absolutely whether the place is significant, but rather whether it has strong potential for significance. In accordance with PPN1, this could include:

- Individual significance at the local level, or
- Significance, as part of a ‘group, thematic or serial listing’. Places in such a listing would not meet the threshold of significance on their own, but would be of contributory significance as part of the listing. They would need to have clearly defined characteristics and a strong historic/thematic association.

Assessment of heritage places using the Hercon criteria involves a two-step process:

- Does the place satisfy the Hercon criterion?
- Does the place satisfy the Hercon criterion at the local (or State) level?

On this basis, the assessment of each nominated house has considered:

- Whether the house demonstrates the characteristics of the Mid-century Modern (MCM) style?
- If the answer to the above is yes, having regard to the details known of the place whether it has potential to satisfy any of the Hercon criterion.

Characteristics of the mid-century modern style
Of the many thousands of houses built in the post-war era not all display the key characteristics of what is defined as the MCM style. Many simply carried over the traditional layouts and forms of the
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Hipped roof bungalows of the interwar period, which evolved into the almost ubiquitous double and triple-fronted houses with tiled hip roofs and cream brick walls. The key difference was the stripping away of almost all external (and internal) decoration.

MCM houses built in the period from c.1945 to c.1970 on the other hand are broadly characterised by open planning and simplicity with bold geometric shapes and little or no ornamentation. Key characteristics include:

- Flat, low pitch, or single angle (skillion) rooflines, often with large eaves. Often extend to form an open carport at one side.
- Floor to ceiling windows, often arranged as ‘window walls’ allowing for strong connections between indoor and outdoor spaces, which are often placed as courtyards in the centre of dwellings.
- Clean lines and open plan spaces.
- Site-specific responses to building siting and placement having regard to topography and orientation. Often, the front of the house does not face the street.
- Internally, rooms are characterised by clean lines and open plan spaces, often with split-levels and sunken living areas.
- Lack of decorative and ornate styling such as ceiling roses, iron lacework etc.
- The use of new materials and technology from the era in both construction and finishes.

Applicable Hercon criteria

Using the Heritage Victoria Threshold Guidelines, the potential reasons for significance under the relevant Hercon are set out below.

Criterion A
Importance to the course or pattern of our cultural or natural history (historical significance).

MCM style houses associated with the development of Beaumaris as one of the epicentres of Modern architecture in Melbourne in the post-war era. Having regard to the historic themes identified in the City of Bayside Inter-War & Post-War Heritage Study 200 this association is demonstrated by:

- MCM style houses of individual designs by architects, including as their own residences, or for clients.
- MCM style project homes or ‘off the shelf’ designs, by building companies.

Criterion B:
Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of our cultural or natural history (rarity).

Given the sheer numbers of houses constructed in the post-war era, it may be difficult to establish significance under this criterion.

Criterion C:
Potential to yield information that will contribute to understanding our cultural or natural history (research potential).

Not applicable.

Criterion D:
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a class of cultural or natural places or environments (representativeness).
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To satisfy this criterion, the houses will display a large number or range of characteristics that is typical of MCM houses, or characteristics that are of a higher quality or historical relevance than are typical of others MCM houses, or displays the principal characteristics of MCM houses in a way that allows this style to be easily understood/appreciated. They may also be:

- A highly intact example.
- An influential example.
- A pivotal example.

**Criterion E:**

*Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics (aesthetic significance).*

May be applicable to some places. This would include houses and their settings that display distinctive visual qualities having regard to form, scale, setting, unity, contrast, colour, texture and material of the fabric.

**Criterion F:**

*Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period (technical significance).*

May be applicable to some places. For example, in the demonstration of a new building technology.

**Criterion G:**

*Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons. This includes the significance of a place to Indigenous peoples as part of their continuing and developing cultural traditions (social significance).*

Not applicable.

**Criterion H:**

*Special association with the life or works of a person, or group of persons, of importance in our history (associative significance).*

May be applicable to some houses – e.g., those designed as an architect’s own house, or if they represent an early or pivotal design in the works of the architect/designer.

---

**6. Sources**

Beaumaris Modern (BM) website (beaumarismodern.com.au), accessed 19 May 2019

Beaumaris Modern, 2018, Fiona Austin with Alison Alexander and Simon Reeves

Built Heritage (BH) website (builtheritage.com.au), accessed 19 May 2019

City of Bayside Inter-War & Post-War Heritage Study (Heritage Alliance, 2008)

Modernist Australia (MA) website (modernistaustralia.com), accessed 19 May 2019

Property Sewerage Plan (PSP), obtained from South East Water

Saunders & McDougall Directories (SM)

Survey of Post-War Built Heritage in Victoria: Stage One (Heritage Alliance, 2008, for Heritage Victoria).
## Attachment 1 – Nominated houses findings and recommendations

Houses are listed in alphabetical order by street address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>History and description summary</th>
<th>Stage 1 recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>384 Balcombe Road,</td>
<td>The current owner claims that Daryl Jackson designed this house in 1969. However, the earliest building plans held by the City of Bayside are dated 1974, and the name of the designer has been obscured. The PSP also confirms a 1974 construction date for the present house. The house was a single storey with mottled brick walls and a flat roof.</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. A representative example of a house showing MCM influences. However, as a relatively late example, potential significance will depend upon a site inspection, further research and comparative analysis, including determining whether there is any connection to Daryl Jackson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaumaris</td>
<td>There was a house on this site from at least 1965 when Mrs. L. Brown was listed here, followed by P.K. Murray in 1970 (SM). The 1974 plans were prepared for a Mr &amp; Mrs Andrew, so it is probable that the present house replaced an earlier house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This single storey house with mottled brick walls has some MCM characteristics including the flat roof. It appears to be relatively intact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>397 Beach Road,</td>
<td>Building plans show the first stage of this house was built c.1948 and appears to have been single storey (possibly with a flat roof) and a rear double storey wing with a hip roof. First floor additions were made c.1961 and c.1994. While this house dates from the post-war era, it has a conventional hip roof form and the later additions have radically changed the form of the original house and it does not demonstrate characteristics of the MCM style.</td>
<td>Not recommended for Stage 2. Although constructed c.1948, as a consequence of later alterations this house is not in the MCM style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaumaris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendell House</td>
<td>33 Glenmore Street,</td>
<td>Ken Rendell, architect, designed this house as his own residence. The first stage was complete by 1967 and he also designed additions in 1969 and 1972, and a carport in 1985, all sympathetic to the original dwelling (Original building plans and permits held by City of Bayside). A MCM style house with a flat roof, constructed of brown brick, set within a related native garden. Appears to be very intact. Incl</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Strong potential for local significance as a good example of an architect’s own residence in the MCM style. Potential significance against Heron Criteria A, D &amp; E, and possibly H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MID-CENTURY MODERN HERITAGE ASSESSMENT STAGE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>History and description summary</th>
<th>Stage 1 recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>7 Coreen Avenue,</td>
<td>Reputedly built to a ‘Small Homes’ design, this house was built some time between 1960 and 1965. Coreen Avenue is not listed in the 1960 Directory, but by 1965 was almost fully built up. D.W. Clark was listed as the occupant of this house at no.7 (SM). Original building plans are not available, but there are plans showing the addition of a bedroom to the rear in 1971, and a family room (also at the rear). These show the original house was designed in a U-shape around a central courtyard. At some time, the carport has been enclosed to form a garage. A single storey timber residence with MCM style features including the low-pitched gable roofs and timber window wall, as well as the courtyard planning.</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. A good representative example of the simple MCM project or ‘off the shelf’ houses constructed in Beaumaris during the post-war era. Potential significance (Criteria A &amp; D) will depend upon further research and comparative analysis. Could form part of a ‘serial listing’ of similar small project houses (see also 113 Dalgety Road and 14 Emily Street).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaumaris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson House</td>
<td>17 Coronet Grove,</td>
<td>It appears that R. Milton Johnson, an engineer, designed this house as his own residence in about 1957 (PSP). In 1955 there were two listings in Coronet Grove: Mrs A. Piercy and N.S. Hoekling. By 1960, this house was one of 11 in the street (six on the east side and five on west) (SM). Johnson lived in the house with his wife, Sylvania. The City of Bayside does not hold the original plans, but it does have building plans for additions and alterations made in 1965. The building permit form lists R. Milton Johnson as the ‘Supervising architect or engineer’, and the plans were prepared by Milton Johnson &amp; Associates, Consulting Engineers of 317 Collins Street, Melbourne. A letter appended to one of application shows that Johnson gained his qualifications at Harvard. It appears the 1965 additions extended the house on the north side, and added an ensuite to the master bedroom on the south side, rooms into lower level and the arched entrance canopy (originally, this was intended to extend closer toward the street, but was reduced at the request of Council as well as the carport. The 1965 plans also show</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Strong potential for local significance as a good example of a designer’s own residence in the MCM style. The house is complemented by original fencing and landscaping details. Potential significance against Heron Criteria A &amp; E, and possibly H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaumaris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Information provided by current owner.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>History and description summary</th>
<th>Stage 1 recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| House  | 113 Dalgety Road, Beaumaris | That the bluestone walls, and lava rock retaining walls were part of the original design.  
This is a flat roofed MCM style house, which appears to be very intact to the 1965 design, including remnants of the original landscaping. | Recommended for Stage 2 assessment.  
A good representative example of the simple MCM project or ‘off the shelf’ houses constructed in Beaumaris during the post-war era.  
Potential significance (Criteria A & D) will depend upon further research and comparative analysis. Could form part of a ‘serial listing’ of similar small project houses (see also 7 Coreen Avenue and 14 Emily Street) |
| House  | 14 Emily Street, Beaumaris | This house was constructed in 1967 for S.J. Golden who was still living here in 1960. The current owner believes this house may have been constructed by Eric McLean and Company, a project home builder that was active in Beaumaris in the post-war era (see section 4 of this report). However, this appears unlikely as the original plans held by the City of Bayside were prepared by King & Reynolds ‘Industrial and Home Designers’ of East Bentleigh.  
The original plans show the house originally had a L-shaped plan with each wing having a separate skillion roof. The front section facing the street contained the lounge, dining and kitchen/launder with an open carport at the eastern end and featured a timber window wall across the façade (which may have been clad with vertical timber boards). The rear wing contained two bedrooms and a bathroom. Subsequent additions in 1968, 1973 and 1982 extended the house at the rear. However, it appears that no changes were made to the façade.  
This house is not visible in Streetview, so the integrity of the house is partly obscured by the adjacent houses. | Recommended for Stage 2 assessment.  
A good representative example of the simple MCM project or ‘off the shelf’ houses constructed in Beaumaris during the post-war era.  
Potential significance (Criteria A & D) will depend upon further research and comparative analysis. Could form part of a ‘serial listing’ of similar small project houses (see also 7 Coreen Avenue and 113 Dalgety Road) |
## MID-CENTURY MODERN HERITAGE ASSESSMENT STAGE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>History and description summary</th>
<th>Stage 1 recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell House</td>
<td>14 Gramatan Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>This house was constructed sometime between 1960 and 1965 for Robert Bell (SM). Eric McLean &amp; Company was the builder (and possible designer). It is unclear whether Eric McLean (or anyone within his company) was an architect, but he is acknowledged as a skilled designer (SM). Alterations and additions carried out in 2012 included the construction of a new front deck and replacement of some original features. A house with MCM characteristics including the simple cubic form, flat roof and open plan layout and details such as breeze blocks. Complemented by remnants of original or early landscaping including lava rock retaining walls. Included in the Beaumaris Modern book.</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. A good example of a house in the MCM style, possibly architect-designed, complemented by landscaping. Potential significance against Heron Criteria A, D &amp; E, and possibly H. However, will need to assess impacts of the 2012 changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipot House</td>
<td>7 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Designed in 1959 by architect, John Baird (who lived in Beaumaris and designed several houses in the area) this house was completed by 1960 for R &amp; V. Philipot. Baird also designed the additions carried out in the late 1960s. This was one of his earliest commissions (SM). This is a MCM style house with a flat roof and open carport to one side. The front yard is enclosed by a high brick fence that is likely contemporary with the house. Included in the Beaumaris Modern book.</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Strong potential for local significance as a good example of an architect-designed house in the MCM style. Potential significance against Heron Criteria A, D &amp; E, and possibly H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grutzner House</td>
<td>55 Haydens Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>John Mockridge, architect, of Mockridge, Stahl &amp; Mitchell designed this house in 1957 for Patrick and Angela Grutzner. The house was completed by 1959. In 1969, architect John Baird (a friend of the owners who had originally recommended Mockridge) designed a small extension. The City of Bayside Inter-War &amp; Post-War Heritage Study 2008 assessed this place to be of local architectural and aesthetic</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 review. I believe the 2008 assessment is sound and this house would still satisfy the threshold of local significance. The review should not note any changes since 2008, and clarify whether the additions made in 1961 and 1969 also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>History and description summary</th>
<th>Stage 1 recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>8 Stevens Road, Black Rock</td>
<td>This house, constructed c.1960 (SM) shows the influence of the Streamlined Moderne style, which emerged during the 1930s, in features such as the curved corner porch, and corner steel-framed windows. However, otherwise it has a conventional bungalow form and the Moderne features are diluted by the prominent hipped tile roof. At the time of its construction this style was rather old-fashioned. While the house is very intact and complemented by an original front fence it is not an example of the MCM style.</td>
<td>Not recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Although constructed c.1960 this house is not in the MCM style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>23 Third Street, Black Rock</td>
<td>This house was constructed c.1962. While it is of the post-war era, the style is old-fashioned and harks back to the attic bungalows of the 1930s and displays some Colonial and Georgian Revival influences.</td>
<td>Not recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Although constructed c.1962 this house is not in the MCM style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsbrough House</td>
<td>163 Tramway Parade, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Ronald G. Monsbough, architect, designed this house as a residence for himself and his wife Barbara. The house was constructed in 1957 and Monsbough also designed the additions that were carried out in 1963 and 1970. Monsbrough (sometimes misspelt as ‘Monsboor’ or ‘Monsbough’) also designed the house at 132 Tramway Parade (MA). In the 1970s he designed several movie theatres and cinemas. The Built Heritage website has a biography. The house demonstrates characteristics of MCM style including the low-pitch hip roof, the large timber windows and the unusual plan form comprising two overlapping squares.</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Strong potential for local significance as a good example of an architect’s own residence in the MCM style. Potential significance against Mercon Criteria A, D &amp; E, and possibly H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon House</td>
<td>10 Valmont Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>Eric Lyon, architect, designed this house as his own residence. The house was constructed in 1953. Built on a sloping site, at the corner of Wells Road, this MCM style house has a H-plan with a low-pitched skillion or gabled roofs and timber windows in long horizontal banks, and a carport within the</td>
<td>Recommended for Stage 2 assessment. Strong potential for local significance as a good example of an architect’s own residence in the MCM style. Potential significance against Mercon Criteria A, D &amp; E, and possibly H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>History and description summary</td>
<td>Stage 1 recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undercroft area. The walls are clad in concrete block or vertical timber boards. Plans approved in 2019 would result in some changes to the house, including replacement of original windows. The City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study 2009 included this house on a list of places of potential individual significance. Also included in the Beaumaris Modern book</td>
<td>E, and possibly H. However, will need to assess impacts of recent changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>Year of construction</th>
<th>Recommend for Heritage Assessment?</th>
<th>Included in the Early Years Infrastructure Plan?</th>
<th>Further Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ricketts Point Tea House</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not present any common characteristics of an MCM building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-53 Bluff Road, Black Rock</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Property already listed in the Heritage Overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28B Bodley Street, Beaumaris MCH centre</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor capital works are proposed to the property to amenities and the front entrance. It is unclear whether the building has been previously assessed, as it is not referenced in the <em>Inter-War and Post War Heritage Study</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28A Bodley Street, Beaumaris Olive Phillips Kindergarten</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previously assessed and considered to be of significance in the <em>City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study Volume 1</em> (2008). This building should be re-assessed again and reviewed in comparison to the previous assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Bodley Street, Beaumaris Tennis Building</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not present any common characteristics of an MCM building. The building is potentially being removed, as this is the resolution being put forth to Council in May 2019. The building was previously leased commercially however this has since expired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Martin Street, Beaumaris Beaumaris Bowls Club</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building was built during the interwar period, however, has not been identified previously to be of significance in the <em>City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study Volume 1</em> (2008). The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. It is recommended that the building be assessed for MCM heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Street, Beaumaris Cath Wild Girl Guide Hall</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building was built in 1960, however, has not been previously listed in the <em>City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study Volume 2</em> (2008). The property is council owned and is leased by the Girl Guide Club. The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. It is recommended that the building be assessed for MCM heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bodley Street, Beaumaris Sea Scouts Hall</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building was built in 1950, however, has not been previously listed in the <em>City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study Volume 1</em> (2008). The property is council owned and is leased by the Sea Scouts Club.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>55 Bluff Road, Black Rock</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. It is recommended that the building be assessed for MCM heritage significance. Council has allocated approximately $300,000 for improvements to spaces and amenities to increase the functionality of the centre. It is recommended that the value of the building is in its current use rather than being restricted by a Heritage Overlay, however it may be worth assessing the property for potential significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Black Rock Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>60-62 Wells Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Council is investing $2.2 million to expand the centre significantly. It is recommended that the community benefit remain in the redevelopment of the centre rather than the preservation of the existing building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Beaumaris East Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>80 Wells Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended for assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Beaumaris East Stan Hawkins Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>17 &amp; 19 Gordon Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Council is investing $678,000 into the redevelopment and expansion of the centre to increase space and amenities. It is recommended that the value of the building is in its current use rather than being restricted by a Heritage Overlay, however it may be worth assessing the property for potential significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Gordon St Kinder and MCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>574-576 Balcombe Road, Black Rock</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Previously assessed as part of the City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage study Volume 1 (2008). It is considered that this be updated and reviewed to ensure the previous material remains relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Black Rock Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>20 Keating Street, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not present any common characteristics of an MCM building. The resolution from the April 2019 Council meeting was to demolish the building. This has come from the recommendations listed in the Bayside Sportsground Pavilion Improvement Plan 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Donald McDonald Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>30-36 Ebden Avenue, Black Rock</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Property already listed in the Heritage Overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Black Rock House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>24 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does not present any common characteristics of an MCM building. No plans proposed as part of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Beaumaris Playhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>26 Grandview Avenue, Beaumaris</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The kindergarten building was considered as part of the Inter-War and Post-War heritage study and deemed to not present heritage value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Jack and Jill Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Has Characteristic</th>
<th>Has Significance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Karrakatta Street, Black Rock</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Council resolution to sell this property and move to the masonic hall in 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris (Art Studio)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building is potentially being removed, as this is the resolution being put forth to Council in May 2019. The report recommends that the existing building be demolished and replaced, this is proposed to occur in 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-38 Bonanza Road, Beaumaris (Men’s Shed)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does appear to have some traits of an MCM building. The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. It is recommended that the building be assessed for MCM heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris (Soccer)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not present any common characteristics of an MCM building. Not recommended for assessment. Resolution was endorsed at the April 2019 Council meeting to demolish the building. This has come from the recommendations listed in the Bayside Sportsground Pavilion improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris (Tennis)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Proposed works for the building include the installation of a ramp and connecting paths to the adjacent art and community centre buildings. This can be included for assessment but it is not thought that the building presents any common characteristics of an MCM building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris (U3A)</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended for assessment. No plans proposed as part of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-96 Reserve Road, Beaumaris (Community Centre/Library)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recommended for assessment, though unlikely to fall within the MCM criteria. This building is also utilised as Council’s emergency evacuation centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Oak Street, Beaumaris (Tennis and Footy)</td>
<td>1970 &amp; 2018</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Original building was built in 1970 however was heavily renovated and extended in 2018 (80% of this is building has been newly constructed), it is not recommended for assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building/Address</th>
<th>Date of Construction</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ricketts Point Tea House – 243 Beach Road, Beaumaris VIC 3193</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Not recommended for heritage assessment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Tea House has an intact art deco style, however this has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heavily renovated [all external materials have been upgraded] and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>developed as a beachside café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The building was constructed in 1984 which is outside of the mid-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>century modern architectural era. This is further distinguished in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the photos – the café has a large curved roof and timber cladding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which does not represent the era whatsoever.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 51 - 53 Bluff Rd BLACK ROCK – Baby Health Care Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The property is already listed within the Heritage Overlay and was constructed in 1939 as a Health Centre and is of aesthetic and historical significance. As described in the City of Bayside Heritage Review, Volume 2 - Building citations – Part 1 (A-F), ‘the Modern style of the building is characteristic of the health centres constructed during this period, displaying typical features such as cream brickwork, steel-framed windows, a cantilevered concrete hoot and steel lettering.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
28B Bodley St BEAUMARIS – Maternal and Children Health Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Not recommended for heritage assessment:

The property appears to have mid-century modern Heritage appearance however has been listed as part of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan 2018 - 2028 for improvements to amenities and front entrance (estimated cost is $50,000). It is considered that applying the Heritage Overlay may significantly impact on providing these improvements which are necessary as the building is a Maternity and Child Care Centre.

The proposed minor capital works includes the replacement of a breezeway which connects the MCH and Kindergarten buildings.

Whilst there are no plans to suggest so, the MCH could be materially changed to be utilised as a 3 year old Kindergarten coming into the future. This would however pend on the increasing number of children within Bayside.
28A Bodley St BEAMARIS - Child Care Centre

1975

Recommended for heritage assessment;

The building is known as the Olive Phillips Free Kindergarten and was previously assessed as part of the City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage study Volume 1 (2008) by which it was recommended for inclusion within the planning scheme Heritage Overlay. In Volume 2, the statement of significance states that;

The Olive Phillips Free Kindergarten and Infant welfare centre is a single-storey concrete block building, expressed as two attached pyramid-roofed pavilions with a connecting flat-roofed breezeway. Erected in 1974 to replace an original community building destroyed by fire, the new centre was designed by local architect David Godsell.

Architecturally, the building is significant as a rare example of a non-residential building designed by noted architect David Godsell (Criterion 8). He was one of Melbourne’s leading exponents of the Prairie School style that was revived by a new generation of young architects in the years prior to, and just after, the death of Frank Lloyd Wright in 1959. Best known for his Wrightian houses, Godsell designed very few non-residential buildings, and fewer still were ever built. A long-time resident of Beaumaris (from 1960 until his death in 1986), Godsell designed a number of houses in what is now the City of Bayside (including his own at 491 Balcombe Road) but the Olive Phillips Free Kindergarten remains as his only realised non-residential building in the municipality.
28 Bodley St BEAUMARIS - Tennis building

1960

Not recommended for heritage assessment:

There is no existing information on the tennis building that indicates it is of significant mid-century modern heritage value. Whilst the building was constructed in 1960, its purpose as a small tennis shed/clubhouse is not considered to be worthy of heritage overlay protection. Furthermore, the building has been painted in bright colours (red and green) which does not contribute to its value.

In regards to the operation of the tennis club, the building was previously leased by Beaumaris Lawn tennis, however this has since expired. The building is potentially being removed, as this is the recommendation of the Council Report that is being put forth this month (May 2019) to the Council meeting. The report also recommends upgrades to the weather surface on the courts and new nets.

It is thought that there is no real community attachment to the building, and Council has not received any previous information or interest for the building.
45 Martin St BEAUMARIS - Bowls Building

1960

Recommended for heritage assessment:
The building has a flat skillion roof and does appear to have Mid-Century Modern heritage aesthetic. The bowls club was built in 1960 and appears to have maintained its external aesthetic appearance. Internally, the club has been renovated (only to the bar and kiosk), and was funded by the Bowls Club, as the lessee of the building. All other features of the building have remained intact, clean and tidy. Upon discussion with Council staff, it has been noted that there is a strong investment at the bowls club, and memberships are very high.

As aforementioned, it has been identified on the Open Journal website that the Beaumaris Bowls Club is a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris.

Further discussions should be had with the Beaumaris Bowls Committee regarding any concerns of this inclusion, and to also discuss the history of the building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recommended for heritage assessment;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cath Wild Girl Guide Hall Martin Street BEAUMARIS</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. The building does appear to have mid-century modern aesthetic with panelled windows, exposed brick and a flat skillion roof to match. The property is owned by Council, with the lessee of the building being the Girls Guide Club. According to our records, this leasing agreement dates back to 1994. A fire took place within the building approximately 5 years ago, and in subsequence, renovation to various internal features (including the kitchen, bathroom and storage room) were required. The Girl Guide group received funding to complete the building works. Accessibility to the building has also been upgraded to comply with the relevant Building Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bodley Street, BEAUMARIS - Sea Scouts Hall</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. The building is very simple in design, mostly brick with some small windows and doors facing Bodley Street. The property is owned by Council, with the lessee of the building being the Sea Scouts Club. According to our records, this leasing agreement dates back to 1955. The Club have built a new outbuilding (shed) at the rear of the building, however no alterations or modifications have been completed to the Hall itself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The building has heritage character but does not appear to be of mid-century modern style. The roof comes to an apex and rather than exposed brick being used for the walls, there are timber slats. The subject site houses a kindergarten and is next door to 51-53 Bluff Road, which is already within the Heritage Overlay. A new kindergarten is currently being built on Fern Street to be used in conjunction with this kindergarten.

Furthermore, the property has been identified in the infrastructure plan 2018-2028 for improvements to spaces and amenities to increase functionality (cost estimate is $192,000).

The proposal’s design will improve access to the amenity building and an access ramp at the entrance of the building, to comply with the necessary building standards.
This property has been included as a large item on the Early Years Infrastructure Plan 2018-2028, it is estimated that $2,250,000 will be spent replacing with a new double room, 55 place facility as it has comparatively high use and is poorly functional. This recommendation has come from the Bayside Early Years Facilities plan. Building works are considered to commence in the second half of the Infrastructure Plan, from 2026 onwards;

- Entrance veranda
- Foyer
- Office
- Staff/meeting room
- Indoor play room 1
- Indoor play room 2
- Internal storage
- Kitchen
- Staff/accessible toilet
- Children’s amenities area
- Verandas off playroom
- External storage.
80 Wells Rd BEAUMARIS – Hall

1965

Recommended for heritage assessment:
The building is leased by the Beaumaris Theatre Inc. and appears to potentially be of mid-century modern heritage value however has not been previously identified in Council’s heritage documents. Whilst it appears that various alterations have been made to the building (the front façade has an attached awning at the entrance), all other external materials have remained intact with exposed brick, and glass panelled windows at the front, and flat roofing.

Furthermore, the building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the ‘walking tour’ of Beaumaris. It is recommended that further investigations on the building take place.
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17 & 19 Gordon St BEAUMARIS

1959

Not recommended for heritage assessment:

This property has been included as a large item on the Early Years Infrastructure Plan 2018-2028, it is estimated that $678,000 will be spent redeveloping and extending the existing facility to increase spaces and amenities.

The two buildings upon the site are currently used separately; one is the Kindergarten and the other is leased by a community group. It is planned that the Kindergarten will be redeveloped by extending into the existing facility once the lease for the community group is discontinued. The redevelopment proposes the following changes by creating a second internal playroom:

- New kitchen provided
- Part of kitchen converted to staff/confidential meeting room
- Office extended
- Storage area made more efficient
- Front veranda and foyer area provided
- Staff/disabled toilet created
- Main playroom extended
- Children’s bathroom updated
- Second internal playroom created
- Internal storage area and kitchen provided off second playroom.

In considering the large amount of proposed works that will take place to the building to ensure it is fit for future purpose, it is recommended that the community benefit remain in the redevelopment of the centre rather than the preservation of the existing building.
574 - 576 Balcombe Rd BLACK ROCK – Public Hall

1962

Recommended for heritage assessment;

The property has been previously assessed as part of the City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War heritage study Volume 1 by which the property was recommended for inclusion within the planning scheme Heritage Overlay. In Volume 2, the statement of significance identifies that;

The Black Rock Public Hall at 574-576 Balcombe Road, Black Rock, is a flat-roofed modern building comprising a double-height brick box and a single-storey glazed wing. These are linked by an entry foyer, with a feature wall of coloured glass set in a concrete block screen. The hall was designed in 1961 by Nates, Smart & McCutcheon, which undertook several projects for the City of Sandringham at that time.

Architecturally, the hall is significant as an example of the work of the important mid-twentieth century firm of Bates, Smart & McCutcheon (Criterion H.1). As Melbourne’s oldest architectural office, it was responsible for many noted building during its various incarnations, but was best known in the mid-century as a leading exponent of the International Modern style. This prolific firm, best known for large-scale commercial and institutional projects, made surprisingly few forays into the field of civic architecture. The public hall at Black Rock stands out as the most intact of a series of buildings that were designed for the City of Sandringham in the late 1950s.

The building has remained as is since its construction, however is in need of renovation to restore its internal condition. The only minor internal works that have been completed include a fresh coat of paint and a small renovation to the kitchen. Despite its
Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 Keating St BEAUMARIS</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>Not recommended for heritage assessment;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst the building was constructed in 1960, it does not appear to be of Mid-Century Modern heritage appearance or value. The roof is not skillion flat styled and whilst there are some glass panelled windows, this is only for a small portion of the building. Furthermore, a resolution was reached from the April 2019 Council meeting to demolish the building. This has come from the recommendations listed in the Bayside Sportsground Pavilion Improvement Plan 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 - 36 Ebden Av BLACK ROCK – Black Rock House</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not recommended for heritage assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst this property is of heritage significant, it is not symbolic of the mid-century modern architectural design. Furthermore, the building is already identified in the Heritage Overlay for other reasons. As explained in the City of Bayside Heritage Review - Building citations – Volume 2 – Part 1 (A-F), the design of the house is believed to be influenced by South African precedent where Charles Ebden (the owner) lived for a period. The Black Rock house is of national significance as the home of Charles Ebden and of State significance as a post gold rush marine villa associated with the first phase of settlement in this vicinity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>24 Grandview Av BEAUMARIS – Beaumaris Playhouse</strong></th>
<th><strong>1965</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended for heritage assessment:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This property has been included for **general works** as part of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan 2018-2028. The following actions could be undertaken and are part of the general works list:

- Accessible bin enclosures;
- Entrance improvements – landscaping, paving;
- Bike and scooter racks;
- Storage expert. Disposal of surplus equipment etc. Recommendations on improvements to storage areas. Minor works undertaken;
- Technology improvements;
- Privacy doors on children’s bathrooms;
- Verandas made enclosable;
- Acoustic ceiling tiles replaced; and
- Hire and siting of portables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26 Grandview Av BEAMARIS – Kindergarten</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>Not recommended for heritage assessment;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building does not appear to have any mid-century modern aesthetic or architectural value. Furthermore, the property has been included for <em>general works</em> as part of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan 2018-2028. The following actions could be undertaken and are part of the general works list;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessible bin enclosures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entrance improvements – landscaping, paving;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike and scooter racks;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storage expert. Disposal of surplus equipment etc. Recommendations on improvements to storage areas. Minor works undertaken;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technology improvements;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privacy doors on children’s bathrooms;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10.11 – Reports by the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Verandas made enclosable;  
- Acoustic ceiling tiles replaced; and  
- Hire and siting of portables  

The City of Bayside Inter-War and Post-War Heritage Study (2008), briefly makes mention to the building;  

An earlier kindergarten in Beaumaris, located in Grandview Avenue [this building], was erected in 1958 to the design of Berg & Alexandra, who undertook a number of projects for the City of Sandringham at that time. This, however, is a fairly conventional skillion-roofed timber-framed building.  

The building is therefore not deemed to be heritage significant, and was not listed as a building citation.
| 2 Karrakatta St BLACK ROCK | 1965 | Not recommended for heritage assessment:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council has resolved to sell this property once the Black Rock Senior Citizens are relocated to Masonic Hall Sandringham in 2021. This property is therefore not required to be included in the Heritage Overlay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Address</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 - 96 Reserve Rd BEAUMARIS - Art Studios</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Not recommended for heritage assessment; The building is potentially being removed, as this is the resolution being put forth to Council in May 2019. The report recommends that the existing building be demolished and replaced, this is proposed to occur in 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 36 - 38 Bonanza Rd BEAUMARIS - Men's Shed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>The building has a very simplistic design and is complimented by the flat skillion roof. The building is listed on the Open Journal website as a site to visit on the 'walking tour' of Beaumaris.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended for heritage assessment;
84 - 96 Reserve Road BEAUMARIS – Soccer

Not recommended for heritage assessment:
The building is not very distinct and does not appear to be of heritage value. Resolution was endorsed at the April 2019 Council meeting to demolish the building. This has come from the recommendations listed in the Bayside Sportsground Pavilion improvement Plan.
Proposed works for the building include the installation of a ramp and connecting paths to the adjacent art and community centre buildings. This can be included for assessment but it is not thought that the building presents any common characteristics of an MCM building.
| 84 - 96 Reserve Road BEAUMARIS - U3A | 1960 | **Recommended for heritage assessment:**  
The property does appear to potentially have mid-century modern aesthetic, particularly the flat roof and front entrance that has large windows. The building should be reviewed by a heritage assessor. |
84 - 96 Reserve Rd BEAUMARIS - Community Centre / Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reports by the Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Working Draft – Preliminary assessment of Mid-Century Modern Heritage for Council-owned land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**84 - 96 Reserve Rd BEAUMARIS - Community Centre / Library**

**Recommended for heritage assessment:**
This property is the Library and Community Centre. It is considered to have heritage significance however it is uncertain what the architectural era. Whether it is of Mid-Century Modern Heritage significance or of other heritage value, it is considered assessment should be undertaken for its potential inclusion in the Heritage Overlay regardless.
68 Oak St BEAUMARIS (Tennis and Footy)

2018

Not recommended for heritage assessment:
This original building was built in 1970 however was completely modernised and expanded on in 2018.
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10.12 3D MODELLING TOOL

Executive summary

Purpose and background
To present Council with the research undertaken into the feasibility of implementing a suite of innovative tools to communicate what suburbs will look like in 20 years.

This report has been prepared in response to Council Plan Action 3.3.1.8 and taking into consideration broader actions of the Council Plan 2017-2021, to provide stronger planning tools to achieve certainty regarding height and building form in activity centres. The 3D modelling initiatives that are being utilised across the development and design and local government sector have been assessed and the application to Bayside explored.

Key issues

What is 3D modelling?
3D modelling is created using high resolution imagery and data and allows viewers to interact with a map on a 3D level. This gives reality to heights, depths and density of the natural and built environments, and offers a new platform for Council’s current processes and procedures.

How have Council’s implemented a 3D model?
The most notable theme in delivering a 3D model has been as a tool that is publically available, to the benefit of the community and Council by increasing the opportunity for community consultation in investment decisions. This report compares the implementation of a 3D model within three different Councils:

1. Melbourne City Council – titled as ‘3D DAM,’ the program is used to track the activity of development that is proposed, approved, and under construction; and

   A separate tool has also been developed to provide a virtual reality experience and has been set at events to promote Melbourne.

2. Moreland City Council – a three tiered project which delivers:
   - A 3D Model for public and internal use;
   - An iPhone and Android App which provides residents the ability to see proposed development applications as an augmented reality; and
   - A virtual reality experience which will be set up at Council office and events to promote the ‘future of Moreland.’

3. Woollahra Municipal Council (NSW) – 3D mapping program utilised for planning permit applicants to submit 3D development plans to then be uploaded for advertisement. Also utilised as an internal feature for strategic planning to visualise the effects of rezoning applications (a common request for this municipality), and to plan for planning controls in activity centres.

Two of the aforementioned Councils were successfully granted funding by the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities – Smart Cities and Suburbs program. The
Smart Cities and Suburbs program ran over three years and 2 rounds of funding. The second round was awarded in 2018 and is now closed.

Information regarding the implementation of the 3D mapping tool at all three Councils (including the amount of awarded funding, ongoing resources and outcomes of the project) is included in Attachment 1. The costs of developing and implementing 3D mapping ranged from approximately $300,000 to more than $1 million. The ongoing costs for sustaining an accurate and accessible tool are unknown, as the case studies explored are still in the implementation phase.

**Benefits of a 3D modelling tool**

The most notable benefit of implementing a 3D modelling tool is the vast and varying areas it can apply to. Whilst each Council has identified its role as a tool for statutory planners in assessing planning applications, the tool can also be utilised in the following situations:

*Modelling Building Height and Design Controls;*

A responsibility of the Urban Strategy department is to implement, where necessary, discretionary and/or mandatory building heights in particular areas of the municipality. Applying height and building controls to these areas can be difficult, especially without knowing the full impacts that could incur. By implementing a 3D model, Council would be able to visualise the effects if certain building heights or setback controls were implemented in request of a rezoning, structure plan or amendment to the planning scheme. The tool will also allow to consider the cumulative impact of development in particular in areas designated for change.

*Council Public Realm and Major Infrastructure Projects;*

The 3D model could be utilised for urban design projects (creating renders and fly-through videos). This will result in improved engagement opportunities and improved design outcomes.

*Development Activity Tracking;*

Development can be tracked to the year and location of build to identify trends, areas of notable growth and the cumulative effect of development.

*Community Engagement Tool;*

The 3D model would be utilised to help visualise planning applications upon their advertisement as well as visualising recommendations and implications of broader land use and planning strategies. Capital projects, open space, traffic, transport, infrastructure and community planning can also benefit from it.

*Urban Forest Strategy Tool;*

By inserting a vegetation cover dataset into the 3D mapping tool for internal use, Council can commence the delivery of the strategic outcomes of the Urban Forest Strategy, which was proposed at Council’s Ordinary meeting on 19 March 2019.

3D modelling has an obvious potential to be utilised across the Council, in delivering public and private development, infrastructure and urban forest canopy and cover. If implemented in conjunction with the Urban Forest Strategy, the tool could assist in the monitoring and protection of tree canopy and vegetation cover, and build strategies to encourage the maximisation of the public and private urban forest.
Existing Council resources

Intramaps is a resource system that is accessible to all Council staff. Training is provided to staff to assist in the correct use and navigation of the system. Intramaps has a ‘Development’ layer that is linked to the Bayside Planning Scheme and is used to identify applicable zones and overlays to properties. It is also utilised to map structure plans, and changes that are proposed as part of a planning scheme amendment.

Alongside Intramaps, the Urban Strategy department also utilises the program, SketchUp. This program allows the user to build a 3D render of a street or location and is most notably utilised for urban design projects and for strategic planning projects, to apply and vary planning controls. Whilst the program does provide for the 3D modelling of objects, it does not give the amount of accuracy or high resolution that photogrammetric data does when captured to create a 3D Modelling tool.

Council’s GIS department were successful in receiving funding to capture photogrammetric data, known as LiDAR and can utilise this data to create the 3D mapping platform. This data currently sits as a layer within the Intramaps program. All three Councils that have been identified in Attachment 1 did not own photogrammetric data prior to receiving Federal funding, and this was therefore a cost included in their grant.

Next steps

In order to progress the formation of a 3D modelling program, it is recommended that a consultant be sought to provide an estimate to the ongoing costs, resources and schedule of works that would be required to implement and run the system indefinitely. The consultant should also assist in providing information on the implementation of datasets for both built and natural environments, to ascertain the strategic outcomes of the Urban Forest Strategy.

As noted above, the Federal funding program, ‘Smart Cities and Suburbs’ program has been finalised and Council is unable to apply. If the decision is made to implement a 3D modelling program, Council will apply for any relevant future federal funding programs and seek eligibility for grant activities.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Commences the preparation of a project brief and engages a specialised consultant to understand the real cost, schedule and options available to implement a 3D Modelling system that responds to Bayside’s needs.

2. Receives a report at the 15 October 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council that presents the anticipated costs of such a model.

Support Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Comparative Costs and Resources of Council Initiatives - 3D Modelling Tool
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
There is a strong relationship between social interaction and the provision of a high amenity urban environment. The 3D modelling tool would contribute to ensuring that the high level of amenity and character within the built and natural environment is not only maintained, but maximised, through the application of planning controls.

Natural Environment
The Urban Forest Strategy can be applied as a dataset which contains mapping of the municipality’s vegetation cover and tree canopy. The modelling would seek to monitor, protect and enhance the urban forest and assist in combatting climate change impacts.

Built Environment
The 3D Modelling tool provides the opportunity to assess planning applications with greater detail, monitor the urban growth of the municipality, and maintain the high amenity of the Bayside locality and character.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
As this report suggests, the implementation of the 3D modelling tool could be upon a public platform, and would assist the community's understanding and visualisation of proposed developments within Bayside. The modelling tool would also provide an opportunity to engage with the community, advocate and educate, for the benefits of having a cooler, greener city.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
There are no immediate legal implications associated with the scoping for a 3D modelling tool.

Finance
Further information is required in order to determine the anticipated costs of maintaining an ongoing 3D model. The process of implementing a 3D modelling tool would rely upon the successful approval of the project proposal being put forward as both an item in Council’s budget process, and funding granted by the federal government Smart Cities and Suburbs program. The preparation of the 3D modelling tool will require the resourcing of GIS and strategic planning staff.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The protection of the Bayside built and natural environment has been directly implemented in a number of Council’s strategies. The implementation of a 3D modelling tool would be able to assist in reaching the objectives of these strategies, including:
• Bayside Tree Strategy;
• Open Space Strategy;
• Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework;
• Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy;
• Water Sensitive Urban Design – Compliance Guidelines for New Development;
• Neighbourhood Character Review;
• Bayside Housing Strategy;
• Structure Plans; and
• Bayside Landscape Guidelines.
## Comparative Costs and Resources for Council Initiatives – Implementing a 3D Modelling Tool

| Council | Melbourne City | Moreland City | Woollahra Municipal | Sydney, NSW | | | Funding | 3D DAM was funded by the City of Melbourne wholly and commenced in 2016. The cost of which is unknown. | Successfully granted $396,900 from the Smart Cities and Suburbs program. A co-contribution was made for $439,912. | Successfully granted $150,000 from the Smart Cities and Suburbs program, and Woollahra spent $150,000 of their own budget. The overall project value was $300,000. | | Use | Statutory Planning/Community Engagement | Statutory Planning/Community Engagement | Statutory Planning/Community Engagement | Model is utilised for the advertisement and approval of planning applications. Applicants are requested to submit a 3D digital model if the development proposes; | - A new building or the amendment of a buildings form within the B2 Local Centre or B4 Mixed Use Zones; or | - A new building or the amendment of a building’s form where the building height is 12 metres or more. | | Other uses | Smart Cities/Strategic Planning | Community Engagement/Urban Design | Strategic Planning | The model is also utilised to assist the strategic planning team by providing detailed visualisation to the revision and amendment of planning controls in activity centres. | The Strategic Planning team have been utilising the model for a major planning and urban design project for the Double Bay commercial centre. | The model has also helped identify potential issues in response to the many requests the Council receives to rezone commercial areas to high density residential. These applications have been a constraint to Council, as the higher density residential places impacts on |
### Comparative Costs and Resources for Council Initiatives – Implementing a 3D Modelling Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 10.12 – Reports by the Organisation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other uses</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tree/vegetation canopy mapping (Urban Forest Strategy)</strong></td>
<td>City of Melbourne already has a 3D Map titled the Urban Forest Visual, which is not linked to 3D DAM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commencing the project</strong></td>
<td>City of Melbourne did not procure a consultant to capture data for 3D DAM. However, AAM Consultants were contracted and worked alongside Council’s IT and GIS team to implement the internal 3D Modelling program which is of a higher resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Operational costs and internal use</strong></td>
<td>N/A City of Melbourne have teams that deliver the operational costs as their position description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>views and amenity, but is of high demand for the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upon discussion with the Manager of Strategic Planning at Woollahra Council, it was said that they are investigating if a dataset that identifies public and private tree canopy and vegetation cover could be applied to their 3D Modelling program. However, implementing this feature also depends on the type of dataset (if it is a vector or mesh model) that are utilised and whether they can function as a combined layer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councils IT department put together and administered the successful application for the federal grant. Consultants AAM Group were also procured to provide quotation to the proposed works to create a 3D map of the entire LGA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Costs and Resources for Council Initiatives – Implementing a 3D Modelling Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information: Implementation/Consultant</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Officers within the Urban Design team have been employed as an ongoing resource to directly deliver the other features of the Virtual Moreland Project, being the augmented reality and virtual reality programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three different consultants were utilised for the three parts of the project:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                               |     | - Procured consultant AAM to capture data and create 3D Model.  
|                                               |     | - A second consultant was procured to create the augmented reality (available as the iPhone and Android app)  
|                                               |     | - A third consultant was procured to create the virtual reality (available at Council to experience)                                                                                     |
| Due to the various layers of this project, the cost was notably higher. | Procured consultant AAM to capture data and create model. There are 3 layers of usage:                                                                                                                   |
|                                               |     | - Public view license - limited layers as it is for the public website  
|                                               |     | - Viewers license – better but limited resolution and access – available internally to staff members  
|                                               |     | - Pro license – Access to all tools and high resolution and capability to build models inside. Only provided to the necessary staff.  
|                                               |     | The cost of the project is inclusive of the capturing of photogrammetric data.                                                                                                                        |
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is to provide the outcomes (including community feedback) of a trial of three key initiatives from the draft Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan (Attachment 1), and to present the final Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 for adoption.

As part of developing the Masterplan and the initial consultation in 2017, three key initiatives related to traffic and parking, cliff safety and pedestrian safety were identified to be trialled, prior to presenting the final Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan to Council for adoption. This trial commenced in August 2018, following a further detailed traffic assessment to inform line marking and the placement of bollards.

A further round of community consultation concluded in February 2019. Further advice was also received from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), and Parks Victoria, resulting in some minor amendments to the final Masterplan.

The Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan Consultation Summary (Attachment 2) includes the feedback received during the trial period and the advice received from DELWP and Parks Victoria.

A summary of the initiatives trialled and the amendments made to the final Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 is outlined below.

Key issues

Improving pedestrian safety at Half Moon Bay

One of the key objectives of the draft Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan is to improve pedestrian access and safety throughout the precinct, including pedestrian access on Cerberus Way and within existing car parking areas. An assessment completed during development of the draft Masterplan recommended trialling new pedestrian routes with line marking and signage over the summer period through the B14 car park. The line marking took into account boat rigging and launching requirements and Black Rock Yacht Club’s weekend sailing events.

Trial actions

- A designated, line marked and signed pedestrian route and crossings along Cerberus Way and B15 to the lower B14 car park and in front of the Yacht Club to the beach was established;
- Designated boat trailer waiting area in the B14 car park to reduce congestion for through traffic when there are queues to use the boat ramp was established; and
- Two removable bollards to restrict public vehicle access past the Cerberus Beach House were installed.

Trial result and final recommendation

Following further site assessment and advice from traffic and risk consultants, six yellow bollards were installed as opposed to the initial two, as two bollards were considered insufficient to prevent vehicle access into the pedestrian zone.
However, in response to local stakeholder and community feedback, during the trial the number of bollards was reduced from six to five, the bollard colour was changed to white, the size (height and diameter) was reduced and the alignment was also modified slightly at the request of the licensee of the Cerberus Beach House.

Vehicles towing boats were observed throughout the trial using the designated boat waiting area while queuing for access to the boat ramp, allowing the through movement of other cars and keeping vehicles circulating through car park B14, reducing the previous congestion.

It is concluded that this trial action has been successful and it has been included in the Masterplan.

Parking
Council provides car and boat trailer parking at Half Moon Bay. Accessed from Cerberus Way, the B14 lower car park provides 61 standard car spaces, two accessible spaces and 10 long spaces (i.e. for cars with trailers). The B15 upper car park provides 19 standard car spaces and 15 long spaces. There are no designated bus, bicycle or motorbike parking areas.

The B13 (Love Street) car park at Red Bluff provides 130 - 150 unsealed spaces (depending on efficiency of parking) and can also be used by boat trailers and other long vehicles including buses. There is also parking along Beach Road.

Half Moon Bay experiences high levels of weekend visitation especially over the summer peak when demand for car parking in B14 and B15 frequently exceeds capacity. Boat trailer parking is less frequently used but peaks during popular fishing periods and sailing events. At peak times there are long queues to use the boat ramps.

The B14 lower car park is not visible from Beach Road or Cerberus Way. This means all vehicles must enter the lower car park to see if spaces are available, crossing both the Bay Trail and Coastal Walking Trail and creating significant congestion at the public boat ramp and entry/exit from Beach Road. There is also no direct walking path link between B15 and B14 car parks through to the beach with pedestrians forced to walk down Cerberus Way.

The unsealed B13 car park is currently not well used, operating at only 30-40% capacity even during the summer peak, despite being the closest car park to the beach.

Trial action
Temporary signage was established on Beach Road directing Half Moon Bay beach visitors to the B13 (Love Street) car park. Boating visitors were directed to Cerberus Way. This was to reduce congestion and improve public safety on busy days.

Trial result and final recommendation in Masterplan
Permanent foreshore directional signage was installed on Beach Road at the southern entrance to B13 (Love Street) car park. This sign aims to direct first time visitors to Half Moon Bay to ample beach parking, reducing beach traffic to the smaller capacity lower B15 car park. This sign appears to be working well and a greater use of B13 car park was observed during the trial period.

It is concluded that this trial action has been successful and it has been included in the Masterplan.

Red Bluff and White Cliffs
Rainwater runoff has cut into the cliffs leading to cliff instability and the seepage of ground water can lead to slumping of rock material onto the beach. These processes are in addition
to wave attack at the base of the cliff; however, an outcrop of harder rock provides some protection to the cliff base. The cliff area is unstable with rock falls at times. It is expected to remain a hazardous area into the future, both at beach level, and at the lookouts and paths above.

Red Bluff beach continues to be used by walkers, for weddings/photos and occasional illegal parties. Use of security fencing from the beach out past the low water mark is an option; however, this is unlikely to be successful in keeping the public from the site in the long term and will detract from the important visual amenity of the site.

Assessments completed during development of the draft masterplan recommend using low level bollards and chains, and signage to clearly alert visitors to the dangers of the area. Whilst members of the public may elect to bypass the signs and bollards and chains, particularly at low tide, this would be a conscious decision. Alternative bypass routes will be clearly signed at beach level and on paths along the cliff top.

**Trial action**

Warning signage was installed on the beach at Red Bluff and White Cliffs to highlight the risk associated with proceeding beyond at key points.

**Trial result and final recommendation in Masterplan**

Signage has been installed at the top of Red Bluff cliffs and at all beach level entry points to both White Cliffs and Red Bluff advising of the risk of proceeding beyond the point of the sign. Fencing has also been installed north of Red Bluff at beach level to restrict access to the toe of the cliff face.

Some negative feedback was received from beach users regarding the fencing but the immediate risk from rock fall and access has been mitigated by the installation of fencing.

It is concluded that this trial action has been successful and it is included in the Masterplan.

**Recent submission from Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club**

Council recently received a further submission from Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club (HMBSLSC). This draft Facility Location Report proposes to locate a Personalised Water Craft (PWC) Emergency Response Centre for emergency service provision to a nominated section of the Bay.

The proposed project stakeholders in the report include Life Saving Victoria, HMBSLSC and the Sandringham Swimming Club. The current proposal is to provide a base at HMBSLSC for PWC to be operated by Life Saving Victoria in an extension to the HMB Club House. The Club House extension is anticipated to accommodate the following:

1. Storage and maintenance area for PWC;
2. Administration and training area for Life Guards; and
3. An observation post for monitoring of the immediate area of the Bay as well as beaches in the designated zone of responsibility for the Life Guard post.

While the Masterplan does not preclude such a proposal, it is considered unlikely that this proposal would be supported by current Council policy and strategies. In particular, the Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 has a strategic direction that net building footprint should not increase on the foreshore.

The Victorian Coastal Strategy 2014 also contains revised ‘Criteria for use and development on coastal Crown land (including reuse and redevelopment)’ which are required to be met for any proposal development on the coast to proceed.
All use, development or works on marine and coastal Crown land by any party, including committees of management and local government, requires consent under the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018*. This proposal would be subject to further approvals including consent under the *Marine and Coastal Act 2018* and, due to the cultural significance of this area of coast, a Cultural Heritage Management Plan would also be required through the consent process to determine sustainable management and protection of existing cultural heritage values around HMBSLSC.

It is considered that this proposal would be unlikely to obtain consents due to the size of the existing facility in this location, the already congested nature of the site with current parking arrangements, known cultural heritage issues and higher priority of other LSC facilities for upgrade around the Bay.

There is no allocated funding in the Masterplan for this proposal.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Notes the outcomes of the trial initiatives relating to pedestrian access at Half Moon Bay, parking in the B13 car park and safety at Red Bluff and White Cliffs that were implemented as part of the development of the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019.


**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan May 2019 (separately enclosed)
3. Attachment 3 - Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Implementation Schedule May 2019 (separately enclosed)
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community
Half Moon Bay is a favourite swimming beach and summer destination for both locals and visitors alike. During both rounds of consultation (2017 and 2018/19), local residents highlighted the unique nature of the site and many regarded Half Moon Bay as a special place, and wanted to protect and preserve it for use by future generations. Red Bluff and White Cliffs are impressive natural features, and the whole precinct is a popular tourist destination.

The initiatives identified in the Masterplan are intended to enhance and protect the unique natural features of this area.

Social
Half Moon Bay contains a range of facilities and buildings in a relatively small space and can easily become congested during peak summer periods. With a free-of-charge publicly accessible boat ramp, this precinct is also heavily utilised by recreational fishers and boaters. The geography of the Bay at this site means that boats can often be launched here in adverse weather conditions.

Both Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club (HMBSLSC) and Black Rock Yacht Club (BRYC) are located at Half Moon Bay and both clubs have membership numbers in the hundreds. The Cerberus Beach House (kiosk and restaurant) is also located at Half Moon Bay and is open throughout the year. Three private use boat sheds are located between the HMBSLSC and the Cerberus Beach House, each with an ongoing lease agreement with Council.

Black Rock and Sandringham Conservation Association (BRASCA) have been working in this precinct for 50 years. Initially formed in 1969 to lobby the then City of Sandringham to cease rubbish dumping at the ‘Little Beach’ (White Cliffs area), they continue to maintain an active presence in this precinct, weeding and planting as well as continuing to advocate for protection of the environment.

The initiatives identified in the Masterplan are intended to improve the experience of visitors to this precinct.

Natural Environment
The Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay foreshore precinct contains the unique Red Bluff and White Cliffs – two geological formations with distinctive colour and shape that are key identifying features of the Bayside foreshore. Continual rain water runoff, groundwater seepage and wave attack has led to ongoing erosion and cliff instability at both sites. These processes are expected to continue and it is anticipated that they will also remain hazardous in the future – both at beach level, and at the lookouts and paths above.

The precinct is covered by a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO3) in the Bayside Planning Scheme. This overlay and ongoing Council management of the foreshore aims to maintain and enhance habitat and encourage the regeneration of native vegetation. As mentioned above, there has been extensive historical and ongoing community involvement in the protection and enhancement of indigenous vegetation throughout this precinct by BRASCA.

Built Environment
Half Moon Bay has a number of buildings and facilities all located within close proximity to each other.

There are also three boat ramps at Half Moon Bay, and three car parks associated with this precinct; B15 (the top car park above Cerberus Way), Half Moon Bay B14 (the car park at the bottom of Cerberus way) and the Love Street car park B13. Both B14 and B15 are heavily used during peak periods for both car and boat trailer parking and become easily congested. B13 is relatively unused for the majority of the year but provides the most direct beach access for visitors to Half Moon Bay.

The initiatives identified in the Masterplan are designed to enhance the ability for people to safely access this important area.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

Extensive consultation was undertaken during development of the initial draft Masterplan from 14 August 2017 until 1 October 2017.

After completion of the initial phase of public consultation, and in response to community feedback, it was recommended to undertake a trial of some key initiatives in the draft Masterplan.

The subsequent consultation period for these initiatives ran from 28 August 2018 until 28 February 2019 and comprised of the following:

- Installation of new bollards to improve safety for patrons in the cafe queue and exiting/entering the restaurant with new lockable fold down bollards to retain Life Saving Club and beach cleaning access;
- New bicycle parking area near the café;
- New accessible parking space and refuge/turn around area closest to the beach and café. This was created by adjusting the existing bay widths to ensure no net loss of parking;
- New accessible parking space adjacent to the boat ramp, closest to the beach and café;
- New shared pedestrian zone advisory signage and designated crossing points and refuge areas around the public boat ramp to improve pedestrian safety;
- New line marking and signage to define boat rigging areas to maintain clear pedestrian and emergency vehicle access through to the beach; and
- New line marking to define the boat trailer waiting area to encourage drivers with boats to queue to the side while waiting to launch, leaving adequate width for vehicles to pass/circulate to reduce congestion.

A copy of the trial plan detailing these initiatives is in Attachment 3. This was advertised via Council’s ‘Have your Say’ page and the trial plan was also available onsite in several locations as an A1 size sign. It was also emailed to all previous respondents to the initial draft Masterplan in 2017.

Over 200 people visited the ‘Have your Say’ page; however, only nine comments were submitted indicating that the trial changes have been well received and have assisted in the effective management of pedestrians and vehicle conflicts at the site.
A full copy of the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan Consultation Summary Report detailing the feedback received is at Attachment 2.

**Human Rights**
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**
There are no legal implications associated with this report, however by implementing the actions contained within the trial, Council addresses and manages identified areas of risk to the public.

**Finance**
The proposed opportunities identified in the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 will renew, upgrade or improve existing facilities and assets to improve amenity, usability and performance for the community.

The total estimated cost of the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 over ten years is $1,648,200.

Of this total, $301,200 is identified to be funded by others (DELWP, Melbourne Water and onsite lessees), and a total of $1,347,000 is proposed to be funded by Council over a ten year period. Many of the identified actions will be funded via ongoing renewal budgets while other upgrades and new items will need to be considered for funding. Allocation of funding during the annual budget process will assess the needs of these works against other projects.

A detailed Implementation Schedule can be found in Attachment 3.

An Implementation Schedule Summary of proposed works and priorities for the Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 over a ten year period is shown below.
Links to Council policy and strategy
The Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan 2019 addresses the following areas of the Council Plan 2017-2021.

**Goal 1: Infrastructure**
Council will work together with the Bayside community to plan and deliver community infrastructure that responds to the changing needs of the Bayside community.

**Goal 5: Environment**
Council and the Bayside community will be environmental stewards, taking action to protect and enhance the natural environment, while balancing appreciate and use with the need to protect natural assets for future generations.

The Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 classifies this precinct to be of Municipal and Reginal importance in Bayside. Municipal and Reginal spaces are intended to cater for a diverse range of interests and often have a wide catchment because of the unique features they offer.

The Bayside Coastal Management Plan (BCMP) 2014 included extensive consultation within the Bayside community and has informed development of the draft Masterplan. The BCMP 2014 provides the strategic direction for actions and works proposed within the draft Masterplan.
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1. Consultation Process

1.1 Stakeholder consultation during the analysis phase

Community consultation at the analysis phase included:

- **Review of previous consultation**
  Community consultation and Council endorsed recommendations and priorities arising from the Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014, Jetty Road Path Improvement Project 2014, Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 and Sandringham Foreshore Management Plan 2010 were reviewed and reconfirmed with precinct stakeholders.

- **Precinct Stakeholder Meetings**
  Tuesday 21/3/2017 from 3:00pm to 6:00pm at Black Rock Yacht Club. The meeting confirmed the project scope and objectives and facilitated discussion of key issues and opportunities to be considered in development of the Master Plan. The draft meeting notes were supplied to all precinct stakeholders allowing those unable to attend to provide further comment via e-mail and phone via the Project Manager to inform development of the draft Master Plan. Refer Attachment #2

- **Site Meetings**
  Friday 21/4/2017 from 10:00am to 12:00pm site walkover with Traditional Owners and Community Stakeholders.

1.2 Community consultation at the Draft Master Plan phase

Community consultation on the draft Master Plan was completed over a six week period from 16 August 2017 to 1 October 2017. This included:

- **On site signage displays**

- **Saturday Community Information Session**
  Saturday 16 September 2017 from 2:00pm–4:00pm at the Black Rock Yacht Club. This provided an opportunity for interested people to attend and ask questions, provide direct feedback to Council officers and the consultant team. Attended by 40 people. Refer Section 3.1

  The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council’s website for community feedback via the ‘Have Your Say’ online portal. Refer Section 3.1

- **Other consultation**
  On site meetings, phone and email clarifications were undertaken by Council officers to address specific issues/opportunities raised in consultation. Refer Section 3.3

1.3 Agency feedback at the Draft Master Plan phase

1.3.1 **Parks Victoria**
  Emily Verey, Ranger Team Leader North Port Phillip Region confirmed via e-mail 21/1/2019 that Parks Victoria requires maintenance vehicle access to the Black Rock Jetty. However Parks Victoria do not object to the installation of seats on the jetty and improvements to all ability access from the car park onto the jetty as these assets will be maintained by Council.
1.3.2 Department of Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP)

Michelle Willis, from Regional Planning and Approvals Port Phillip Region confirmed via e-mail 16/4/2019 feedback summarised as follows:

- Reference to the ‘Coastal Management Act 1995’ should be amended to read ‘Marine and Coastal Act 2018’
- Office of Aboriginal Affairs Victoria is now Aboriginal Victoria
- Reference to the ‘Heritage Act 1995’ should be amended to read ‘Heritage Act 2017’
- Reference to the naval depot should be HMAS Cerberus at Crib Point formerly known as the Finders Naval Depot https://www.navyhistory.org.au/tag/finders-naval-depot/
- No acknowledgement of election commitment to have free parking at all boat ramps and the impacts this may have.
- A12 - Question the need to remove two car parking spaces (in an area where car parking is at a premium) to accommodate new seating.
- Repairs to the seawall at HMB by DELWP are complete
- ‘Coastal Management Consent’ should be amended to read ‘Marine and Coastal Act consent’
- Not supportive of location of proposed fencing which should be running along the cliff, rather than cutting off public access to the beach. Fencing works to the north of Red Bluff have also already been carried out (except for the section that blocks access for pedestrians)
- Include reference to White Cliffs also having a fence and the need to replace and add signage (A23)
- The ‘bathing boxes’ at HMB are actually boat sheds (larger than bathing boxes)

1.4 Half Moon Bay car park signage and line marking trial

After completion of the initial phase of public consultation on the Draft Masterplan from August to October 2017 and in response to community feedback Council resolved to undertake a trial of changes to signage and line marking within the Half Moon Bay Car park. The proposed changes were implemented late 2018 and included the following:

- Installation of new bollards to improve safety for patrons in the cafe queue and exiting-entering the restaurant with new lookable fold down bollards to retain Life Saving Club and beach cleaning access.
- New bicycle parking area near the cafe.
- New accessible parking space and refuge/turn around area closest to the beach and cafe. This was created by adjusting the existing bay widths to ensure no net loss of parking.
- New accessible parking space adjacent to the boat ramp, closest to the beach and cafe.
- New shared pedestrian zone advisory signage and designated crossing points and refuge areas around the public boat ramp to improve pedestrian safety.
- New line marking and signage to define boat rigging areas to maintain clear pedestrian and emergency vehicle access through to the beach.
- New line marking to define the boat trailer waiting area to encourage drivers with boats to queue to the side while waiting to launch, leaving adequate width for vehicles to pass/circulate to reduce congestion.
Changes were implemented in October 2018 and comment and feedback sought via Council's have your say page through until February 2019. Yellow bollards were initially installed however in response to local stakeholder and community feedback the bollard colour was changed to white half way through the trial.

Over 200 people visited the have your say page however only 9 comments were received indicating that the changes have been well received and have assisted in the effective management of pedestrians and vehicle conflicts at the site.

The following points is a summary of other community responses to the trial:

- Why does BCC not develop underground carparks at beaches? There is lots of distance from roadside down to the beach sand.
- The road that leads to the pier at the top of the hill badly needs a STOP SIGN. People drive way too fast in 4 Wheel drives with boats and jet skis attached both heading down the hill and those traveling up the hill. Myself and my dog over the past 10 yrs have nearly been hit knocked down crossing this road in order to continue along the Bay trail track. You recently last year put a sign saying SLOW but it has had no effect at all to slow traffic. There needs to be a 5/ or 10 km per hour sign and a large Red Stop sign so walkers and runners can safely cross this area of road
- It is pretty clear that Council has lost control of the beach. Cars are parking all the way up to bluff road and on the side streets - particularly dangerous driving in Love and Eliza streets. Sunday 24th Feb had many people climbing and jumping off the shipwreck, people all over the cliffs, dogs on the beach, DJ equipment and loudspeakers on the beach, people jumping off the pier and an insanely overcrowded beach. It has become a lawless place. I am not sure your "improvements" are going to do anything. What can you do to get control of the bay back? Not one council member anywhere to enforce your by-laws.
- The Red Bluff cliffs and Half Moon Bay are some of the most iconic coastal locations within the bay and within the domain of Bayside Council. Their current neglect by
Bayside Council is disturbing given their iconic status and high patronage over much of the year. Some suggestions for improvements include:

- Make the vehicle parking above Half Moon bay more appealing to users by tidying it up, asphaltling and landscaping it similar to that which has occurred to many of the other coastal bayside car parks.
- Attend to some of the scrub along the foreshore so as to remove the risk from fires whilst reducing habitat for rats, snakes & foxes. Replace the rotting and decaying vegetation with new native plantings.
- Remove the asphalt and concrete path debris that litters the grass slope on the Northern end of the Red Bluff cliffs.
- Install public fresh water showers at the Edward St beach access ramp - similar to that which many NSW and QLD Councils provide at their popular beaches. Water is currently available at this location by way of a tap for foot washing.
- Half Moon Bay could be such a wonderful asset to the Bayside community / residents / visitors, but it is currently such an eye sore. Look at the improvements that have been made at Mordialloc and Seaford foreshores for inspiration.
- For out of the box inspiration and ideas, look at the wonderful amenity that has been created along the Cairns foreshore.

- There’s a need for a safe pedestrian path (line-marking at least) from the end of the footpath down the hill to get across to the front of the yacht club. This is a shortcut that every pedestrian accessing the area takes if they walk down the road. No-one aiming for the beach walks all the way around the main car-park.
- I think the parking restrictions in front of the Yacht club should remain as is - this does need more enforcement on the weekends. The all day car-parking fees are way too high. The installation of the bollards is great - its much safer now.
- Our beaches including Half Moon get trashed with litter that flows in from the streets or people who leave it at the beach. Please educate people on minimising waste and being responsible for their trash. People need to be responsible everywhere, not just at the beach. I think Council should target teens via social media (eg. Instagram ads) to make them realise they were already born into a polluted world and it’s theirs to clean up not make worse.

- Where has the topograph (orientation table) gone? This was a brilliant feature of Red Bluff - a place to lay the foundations of trigonometry, mapping and spatial geometry with the kids. People are desperate to bring STEM to life with the kids. The topograph was a prime example of “living” science. It has been gone for years - bring it back! Which raises the question - who has it now; and why was it removed? Across Bayside foreshore - why don’t you rationalize and consolidate the masses of advertising billboards and “information” into one sign? If the signage is safety critical - fair enough, isolate it. But for the masses of useless advertising and self promotion - minimize it. Or instead, display a WWW location to reference. The foreshore should be about nature, not a location for advertising.

- Why can’t the hundreds of “no standing” signs be replaced with single or double yellow lines painted on the road. A driver’s license implies that you must know the meaning of a yellow line and please, no concrete or bitumen. Leave the parking areas permeable and when is the overhead power cabling along Beach Road and throughout the foreshore areas going underground? Rather than responding to the needs of a few drunks sitting on the fence at Red Bluff, or bowing to political correctness - I think you need to consider the big picture in your environmental responsibilities.

Item 10.13 – Reports by the Organisation
- The elevated “warning” signs on poles commanding the field of view at Red Bluff should go - an eyesore. The safety signage can go on the existing fence. If you cannot perceive the danger from the fence and low signage, signs on poles obscuring the view will not make the slightest difference.
- Parking - motorists cause holdups and drive dangerously in their search for a park during the peak months. Need more car park spaces, Love Street carpark could have logs to indicate carpark space. Create more carpark spaces in lower carpark and less boat spaces. Beach Safety - Love the new disabled car space, but it does remove an area for people to sit on the beach. Ban all jet skis from accessing the water at Half Moon Bay. The water area is already too busy and some disregard the signs and drive in the beach in-between swimmers. Swimmers are also crossing the boating area to the pier, causing havoc for water craft. Increase the number of buoys around the swimming area and move the buoys out to make the swimming recreation area larger. At low tide you can walk out to the first buoy! Jet skiers are also rude and aggressive towards other beach users. Pedestrians should take some responsibility for their safety when walking around this area. The new markings and limiting access to the area in front of the cafe has been a great idea. Traffic congestion - perhaps a barrier access which limits the number of cars through to a maximum number and signs on the road indicating the carpark is full would help. The side streets also suffer and getting in and out of your property is difficult can be challenging. Perhaps limit parking to 3-4 hours in the side streets and allow residents to have permits for visitors to their home to stay longer.
- If you will be handing out unconstitutional infringements on Crown land then please at least place a sign letting us know. Beaches are unsafe due to increased presence of Council & Police officers.
2. **Response to the key issues raised during the consultation on the Draft Master Plan**

The following summarises the relevant key issues raised in community consultation on the Draft as displayed for comment and outlines the proposed response for consideration in finalisation of the Master Plan. The number of respondents for each issue, including those received via the website, via e-mail, at the drop in session and walk around, are noted in brackets where more than one person commented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Much of the draft is sensible, but really needs more evidence, not speculation or value judgements, before the natural foreshore is damaged by widened paths, better sightlines, disability access. As such all changes should be marked L, giving time for assessment before anything is done.</td>
<td>In accordance with standard Council procedure the Draft Master Plan and associated recommendations and priorities were developed following on site consultation with community stakeholder groups and specialist technical assessments for the site completed in the area of Traffic Engineering, Civil Engineering (Water Sensitive Urban Design) Coastal Engineering, Landscape Architecture, Environmental Planning and Accessibilty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These recommendations and priorities were then endorsed for consultation by the various departments of Council to ensure a balanced cost effective and implementable draft master plan was displayed for community comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This report summarises issues and opportunities raised during public consultation on the draft and the recommendations for changes if appropriate for consideration by Council prior to endorsement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>In general, the Masterplan seems to be engineering solutions to problems that do not really exist. They are perceived problems directed toward risk management and perceptions of public safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Draft Masterplan proposes maintenance type activities and does not seem to provide any long term or innovative or creative ideas for tackling existing known issues relating to competing uses.</td>
<td>The following initiatives were implemented to assist on ground management at Half Moon Bay over summer 2018/19. These included:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Installation of signage on Beach Road to direct Half Moon Bay beach visitors where possible, to the B13 Love Street car park to reduce congestion on Cerberus Way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Installation of additional risk/warning signage at Red Bluff and White Cliffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Installation of bollards to prevent public vehicle access beyond the Beach House Café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation of trial line marking to improve pedestrian safety in front of Black Rock Yacht Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ongoing vegetation management to maintain sightlines at road crossings for the Bay Trail and Coastal Walking Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>I was disappointed that there was no take away document available for me to take home from the</td>
<td>Consultation approach and information made available was consistent with current Council Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>Council Offices. There was only a lengthy document I could review at the Council Offices.</td>
<td>Review with Council Communication department to confirm document availability for future plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Replace the metal plate that used to be installed at Red Bluff indicating the points of the compass and direction to points all around the bay. It was removed when the aboriginal garden was introduced.</td>
<td>There are no records of the plate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Add note to (B26) Figure 12 for installation of orientation information when the handrail at Red Bluff is replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Rubbish bins need to be disinfected weekly, and additional bins provided.</td>
<td>Bin locations were reviewed and confirmed as part of the master plan process. Operational Management and cleaning is part of the municipal maintenance contract and out of scope of this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Proposed steel handrails are useless in hot weather as they are too hot to hold, and useless in wet weather as they are too slippery to provide any support. Does the Council have any evidence that such rails are suitable?</td>
<td>Handrails are required to designated accessible ramps in accordance with AS1428 Access and Mobility Standards. Coastal conditions mean stainless steel or aluminium/magnesium alloys are the preferred materials to maximise corrosion resistance and all rails used will comply with current standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Users of the public boat ramp who come with fishing boats and Personal Water Craft (PWC) regularly ignore boating safety regulations in a heavily used compact harbour populated by swimmers and other water users.</td>
<td>Parks Victoria are responsible for recreational boating and PWCs within Port Phillip Bay and Half Moon Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Photo 6 (pg 3 of Draft Masterplan) the Cerberus was not scuttled until 26/9/1926 – the date on the plan says 1920. Photo 7 &amp; 8 are dated incorrectly, the sea wall wasn’t built until 1937, the photos are more likely very late 1940's or early 1950's (bear in mind the boats for hire concrete structure, later/restaurant and café</td>
<td>Review photo dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Amend dates as shown on photo 6, 7 and 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.10 | The wording under the ‘Land Management’ paragraph 1, pg 2 of the Draft Masterplan should be amended. | Noted.  
**Recommendation**  
Amend plan text as provided by Parks Victoria.  
Parks Victoria manage the Black Rock Jetty, as Committee of Management on behalf of the Crown (State Government of Victoria). The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) are responsible for the sea wall and other coastal stability measures at Half Moon Bay and elsewhere along the Port Phillip shoreline. |
| 2.0 B13 CAR PARK | | |
| 2.1 | • Resetting of the entry to B13 is a good idea.  
(4 responses)  
• Bay Trail users need to be aware of busy traffic, with parked cars backing out, pedestrians, children, and bike riders moving quickly | The two entries at B13 car park and at Cerberus Way will be reset to improve sightlines and to allow cars to wait to turn in and out without blocking the bay trail.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan, works to be completed in 2019 |
| 2.2 | Make the northern exit from B13 a left turn only for greater safety for all users of Beach Road and the Bay Trail. | |
| 2.3 | Can you line mark on the gravel surface? | The car park entries will be sealed to enable line marking to improve safety and reduce maintenance costs at these locations.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 2.4 | Using asphalt in this car park for the disabled parking bays could cause an awkward edge on to gravel making it difficult for those with unstable walking ability. | AS2890 Section 2.3 requires a firm plane surface with a slip resistant finish. This is typically only sustainably achieved using an asphalt or concrete seal.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 2.5 | Reduce the fees to park at B13 to encourage usage, and to take pressure of B14 and B15. | Review of beach parking fees is outside scope of the master plan.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 2.6 | To encourage use of B13 car park introduce signage now at B15. (Not that we want more signs). | Installation of signage direction Beach visitors to the B13 Love Street car park to reduce visitor pressures and congestion at Cerberus Way/Half Moon Bay has been completed.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.7  | Ensure drain is kept clear of sand and weeds as this storm water drain takes pressure off the cliff top erosion from heavy wind and rain. | Council officers attending the community information session have alerted maintenance contractors to this issue.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 2.8  | Capture rain water in the upper car parks, channel it into the bushes rather than the stormwater pits. (NB this note applies to B15 too). | Redevelopment of the B13, B145 and B15 car parks will include use of Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) elements to improve stormwater quality prior to discharge to the bay. The cliffs at Red Bluff are susceptible to erosion and while some natural irrigation of adjoining vegetation is possible stormwater runoff must be carefully managed to prevent accelerated erosion in this area.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 2.9  | The plan should explicitly require offsets for vegetation removal to be established in the Bayside foreshore and not elsewhere. | A small amount of planted vegetation will need to be removed at the car park entries to improve sightlines for safety and along Cerberus Way to encourage pedestrians to avoid using the road. Where possible offsets (new planting) to compensate for vegetation removal will be undertaking within the Bayside Foreshore area and potential locations have been indicated on the plan.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan |
| 3.0 B14 CAR PARK | | |
| 3.1  | The boat launching/waiting area is extensive – and could be shared for patrons of Half Moon Bay for loading and unloading. | The boat waiting area is a line marked standing area in the B14 car park to enable through traffic to continue without creating congestion. It can be used by any vehicles for loading/unloading.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 3.2  | Ensure views from seating is not blocked by unnecessary signs. | The need and location for new signage will be carefully considered to minimise impacts on views.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 3.3  | Why is this so expensive? I recommend that Council provide its own maintenance crew, who are available for constant and reliable maintenance of our precious foreshore. (REF Implementation Schedule p15). | Costs for works are an estimate for budgeting purposes only and are subject to detailed design. Rates shown are consistent with recent Council works of a similar type.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 3.4  | • The creation of crossings throughout the car park area appears to be over regulated. These will not provide access to all cars. | The plan aims to provide a clear, safe, direct and easily identifiable route for pedestrians through to the beach. Where pedestrians are required to cross roads a designated crossing point will be provided and signage updated to improve safety for all users. |
**ITEM 10.13 – Reports by the Organisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>It is disappointing that changes to the B14 car park have not been explored – there is ongoing conflict between public boat ramp users, other traffic and pedestrians in this area. This Draft Masterplan would have been a good opportunity to consider options for the re-siting of the boat ramp (within the same area) and changes to the parking layout and traffic flow to reduce conflict. (See photos supplied)</td>
<td>The public boat ramp was recently assessed and upgraded in its current location. Alternative siting for this ramp is therefore not practical or cost effective within the 10 year life of this master plan. The new pedestrian paths, vehicle controls and formalisation of crossing points as outline in the plan provide a practical and implementable improvement to safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Investigate the development of an App using cameras that would help fishing people to see whether launching areas were full or not. (Applies to B15 too)</td>
<td>A great suggestion but outside the scope of the master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>• The creation of crossings throughout the car park area appears to be over regulated. These will not provide access to all cars and beachgoers will continue to use the most convenient paths directly from the car space towards the beach. • The whole car park should be speed restricted with better signage to assist with pedestrian safety if needed.</td>
<td>The plan aims to provide a clear, safe, direct and easily identifiable route for pedestrians through to the beach. Where pedestrians are required to cross roads a designated crossing point will be provided and signage updated to improve safety for all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>B15 CAR PARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>• Bay Trail users should give way on entry to the B15 car park.</td>
<td>The Bay Trail is given priority at all road crossing points along the Bayside Foreshore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2  | The proposed pedestrian walkway from B15 down Cerberus Way is to be commended, as it will give a safer approach to Half Moon Bay. | Noted.  
*Recommendation*  
No change to plan |
| 4.3  | Rain gardens and GPT is supported as a good step towards reducing stormwater run off and pollution in the bay. | Noted.  
*Recommendation*  
No change to plan |
| 4.4  | I am concerned that the raised pavement (REF A16 pg 12 Draft Masterplan) will be the last straw for some cyclists. Maybe this could be set back from the current proposed location and the rain gardens moved west and the coast trail duplicated towards Beach Road? | The proposed raised pavement for the Coast Trail Crossing on Cerberus Way will not impede cyclist traffic through the B14 car park and beach.  
*Recommendation*  
No change to plan |

**BLACK ROCK YACHT CLUB**

- Proposed improved pedestrian access is great to the point in front of the Yacht Club. However, the effect on the yacht club for the rigging area is significant. The Yacht Club should have priority to this space as has been the case for a long time. Council to consider making this area ONLY for boats with pedestrians and cars being totally removed.  
  *(2 responses)*

- Majority of members would be social members, and would not need more space for sailing. Stacking boats inside the perimeter and/or using a forklift to move boats around would leave the yacht club space within the club for rigging or storage of boats during competition.

Black Rock Yacht Club (BRYC) utilise the public parking area in front of the club for rigging boats on Thursday night and all day Saturday and Sunday during daylight saving period over summer.

At these times the area in front of BRYC is closed to public parking by the club. Retention of safe pedestrian and emergency access through this area to the beach can still be an issue when there are lots of boats rigging and launching.

Larger sailing and other events at Half Moon Bay are managed through event specific management plans prepared by the event organiser. Event management plans are then reviewed by Council and if required public notifications provided.

Consultation with the Yacht Club and all other stakeholders was undertaken in preparation of the draft master plan.

*Recommendation*  
There is no change to the existing management arrangement or use of the car park area by Black Rock Yacht Club for boat rigging on Saturdays, Sundays and Tuesday nights over Summer.

A new plan illustrating these arrangements including additional line marking to retain the central emergency access land and pedestrian through route free of obstruction and new removable bollards to assist Club.
### Item 10.13 – Reports by the Organisation

**Response:**

- The area in front of the Yacht Club should be No Parking during daylight saving time.
- The road area in front of the Yacht Club should be painted in a contrasting colour to make it clear it is a shared pedestrian/car/yacht zone.
- There are a numbers of community groups including schools and junior sports programs who use the club and its facilities for sailing and other activities, and there have been a number of close calls.
- The proposed inclusion of the 2.0m pedestrian path is going to push boats further into the car parking area. (REF photos supplied).
- It appears to me that the Yacht Club has not been consulted, or if they have their views and concerns have not been taken into account whatsoever.

### 6.0 Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club - Extension

6.1 Application received from HMBSLSC requesting approval for extension to the southern and of their existing building.

- This small fragile bay could not withstand any more extensions to footprints of buildings. *(5 responses)*
- Would it be possible for the Council to provide storage for the “surfboats” and other equipment to be stored on Council owned property inland?

**Response:**

- HMBSLSC patrols the foreshore with members trained and prepared for emergency situations. The existing beach access is constrained by the building making it difficult for patrols to quickly manoeuvre rescue craft and equipment from their storage area at the southern end of the building to the beach, especially on busy beach days.

The following options were assessed as part of the draft master plan:

- **Option A – Maintain the Status Quo.**
- **Option B – Modify the HMBSLSC verandah to allow for widening of the ramp.**
- **Option C – Extend the existing HMBSLSC boat ramp along the existing sea wall and widen the opening to allow access for the existing roller doors.**
- **Option D – HMBSLSC have requested an extension to the southern end of the existing building and construction of a new boat ramp for rescue craft.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.2  | • I understand there are protected middens between the LSC and the Boatsheds, so nothing can be built on here.  
     • Following previous extensions to the HMBLSLC there has been considerable loss of vegetation, rubbish buried in the soil making it difficult to prevent erosion. | The shell midden site at Half Moon Bay is extensive and not well documented. There has been significant site disturbance through historical development building works.  
Recommendation  
Preparation of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan in accordance with the Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2018 is required to determine site protection and the appropriateness of and impacts of any future building works in the area. Only after the Cultural Heritage Assessment can the sustainability of the site for further building works be assessed. |
| 6.3  | • The building is an architectural nightmare, in a prime location, it would be great if the whole building could be rendered.  
     (3 responses)  
     • The LSC should finish their building before requesting any additions. | The existing building is constructed of raw (untreated) concrete blocks and provides little contribution to architectural character.  
Recommendation  
As part of any future redevelopment of the HMBLSLC consider rendering the building to improve the architectural character of the building. |
| 6.4  | The LSC needs to do a tidy up around the building before requesting any additions.  
     (2 responses) | The rear of the HMBLSLC has historically been used as outdoor storage by the Club. This is not part of the Club’s lease and may impact on sensitive coastal vegetation and cultural heritage values.  
Recommendation  
HMBLSLC to remove all stored materials not covered as part of their existing lease. Site rehabilitation to be confirmed as part of the proposed Cultural Heritage Management Plan. |
| 6.5  | • Vegetation between the Boatsheds and the LSC should be retained.  
     • Gabled roof shelter and picnic table and seating situated on the land between boatsheds would be preferable to the seating option shown as A12, page 12 of the Draft Masterplan. | All Native Vegetation at Half Moon Bay, like other areas of the Bayside Foreshore is protected by a Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO1) in the Bayside Planning Scheme. This area was planted to halt erosion however, the former building foundations and retaining walls are failing and more permanent solution will be required.  
Recommendation  
Review site management as part of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.0  | BOAT RAMPS | There are currently three boat ramps positioned along the northern side of the Half Moon Bay car park area. The boat ramps are protected from wind driven waves from the south and south-west, however the ramps are still exposed to rough chop on occasion. The area immediately offshore from the ramps is quite shallow and the public boat ramp requires regular dredging. The public boat ramp was refurbished by Council in 2015 and ramp will require little maintenance in the next 10 years. The Yacht Club and HMBSLSC ramps are of unknown age and in relatively poor condition, these ramps are likely to require demolition and reconstruction in the next 5 -10 years to remain in peak operational condition. The bluestone sea wall and returns either side of the ramps have recently been repaired by DELWP.  
**Recommendation**  
Retain and maintain the existing boat ramps in their current arrangement. |
### Item 10.13 – Reports by the Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.2  | The existing beach ramps are not wide enough for LSC members (2 either side) to carry the IRB from the Club, to the beach and into the water. New OH & S standards have been developed by the ASLA – and it is no longer advisable for members to carry the IRB. The requested extension ‘Option C/D’ is prime foreshore – should this be allowed? | Refer 6.1. Investigate improved trailer options to assist relocation of the IRB to the beach. **Recommendation**

**Option A**
- Retain the boat ramps in their current arrangement and ensure emergency craft continue to be moved to and from the beach outside peak visitor periods.
- Support potential/extension to the HMBSLSC building to improve emergency access subject to the outcomes of the Cultural Heritage Assessment finding by Life Saving Victoria and the Club and Coastal Management concept from Department of Environment Land Water and Planning. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.0</th>
<th>HALF MOON BAY SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB – TOILETS</th>
<th>8.1 The public toilets need to be re-designed within the current footprint incorporating more toilets and separate change rooms. (3 responses).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half Moon Bay public toilet facilities are located on the north side of the HMBSLSC. They are accessible from the beach via a ramp or stairs and the Coastal Walking Trail via Bayview Crescent ramp. All three cubicles are fully accessible and provide changing facilities. During busy beach days there can be a wait when facilities are more frequently used for changing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment completed as part of the updated Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2019 recommended no additional toilet facilities. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bayside City Council
### Ordinary Council Meeting - 25 June 2019
#### Attachment 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.0 CERBERUS BEACH HOUSE CAFÉ &amp; RESTAURANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Could installation of the proposed bollards be made urgently? <em>(2 responses)</em></td>
<td>Bollard were installed in October 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.2 | • A loading bay in front of the Beach House Café is not good idea due to the high level of foot traffic in this area. Maybe a loading bay in front of the restaurant bins may be a better place.  
• Buses for people with disabilities are too long for the designated parking area on the sea wall side opposite the Cerberus Beach House café & restaurant. Could they be permitted to park in boat/trailer parking when necessary?  
• The Masterplan suggest “improved” access to the area in front of the Yacht Club and the Cerberus Beach House café and restaurant – with the creation of a vehicle turning bay and a formal disabled car space. It is not appropriate for the council to prioritise a commercial operation over the needs of a community club, most whose members are residents of Bayside. | The line marking for establishment of a designated short term (5 mins) drop offloading bay is required for deliveries to both Cerberus Beach House and the HMBSLSC and rubbish collection. These are done outside peak visitor periods where possible. The establishment of this bay will also assist beach drop off by longer mini bus vehicles used by persons with limited mobility and will separate vehicles from the designated pedestrian route. |
| | | **Recommendation** No change to plan |
| 9.3 | Parking near the café should be reverse in drive out only. | There is sufficient room for standard 90 deg parking and attempting to enforce reverse in only parking is unnecessary and impractical. |
| | | **Recommendation** No change to plan |

<p>| <strong>10.0 BOATSHEDS</strong> | | |
| 10.1 | Please replace the term Bathing Box with Boatsheds. | This label was incorrectly shown on the draft plan. |
| | | <strong>Recommendation</strong> Amend labels to refer to Boatsheds. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.2 | Remove reference to lease terms from the Boatshed, as it is not relevant to the masterplan. (2 responses) | The lease terms are typically shown on foreshore master plans.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| 10.3 | Please clearly recognise the value of the Boat Sheds in the masterplan. (2 responses) | The brightly painted boat sheds add to the architectural character of the area but are privately leased.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| 10.4 | Replace the Boat Shed numbers with their new address (eg #207 Beach Park is now 26 Cerberus Way). | Noted.  
Recommendation  
Add note to page 2. Remove reference to numbering. |
| 11.0 | BLUESTONE SEA WALLS/ROCK WALLS | |
| 11.1 | Link new wall with old wall for safety. (2 responses) | A gap is needed between the proposed new seawall and the existing seawall at B14 car park to provide an outlet for stormwater if drain capacity is exceeded during heavy rainfall.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| 11.2 | • The basalt rock walls on the access ramps from the coastal trail to the beach require constant managing and maintenance. (2 responses)  
• Employ qualified stonemasons to re-build or replace the walls to make sure they last for future generations. | Ongoing maintenance of rockwork where needed is completed by professional stonemasons to match the existing style.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| 11.3 | • Handrails are required on both sides of the Bayview Crescent access ramp.  
• Why are handrails required on both sides of the access ramp when there is a solid stone wall on the high side which should protect people from falling? | Handrails on both sides allow people with an injury or disability to one side of their body use the ramp in both directions and are a requirement to meet current accessibility standards as defined in AS1428.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
<p>| 12.0 | CERBERUS | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12.1 | • In the plan there is little about the HMVS Cerberus, it is the icon that draws people to the area. I feel it should be incorporated into your plans.  
  • Council should refrain from spending any more money on Consultants for “Saving the Cerberus”.  
  • Get rid of the Cerberus if it is an eyesore. |
|      | The HMVS Cerberus is outside the scope of the master plan however replacement of interpretative signage regarding the wreck is planned for the jetty. This will be carefully planned to avoid obstruction of views.  
  **Recommendation**  
  No change to plan. |
| 12.2 | • Potentially bags of cement could be placed in the ship to block openings, giving the ship a longer life while creating a reef for fish.  
  • Reinstall the interpretive signage – but make it low so as not to interrupt the view.  
  • Include additional interpretive signage in the upper car park to provide some history of the Crimean War, Victorian colony forts and a picture of the Cerberus as was. |
|      | Refer 12.1 above  
  **Recommendation**  
  No change to plan. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td><strong>RED BLUFF CLIFF TOP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | Noted.  
  **Recommendation**  
  Reference to be amended. |
| 13.2 | • Red Bluff - Box thorn cuttings and brush matting are a good idea to prevent erosion.  
  (2 responses).  
  • I support increased to measures to prevent |
|      | Red Bluff lookouts are easily accessible from the Coastal Walking Trail and B13 car park. Situated on top of elevated Red Bluff cliffs they provide impressive views across the Bay. The lookouts are a part of the Bayside Coastal Indigenous Trail. Here you will find the site of the Bunjil Eggs sculpture, which is the most prominent and formal lookout area in the precinct. The current timber post and wire fencing does not provide a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.13 | Reports by the Organisation | People accessing the top of the cliffs, but don’t believe that the box thorn is enough of a deterrent. Pius, the box thorn defraris from the view and the seating provided in the area.  
- Place more plants in front of cliffs and in pockets of cliff face. Grass helpful.  
(3 responses). | Sufficient barrier to prevent the public from climbing over the fence to explore the cliffs and beaches below.  
Proposed works include:  
- Undertake brush matting using Boxthorn and planting of low spiky indigenous vegetation to the coast side of fencing to reduce public access over the fence.  
- Relocation of cliff fencing back from the cliff edge when upgrade is required.  
Not far from the Bunjil Eggs lookout, there are two smaller lookouts with a single timber picnic table and seating. The post and wire fence has no top timber rail and needs to be upgraded to restrict access to the fragile cliff top.  
Recommenlation  
No change to plan. |
| 13.3 | The new fence does not need to be as high as it is at present. (2 responses)  
Post hole digging on erosion sensitive cliff top could lead to more erosion.  
A rail on top of fencing will only encourage more people to climb over (they will use the rail to jump clear of the box thorn). | The new fence will be relocated further back from the Cliffs to reduce risk of longer term structural failure and to provide more room to stabilise the cliff top and slow the progress of erosion.  
The cliff top is like many along the Bayside Foreshore and a higher fence is unlikely to deter irresponsible and stupid high risk behaviour but will spoil the magnificent view for all visitors.  
Recommenlation  
No change to plan. |
| 13.4 | Security fencing and warning signage at the base of the cliff will not have the desired effect of keeping people off the cliffs, and would spoil the ambience of the bay. (2 responses)  
Security fencing is not practical at the base of the cliffs - people will just wade around it through the water  
Fencing at the base of the cliff will just become damaged by the salt water and winds.  
Interference by post hole diggers could interfere with the rocky reef could weaken the natural rocks which | The distinctive colour and shape of the exposed Red Bluff cliffs is a key feature of the Bayside foreshore. Rainwater runoff has cut rills into the cliffs leading to cliff instability, and the seepage of ground water can lead to slumping of rock material onto the shore. These processes are in addition to wave attack at the base of the cliff, however an outcrop of harder Sandstone provides some protection to the cliff base. These processes will continue to act to destabilise the cliff and the area is expected to remain hazardous into the future, both at beach level, and at the lookout and path above.  
Red Bluff continues to be used by walkers, for weddings/photos and occasional illegal parties. Use of security fencing from the beach out past the low water mark is an option, however this is unlikely to be successful in keeping the public from the site in the long term and will detract from the important visual amenity of the site.  
Assessment completed as part of the masterplan recommends using low level fencing and signage to more clearly alert visitors to the dangers of the area. Whilst members of the public may elect to bypass the fencing, particularly at low tide, this would be a conscious decision after being fully aware of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.13 | Protect the base of the cliffs from erosion.  
- A warning sign could be placed to the south of the cliff on the edge of the vegetation area which could blow in the wind without causing harm to the stability of the cliffs.  
- Suggested wording for signs.  
  Danger, cliffs are insecure.  
  Do not climb on cliffs.  
  Climbing destabilises cliffs causes erosion and damages indigenous plants which prevent erosion.  
- Signage could also include explicit drawings for those who don’t speak English.  
- Red Bluff – people access the top of the cliffs. Council may have to issue fines before someone gets killed  
- Red Bluff - Suggested signage “For your safety, Cliff eroding dangerously”, “Entry beyond this fence is illegal and could attract a fine.” | Relevant risks and local laws infringements for unauthorised use and events. Signage will include standard internationally accepted risk/warning pictographs. Alternative bypass routes are also to be clearly signed at beach level and on paths above to provide clear direction for those seeking to safely walk between Sandringham and Half Moon Bay.  
Recommendation  
No change to plan. |

13.5 White Cliffs – consider ambience and erosion.  
Install risk warning signage in sand close to vegetation not in cliff surface.  
(2 responses) | As with Red Bluff, installation of low level fencing and signage is proposed to alert visitors to the risk associated with access in this area. Signage will carefully be installed to minimise further damage to the cliffs.  
Recommendation  
Notes on plan updated to clearly reference the need for fencing at White Cliffs. |

14.0 FLORA & FAUNA  
14.1 Page 10 – Flora & Fauna the first para should be re-written to celebrate the vegetation a little more, to improve the wording about fauna, and to recognise that there are gardens for wildlife nearby, with one that is 100m away being home to | Noted.  
Recommendation  
Amend plan as per supplied text.  
*This area of foreshore includes Coastal Headland Scrub (EVC 161) and Spray-Zone Coastal Shrubland (EVC 876) with the varied vegetation providing important habitat [and refuge] for [a range of indigenous] native birds, mammals, especially bats, reptiles and invertebrates in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Any works associated with the Draft Masterplan should avoid disturbance to the areas marked on the attached plan (markup supplied by email). The Draft Masterplan needs to acknowledge the presence of the Mallee Drumstick Fungus, <em>Battararea stevenii</em>, a rare fungus in the Melbourne area. Sites where the Mallee Drumstick Fungus is present should be a 'no go area; when any works are being undertaken in the immediate vicinity.3 responses).</td>
<td>All native vegetation is covered by the Vegetation Protection Overlay (VPO1) in the Bayside Planning Scheme. Mallee Drumstick Fungus, <em>Battararea stevenii</em> – can be found on the Significant Species Report from 2017 (Citywide Services). This also includes the Pink Purslane, Dianella and Orchids. <strong>Recommendation</strong> Amend Figure 8 plan to include specific reference to Mallee Drumstick Fungus, <em>Battararea stevenii</em> and other significant species identified in the Bayside Native Vegetation Works Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>More volunteers (and works) are needed to continue foreshore weed eradication works. (2 Responses)</td>
<td>Council provides ongoing support to local community groups. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Removal of introduced Palm trees – will require harnessed professionals due to the steep slope. (2 Responses)</td>
<td>Palm tree removal will be completed by specialist contractors. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>Areas marked E4 (pg 10- of Draft Masterplan) needs to be extended to include the area between our boathed and the LSC (it has already been revegetated as referred to in the description of E4).</td>
<td>This area has been revegetated however it may require works subject to the outcome of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the HMBLSAC area. Refer 6.1. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Waste rubble such as concrete slabs etc be removed from the beach for safety purposes and to improve the visual appeal of this otherwise beautiful location.</td>
<td>The steep embankment north of Red Bluff has been filled using concrete rubble from road works. Revegetation in this area is not considered suitable due to ongoing risk from loose debris. Establish fencing and use signage at the beach level to restrict public access and continue to monitor bank stability. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>Open up tea-tree areas at car parks for better views of the bay and to provide more parking.</td>
<td>Refer 14.2. Vegetation is protected under a vegetation protection overlay in the Bayside Planning Scheme. <strong>Recommendation</strong> No change to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Infill planting required along the Bay Trail path between Love Street and Arkaringa Crescent.</td>
<td>Noted. Recommendation Add to plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>COASTAL WALKING TRAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>The Coastal Trail should not be widened – BRASCA wishes to be involved with on site evaluation with its knowledge, input taken into account prior to removal of any flora. (Ref Bayside Coastal Management Plan (2014) reference to walking trail width up to 2.5m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of the walking trails – topping covering exposed roots so that rainwater can soak through.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of the walking trails to help avoid the low spots that become mud holes after a shower of rain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate remediation required along coastal walking trail where insect habitats have been removed or damaged. More logs and replanting is required to provide cover for native insects including the Blue Banded Bee, and Sand Wasps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No vegetation should be removed for joggers or bike riders as the Bay Trail was created for this type of activity and much of this type of vegetation was lost when it was installed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The unsalted Coastal Walking Trail runs parallel with Beach Road, winding its way through the coastal bushland offering elevated views out to the Bay. It varies in width and is increasingly popular with walkers and joggers of all ages and abilities. Cyclists are discouraged from using the coastal walking trail to minimise erosion, impacts on sensitive coastal vegetation, habitat values and for safety reasons. In accordance with the Bayside Coastal Management Plan (2014) recommendations, the trail is to remain a compacted granitic gravel/sand walking trail up to 2.5m in width (site specific), inclusive of pruning to either side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance of the Coastal Walking Trail is a high priority. Works are undertaken by experienced Council Contractors with every effort made to minimise impacts on native vegetation and habitat values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change to plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15.2 | Include more picnic areas in shady spots with water for dogs and native birds. | There is limited access to potable water in this section of the foreshore and no additional drinking fountains are proposed to avoid potential impacts on vegetation and cultural heritage values.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 15.3 | • The area at the Potter Street steps is a very good viewing area, maybe only a partial closure might be warranted, keeping an unsealed walking track to steps  
(2 responses)  
• Retain Coastal Walking trail through new vegetation on cliff top area at Potter Street  
(3 responses)  
• It would seem appropriate to include a ramp for wheelchair access in the B13 car park (while steps to the cliff top and coastal trail remain where they are for the masses that use them daily). This proposal seems to be putting the needs of a few ahead of the very large majority of others.  
(2 responses) | Following improvements to the Coastal Walking Trail through the B13 car park, investigate the closure and revegetation of the cliff top at the end of Potter Street. This was intended to apply to the northern end when improved access via the B13 car park was established.  
**Recommendation**  
Amend E8 to indicate revegetation only with retention of the stairs and existing coastal walking trail areas at the 2.5m width applicable in other sections. |
| 15.4 | • Where possible can trees have overhanging canopy rather than being removed?  
• When trees along coastal walking trail are pruned could they be cut back flush to the nearest main bough or trunk, as protruding boughs are hard to see and dangerous when watching under foot. | The entire Bayside Foreshore is covered by a Vegetation Protective Overlay (VPO1). Trees are always retained except where they pose a risk to the public. Ongoing pruning to maintain paths and clear sightlines where needed is undertaken by experienced Council contractors operating within set guidelines.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
| 15.5 | Trees are good for shade for people sitting in cars. | Establishment of additional trees in car park areas is supported.  
**Recommendation**  
No change to plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.0 BAY TRAIL/BEACH ROAD | • Needs to be some form of speed restriction 25 metres before cyclists approach the intersection of the Bay Trail and B15 car park entrance/exit.  
• Vegetation at the intersection of the Bay Trail and B15 car park presents a hazard as car drivers do not have a clear view looking north to see oncoming cyclists.  
• Changes to car park entry and exits are good – but Bay Trail users still require a warning they are entering a heavy traffic area. | The 2.5m wide concrete Bay Trail provides continuous off road access for both pedestrians and cyclists travelling along Beach Road. The Bay Trail crosses vehicle entry points at Cerberus Way and B13 car park and there is sufficient width to allow vehicles turn in and out. Currently vehicles block the path while waiting to exit. Refer to Detail Plans A and C for proposed upgrades.  
**Recommendation**  
Add note regarding installation of additional advance warning signage for cyclists on approach to road crossing points. |
| 16.2 | The area benefits from direct access by bicycle (via the Bay Trail) – it would be great to see some secure bicycle parking worked into the masterplan. It would encourage more people to cycle to the beach, alleviating pressure on the car park. | Additional beach bicycle parking facilities are proposed opposite the Cerberus Beach House.  
**Recommendation**  
*No change to plan.* |
| 16.3 | Too many signs to read whilst driving and looking for parking. Beach Road requires a slow down sign on approach to the B13 and B15 car park as there are blind corners and risky entrances and exits. | Beach Road is managed by VicRoads. Council supports lower speed limits to improve public safety.  
**Recommendation**  
*No change to plan.* |
| 17.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE | The historically significant midden area (at the bottom of the "hair pin" ramp Bayview Crescent pedestrian ramp) erosion protection wall is in very poor condition. Create a wall that will protect the midden's rocks within a metal cage (using a narrow gabion wall with cover). The middens would be protected and | Half Moon Bay has ten registered Indigenous archaeological sites within the precinct, including shell middens and rock walls. Ongoing protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage sites is a key requirement of the Masterplan.  
Specific recommendations will be guided by the preparation of a new Cultural Heritage Management Plan which is a high priority action.  
**Recommendation**  
*No change to plan.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>native creepers could be planted above the midden areas on both sides of the path.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.0 FORESHORE FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **18.1** New picnic tables should be in the shade. | Where possible facilities are located in the shade however, it is important to minimise disturbance to root zones of the few large trees on the foreshore. | Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| **18.2** New picnic tables should not be metal – as they get too hot to use in the warm weather. | New seats and tables are to have timber slats. | Recommendation  
No change to plan. |
| **OTHER** | The following comments related to areas outside the scope of this master plan | |
| • No clean-up of dead trees, no tap, no replacement of toilet block and drain area – all at the Seaview Crescent end of beach. | | |
| • Seaview Crescent beach needs continuous cleaning of dead seaweed and rubbish especially at the drain end and after storms. | | |
| • Seaview Crescent needs action. Open up the viewing area, include extra seats, and a drinking fountain. | | |
| • No dogs on beach use area between Seaview Crescent ramp and cliff area for dogs. | | |
| • Clear loose rocks from water around Seaview Crescent drain. | | |
| • Edward Street beach should be made dog accessible throughout the year as it is not used much even in the height of summer. | | |
| • Outside of this Draft Masterplan area. | | |
3. Feedback received during consultation on the Draft Master Plan

Community consultation on the Draft Master Plan was completed over a six week period from 14 August 2017 to 1 October 2017. Comments and feedback were received as follows.

3.1 Community Information Sessions

Weekend Community Information Session
Saturday 16 September 2017 from 2:00pm–4:00pm at Black Rock Yacht Club.

Walking tour
Sunday, 23 September 2017 from 2:00pm to 3:00pm (meet at front of Black Rock Yacht Club).

3.2 Council Website


The draft Master Plan and full report was displayed on Council's website for community feedback via the 'Have Your Say' online portal. Comments and feedback were provided via the online forum as follows:

Should the Half Moon Bay Surf Lifesaving Club extend their premises? (30 responses and 4 were removed by Bayside City Council as requested by the individuals who posted them):

- Yes, the club is a vital volunteer community service organization and in line with current OH and S requirements more footprint space is required to store the upgraded OH and S equipment needed for the current and future services.

- As a lifelong user of the Half Moon Bay beach I think it is a fantastic idea. Looking around at surrounding beaches and surf clubs it is clear that the facilities are no longer serviceable to the volunteers that keep this beach safe. I also personally believe it is the perfect location (out the front of the car park in this diagram) to have an open air seawater 50 metre swimming pool similar to Bondi Beach or the other hundreds that dot the beaches all along the coast.

- YES!!! The club appears to be the most active club in the whole Bayside area in terms of participation. The club appears to be at complete compacity in terms of storage and the number of community members it supports. The current land area intended to extend on is a completely underutilised patch of dirt in a prime area that the club would make fantastic use of.

- I visit Half Moon Bay minimum once week - The area next to the club is currently unused and previously contained a bathing box. Given how active the club is, their ongoing contribution to the community this extension should be granted. Would be great to see improved access to the beach for the club but also the community.

- Half Moon Bay is one of the busiest beaches in Bayside. Particularly during summer, the beach is packed with people. This makes the job of the life savers challenging enough, and with the added complication of the jet ski crowd, the role of the life savers is vital. The extension is looking to replace an unused (except as a garbage tip!) piece of dirt with storage for life-saving equipment, and looking to make it easier to get the IRBs in and out. Speedy access to craft by life savers can be the difference between life and death for beach goers, and as a fully set up IRB with
motor on it is very heavy, life savers should be able to use ramps to get the craft out quickly.

- This is a no brainier. Replace empty dirt patch with space for life saving equipment. Enough said really.

- The support of volunteer Life Savers is critical for the safety of the local community. It would be great to see the Bayside Council supporting this initiative as the Kingston Council has done at Mordialloc LSC. Half Moon Bay is a much busier beach but the facilities are now poles apart. Council needs to support the safety of the Life Savers to enable them to best serve the community.

- This extension is essential to avoid compliance problems in the future with OH&S requirements and increasing use of the beach. The modern efficient equipment that is now being rolled out requires greater access. I support the extension of the clubhouse.

- I am in favour of extending the Lifesaving Club, it is a dead space and had a boat shed anyway. The lifesaving club provide a valuable safety and community service who need the space.

- The Club desperately needs more space as we continue to grow with a broad section of the Bayside community utilising training, outdoor activity and patrolling the most popular beach in Bayside. The ramp is needed to get craft in the water a lot quicker than they currently have in order to respond to requests for neighbouring beaches and other situations which occur well off shore. It is currently cumbersome, and time consuming which wastes precious time in an emergency situation.

- Yes. This is well needed to protect the community.

- This is an essential upgrade. This SLSC is extremely busy and an extension would result in an increase in safety to allow club members to navigate the pathways with less impact on the local community members enjoying the beach.

- The voluntary service the Half Moon Bay surf lifesaving club provides our local community should definitely be supported by expanding the club for their life saving equipment which in turn expands the protection of our community.

- The request for an extension should definitely be granted to allow sufficient space for necessary equipment, to maximise the level of service that can be provided to the booming Bayside community.

- Yes. Although grass has been planted here, this is obviously an unused space which could be put to better use.

- The Bayside City Council should be doing all that is possible to aid community groups like lifesaving clubs to expand and gain new members. Half Moon Bay LSC is always busy and more space would only help this already thriving lifesaving club. It would be ludicrous to knock back a development of a vacant piece of dirt when the benefit is so vast.

- Yes, without a doubt - the extension should be granted. Apart from the fact that the surf club supplies invaluable rescue services at the busy beach, it is home to generation after generation of nippers and senior members whose active lifestyles have positive ripple effects throughout the community. This is a very worthwhile investment.
- Yes, the club provides a crucial voluntary service and it should be supported in its endeavours.

- 100% for the HMB SLS extension as safe & easy rescue access is crucial to the club to patrol this popular & busy summer beach. The small extension space does not oppose any other developments in place & it is an under utilised space at present. The club provides important emergency services, sporting & social services to the local community & it needs to upgrade its facilities with the demand of the beach goers.

- NO, the Life Saving Club has had recent extensions to store Surf equip mostly for competition, and if necessary to alter for OH&S, should be modified within the existing footprint. "Surf" Life savers carry equipment to beach and water. A ramp into the bay so close to the beach would act like a groyne and effect the flow of coastal drifts. The consequence could be a drastic loss of beach sand or a build up at the ramp. The HMB swimming beach has not altered in 100 years,

- It's a great idea and Council should immediately agree to the extension for the benefit of all residents using the area rather than continuing to pander to extremist greenie minority groups who don't want ANY improvements or progress in Bayside

- 100% Yes. The land beside the club is vacant anyways and supporting a local voluntary organisation is something we should do. Half Moon Bay is one of the busiest beaches in the bayside area and everything should be done to ease access for any equipment they need!

- No problem with the extension of the building, but the boat ramp in works to the existing pristine beach is a whole other issue. This is one of the most popular parts of the beach for small kids and there is an existing boat ramp spitting distance that has provided safe access - removed from beach patrons and their kids - for donkeys years. What scientific analysis has been done as to sand movement and the environmental. More importantly what is the need here when there is an existing boat ramp there already - particularly when the ramp and beach proposal serves to reduce the beach area in its most popular spot for families with small children. This ramp and beach works need to be rethought completely.

- Yes, this is an extremely reputable organisation, and great community servant. A popular location that has outgrown its current facility. Expanded facilities will allow vital equipment to be housed is more appropriate space, and provide a better facility for supporting the wider community more.

- Even though Half Moon Bay is a relatively safe beach with no strong rips, the life saving club is very important to the community and other users. I support extending the building to accommodate the increase in members as long as it does not impact on any aboriginal artefact site. I can only support option A in view of the ramps proposed in either option C or D. Option B might be possible but the life savers use the veranda to look out over the beach. I understand that it would be easier to move the ILB directly down a ramp in front of the storage area. However, option C would take up a significant area of sand already used by beach corners and possible act as a groyne, plus it would still be difficult to move an IRB onto the beach and into the water. Option D is a definite no as it would impact on the coastal movement of sand and act as a groyne, spoiling the existing beach. Parking the IRB on the beach takes up valuable space, plus it would be difficult to launch through the people swimming. Personally I have never seen the IRB at HMBSLC used to rescue anyone, but it would be useful to rescue people who get trapped on the Cerberus. As an alternative, I would like to suggest that the life saving club be allowed exclusive use
of the existing ramp opposite the Beach House. Because the on duty life-savers generally stand up on the veranda in front of the first aid room, where they have a better view across the Bay than on the beach, the ILB could be kept on this ramp and safely moved into the water without having to go through a crowded beach. The yacht club sometimes uses this ramp during competition days but already has a double width ramp in front of its club for its own members. Sharing at peak times could be part of the discussion. Many life-saving clubs have much further to manually move equipment and some have motorised vehicles. If it is an OHS issue perhaps we could fund a motorised vehicle to help. The boat though still has to manually be moved into deep enough water wherever it is located for use.

- Members of Life Saving Clubs around the coast of Victoria carry their equipment over sand to the sea. I have always thought this was part of their physical fitness training. A ramp directly into the water in front of the Life Saving Club would act like a groyne, with waves becoming fractious as they drive off the hard construction and probably remove sane from the beach... The building of this unnecessary intrusion into the bay could cause long term, even permanent damage. (comment from Bayside resident)

- There should be no net increase in the footprint of existing buildings. Following previous extensions to the HMBSLC, there has been considerable loss of vegetation, rubble buried in the soil making it difficult to replant and prevent erosion. Would it be possible for Council to provide storage for the HMBSLC “surf boats” and other equipment on council owned property, inland?

- I don’t see any need to build a new ramp, but an extension of the existing one is reasonable.

- I am unfamiliar with the existing footprint and layout of the premises. However, I would think the first option would be the reconfiguration of existing space to enable desired use and access to be facilitated. Is there an option of going ‘up’ more, and freeing up more space on the lower levels?

**Should the Life Saving Club alter its verandah to allow for ramp widening?** (12 responses)

- Yes, the Ramp should be made compliant.
- Yes, this ramp is definitely a hazard - the ramp should be widened along with the access to the beach.
- Yes, the ramp as it stands is far too narrow, and the railing is unsafe. With the public toilets at the top of that ramp, widening it would allow for wheelchair and wide pram access. As the majority of Half Moon Bay beachgoers are young families (often with grandparents in tow), I think better ramp access would be a fantastic idea.
- The ramp is too narrow and the railing unsafe. I am often waiting at either end for people to come up/down it before proceeding. I don’t know what the code for ramps requires but this ramp, at a bare minimum, should be wide enough for two people to pass by each other.
- It is critical the ramp is compliant so rescuers can efficiently do their job in an emergency.
- The ramp should be compliant and as long as the club has access to the double doors it should not worry the club.
- Again, this is essential to help the lifesavers help the community.
- Yes, the ramp should be made compliant to maximise access from the clubhouse/toilets/upper level to the beach for not only the lifesavers, but the public too.
- Yes. It is difficult to walk up and down here if someone is going the other way.
• Yes, it is far too narrow and should be compliant.
• Yes, I support this proposal which is again just a common sense approach which should be supported by Council for its ratepayers use & benefit rather than listening to minority groups who neither use the area or want any improvements no matter how good.
• Yes, widening an existing access is appropriate.

**Should the boat ramp be extended along the seawall to allow access from the existing roller doors?** (16 responses)

• Yes, the Half Moon Bay SLSC is a vital volunteer community service. As the population of the Bayside community grows, our recreational use of the bay is expanding and the club is being called upon to assist at all times of the day and night. The ramp extension will allow the club to launch rescue equipment after hours without 4 or 5 people being required. The Half Moon Bay SLSC requires an upgrade in equipment to assist in controlling the expansion of use by Jetskis, which seems to be more popular in our area than other locations around the bay. The club is determined to improve in this area.

• Yes, I have seen patrolling members struggle to get their IRB down this ramp many times, it appears to be unsafe for such a use. I would hate to see them have to get their rescue equipment down in a real emergency situation.

• Absolutely. IRBs are far too heavy for one or even two people to launch, and having access to the ramp could make all the difference in an emergency situation.

• Yes, this should go ahead - would also improve the experience beach goers and general public. Whenever the rescue equipment is being transported to the beach the entire path is taken up and is unsafe for lifesaving volunteers and the public.

• Yes. Like any infrastructure, practicalities of usage change overtime, particularly with a rapidly expanding population base. These proposals will ensure that this vital community volunteer service can continue to operate effectively as required.

• The support of volunteer Life Savers is critical for the safety of the local community. Council needs to support the safety of the Life Savers to enable them to best serve the community.

• Yes, should go ahead.

• The boat ramp should not only be extended to allow easy access to the roller doors (and therefore rescue equipment, IRB etc.), to ensure the safety of all members of the public, but also to minimise the length of the reaction time of lifesavers coming down from the clubhouse in an emergency situation.

• Yes. On any day where there are a few people on the beach this can be a bit of a bottleneck, it would make it easier to get on and off the sand.

• Yes, it takes lifesavers a good amount of time to take their equipment down to the beach holding up members of the public who just want to walk past.

• Yes, once again an obvious safety improvement which this Council should support.

• I can only support option A in view of the ramps proposed in either option C or D. Option B might be possible but the life savers use the veranda to look out over the beach. I understand that it would be easier to move the ILB directly down a ramp in front of the storage area. However, option C would take up a significant area of sand already used by beach comers and possible act as a groyne, plus it would still be difficult to move an ILB onto the beach and into the water. Option D is a definite no as it would impact on the coastal movement of sand and act as a groyne, spoiling the existing beach. Parking the ILB on the beach takes up valuable space, it would be difficult to launch through the people swimming. Personally, I have never seen the ILB at HMBSLC used to rescue anyone, but it would be useful to rescue people who get trapped on the Cerberus. As an alternative, I would like to suggest that the lifesaving club be allowed exclusive use of the existing ramp opposite the Beach House. Because the on duty life-savers generally stand up on the veranda in front of the first aid room, where they have a better view across the Bay than on the beach,
the ILB could be kept on this ramp and safely moved into the water without having to
go through a crowded beach. The yacht club sometimes uses this ramp during
competition days but already has a double width ramp in front of its club for its own
members. Sharing at peak times could be part of the discussion. Many life-saving
clubs have much further to manually move equipment and some have motorised
vehicles. If it is an OHS issue perhaps we could fund a motorised vehicle to help.
The boat though still has to manually be moved into deep enough water wherever it
is located for use.

- Yes, the Half Moon Bay SLSC is a vital volunteer community service. For the safety
of all those that Live in Bayside or visit our beaches we need to make sure that
Public Safety is paramount. The ramp extension Option C & D provide a Safe access
to the Volunteers who patrol our beach and create a culture of health and wellbeing
for all. The ramp extension will allow the club & emergency services if required to
launch rescue equipment. Doing nothing isn’t the answer as we can see what has
happened to the Cerberus when nothing is done. Bayside Council needs to be
proactive and look at the big picture on ensuring the HMB is around and looking
good for years to come for the economic value that bring tourists to Bayside and
surrounding areas. Lets show visitors that we take out Health and Wellbeing and
Water Safety seriously by ensure that our Lifesavers have the best possible access
to the water for any rescues, water safety requirements.

- Council will consider fish cleaning facilities as part of this masterplan process, along
with the community benefits and maintenance challenges it entails. We are aware
that the sand has accumulated at the base of the boat ramps and have undertaken
surveys to determine that dredging will be required. This project is in progress with a
suitable contractor to do these works currently being sought. The jetty, sea wall and
beach re-nourishment are actually all out of Council’s control. The jetty is owned
and managed by Parks Victoria, the re-nourishment you mentioned was a decision
by the Dept. Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), and the sea wall is
also owned by DELWP. Half Moon Bay is considered a local facility under the
Central Coastal Board – Boating Action Plan. Car parking for seasonal fishing is
considered adequate in this plan for a local facility. The area for parking is restricted
due to the nature of this site, and Council has undertaken in its Coastal Management
Plan not expand any existing car park footprints on the coast.

3.3 Stakeholder Submissions

Summary of submissions received via phone and email during the Draft Master Plan
Consultation Phase include:

3.3.1 Half Moon Bay Surf Life Saving Club, Cliff Goulding, President, 1/10/2017

- In 1999 the club was renovated and part of the footprint was reduced to allow the
inclusion of the public toilets within the club footprint. There was agreement with
Bayside Council and DSE that HMB LSC would be able to use the footprint of the
previous toilets to store surf boats.

- A few years after the completion of the HMB Club renovation the Blue and Orange
bathing box, originally located directly next to the club was relocated to the previous
public toilet site. This was as agreed by Council, DSE and the club to allow for the
HMB LSC future extension. This Beach Box now takes up most of the area of the
previous toilet site. This proposal is to extend the club at ground level to get better
and safe access for boats and rescue equipment.

- In 2004 The Bayside Swimming Club and Half Moon Bay LSC jointly received Town
Planning approval to extend the club house. Time to raise the funds was running out
and Mark Stockton from Bayside City council asked both entities to retract the
application and revisit the extension in the future.

- A initial drawing of the club’s anticipated requirements is overleaf:
As part of the overall Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Master Plan HMB LSC see this extension as an imperative inclusion.

- HMB LSC Extension is needed to adapt to the cultural changes.
- In 2017 the Half Moon Bay Beach is in a new era from the 1990s when Club's last renovation was planned. A number of demographic and cultural changes will continue to impact the Club's resource requirements.
- The Bayside Population and local beach activity has grown.
- Half Moon Beach is promoted in Melbourne Media as an Icon which attracts many visitors.
- Mid Week Rescues due to Flexible work hours will increase.
- Increase in type of water craft has led to more frequent capsizing and lost recreational canoeists.
- Half Moon Boat Ramp has increased activity.
- Jets Ski numbers have ballooned at Half Moon Bay and are seen to be a danger to swimmers.
- As local Real Estate prices and disposable incomes climb, Lifesaving Clubs need to more emphasise and promote "cool activities" to ensure we attract capable volunteer lifesavers.
- Volunteer groups need to keep abreast of new community cultures to maintain volunteer numbers.

- HMB LSC Extension and how will it assist the club to adapt:
  - Half Moon Bay LSC have a number of strategies that require more Ground Level access and overall storage.
  - To keep up with growing demand the Club needs more ground floor access storage be able to quickly access rescue boat and jets ski with an All Terrain Vehicle. This is a Lifesaving Victoria initiative.
  - This craft needs to be accessible 24 hours 7 days per week and be launched by just two persons.
  - In conjunction with Life Saving Victoria a Response Team will also be able to access this craft to respond as part of the Emergency Service.
  - During a recent missing person incident at Half Moon Bay mid-week, rescue craft was transported in from Port Melbourne wasting valuable time in an emergency.
  - SLSA, Australian Standards, Occupational Health & safety manual handling guidelines stipulate that an All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) be used when launching power craft of this nature.
  - New Disability floating chairs can be easily launched with an ATV via the existing boat ramp.

- HMB LSC Extension & core activities needed for future growth:
- To maintain Volunteer Numbers Half Moon Bay LSC need to continue and expand its current activities and grow new.
- The Club provides free coaching and training to its members all year round. Its team building is the mainstay of its volunteer retention.
- The Club has invested in Board and Skis which keep the volunteers well conditioned and active. The club needs to store these at ground level as well. Training sessions are conducted AM and PM most days.
- The Club is the No. 1 Club in the whole Port Phillip Bay for active members in the 16 - 30 year old age group. This translates to a healthy lifestyle and a great community. Without equipment this would not be possible.
- Half Moon LSC is part of the Sport for Schools program. Being a provider helps to ensure that there is a better understanding of the dangers at the beach. The club will be utilized during school hours. Better access for board storage at ground level is imperative.
- Half Moon Nipper Program is run in addition to this and provides the extension will allow safe manual handling by Nipper trainers to get Inflatable Rescue Boats and motors to and from the beach.
- A Ramp For HMB Rescue Craft
  - O H and S standards have developed and it is no longer advisable for HMB members to lift and carry the IRB Rescue craft from the Club to the beach into the water. Neither of the beach ramps are sufficient wide for the IRB and 2 carry person either side.
  - Jet Skis and Kite Surfers are becoming one of our biggest safety concerns at HMB. As the popularity increases so does the RISK. A dedicated ramp for quick emergency launching HMB own Jetski will soon be necessary.

- In response to the Master Plan Suggestion to widen the ramp to the toilets:
  - The existing ramp is 1050mm between the retaining wall and the hand rail.
  - The retaining wall is part of the structure supporting the building and the veranda above.
  - The veranda is used by public and club members to store bikes in lieu of them creating congestion on the beach path.
  - From our understanding of the structural engineer's drawings of the club, we believe it is possible to relocate the retaining wall 250mm to the east which will be sufficient to make the ramp-path to the public toilets compliant.
  - This would narrow the size of the veranda by 250mm on the south side of the Club Entrance, for which the club is not opposed.
  - However, HalfMoon Bay SLSC front door is also located on the veranda and we
  - strongly oppose any reduction in the path width from the north end of the club to our entry door.
3.3.2 Black Rock Yacht Club, Gary Lokum, Commodore, 30/09/2017

- The Draft Masterplan predominantly proposes maintenance type activities and does not seem to provide any long-term, innovative or creative ideas for tackling existing known issues relating to competing uses.
- Actions A1-A4 propose some changes to parking arrangements in the area between the BRYC and Cerberus Beach House and kiosk. This is a very busy area and is used by the club for yacht rigging, launching and waiting to launch, or having just been retrieved. On weekdays when parking is allowed in this area, it is quite unsafe with cars moving through the area (particularly when they are reversing from car parks). During the year we have a number of community groups including schools and junior sports programs who use the club and its facilities for sailing and other activities. There have been many close calls. This area should have no car parking during daylights savings time. The road in this area should be painted a contrasting colour to make it obvious to all users that it is a shared pedestrian/car/yacht zone.
- Action A3 proposes a footpath along the fence line of BRYC. We feel that this would push yachts waiting to launch further into the car parking area and would be better addressed by the suggestion above (See photos below).
- The proposed changes to the B13 car park is a great idea, better signage and up grading the car park will hopefully see more people parking there rather than in the B14 carpark.
- It is disappointing to see that options for changes to the layout of the B14 carpark have not been explored. There continues to be ongoing conflicts between public boat ramps users, other traffic and pedestrians in this area. This Masterplan would be a good opportunity to explore whether there are any other options for siting of the boat ramp (within the same area) and changes to parking layout and traffic flow to reduce conflict (See photos below).
- The realignment of the cycleway across the entrance to the B15 carpark is good as cars will be able to wait to get onto beach road without blocking the cycleway.
- The proposed pedestrian walkway down the hill to Half Moon Bay and across to the public boat ramp is also to be commended, as it will give a safer approach to Half Moon Bay.
- The incorporation of rain gardens and a gross pollutant trap is supported as a good step towards reducing stormwater runoff and pollution in the Bay.
3.3.3 **BRASCA, Craig Brunnen, President, 27/09/2017**
- BRASCA agrees that there should be no net increase in building footprint for the LSC.
- BRASCA understands that the proposals for ramp changes at the LSC are unfunded and not approved. If these options were to be considered at a later date Options D would be opposed due to the groynes effect it would have. Option C would be the preference as it would not open paths, buildings, dunes and vegetation to wave surges.
- BRASCA supports the strict governance of the Zoning and Overlays as documented.
- BRASCA is not in favour of the coastal path being widened causing significant reduction of its indigenous vegetation. BRASCA wishes to be involved in on-site evaluation, with its knowledge/input taken into account prior to the removal of any flora.
- BRASCA suggests parking fees at B13 be reduced to encourage use of this carpark over B14 and B15.

3.3.4 **Parks Victoria, Stephen McPhee, Chief Area Ranger, 10/01/2017**
- Page 2: Current wording: Parks Victoria own and manage the Black Rock Jetty and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) are responsible for the sea wall and other coastal stability measures at Half Moon Bay and elsewhere along the Port Phillip shoreline.
- Change wording to: Parks Victoria manage the Black Rock Jetty, as Committee of Management on behalf of the Crown (State Government of Victoria). The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) are responsible for the sea wall and other coastal stability measures at Half Moon Bay and elsewhere along the Port Phillip shoreline.
10.14 SMALL NEIGHBOURHOOD ACTIVITY CENTRE BUILDING HEIGHT REVIEW (AMENDMENT C126)

City Planning & Amenity - Urban Strategy
File No: PSF/19/954 – Doc No: DOC/19/147011

Executive summary

Purpose
To present Council with the progress made in relation to a study to support the introduction of mandatory height controls in Small Neighbourhood Activity Centres, where mandatory controls were not supported by the Planning Panel appointed to consider Amendment C126.

Background
The Planning Panel appointed to consider Amendment C126 supported the preferred building scale and other design measures proposed in the Design and Development Overlay Schedules ('DDOs') used within the amendment. However, the Panel did not support the proposed mandatory maximum heights, except in a number of limited circumstances (refer Attachment 1).

At its 19 March 2019 Ordinary Meeting, Council adopted Amendment C126 incorporating the majority of the Panel’s recommendations. In deciding to adopt the Amendment, Council also resolved to:

- Immediately commence the preparation of a study to support the application of mandatory height controls in Small Neighbourhood Activity Centres where mandatory controls have not been supported by Planning Panels Victoria; and

- Present a report to Council in June 2019 with the outcomes of the study.

Key issues

Preliminary findings of the Study
A study has commenced to investigate the potential to justify mandatory height controls in centres where Council was unsuccessful in securing mandatory height controls through the Planning Panel process.

In determining whether a mandatory control is appropriate, Council must consider the following criteria, outlined in Planning Practise Note 59 (The role of mandatory provisions in planning schemes):

- Is the mandatory provision strategically justified?
- Is the mandatory provision appropriate to the majority of proposals?
- Does the mandatory provision provide for the preferred outcome?
- Will the majority of proposals not in accordance with the mandatory provision be clearly unacceptable?
- Will the mandatory provision reduce administrative costs?
In addition, in activity centres, Planning Practice Note 60 (Height and setback controls for activity centres) sets out when mandatory height or setback controls should be applied. This practice note was revised in October 2018 and broadens the circumstances under which mandatory provisions may be justified. In activity centres, they should only be applied where:

- Exceptional circumstances exist; or

- Council has undertaken comprehensive strategic work and is able to demonstrate that mandatory controls are appropriate in the context; and

- They are absolutely necessary to achieve the preferred built form outcomes and it can be demonstrated that exceeding these development parameters would result in unacceptable built form outcomes.

The Planning Panel assessed whether the mandatory heights proposed in Amendment C126 met the above criteria and determined that they did not, except in a number of limited circumstances.

In order to pursue mandatory heights in the centres that were not supported by the Planning Panel, Council will need to demonstrate why the Panel's views on mandatory heights are not supported (by Council).

To do this, an analysis of each centre’s characteristics, location and context, opportunity for growth and other features has been undertaken. The analysis has guided the development of preliminary criteria, needed to provide strategic justification for mandatory controls in relevant centres. The preliminary criteria have been tested in a case study (refer Attachment 2).

More detailed analysis and refinement of the criteria is now required to determine whether it can be justified that mandatory height controls are absolutely necessary to achieve the preferred built form outcomes and that exceeding the preferred heights agreed to in Amendment C126 would result in unacceptable built form outcomes.

Challenges with proceeding to pursue mandatory controls

It is noted that there is no guarantee that Council will be able to justify the mandatory controls. As with any planning scheme amendment process, there is a risk that a Planning Panel may find that the amendment is not strategically justified.

This risk is particularly real given past Planning Panels have not supported Bayside’s approach to applying mandatory height controls in areas designated for change, including the C126 Panel which looked at the characteristics of each of these centres in detail.

Further, the community views on the height controls proposed through Amendment C126 were divided, as submitters considered that the height controls were both too low/too high. Expert witnesses at the Planning Panel hearing also had divided views on appropriate heights in these centres. A future planning scheme amendment to change these height controls would likely result in the same set of issues being raised in submissions:

- Those that support the application of mandatory controls (local residents/community)
- Those that oppose that application of mandatory controls to their site (often engaging legal representation and expert evidence at a Panel).

These issues have already been considered by the previous Panel; however, it is possible that more detailed and targeted analysis be undertaken and used as expert evidence to support the application of mandatory heights, where they have been demonstrated to be ‘absolutely necessary’ as specified in the Practice Note (PPN60).
Any new process to look at changing preferred height controls to mandatory controls runs the risk that heights greater than Council’s existing controls could be recommended.

Next Steps

The next step is further refinement of the preliminary criteria outlined in Attachment 2 and completion of detailed analysis for each of the centres where the panel did not support mandatory controls. It is anticipated that a report will be presented to Council in October 2019, describing the outcomes of the study and recommending a way forward.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Continues to undertake the detailed analysis (study) that is required to explore, and potentially provide, the necessary strategic justification to support mandatory height controls for the Small Neighbourhood Activity Centres.

2. Receives a report at its 15 October 2019 Ordinary Meeting with the findings and recommendations from the study.

Support Attachments

1. List of centres and heights
2. Proposed criteria for assessment and case study
Considerations and implications of proposition

Liveable community

Social
Planning for appropriate built form outcomes has potential social and economic benefits by creating higher amenity, vibrant, human-scale activity centres.

Amendment C126 seeks to create more vibrant small activity centres through introducing design requirements which will protect local commercial uses and ensure access for local communities. This will assist in providing a mixture of housing, economic growth and social gathering places in the centres, and supporting housing diversity in appropriate areas.

Natural Environment
Planning for activity centres seeks to reduce car dependency and support sustainable transport usage by increasing the diversity of land uses in the centres. This will ensure dwellings are constructed close to shops and services reducing reliance on private transport.

Built Environment
The proposal to undertake further work to justify mandatory heights has a strong correlation to ensuring appropriate outcomes for the built environment in Bayside. Maintaining and protecting the existing neighbourhood character of Bayside is of high importance to Council and the community.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The community has had strong involvement in providing feedback to Council on Amendment C126 and there is strong community concern about inappropriate development in Bayside. Any planning scheme amendment to change the height controls adopted as part of Amendment C126 will need to be publicly exhibited in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. It is expected that submitters will raise issues with the heights proposed and the use of mandatory controls, as was the case with the submissions received to Amendment C126.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
There are no immediate legal implications associated with this preliminary study on the potential to apply mandatory heights as a result of Amendment C126.

Finance
Work to investigate opportunities for mandatory controls has not been provided for within the current Budget. Any planning scheme amendment to introduce controls is expected to be referred to an independent Planning Panel to consider submissions. It is expected that a Planning Panel process would cost Council between $40,000 and $60,000 depending on the number of expert witnesses required.
Links to Council policy and strategy

**Bayside Housing Strategy 2012**

The Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 provides the vision of directing medium density development into Bayside's smaller order shopping centres.

The Housing Strategy provides guidance on the level of growth to be accommodated and ensures development must have regard to building rhythm and the surrounding residential character. These centres areas are designated as Moderate or Minimal Change Areas.

The Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 is currently being reviewed, with a revised Strategy expected to be presented to Council for consideration in 2019/20.

**Small Activity Centres Strategy 2014**

The analysis undertaken, as described in this report, seeks to further the work undertaken for Amendment C126 which also has its basis in the Small Activity Centres Strategy which defines the role and preferred scale of development for Bayside’s SNACs.

This Strategy was updated in March 2019 to have regard to the recommendations of the Planning Panel appointed to consider submissions to Amendment C126.
## Appendix 1 – List of centres within Study and proposed height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre Name</th>
<th>Height Proposed by Council</th>
<th>Discretionary Height Recommended by Panel</th>
<th>Panel recommendation for height control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balcombe Park, Beaumaris</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balcombe Road and Charman Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Road and Avoca Street, Cheltenham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Road and Jack Road, Cheltenham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Road and Georgiana Street, Sandringham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road &amp; Arranmore Avenue, Black Rock</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road &amp; Bay Road, Sandringham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road &amp; Edward Street, Black Rock/Sandringham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>2-3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road &amp; Highett Road Centre, Hampton (excludes 361-371 Bluff Road)</td>
<td>3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road &amp; Highett Road Centre, Hampton (applies to 361-371 Bluff Road)</td>
<td>4 storeys discretionary</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road and Love Street, Black Rock</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road and Spring Street, Sandringham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Beach (Were Street) Centre, Brighton</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Story Count</td>
<td>Height Requirement</td>
<td>Decision Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dendy Village, Brighton</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Brighton Shopping Centre</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory for the odd numbered properties &amp; 2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory for the even numbered properties</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory for the odd numbered properties &amp; 2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory for the even numbered properties</td>
<td>Combination of discretionary and mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade and Grosvenor, Middle Brighton</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Road Shopping Centre, Brighton East</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hightett &amp; Spring Road (Little Hightett Village), Highett</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Street &amp; Widdop Crescent, Hampton East</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys Street Centre, Beaumaris</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludstone Street, Hampton</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Highway &amp; Centre Road Centre, Brighton East</td>
<td>4 storeys discretionary</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Highway &amp; Milroy Street, Brighton East</td>
<td>4 storeys discretionary</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Street &amp; Martin Street, Brighton</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Street &amp; Bay Street, Brighton</td>
<td>4 storeys discretionary</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaview Shopping Centre, Beaumaris</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Road Plaza, Hampton</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Varying mandatory heights</td>
<td>Varying mandatory heights</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Road &amp; Esplanade Avenue, Brighton</td>
<td>A: 16.0m (5 storeys)</td>
<td>A: 13.5m (4 storeys)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: 14.0m (4 storeys)</td>
<td>B: 11.0m (3 storeys)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: 11.0m (3 storeys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: 9.0m (2 storeys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and Egan Street, Brighton East</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherall Road &amp; Morey Road, Beaumaris</td>
<td>2 storey mandatory</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherall Road Shopping Centre, Cheltenham</td>
<td>2 storey discretionary/3 storey mandatory</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Proposed Criteria for Assessment and Case Study

Difficult to pursue mandatory controls if:

- Large centre
- Laneway or road separates centre from residential surrounds
- Located on a main road
- Within 400 m of the PPTN

Potential for mandatory controls – more detailed assessment to be undertaken.

- Designated minimal change area in Housing Strategy
- Small centre
- Centre contains heritage places
- Direct residential abuttal
- Centre context – set within low rise residential
Case Study – applying criteria - Dendy Village

- Exhibited as DDO14
- Council version of DDO14 to Panel:
  - Mandatory maximum: 11m (3 storeys)
- Panel recommended:
  - Preferred maximum: 11m (3 storeys)

Description

Dendy Village is a vibrant local convenience centre positioned at a dip in Hampton Street. It sits amongst a mostly low scale residential precinct with well-established tree canopy backdrop. Dense built form within the centre results from narrow allotments maximising retail opportunities. (Bayside Small Neighbourhood Activity Centres Urban Design Assessment and Guidelines)

Activity Centre Characteristics:

- Double-sided (both sides of Hampton Street) – west side extends for less than half length of east side
- North-south oriented (residential properties are located east and west of the activity centre)
- Fine-grained properties able to be consolidated (e.g. 736-740 Hampton St.)
- Laneway separation and access on both sides
- Has an established 3 storey scale at corner of Hampton St. and Marriage Rd.
- On a bus route, within proximity of PPTN

Lot depth:

- East side – 47.9m
- West side – 42.5m

Existing conditions audit:
Item 10.14 – Reports by the Organisation
Scenario Testing – Dendy Village

DDO14 – Preferred 11m (3 storey) maximum

DDO14 – exceeding the preferred 11m (3 storey) maximum by one storey (4 storeys)
Item 10.14 – Reports by the Organisation

DDO14 – exceeding the preferred 11m (3 storey) maximum by two storeys (5 storeys)

Assessment

From a strategic perspective, the centre is close to a bus route that connects to the nearby Sandringham line. It has been identified for moderate growth within the Bayside Housing Strategy.

The centre has an established 3 storey built form at the corner of Hampton Street and Marriage Road which appears acceptable but is quite visually bulky in relation to its current context.

Further, there is a current application for a 4 storey building at the corner of Pine and Hampton Streets. The proposed building is consistent with the findings of the modelling – demonstrating that a fourth, visually recessive upper level is achievable without adverse amenity impacts.

Whilst the preferred 3 storeys sits more comfortably within the context of the surrounding area, it is possible to accommodate a 4th level within this activity centre with limited amenity impacts in the form of visual bulk or dominant built form. At 4 storeys, overshadowing and visual bulk (amenity) impacts can be minimised through appropriate upper level setbacks and in the overall design of the building.

Adding a fifth level becomes an unacceptable built form outcome based on the extreme visual dominance experienced by neighbouring and properties in close proximity to the activity centre. Amenity impacts like over looking and overshadowing become larger issues. It starts to become a dominant built form from distant views, detracting from the intimate setting of the activity centre.
Conclusion

For this centre, it is difficult to justify a mandatory 3 storey height limit from the point of view that a Planning Panel in the future would have to assess a proposed DDO along similar criteria. The Panel would also have to assess the centre, to some extent, in the context of the previous Panel’s recommendations.

In this case, a mandatory 4 storey height limit has a more realistic chance of success (support from a Planning Panel) for this centre, based on the analysis undertaken.

Implications for other centres

There are other centres with similar characteristics to Dendy Village that are likely to result in the same outcomes. It is recommended that a more detailed model be undertaken for the following centres to confirm the suitability of the approach taken in the Dendy Village centre:

- Bay Road and Jack Road;
- Bluff Road and Bay Road;
- Hawthorn Road;
- Seaview;
**Executive summary**

**Purpose and background**

To present Council with outcomes of the community engagement undertaken on the Housing Strategy Review and the feedback received to date.

The Bayside Housing Strategy was adopted by Council in September 2012. It provides the framework for how residential development in Bayside will be planned and managed to 2031. The Strategy outlines where new housing growth should be located in Bayside, nominating housing growth areas (activity centres, residential areas in close proximity to Elsternwick, Southland and Cheltenham train stations and strategic redevelopment sites) as appropriate locations for housing growth. The Strategy provides a response to community aspirations of protecting the existing character of Bayside by supporting some of the most conservative planning controls in Victoria.

To ensure that Bayside continues to meet the housing needs of Bayside’s existing and future residents, the Housing Strategy has been reviewed. To help inform this review, the community was asked to provide feedback on the key housing issues in Bayside over a seven week period from Monday 1 April 2019 to Sunday 19 May 2019.

The purpose of this stage of community engagement was to create awareness around key housing issues in Bayside and generate ideas about what options Council could pursue to address the current and future housing challenges, whilst providing an effective blueprint for managing population and housing growth. It was also to inform the community of the current progress Council has made implementing the existing Housing Strategy.

In total, there were 387 survey responses. Of these, 56% were from females and 43% were from males, with the majority of respondents aged between 35 and 69, living with their spouse/partner or spouse/partner and children in a detached house. All suburbs in Bayside were represented, with the greatest representation from Cheltenham (23%), Brighton (15%) and Hampton (14%). Full consultation findings are provided in Attachment 1.

In addition to the survey, staff have met with two Housing Associations/providers active in Bayside to better understand the barriers to delivering affordable housing in Bayside as well as the Healthy Aging Reference Group. A different survey was also sent to 9 consultants that frequently represent applicants in Bayside to better understand barriers to delivering apartments in Bayside, 6 responded.

**Key issues**

**Key Issue – Managing Housing Growth**

**Housing Need**

Survey responses reaffirmed the Housing Strategy’s focus on encouraging a diversity of housing typologies in Bayside including family homes and smaller homes for single people, couples and small families.
There is also a need for the Strategy to recognise that many adult children are now staying in the family home for longer and so downsizing may occur later and that people downsizing do not always want to move into an apartment, often they want to downsize to a smaller, separate single level home with a small outside area.

**Location of new, higher density housing**

If additional housing capacity is needed in future years, most respondents would prefer it to be delivered by allowing higher density housing along the Principal Public Transport Network, followed by widening the activity centre boundaries. Allowing additional building height within existing activity centre boundaries was the least preferred option. Other options suggested included rezoning commercial areas to residential, allowing higher density along Nepean Highway and supporting small lot sizes to deliver density through smaller houses rather than apartments.

There were a number of references to spreading development across Bayside rather than consolidating it in Housing Growth Areas, however, this is not consistent with the community’s desire to protect Bayside’s existing character nor with State Planning Policy.

There was also a perception amongst some respondents that development is unfairly concentrated along the Frankston train line rather than being spread evenly between both the Sandringham and Frankston train lines. This perception highlights the need to communicate and educate the community as to where Housing Growth Areas are located, as they are spread along both the Sandringham and Frankston train lines.

In terms of barriers to developing apartments in Bayside, consultants that frequently represent applicants in Bayside ranked the top three barriers as: not enough areas in Bayside where it is possible, there is too much community resistance, policy context is too restrictive.

**Focus Areas for this Housing Strategy**

The current focus of the Housing Strategy was generally supported, that is, protecting neighbourhood character in Minimal Residential Growth Areas by directing growth to Housing Growth Areas (62% support), minimising negative impacts of new development (95% support), providing adequate infrastructure and traffic management to manage the impacts of increased housing growth (95% support), better communicating to residents where housing change is being directed and what types of developments they can expect in different areas (86% support).

However, respondents did not support the Housing Strategy recognising that the neighbourhood character in Housing Growth Areas will change (45% support).

This reflects the competing objectives in planning. Whilst respondents agreed with protecting the neighbourhood character in the majority of Bayside by directing housing growth to Housing Growth Areas, the consequence of this is that the character in these identified Housing Growth Areas will change.

**Strategic Redevelopment Sites**

The Housing Strategy Review proposes to change the criteria that define a Strategic Redevelopment Site. Respondents supported 3 of the 4 criteria, being: strategic
redevelopment sites should be within 800 metres walk of a train station (55% support); strategic redevelopment sites should be within 400 metres of the PPTN and major community infrastructure (52% support); and strategic redevelopment sites should be able to deliver on key Council policy commitments such as affordable housing and open space available to the wider community (80% support).

However, respondents did not support sites in the Bayside Business District being excluded from consideration as Strategic Redevelopment Sites (37% support, 63% not support).

Existing planning policy does not support residential development in the Bayside Business District (BBD) as it is the last area of Commercial 2 Zoning in Bayside and is an important existing and future economic hub for the municipality. An earlier rezoning of land within the BBD to Mixed Use Zone and Commercial 1 Zone which was intended to contribute to the Bayside Business Employment Area has instead resulted in a residential development that does nothing to contribute to the Bayside Business District and its key role as an employment and economic node. It is anticipated that housing need in Bayside can be met in the identified Housing Growth Areas and surrounding residential neighbourhoods. Given this, and the important employment role the BBD plays, it is not proposed to rezone land in the BBD to enable residential development.

Key Issue - Environmentally Sustainable Design

There was overall support for all residential developments having to achieve best practice environmentally sustainable design, although support was greatest for developments of three or more dwellings.

No locally specific ESD principles were identified that were specific to Bayside and not already addressed by local policies already adopted by other Victorian Councils.

Key Issue - Housing for Seniors and the Elderly

There was support for the Housing Strategy’s approach to encouraging retirement villages/nursing homes near shops and major public transport.

Current State Government planning controls allow Residential Aged Care developments of up to 4-5 storeys to be built in all residential zones.

People’s main planning concerns if a 4-5 storey residential aged care development was built next to their house were overlooking and overshadowing, followed by how close the building is to front and side fences and noise. Other concerns included: height in general, traffic, parking, building bulk, access to green open space, blocking views of the bay, security, rubbish removal and deliveries, impact on the street/neighbours, whether the building is a high quality and environmentally sustainable design, lack of support services, lack of trees and green space, and change of character of neighbourhood.

This supports the Housing Strategy Review’s recommendation to advocate to the State Government to remove the exemption to height controls for Residential Aged Care in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and to provide additional guidance in the Planning Scheme to protect the amenity of residential neighbourhoods from the impact of development of aged care facilities exempted from height controls.
Key Issue - Adaptable Housing

There was support for Council encouraging developers to build more adaptable housing (63% support) with most respondents preferring to adapt their existing house (74%) rather than move house (26%) should household circumstances change in the future.

Of those surveys filled in by people with disabilities, the main design issues that affect ease of movement and their ability to live independently were: width of doorways and halls, steps and lack of handrails. There was a suggestion that all shops in Bayside should have a moveable ramp to allow access to shops (cost effective at approximately $200).

Key Issue - Affordable Housing

There were mixed views in relation to the role Council should play in incentivising the delivery of affordable housing. To encourage developers to provide more affordable housing, there was support for Council: providing a rate reduction/exemption for affordable housing that is owned by a Housing Association (55% support); incorporating some affordable housing into new or refurbished Council owned community buildings (64% support); and advocating for shared equity schemes (51% support).

However, there was not support for Council: leasing its land for a nominal fee to Housing Associations to enable them to build affordable housing (53% do not support); allowing more storeys for buildings where some affordable housing is included (76% do not support); fast tracking the planning process for buildings where some affordable housing is included (70% do not support); or waiving planning application fees for buildings where some affordable housing is included (68% do not support).

In terms of the locations where affordable housing should be encouraged, the majority of respondents (63%) thought other locations close to transport and community facilities were best, followed by strategic redevelopment sites (38%) and activity centres (36%). Please note, respondents could tick more than one answer.

There was also a suggestion that Council should investigate different housing models (cohousing, tiny homes, allowing granny flats in backyards, conversion of part of a home into a smaller home).

To better understand people’s views on affordable housing, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with a number of statements. Overall, respondents were most concerned about young couples and families not being able to buy their first home in Bayside, people needing emergency/short-term accommodation not being able to find housing in the Bayside area and older people on low-moderate incomes not being able to afford to live in Bayside. Respondents were less concerned about young people and families on low-moderate incomes not being able to afford to live in Bayside.

Key Issue - Vegetation and tree protection

There were mixed views as to whether Council should have more control over the removal of trees and vegetation on private property, 49% of respondents said no whilst 51% said yes.

When asked to select the most important benefits of enhancing vegetation and tree cover in Bayside, the contribution it makes to the neighbourhood character of Bayside and biodiversity were the two most important benefits, followed by the intrinsic value of trees, the role they play
in adapting to climate change and their impact in combating the heat island effect. Privacy was considered the least important benefit.

**Key Issue - Physical and Social Infrastructure**

In terms of what types of infrastructure respondents felt was being most impacted by increased housing density, road and street congestion was considered the most negatively impacted (93%), followed by open spaces (55%), drains (48%) and public transport (42%). Participants were asked to consider mechanisms Council could use to improve residents’ access to open space, given that Bayside’s high land costs pose a challenge for Council to buy and find large sites that are suitable for new public open space. Improving the existing parks and public spaces to increase visitation was most popular (76%), followed by better pedestrian connections to existing open spaces and the foreshore (66%). Please note, people could tick more than one box.

**Next Steps**

These consultation findings and the Housing Strategy Review will inform the preparation of a draft updated Housing Strategy and Implementation Plan which will be presented to Council in October 2019 before a 2nd round of community engagement is undertaken. It is intended that the final updated Housing Strategy then be prepared and presented to Council by June 2020.

As part of this update it is not proposed to change the overarching approach to managing growth in Bayside. The approach outlined in the Housing Strategy, that is, to focus new housing growth in housing growth areas, is being effectively implemented. To change the approach now would undermine Council’s strategic framework and could lead to unintended consequences, including pressure to rezone areas of land zoned Neighbourhood Residential Zone to General Residential Zone or Residential Growth Zone.

Similarly, the boundaries of Major Activity Centres will not be reviewed as part of the Housing Strategy update as this level of assessment is best left to Structure Plan reviews and does not belong in a Housing Strategy.

Another round of community consultation on the updated Housing Strategy will be undertaken with the community in November 2019 prior to it being finalised.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Notes the Housing Strategy Review consultation findings.
2. Receives a report at the October 2019 Ordinary Council meeting to consider the draft updated Housing Strategy.

**Support Attachments**

1. Housing Strategy Review Consultation Report - May 2019
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The Housing Strategy guides how residential development in Bayside will be planned and managed over the next twenty years. The Strategy looks at the location and type of residential development required in order to meet the changing needs of the Bayside community.

The Housing Strategy review will ensure that the policy directions contained within the Housing Strategy continue to meet the needs of Bayside’s current and future population.

Natural Environment
The Housing Strategy guides how residential development in Bayside will be planned and managed over the next twenty years. It seeks to focus increased density in locations that do not have significant vegetation character or habitat value, that is, areas not covered by a Vegetation Protection Overlay.

The Housing Strategy review will ensure that the policy directions contained within the Housing Strategy remain current and that the Strategy is effectively implemented.

Built Environment
The Housing Strategy guides how residential development in Bayside will be planned and managed over the next twenty years. The Strategy looks at the location and type of residential development required in order to meet the changing needs of the Bayside community, whilst ensuring development is consistent with and enhances Bayside’s valued urban character.

The Housing Strategy review will ensure that the policy directions contained within the Housing Strategy remain current and that the Strategy is effectively implemented.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The community was asked to provide feedback on the Housing Strategy Review over a seven week period from Monday 1 April 2019 to Sunday 19 May 2019 via an online survey on Council’s ‘Have Your Say’ platform.

To create community awareness of the review and how to provide feedback, the following activities were undertaken:

- Dedicated Have Your Say page with information about the Housing Strategy, the Review and an online survey to complete.
- News item on Council website.
- Social media posts and advertising.
- Two ads in the Bayside Leader.
- Article in Let’s Talk Bayside.
• Email to ‘Have Your Say’ subscribers.

• Email to Highett and Pennydale Structure Plan ‘keep me informed’ subscribers.

• Direct advertising with young people using the Bayside Youth Services facebook page to encourage responses from young people.

• Survey sent to people with limited mobility who have provided information to Council on mobility issues in the past. A few additional questions were included, focusing on design issues and barriers to accessible housing. This was done through Council’s disability inclusion officer to utilise established contacts.

• Email to Bayside Traders group.

• Councillor bulletin.

• Article in Councils internal newsletter ‘In the Loop’ for staff members who are also residents.

• Postcard ad distributed to Bayside libraries, Maternal and Child Health Centres, Brighton Recreational Centre, Sandy Beach Community Centre, Hampton Community Centre, Castlefield Community Centre, Highett Neighbourhood Community House, BayCiSS, Hampton East and local M.P offices

• Letters to all local Members of Parliament.

• Ad placed in 4 school newsletters (all schools in Bayside were asked if they would include an ad in the newsletter, the following did; St Finbar’s Primary School, Brighton East; Beaumaris North Primary School; St Mary’s Primary School, Hampton, Beaumaris Secondary College).

In addition, targeted consultation was also undertaken with the Bayside Healthy Aging Reference Group and Housing Associations.

**Human Rights**

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**

The review of the Housing Strategy is not considered to have any legal implications. Should the review recommend changes to the Housing Strategy which require a planning scheme amendment, the amendment would need to be prepared and exhibited pursuant to the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

**Finance**

Council has provided budget to undertake the community engagement stage of the Housing Strategy Review within the 2018/19 Financial Year. The Review is a two year project with further Budget made available in 2019/20.
**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The Bayside Housing Strategy underpins Council’s planning framework. The Housing Strategy review should not revisit the significant volume of strategic work completed since 2012 unless there is a policy reason to do so. The following Council Strategies are relevant to the Housing Strategy and Housing Strategy review.

**Bayside Community Plan**

The Housing Strategy seeks to focus increased housing growth into activity centres which have good access to public transport, services and facilities. This is consistent with the community’s aspiration set out in the Bayside Community Plan:

‘By 2025, members of our community will live close to public transport, in a home that suits their stage of life and is close to the services and facilities needed. Development will be sensitive to the neighbourhood character and will enhance what is currently enjoyed in Bayside.’

**Bayside City Council Plan 2017 – 2021**

Reviewing the Housing Strategy is identified as an action under Goal 3, Housing and neighbourhoods, in the Council Plan.

**Ageing Well in Bayside, An Age Friendly Strategy, 2008 – 2018**

The Housing Strategy seeks to increase the number and diversity of housing in Bayside close to public transport, services and facilities. It also seeks to encourage more adaptable housing to enable housing to meet the needs of different life stages. This is consistent with the following strategies in the Ageing Well Plan:

‘Enable housing developments that seek to increase housing diversity and promote universal housing design.’

‘Advocate for, and work with housing providers to retain and expand low cost housing options for older people.’

**Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy, 2018 – 2028**

The Housing Strategy seeks to increase the number and diversity of housing in Bayside close to public transport. This supports Strategic Direction 15 of the Integrated Transport Strategy:

‘New land uses and development will be located in accessible locations that provide the greatest access to public transport and facilitate walking and cycling’.

**Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework, 2016 – 2025**

The Housing Strategy seeks to ensure new development incorporates ecologically sustainable design in new developments, with one of the implementation actions of the Housing Strategy being to introduce an Environmentally Sustainable Development Local Planning Policy into the Bayside Planning Scheme.

This is consistent with the following target set out in the Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework:

‘Improved environmental standards for new residential and commercial buildings and renovations in the planning and approval process.’
Other Projects

Current projects which the Housing Strategy review will directly influence include the Neighbourhood Character Study Review, the Economic Development Strategy review, the Open Space Strategy Review, and the Parking Strategy, all of which are at the planning or development stage.
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Report Overview

Bayside City Council carried out a community engagement program from Monday 1st April 2019 to Sunday 19th May 2019 to inform the review of the Bayside Housing Strategy. This report presents the results of this engagement.

Project Background

What is the Housing Strategy?

The Bayside Housing Strategy guides where and how residential development will occur in the future. It looks at the location and type of residential development required to meet the changing needs of the Bayside community, whilst ensuring development is consistent with and enhances Bayside’s valued urban character.

The Strategy outlines where new housing growth should be located in Bayside, nominating Bayside’s activity centres, residential areas in close proximity to Elsternwick, Southland and Cheltenham train stations, and strategic redevelopment sites as appropriate locations for housing growth.

The Housing Strategy has been very effective in directing medium and high density development to these identified housing growth areas, whilst retaining the low rise nature of the established residential areas (called minimal residential growth areas).

As a result of the Housing Strategy, Bayside has one of the lowest proportions of land covered by high and medium density residential zones across Victoria.

Why review it?

The Housing Strategy is being reviewed to make sure it is still addressing the needs and aspirations of the Bayside community. The review of the Strategy aims to ensure housing meets the needs of the community, now and in the future, focusing on how to:

- Improve and increase affordable housing for moderate-low income households.
- Encourage more aged care and retirement living close to shops and services.
- Require housing to include environmentally sustainable design.
- Encourage more adaptable housing.
- Strengthen Council’s ability to protect and enhance Bayside’s vegetation and tree cover.
- Plan for and deliver the required social and physical infrastructure.

Community Engagement

As part of this review, the community was asked to provide feedback on the key housing issues in Bayside over a seven week period from Monday 1st April 2019 to Sunday 19th May 2019 through an online survey.

The purpose of this stage of community engagement was to create awareness around key housing issues in Bayside and generate ideas about what options Council could pursue to address the current and future housing challenges, whilst providing an effective blueprint for managing population and housing growth. It was also to inform the community of the current progress Council has made implementing the existing Housing Strategy.

To create community awareness of the review and how to provide feedback, the following activities were undertaken:
• Dedicated Have Your Say page with information about the Housing Strategy, the Review and an online survey to complete.

• News item on Council website

• Social media posts and advertising

• Two ads in the Bayside Leader

• Article in Let’s Talk Bayside

• Email to Have Your Say subscribers

• Email to Highett and Pennylane Structure Plan ‘keep me informed’ subscribers

• Direct advertising with young people using the Bayside Youth Services Facebook page to encourage responses from young people.

• Survey sent to people with limited mobility who have provided information to Council on mobility issues in the past. A few additional questions were included, focusing on design issues and barriers to accessible housing. This was done through Council’s disability inclusion officer to utilise established contacts.

• Email to Bayside Traders group

• Councillor bulletin

• Article in Council’s internal newsletter ‘In the Loop’ for staff members who are also residents.

• Postcard ad distributed to Bayside libraries, Maternal and Child Health Centres, Brighton Recreational Centre, Sandy Beach Community Centre, Hampton Community Centre, Castlefield Community Centre, Highett Neighbourhood Community House, BayCISS, Hampton East and local M.P offices

• Letters to all local Members of Parliament.

• Ad placed in 4 school newsletters (all schools in Bayside were asked if they would include an ad in the newsletter, the following did; St Finbar’s Primary School, Brighton East; Beaumaris North Primary School; St Mary’s Primary School, Hampton, Beaumaris Secondary College)

In addition, targeted consultation was also undertaken with the Bayside Healthy Aging Reference Group and Housing Associations. A different survey was also sent to 9 consultants that frequently represent applicants in Bayside to better understand barriers to delivering apartments in Bayside, 6 responded.

**Participation Rate and Profile**

387 survey responses received. In addition there were 42 views of the Bayside Have Your Say project webpage. Whilst this is a good result, it is important to note that these views only represent approximately 0.4% of the Bayside population.

More females (56%) participated than males (43%).
Q27 Are you ...

There was a good spread of ages represented, with the highest participation in the 35-49 age group, followed by the 50-59 age group.

Q28 What is your age group?
Participants were spread across Bayside, with all suburbs in Bayside represented and the majority of respondents coming from Cheltenham and Hampton.

Q29 Where do you live?

The majority of respondents lived in a couple household with children (45%), followed by couple only households (34%), with most respondents living in a detached house (70%) followed by town house/unit (13%).

Q31 What is your current housing type?
The Survey

The survey was designed to gather community feedback on the key housing challenges in Bayside, namely managing housing growth, delivering homes that are environmentally sustainable, enabling people to age in place, ensuring housing can adapt to changing household needs, protecting and enhancing vegetation and tree cover and planning for and delivering the required social and physical infrastructure.

The Questions

Housing Need

Participants were asked to consider what their housing needs might be in the next 15-20 years.

Of all survey respondents, 64% said they were unlikely to change, or move from their current home in the next 15-20 years, 21% would consider downsizing to a smaller home, 14% would consider upsizing to a larger house with a garden, 7% would consider moving to a retirement living complex, whilst 2% would consider moving to a nursing home/age care facility.

Q1 Which of the following changes would you consider making, in the next 15-20 years?

Respondents could elaborate on their answer. The most common themes were ‘move from Bayside’ (9 references), ‘move to a bigger house’ (7 references) and ‘stay in current home/children will take over’ (6 references).

Location of new, higher density housing

Participants were asked to consider where additional housing capacity should be delivered if required in future years.

If additional housing capacity is needed in future years, most respondents would prefer it to be delivered by allowing higher density housing along the Principal Public Transport Network, followed by widening the activity centre boundaries. Allowing additional building height within existing activity centre boundaries was the least preferred option.
Survey respondents could suggest other ideas for catering for additional housing for Council to investigate. The most common suggestions were change the planning scheme to allow for more dual occupancy development (21 references), direct additional housing to other municipalities (21 references) and that it should be spread evenly across the municipality (20 references). A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

**Focus Areas for this Housing Strategy**

Respondents supported the Housing Strategy continuing to focus on the following actions:

- Protecting neighbourhood character in Minimal Residential Growth Areas by directing growth to Housing Growth Areas (including activity centres) (62% support).
- Minimising negative impacts of new development (95% support).
- Providing adequate infrastructure and traffic management to manage the impacts of increased housing growth (95% support).
- Better communicating to residents where housing change is being directed and what types of developments they can expect in different areas (88% support).

However, there was ambivalence towards the Housing Strategy recognising that the neighbourhood character in Housing Growth Areas will change (45% support).

**Q4 Please indicate if you support, or do not support, each of these actions:**
Respondents were asked to elaborate on their reasons for not supporting the above actions (if they didn’t). The primary reason given was it was unfair to protect only the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and growth should be spread evenly across the municipality (52 references), they don’t support the actions as they don’t support increased density in any form (11 responses) and new development will destroy neighbourhood character and increased traffic congestion (8 references each).

Other important actions respondents thought the Housing Strategy should consider include: spreading development evenly across Bayside (13 references), capping population in Bayside (10 references), and minimising high density in general (10 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

Strategic Redevelopment Sites

The Housing Strategy Review proposes to change the criteria that define a Strategic Redevelopment Site. Respondents supported 3 of the 4 criteria, being:

- Strategic redevelopment sites should be within 800 metres walk of a train station (55% support)
- Strategic redevelopment sites should be within 400 metres of the PPTN and major community infrastructure (52% support)
- Strategic redevelopment sites should be able to deliver on key Council policy commitments such as affordable housing and open space available to the wider community (80% support)

However, respondents did not support the criteria that Strategic Redevelopment Sites not be located within the Bayside Business District (37% support, 63% not support). Although there seemed to be some misunderstanding with the term Bayside Business District, with some people assuming this meant activity centres.

Q7 We are proposing to change the criteria that define a Strategic Redevelopment Site. Please indicate if you support, or do not support, each of these criteria:

- Within 800 metres walk of a train station.
- Within 400 metres of the principal public transport network and any major community infrastructure (e.g. school, hospital).
- Should not be in the CBD.

The reasons for not supporting the criteria included: strategic redevelopment sites shouldn’t be limited to areas near train stations (28 references), the Bayside Business District (BBID) should be a strategic redevelopment site (24 references) and Bay Road should be considered (10 references).

Other criteria that respondents felt should be considered included: in commercial and mixed use zones (7 references), general comments regarding minimising any new development (6 references).
less than 800m from railway stations as this catchment was too large (5 references), and along arterial roads (2 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

**Environmentally Sustainable Design**

If an ESD policy is introduced for Bayside, respondents felt that all residential developments should have to achieve best practice environmentally sustainable design, although support was greatest for developments of two or more dwellings.

Q10 If an ESD policy is introduced for Bayside, which of the following residential developments do you think should have to achieve best practice environmentally sustainable design:

![Chart showing preferences for ESD policy]

When asked if there were any locally specific ESD principles Bayside should consider over and above those included in local policies adopted by other Victorian Councils, suggestions included: making solar panel installation mandatory on all new developments (26 references), introducing more ways to improve water capture and reuse (i.e. grey water tanks etc) (20 references) and increasing car parking spaces and bicycle storage facilities (13 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

**Housing for Seniors and the Elderly**

When asked if they, or a family member was to move to a retirement village or nursing home, where they would prefer it to be located, the majority of respondents chose 'near shops and major public transport so a car is not needed to run errands' (74%).

Q12 If you (or a family member) were planning to move to a retirement village or nursing home in the next ten years, where would you prefer it to be located?

![Chart showing preferences for housing location]
When asked what to rank what their main planning concerns would be if a 4-5 storey residential aged care development was built next to their house, overlooking and overshadowing was the main concern, followed by how close the building is to front and side fences.

Q13 Current State Government planning controls allow Residential Aged Care developments of up to 4-5 storeys to be built in all residential zones, in order to meet demand. If a 4-5 storey residential aged care development was built next to your house, what are the three main planning concerns - other than the building height - would you have?

Other concerns included: sufficient parking (42 references), followed by the visual bulk (26 references) and the traffic congestion that would be generated (26 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

Adaptable Housing

If household circumstances change in the future, most respondents would prefer to adapt their existing house (75%) rather than move house (26%).

Q15 If your household circumstances change in the future would you rather:
63% of respondents thought Council should encourage developers to build more adaptable housing (37% did not).

**Q16 Do you think we should encourage developers to build more adaptable housing?**

![Graph showing voting results](image)

**Affordable Housing**

To encourage developers to provide more affordable housing, respondents were asked which incentives they would support.

The following incentives were supported:

- Council providing a rate reduction/exemption for affordable housing that is owned by a Housing Association (55% support)
- Council incorporating some affordable housing into new or refurbished Council owned community buildings (64% support)
- Council advocating for shared equity schemes (51% support)

The following incentives were not supported

- Council allowing more storeys for buildings where some affordable housing is included (76% do not support)
- Council leasing its land for a nominal fee to Housing Associations to enable them to build affordable housing (53% do not support)
- Council fast tracking the planning process for buildings where some affordable housing is included (70% do not support)
- Council waiving planning application fees for buildings where some affordable housing is included (68% do not support)

In terms of the locations where affordable housing should be encouraged, the majority of respondents (83%) thought locations close to transport and community facilities (but not activity centres) were best, followed by activity centres (36%), strategic redevelopment sites (36%) and none of these (23%). Please note, respondents could tick more than one answer.
Q18 In which locations do you think affordable housing should be encouraged?

Respondents were asked if there was anything else Council should be doing to encourage more affordable housing and the answers were mixed. Suggestions included: giving permit applications that include an affordable housing component priority at the assessment stage (8 references), mandating that all new developments include a percentage of affordable housing (6 references) and changing planning controls to make it easier to build dependent people’s units in underutilised backyards (5 references).

To better understand people’s views on affordable housing, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with a number of statements.

Overall, respondents were most concerned about young couples and families not being able to buy their first home in Bayside and older people on low-moderate incomes cannot afford to live in Bayside. Respondents were less concerned about young people and families on low-moderate incomes not being able to afford to live in Bayside or people needing emergency/short-term accommodation not being able to find housing in the Bayside area.

Other comments in relation to housing affordability which were referred to 3 or less times included; people in need of affordable housing can live in other more affordable locations of Melbourne or regional Victoria, people shouldn’t be subsidised to live here, have worked hard to be able to live in Bayside, others should have to do the same, a mix of people and incomes enhances the area, affordable housing is a state government issue that local council shouldn’t get involved in, apartment developments should be mandated to include social housing, the high prices in Bayside mean local children are having to move away when they leave home, ensure homes are disability friendly.

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

**Vegetation and tree protection**

To better understand what people value about vegetation and tree cover in Bayside, people were asked what to select the most important benefits of enhancing vegetation and tree cover in Bayside.
Q22 In your view what are the most important benefits of enhancing the vegetation and tree cover in Bayside?

[Graph showing percentages]

Biodiversity, and the contribution it makes to the neighbourhood character of Bayside where the two most important benefits, followed by the intrinsic value of trees, their impact in combating the heat island effect, and the role they play in adapting to climate change. Privacy was considered their least important benefit. All of these points were referred to 4 times or less.

When asked whether respondents felt Council should have more control over the removal of trees and vegetation on private property, 51% of respondents said yes whilst 49% said no.

The main reason for this answer was enforcement of tree protection should be much stronger (11 references) and Council needs to more monitoring of both existing vegetation stock and monitoring of landscape plans following development (5 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

Physical and Social Infrastructure

Participants were asked what types of infrastructure they felt was being negatively impacted by increased housing density.

Road and street congestion was considered the most negatively impacted (93%), followed by open spaces (55%), public transport (42%) and drains (48%).

Q25 What types of infrastructure do you think is being negatively impacted by increased housing density?
Lack of car parking space was a common concern (17 references) as was the lack of cycling paths (6 references). Many respondents also highlighted the importance of infrastructure keeping pace with development (9 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.

Participants were asked to consider mechanisms council could consider to improve residents’ access to open space, given that Bayside’s high land costs pose a challenge for Council to buy and find large sites that are suitable for new public open space.

Q26 Bayside has very high land costs and is a built up area, which poses challenges for Council to buy and find large sites that are suitable for new public open space. What other mechanisms should we consider to improve residents’ access to open space?

![Graph showing responses to Q26]

Improving the existing parks and public spaces to increase visitation was most popular (78%), followed by better pedestrian connections to existing open spaces and the foreshore (68%). Please note, people could tick more than one box.

Comments included: developing underground parking with parks on top (4 references), improving the quality of existing open spaces (4 references), require new developments to include public open space (4 references), providing open spaces on rooftops in the commercial zone (4 references) and improving cycling infrastructure (4 references).

A full record of all verbatim answers to this question is located in Appendix 1.
Targeted surveys

As part of the consultation and engagement program two targeted surveys were prepared to better understand the specific needs and challenges these groups faced. One survey presented question focused on design issues and barriers to accessible housing. This was done through Council’s Disability Inclusion Officer to utilise established contacts. Another survey was sent to 9 consultants that frequently represent applicants in Bayside to better understand barriers to delivering medium and high density development in Bayside, 6 responded.

Residents with limited mobility

As part of the targeted consultation, the standard survey had three additional questions added to it, to specifically understand the needs of residents with limited mobility. The questions related to design issues and barriers to movement. This survey received three responses.

Respondents were asked what the main design issues in their home were that affected ease of movement and their ability to live independently. Respondents answered that the main barriers were steps, uneven floor surfaces, narrow door widths, and a lack of handrails.

Other issues identified through the survey were the lack of ramps at shops and other houses and a lack of access to rental housing because not allowed to install handrails.

Frequent Applicants

Q1 How many applications do you or your clients lodge per year with Bayside City Council?

![Pie chart showing distribution of applications]

Most respondents lodge at least ten applications a year which give them insights into development in Bayside. Respondents were asked to rank what they consider to be the top barriers to developing apartments in Bayside. ‘There aren’t enough areas in Bayside where apartments are possible’ followed by ‘policy context is too restrictive’ and ‘there is too much community resistance’. The return isn’t profitable enough’ was nominated as the smallest barrier to development of apartments in Bayside.

The majority of frequent applicants work in Brighton the most.
Q5 Which Bayside suburb do you have the most applications?

![Pie chart showing distribution of applications]

Housing Associations and Housing Providers

In addition to the survey, staff have met with two Housing Associations/providers active in Bayside to better understand the barriers to delivering affordable housing in Bayside. Issues identified by the Housing Association/Providers were:

- There is an acute shortage of affordable housing across Melbourne, particularly for single person households. This is a difficult need to meet because the rent that Housing Associations can charge is significantly lower than for other household types.
- In negotiating the delivery of affordable housing, it is important to consider the needs of the Housing Association that will take these on. For example, if all units are single bedroom then the Housing Association may not be able to afford to run these. Better outcome is a mix of bedroom numbers so the Housing Association has a greater income stream.
- Housing Associations need to be included early on in the planning process if they are to buy/be gifted the properties in the end. They have specific requirements in relation to design and materials to ensure they can afford to maintain the property.
- Housing Associations need to be able to borrow against their asset for their business model to work. This means that S173 agreements with clauses that require the housing to remain as affordable housing in perpetuity are problematic- they can’t borrow against them.
- When buildings get older (around 15 year mark) and maintenance costs increase Housing Associations need to be able to sell these properties and recycle the money into other affordable housing stock.
- Knox sold Council land to Housing Association at Valuer General Assessment rather than putting it to the market. They also don’t charge rates for Housing Associations. These small actions provide a strong incentive for Housing Associations to look for sites in the municipality.
- Hobsons Bay and Port Phillip have housing trusts, if developers don’t want to provide affordable housing onsite they pay a contribution into this trust and this is then granted to Housing Associations to deliver affordable housing in the municipality.
- Planning process can be onerous – need to ensure planning policy and statutory implementation align. Housing Associations generally have standard design and require less parking – Council could agree with Housing Association on acceptable standard design and then fast track through the planning system.
• There is a lack of suitable sites, the price of land is too high and the permit application process is so lengthy that they can’t provide housing in a timely manner to those in need.
• There was also a discussion around the demand for more dependent people’s units (aka ‘granny flats’) as a useful housing option for elderly relatives or young people in need to be independent yet be connected to family resources.

Bayside Healthy Aging Reference Group

As part of the consultation program Council Officers attended a meeting of the Bayside Healthy Aging Reference Group in order gain a deeper understanding of the needs of this stakeholder group. The group members provided the following information: they do wish to downsize but some still want a small garden, thus apartments are often not suitable. The group believes development should go to existing activity centres rather than be spread across all areas and garden and house maintenance are a major barrier to aging in place. It is important that retirement villages are close to shops and public transport. Generally people would like to age in place, however, there were some who would be happy to move to a different area.
Submissions

In addition to the survey, 2 people sent in a written submission for Council to consider.

Submission 1

The key points outlined in the submissions were:

- The Bayside population is aging.
- Over 65 year old group will increase as will single occupants and couples without dependants.
- This group of people have specific needs in regards to housing. There is a preference for 2 bedrooms, single level, no steps, with a small garden and need shops and public transport.
- The updated Housing Strategy should include more provision of this type of housing.

Submission 2

The key points outlined in the submission were:

- 332 Bay Road Cheltenham (the Laminex site) is a significant parcel of land that should be designated as a strategic redevelopment site in the Housing Strategy. It is close to the Southland railway station and shopping centre and provides an opportunity to include additional public open space and pedestrian linkages and to better connect Penroydale, the Bayside Business District and Southland Activity Centre.
- Any new criteria for strategic redevelopment sites should include proximity to activity centres and public transport and focus on parcels that are of sufficient size and in locations to accommodate higher density development without disruption to the amenity of the surrounding area. Additionally these sites should provide for benefits to the surrounding area through the creation of additional open space, vehicular and pedestrian movement and employment options. The Laminex site meets all these requirements.
10.16 DISABILITY INCLUSION BEYOND DECEMBER 2019

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure - Open Space, Recreation & Wellbeing

File No: PSF/19/11 – Doc No: DOC/19/125258

Executive summary

Purpose and background

At its June Ordinary 2018 meeting, Council resolved to receive a report prior to June 2019, outlining options for Council’s ongoing role in relation to disability inclusion, advocacy, capacity building and planning beyond the cessation of the Building Inclusive Communities Program (the Program) funding in December 2019.

The Program has been funded since 2006 through the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The Program (formerly called MetroAccess) focuses on community inclusion, ensuring people with a disability are connected into their communities and ensuring the community becomes more accessible and inclusive of people with disability. The Program is different to personal care, which is transitioning from Council’s Aged and Disability Services to client-chosen providers under the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS). Around 90% of Victorians with a disability are not eligible for NDIS support and depend on mainstream services being designed to incorporate the range of abilities in the community.

In 2018/19 Council received $144,000 funding for the Program from DHHS. This funding was utilised to employ a dedicated Disability Inclusion Officer and to fund inclusive community initiatives. Initiatives have included: the accessible beach program at Hampton Beach and Half Moon Bay, the Bayside Inclusive Grants, and planning for a new regional all abilities playground at Thomas Street Reserve.

The establishment of the NDIS has created uncertainty for the future of the Program (including the Disability Inclusion Officer role). Funding for the Program formed part of the State Government’s financial contribution commitment to the NDIS.

Council has received written confirmation that the Municipal Association of Victoria and DHHS have successfully advocated to the National Disability Insurance Agency to continue the Program (including Disability Inclusion Officer) funding only until December 2019 and the Program will cease on 31 December 2019 unless funding is provided by Council or another agency. A decision regarding the ongoing role of Council in disability inclusion and capacity building (including the dedicated Disability Inclusion Officer) and funding arrangements is required.

Key issues

Rates of disability within Bayside

One in five Australians have a disability and of those only 10% are eligible for NDIS with the majority relying on accessible and inclusive environments within the community. In 2016, over 4,200 people or 4.3% of the Bayside population, reported that they needed assistance in their day-to-day lives because of a disability.

Bayside has an ageing population with an average age greater than other metropolitan municipalities. It is expected that the incidence of disability will continue to rise with the ageing population and as a result a demand to ensure people with a disability are connected into their community and that the community becomes more accessible and inclusive of people with disability.
Statutory requirements

Under the Victorian Disability Act (2006), councils are required to develop a Disability Action Plan. These plans must reduce barriers to employment, promote community inclusion and bring about changes in attitudes and practices across the community. At Bayside the Disability Action Plan is incorporated into the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2018-2021. However, in the current State Disability Plan (2017-2020) it alludes that future council Disability Action Plans will need to be a stand-alone document. It is important to ensure that Council is appropriately resourced to develop and deliver the next Disability Action Plan.

Approximately 90% of Victorians with a disability are not eligible for NDIS support and depend on community services and local infrastructure being designed to be more accessible and inclusive of people with all abilities. Staff across Council work with the Disability Inclusion Officer to ensure that Council complies with the Disability Discrimination Act (2006) in the design and delivery of services, projects and facilities. Targeted projects seek to advance the degree of accessibility and inclusiveness in areas where people with a disability have historically been excluded. Some of these projects, such as building retrofits and beach matting, require capital funding and all require extensive engagement and planning to ensure they meet relevant community needs. Currently this work is coordinated by the Disability Inclusion Officer.

Benchmarking other Council’s role in Disability Inclusion

1. Disability Inclusion Officer

Some local government Disability Inclusion Officer roles will cease in December 2019; however, others will continue with council funding. Staff have benchmarked councils in the Bayside, Peninsula and southern Melbourne region. Several councils have decided to dedicate resources to continue Disability Inclusion Officer roles and support capacity building initiatives within their municipality. These councils include Port Phillip, Stonnington, Greater Dandenong and Mornington Peninsula. Kingston and Frankston are currently undecided.

2. Disability Advisory Committee or Network

To ensure that actions are well targeted and effective in improving access and inclusion, many councils have established a Disability Advisory Committee or network, calling on the knowledge and lived experience of local residents to identify priority issues and assist in developing and delivering solutions. Currently this work is coordinated by the Disability Inclusion Officer. Council does not currently have a Disability Advisory Committee and it is proposed that Council facilitate the formation of a new group to carry out this function.

3. Australian Network on Disability

The Australian Network on Disability is a national, membership based organisation that supports organisations to advance the inclusion of people with disability in all aspects of business by providing training, programs and consultancy. Basic membership ($1,470 annually) provides a weekly bulletin and quarterly newsletters, discounted rates for training and consultancy services, and the opportunity to access a wide range of expertise. A number of councils choose to be members of the network to develop their capacity. Bayside Council is currently not a member and it is proposed that Council seek membership to this group.

Council’s inclusion projects post December 2019

The following projects focus on advancing the inclusion of people with a disability in the Bayside community. These projects will require appropriate resourcing and commitment from Council beyond the cessation of the Building Inclusive Communities Program (including the funded Disability Inclusion Officer role) on 31 December 2019. These projects include:
• Disability Action Plan development and delivery to ensure compliance with statutory requirements and Council goals;
• Staff capacity building to meet Council’s obligations under the Disability Discrimination Act (2006) and ensure best practice in disability inclusion;
• Delivery of the Disability Inclusion Grants to community organisations and sporting clubs to encourage and enable groups to include people with a disability;
• Delivery of the Beach Accessibility Program expansion;
• All Abilities playground at Thomas Street to address the low level of accessible play in Bayside;
• Website development to ensure local accessible information is readily available online in the format needed by people with a disability;
• Capacity building/training for volunteering programs to promote opportunities and build community inclusion;
• Work with the Brotherhood of St Laurence to promote and facilitate disability inclusion, in particular in local employment;
• Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve inclusion and accessibility review and implementation;
• Seeking funding and grant opportunities through NDIS Information, Linkages and Capacity funding; and
• Establishment of a Disability Advisory Committee, comprising community members to provide advice to Council on strategic directions, policy, plans and service delivery matters in relation to access and inclusion for people with disabilities.

Further work will be conducted over the journey in the disability space with the roll out of NDIS and the changing platform for disability service delivery.

Way forward

A future Access and Inclusion Officer role enables Council to achieve its goal of enhancing the inclusion of people of all abilities and ages in the Bayside community.

It is recommended that Council considers funding ongoing Access and Inclusion services in 2020/21 and future budget years towards costs including:

• Salaries – (Permanent) Access and Inclusion Officer;
• Community Inclusion Grants; and
• Council staff development and community enabling programs.

Recommendation

That Council:
1. Recognises it has an ongoing role in Access and Inclusion.
2. Considers the costs associated with providing disability inclusion services as part of the preparation of the 2020/21 and future Council budgets.
3. Acknowledges that the cessation of the State Government’s Building Inclusive Communities Program has resulted in this cost shifting to Council.

Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
People with a disability often report that social exclusion and community attitudes are more limiting and have more impact on their health than their disability. The Disability Inclusion Officer aims to decrease the barriers to inclusion and accessibility in the Bayside community.

Natural Environment
Providing compliant access to Bayside’s natural environment will enable more people with a disability to enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits that come from spending time in nature. Any access works will be designed to protect and enhance the natural environment. The Disability Inclusion Officer plays an important role in improving the accessibility of Bayside’s open spaces, particularly foreshore areas.

Built Environment
The Disability Discrimination Act (2006) requires that all public places and commercial businesses meet the accessibility requirements outlined in its associated standards and codes. Currently this work is assisted by the Disability Inclusion Officer.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Confidence in dealing with a person with a disability is an important part of customer service and working with our community. Staff who have a disability or have a family member with a disability often have developed this ‘disability confidence’, but staff who have not (knowingly) interacted with people with a disability benefit from structured training. Developing staff capacity is a vital part of the Disability Inclusion Officer role.

Human Rights
Inclusion of people with a disability is a requirement under the Victoria Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities, which notes that everyone is entitled to equal and effective protection against discrimination, and to enjoy their human rights without discrimination.

Legal

Staff across Council work with the Disability Inclusion Officer to ensure that Council complies with the Disability Discrimination Act (2006) in the design and delivery of all services, projects and facilities.

Finance
The Disability Inclusion service, including the employment of one staff member is externally funded until 31 December 2019. It is anticipated that the existing staff member could be funded until 30 June 2020 through savings within the Open Space, Recreation and Wellbeing 2019/20 department budget.
It is recommended that Council considers $150,000 in 2020/21 and future budget years to provide the Access and Inclusion service, including employing one staff member.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy (2017-2021) encompasses the *Disability Act (2006)* requirements and health and wellbeing needs of all residents, including those with disabilities.

The Disability Inclusion Officer assists Council to achieve its vision in the Council and Community Plan where ‘Bayside’s community will be supported and engaged to live an active and healthy lifestyle regardless of age, geographical location, personal circumstance or physical ability’.
**Executive summary**

**Purpose and background**

The purpose of this report is to present the outcomes of a review of tennis in Bayside and present the Bayside City Council Tennis Strategy (2019 - 2028) (the Strategy) for Council endorsement.

A key driver of the Strategy (Attachment 1) is the need to better understand the key requirements to maintain participation in tennis over the next 10 years and establish a framework for provision that ensures the long-term sustainability of tennis clubs, venues, programs and activities.

The Strategy builds on existing strategic planning and directions developed by tennis, Council and community stakeholders and reflects data and information specifically collected and analysed for this strategy.

In 2007 Council adopted the Tennis, Lawn Bowls and Croquet Strategy, which provided direction for all three sports for a period of 5 years. The strategy identified five areas of focus for tennis including facility provision, precinct planning, clear and consistent occupancy agreements and asset renewal and club sustainability. At the time of the 2007 report, Melbourne was subject to stage 3a water restrictions and significant focus was placed on providing municipal wide water saving initiatives, of particular focus for Tennis was the red porous (en-tout-cas) courts that is the predominate surface found in Bayside, which requires significant water to maintain.

**Key issues**

**Council's Leasing and Licence Policy (2018)**

At the 19 June 2018 Ordinary Council Meeting, Bayside’s Lease and Licence Policy 2018 was adopted. This policy reaffirmed Council’s position that lessees are required to bear costs associated with maintenance and renewal of assets within the specified leased area.

**Participation in tennis**

In 2014, Tennis Victoria in conjunction with Tennis Australia introduced a new affiliation model for all Victorian tennis clubs. This model set an annual fee based on the number of courts at each individual venue, opposed to the previous model where clubs were charged per affiliated member. The changes to the affiliation with Tennis Victoria resulted in a more affordable option for clubs to report actual membership numbers.

As a direct result of the changes to affiliation, Bayside has seen a significant increase in reported membership numbers (301%); however, there is no evidence that more people are playing tennis.
The Strategy recommends that all venues operating from Council facilities, participate annually in the Tennis Australia Club Health Program and provide consent for data to be released directly to Council.

Feedback to the draft Strategy suggests that membership levels at some clubs has increased since the 2015/16 Tennis Australia Club Operational Health Check however this has not been substantiated by data provided to Council from either Club’s or Tennis Victoria and highlights the need for compulsory participation and unfiltered release of data from this program.

Tennis facilities and provision of courts.

The Strategy Background Paper identifies that Bayside tennis venues are highly concentrated, particularly in the areas of Brighton, Brighton East, Beaumaris, Black Rock and Sandringham where 16 of the 21 centres are found. There are 84 tennis courts on Council managed land.

The close proximity of these venues has resulted in duplication of services, and created enormous competition for the same target markets limiting sustainability of Bayside venues.

When applying the tennis industry benchmark planning ratios of 1 court per 1,500 head of population, Bayside is well catered for tennis courts. When considering Council owned/managed assets the minimum required number of courts required in 2019 is 68 and based on projected population growth in 2026 could require 75 courts. If Council was to proceed with recommendations in the Strategy to decrease court numbers by four to 80 courts, Bayside would remain more than adequately supplied of courts well into the future.

The additional 40 tennis courts are managed by private providers or church groups. Even if all of these providers were to close, Bayside would still exceed the ratio of courts required to service tennis within the municipality. As part of the Strategy all private operators were invited to participate and provided with free audit assessments of their facilities. Only one group choose to participate. With limited information available to Council, deeper analysis of non-Council assets and the broader impact of any change to these facilities is not available. Work with these groups will continue, however the offer of financial assistance to undertake audits will be limited to the review of the Strategy in five years.

The Strategy recommends that Council, prior to the end of existing lease agreements, measures the condition and viability of individual sites and club management and where required take action, through consolidation of site and/or reduction of court numbers to ensure the sustainability of tennis into the future.

Court surface type and court condition

Red porous is the predominate surface in Bayside and is labour intensive, requiring significant amounts of water and high maintenance costs. This can prove to be particularly challenging for a community based facility managed by volunteers.

The remaining courts are a mixture of synthetic and acrylic, which provide more sustainable surface types and acrylic providing access for all abilities.
Court audits indicate that just over 50% of court surfaces will require replacement within the next five years and it is apparent that some clubs cannot fund the required renewal costs of the courts and it is predicted the courts will continue to deteriorate to a point where they will no longer be fit for purpose.

The Strategy recommends that Council supports clubs to convert red porous courts to either acrylic or synthetic through the submission of grant applications to relevant funding partners. It is also recommended that if at the end of a current lease agreement a club cannot provide evidence of funding for relevant maintenance or renewal, that lease agreement is not renewed.

Feedback to the Strategy has indicated that financial assistance from Council is being sought to assist clubs in converting to more sustainable surfaces. This assistance is not supported under the Lease and Licence Policy 2018 and any request for support would be considered on a case by case basis after exhausting other avenues of support.

**Court lighting**

Court lighting is an essential component to the sustainability of tennis, enabling clubs to conduct year round competition or coaching at the facility particularly during the winter months, when natural light restricts play after 5.30pm.

The Strategy recommends that Council commence community engagement of residents surrounding the Royal Avenue Tennis Centre, to inform residents of the Centre’s intent to install flood lighting.

The Strategy also recommends that Council supports clubs to install or improve court lighting through the submission of grant applications to relevant funding partners.

**Dendy Park Tennis Club**

The Dendy Park Tennis Club (DPTC) is a significant recreational facility with a rich tennis history. The facilities at DPTC include 19 en-tout-cas (red porous) courts, making it one of the largest clay court facilities in Australia.

The operator of the facility at DPTC is a not-for-profit volunteer organisation, Dendy Park Tennis Club Inc. (the Club) that has operated the facility for almost 50 years. The current volunteer led management model has proven inadequate to operate a facility of the scale of DPTC in a sustainable manner. Significant renewal, which is required in the short to medium term will not be able to be funded by the Club.

Dendy Park Tennis Club has been identified as a strategic long-term tennis asset by Tennis Victoria and Council with the capacity to transition from a large community centre to a Regional Tennis Centre.

The Strategy recommends that Council, in conjunction with Tennis Victoria, conduct an expression of interest process with the view to transition the venue into a Regional Tennis Centre incorporating a professional/commercial component into the management model.

The Dendy Park Tennis Club does not support the proposed EOI process and have prepared an alternative strategic plan for the facility. The Club proposed strategic plan has been assessed by Council and Tennis Victoria staff and is considered unsustainable. The Club provided plan relies on income from an untested food and beverage model and additional member services including a gym.
Consistent with Council’s response to two previous gym and member services proposals put forward by the Club, Council does not support a food and beverage or gym offering at Dendy Park Tennis Club.

To ensure the club retains its identity and continues to operate at the Dendy Park site, the expression of interest process will specify that the Club and all Club related activities should be incorporated into any proposed management model.

Dendy Park Tennis Club feedback to the Strategy is provided in Attachment 2 Stakeholder Feedback – Tennis Strategy.

**Bodley Street Tennis Courts**

The Strategy proposes that the courts at Bodley Street are decommissioned and replaced with two acrylic community courts managed by Council utilising the Book a Court system.

Bodley Street is currently being utilised by Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club as an overflow venue. The lease agreement entered with the club was for a period of one year, with no extension. The agreement is currently in overholding and it is not recommended that this agreement be renewed without considering other providers that may be interested in this short term site while planning of future use is undertaken by Council.

Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club report that during pennant competition times, access to additional courts is required. Consideration to alternate competition times should be investigated by the Tennis Association to provide flexible fixturing arrangements.

**Council Investment into Tennis Infrastructure**

The Strategy proposes that Council considers two items through its capital works program including the staged implementation of Tennis Australia’s Book a Court system across Council owned or managed facilities and the repurposing of Bodley Street Tennis Centre with scope to be determined at a later date. It is proposed that quotes for installation of the Book a Court system will be sought and a budget proposal submitted for consideration in future budgets.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Adopt the Tennis Strategy and associated actions.

2. In partnership with Tennis Victoria undertake an expression of interest for the redevelopment and management of Dendy Park Tennis Centre, Brighton.

**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Bayside Tennis Strategy 2019-2028
2. Attachment 2 - Stakeholder Feedback - Tennis Strategy
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The implementation of the actions detailed in the Bayside Tennis Strategy will provide positive social benefits for people of all abilities and ages through their participation and engagement in sport and recreation activities.

Natural Environment
Council is committed to achieving positive environmental outcomes through the provision of infrastructure that utilises environmentally sustainable products. The Strategy recommends the replacement of red porous courts at community clubs at end of usable life with either acrylic, or synthetic grass surfaces.

Built Environment
There are no built environment implications associated with the proposition in this paper.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Consultation was undertaken in line with Council’s Community Engagement Framework and involved direct consultation with tennis stakeholders including:

- Tennis Victoria
- Tennis Australia
- Bayside commercial tennis centres
- Bayside community tennis clubs
- Private and church run clubs.

Tennis Victoria have expressed a desire that Council invest significant funding into the renewal of tennis facilities within the municipality to ensure that clubs are operating from facilities that meet standards and provide a welcoming and inclusive atmosphere. Council’s Leasing and Licence Policy outlines Council’s role in leased facilities. Tennis clubs have repeatedly expressed their desire for Council to provide financial support to club facility maintenance and renewal.

Tennis Victoria strongly support the expression of interest process proposed at Dendy Park to support Tennis within the region.

Dendy Park Tennis Club do not support the expression of interest process proposed at Dendy Park and are seeking a renewal of their community lease agreement with Council. Club representatives expressed this view in a meeting with the Mayor and senior staff on 20 May 2019.

Feedback provided to the Strategy and comments from Council staff have been included in Attachment 2.
Human Rights

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

Legal

There are no legal implications associated with the proposition included in this paper. Tennis clubs operate under lease agreements with Council and the recommendations of this Strategy are made within the confines of the Council’s Leasing and Licence Policy 2018 and do not vary the conditions of existing leases or those in overholding.

Finance

The Strategy proposes Council financial support to install Book A Court system at community clubs within Bayside. Council funding to support this program will be considered as part of future Council budgets.

Links to Council policy and strategy

The provision and improvements of tennis facilities is supported by a number of key strategy and policy documents including Council Plan 2017 - 2021, Bayside 2025 Community Plan, Open Space Strategy 2012, Recreation Strategy 2013, Sportsground Pavilion Improvement Plan 2013 and Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017 - 2021.

The sustainability of sports clubs is in line with a number of Key Principles included in the Bayside ‘Active by the Bay’ Recreation Strategy (2013-2022) including:

1. The provision of recreational opportunities for all;
2. Providing great places for people to recreate in, and to be socially connected; and
3. Responding to identified recreational needs of the community.
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1. Executive Summary

The Bayside Tennis Strategy (the Strategy) was undertaken to guide the sustainability of tennis in Bayside. It considers a range of issues and provides recommendations to support the sustainability of tennis in the municipality and address issues associated with aging infrastructure.

The report has been informed through consultation with key stakeholders, analysis of membership and participation numbers, review of infrastructure audits and venue management models. Data utilised in this report is based on information provided through the Tennis Australia’s Healthy Club program 2015/16. A complete understanding of the current situation of tennis in Bayside has been difficult to determine without access to results and current data from Tennis Australia Club Operational Health Checks. Without full disclosure of Club/Centre positions the recommendations of this report may not accurately reflect the current needs of venues.

Tennis remains a popular sport amongst the Bayside community and following the introduction of a new Tennis Victoria affiliation model in 2014, which reduced the financial impost of affiliation, a significant increase in membership numbers was recorded. However it is apparent that there remains an oversupply of tennis courts within Bayside.

While the provision of tennis facilities is high, the standard of infrastructure at the majority of venues is quite poor and it has been identified in the short to medium term (1-5 years) an investment of $1.4m will be required to renew end of life court surfaces and associated infrastructure, with a further $1.6m in years six to ten. The current structure of the Leasing Policy places all maintenance and renewal costs onto the lessee and the Strategy has identified that the generation of funds to meet the asset renewal costs is unattainable for community tennis clubs.

The Strategy recognises the opportunity to address the infrastructure issues through the reduction of venues, supporting changes of court surface types, maximising multi-sport and access for all ages and abilities opportunities and providing modern access system’s at community courts to allow broader access by the community. By decreasing the number of venues, consolidating use to the remaining sites and supporting club investment into improving infrastructure, Bayside will provide a sustainable model for tennis in the municipality.

The Strategy focuses on Tennis Australia/Victoria’s four key pillars of successful tennis venues; accessibility, community benefit, sustainability and accountability recommending the following key actions.

- Council to consider funding through its capital works program the installation of Book a Court software and hardware into all leased tennis facilities;
- All new lease agreements (community and commercial) to provide Council with log in details to access club Book a Court data;
- All lease agreements to include the requirement for lessee’s to participate annually in the Tennis Australian Healthy Club program and provide Council with a copy of the results;
- Through the capital works program convert two courts at Bodley Street Tennis Club into acrylic surfaces, install one public hotshot court and return the remaining area including pavilion to open space;
- Endorse the recommendations noted in the Dendy Park Tennis Centre feasibility report and commence the expression of interest process seeking professional management of the site;
- Maximise court lighting across Bayside, through application to relevant funding programs supported by to provide greater access to tennis facilities; and
• Address opportunities to maximise revenue improving the ability to meet future renewal costs.
2. Action Plan

Council’s Lease and Licence Policy 2018 places the responsibility of facility maintenance and asset renewal onto the lessee and accordingly the action plan developed reflect the support role Council plays in the sustainability of Tennis in the municipality.

**Goal 1: Accessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1    | Support clubs and coaches to create welcoming tennis environments for the community to better access playing opportunities for all ages, abilities and backgrounds | Empower local tennis clubs and coaches to help make Tennis a sport to attract and retain all ages, abilities and genders in Bayside. Key focuses on increasing digital engagement, flexible membership/pay for play options and offering playing opportunities for all. Targeted participation focuses for females, casual and social play, transition from school environments and encourage diversity and inclusivity. | S - M | Tennis Victoria
Bayside City Council
Tennis Clubs and Centres
Tennis Coaches |
| 1.2    | Support the roll out of the Book a Court program to create and promote greater access by the broader community for casual play. | Council will consider funding through the capital works program or through available grant opportunities for the installation of Book A Court systems at all tennis venues, with the view of supporting implementation to all tennis venues in Bayside. Provide Council with log in details to access book a court data to review facility utilisation and hours of use per program area. | S | Bayside City Council
Tennis Victoria
Tennis Clubs and Centres
Tennis Coaches |
| 1.3    | On behalf of clubs applications to relevant funding programs to undertake facility upgrades to that improve accessibility, participation and community benefit. | Support club submissions to funding partners (e.g. State Government and Tennis Australia) to improve infrastructure that increases participation, facility usage, improving community access and strengthening social connection of members. Key focuses on lighting, red porous surface conversions and pavilion developments. Council will explore opportunities to provide unisex design change spaces, encourage multi-use and fit for purpose venues. | S - M | Bayside City Council
Tennis Victoria
State Government
Tennis Clubs and Centres |
### Goal 2: Community Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Collaborate with coaches at clubs to improve engagement with the Bayside community to encourage participation in tennis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Victoria to drive quality and progressive participation programs led by qualified tennis coaches at tennis venues to build positive partnerships with their clubs and the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council to partner with Tennis Victoria to increase promotional opportunities for venues including annual Festival of Tennis and free come and try open days through social media platforms and Councils event calendar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tennis Victoria to ensure all head tennis coaches hold Tennis Australia coaching qualifications and membership. This ensures that coaches at affiliated tennis venues are accessing national tennis programs and support are covered by relevant insurance and have been screened annually for compliance with a working with children check, police check and first aid qualification.  | S        | Tennis Victoria  
Tennis Clubs and Centres  
Bayside City Council                       |
| 2.2 Encourage involvement of tennis clubs in the planning of Council open space to provide a diverse range of recreational opportunities for the community.  |
| Involve clubs in the planning of Council open space and precincts to ensure broader community benefit, opportunity to participate and healthy outcomes for residents.  | M - L     | Bayside City Council  
Tennis Victoria  
Tennis Clubs and Centres                       |
| 2.3 Explore opportunities to upgrade facilities at Dendy Park to become Bayside’s regional tennis facility.  |
| Endorse recommendations of the feasibility study and commence planning, development and ongoing sustainability of the tennis at Dendy Park as a Tennis Australia Regional Tennis Centre.  | M        | Bayside City Council  
Tennis Victoria  
Tennis Australia  
Dendy Park Tennis Club                       |
| 2.4 Council in partnership with Tennis Victoria host an annual forum for Bayside tennis clubs.  |
| Council and Tennis Victoria to facilitate an annual Tennis Club Forum, Forums will focus on networking, building and sharing knowledge and providing updates on the Tennis Strategy implementation.  | S        | Bayside City Council  
Tennis Victoria  
Tennis Clubs and Centres                       |
**Goal 3: Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1    | Support clubs and centres to improve club planning and performance to achieve financial sustainability | Partner with Tennis Victoria through its Participation Leader and relevant staff to provide program support and resources, outline participation opportunities and support club development – particularly advice, training and resources in business planning, governance, financial management, workforce development and coaching agreements. | S | Tennis Victoria  
Bayside City Council  
Tennis Clubs and Centres |
| 3.2    | Support clubs to keep well maintained buildings and court infrastructure. | Submit applications of behalf of Tennis Clubs to relevant funding partners for grant opportunities to improve tennis infrastructure. Clubs must show evidence of capital to | S | Bayside City Council  
Tennis Clubs and Centres |
| 3.3    | Explore alternative management models for tennis facilities on a case-by-case basis. | In collaboration with clubs and Tennis Victoria, Council will continue to explore a range of facility management options aimed at providing sustainable, accessible and appropriate facilities. | M | Tennis Victoria  
Bayside City Council  
Tennis Clubs and Centres |
| 3.4    | At the end of the current lease of Boddle Street Tennis Centre, investigate opportunities to convert two courts to acrylic surfaces, provide a public toilet install one public access hot shot courts and return the remaining area to open space. | Council to consider multi-use opportunities for this site and provide a proposal for consideration to future capital works programs. | S | Bayside City Council |
## Goal 4: Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>HOW WILL THIS BE ACHIEVED</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Clubs to plan for capital renewal/planning through regular deposits into sinking funds. As specified in individual lease agreements, ensure that clubs are contributing agreed amounts to sinking funds. Council to monitor contribution to sinking fund through review of clubs/centres annual reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis Clubs and Centres&lt;br&gt;Tennis Victoria&lt;br&gt;Bayside City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Review membership fee structure and to ensure long term sustainability of the club. Clubs to partner with Tennis Victoria and Council to review current fee structure to ensure ongoing sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis Clubs and Centre&lt;br&gt;Tennis Victoria&lt;br&gt;Bayside City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Review coaches annual contribution to community clubs to assist clubs meet the requirements of their sinking fund. Partner with Tennis Victoria to review and understand the appropriateness and benefits of third party commercial arrangements at tennis facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis Victoria&lt;br&gt;Bayside City Council&lt;br&gt;Tennis Clubs and Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Conduct regular audits of facilities to monitor condition of asset. Council to undertake facility audits every five years to determine current condition of assets. Provide results of audits to clubs to ensure investment into infrastructure is being met.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayside City Council&lt;br&gt;Tennis Clubs and Centre&lt;br&gt;Tennis Victoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 3. Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT REFERENCE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Hot Shots</td>
<td>Tennis Hot Shots is a fun way for kids to learn how to play tennis - on the right size court using racquets that are perfect for small hands. These are staged programs for 3 to 9+ year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Term used to describe an Incorporated Association – in this context it generally refers to Local or Regional Tennis Association that is responsible for administering localised competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio Tennis</td>
<td>Cardio Tennis is a high energy fitness activity that combines the best features of tennis with an all over cardiovascular workout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>A geographic information system (GIS) is a computer system for capturing, storing, checking, and displaying data related to positions on a map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHC</td>
<td>Operational Health Check – formal Tennis Australia process for assessing club and venue operations and benchmarking with similar venue types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Member Association of State-Territory Tennis Association (e.g. Tennis NSW, Tennis Victoria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2P</td>
<td>Places to Play – refers to Tennis Australia’s Infrastructure development and venue sustainability team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Participation Leader – MA staff member with responsibility for working with and local tennis clubs and local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered participant</td>
<td>A registered participant is one that is registered on Tennis Australia’s My Tennis member management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Tennis Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Tennis Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Centre</td>
<td>Professionally Managed on Council land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Club</td>
<td>Community Managed on Council land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAA</td>
<td>Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Purpose

This document identifies the projected future demand for tennis across the municipality and reviews the current network of tennis facilities, their management, access arrangements and future infrastructure requirements. In addition, it investigates the potential constraints on local tennis participation and development across Bayside. A key driver of the Strategy was the need to better understand the key requirements to maintain participation in tennis over the next 10 years and establish a framework for provision that ensures the long-term sustainability of tennis clubs, venues, programs and activities.

The Strategy builds on existing strategic planning and directions developed by tennis, Council and community stakeholders and reflects data and information specifically collected and analysed for this strategy.

5. Council’s Strategic Planning Framework

The review will provide an approach that ensure Council invests/supports applications for funding in appropriate infrastructure to enhance liveability and community health and wellbeing through the provision of infrastructure that is fit for purpose and accessible to the broader community.

The following documents have been analysed to inform future directions and recommendations for Tennis in Bayside:

- Tennis 2020 – Facility Development and Management Framework for Australian Tennis;
6. Scope

The scope of the Bayside Tennis Strategy includes:

- Understand the local strategic context and the key drivers for maintaining tennis participation;
- Understand and improve the alignment of Council's policies with Tennis Australia's Four Pillars to successful tennis venue management;
- Review the existing supply and capacity of tennis facilities within Bayside;
- Review existing venue management models and identify opportunities to support improved operational performance;
- Assess the functionality and condition of built facilities and work with Club's to identify plans for renewal/upgrade and integrated facilities that will provide opportunities for sustainable tennis venues;
- Investigate the feasibility of multi-use venues and facilities; and
- Develop a plan for all Council owned/managed facilities that is consistent with Council's broad recreation and open space policies and strategies, leasing policies and meets the current and future need of tennis in Bayside.

7. Methodology

To inform the Bayside Tennis Strategy 2019 – 2028 and provide recommendations to assist in the sustainability of Tennis within the municipality a thorough analysis was undertaken to determine the current type of court surface, standard and accessibility of courts and related infrastructure, condition and accessibility of existing pavilions, membership numbers and management models of current clubs and centres.

The current standard of facilities was determined through the engagement of an external company to audit sites that chose to participate, providing Council with condition reports detailing maintenance required, expected works and anticipated cost at each facility in the short, medium and long term, infrastructure conditions and any risks identified.

To ensure the Strategy captured a multitude of views, stakeholders were provided a variety of engagement opportunities undertaken in accordance with Council’s Community Engagement Policy to identify the current and projected use and development needs for tennis in Bayside.
Operators were invited to participate in an initial forum to collectively determine what they see as their greatest strengths and challenges in the short and medium term and provide suggestions on how Council and Tennis Victoria can support them to ensure a robust tennis network continues within the municipality.

Clubs completed a survey providing current membership data, programs and competitions offered at the facility, planned upgrade or renewal of assets and details of the management model operating at the site.

Representatives from Tennis Victoria and Council reviewed the data provided via the survey and met with clubs individually to discuss the responses provided, gather additional feedback and tour the facility to experience firsthand the functionality and history of each site.

8. Background

A broad and diverse range of tennis activities are available within Bayside and are conducted across 21 venues, including 9 Council owned/managed, 4 private and 8 church owned centres. In addition to the tennis centres, there are 194 residential tennis courts located in Bayside.

In 2007 Council adopted the Tennis, Lawn Bowls and Croquet Strategy, which provided direction for all three sports for a period of 5 years. The strategy identified five areas of focus for tennis including facility provision, precinct planning, clear and consistent occupancy agreements, asset renewal and club sustainability. At the time of the 2007 report, Melbourne was subject to stage 3a water restrictions and significant focus was placed on providing municipal wide water saving initiatives, of particular focus for Tennis was the red porous courts (en-tous-cas) that is the predominate surface found in Bayside, which requires significant water to maintain.

Research undertaken during the development of Bayside’s ‘Active by the Bay’ Recreation Strategy (2013-2022) indicated tennis participation to be very high amongst Bayside residents. In 2011, it was calculated that 14,127 Bayside residents played tennis with this figure expected to increase to 15,939 by 2030, however it was noted that the preferred method of play has shifted from traditional tennis competition to casual play.

Both strategies identified that asset renewal (court, lighting and buildings) as the biggest issue faced by Bayside tennis clubs and the Bayside Tennis Strategy is a key strategic document which will be utilised to plan for the changing tennis environment, set priorities for asset renewal and ensure participation and player development pathways are met.

Engagement with tennis providers to inform the Strategy commenced in 2017 and provided valuable insight for Council staff which informed the initial draft of the Strategy presented to the Executive Team later that year. With the review of the Leasing Policy underway, the Strategy was deferred awaiting the adoption of the Leasing Policy to ensure recommendations made were consistent with the revised policy.

Concurrently, Council commissioned REMPLAN to undertake a feasibility study to determine the need, benefit and opportunities for a Regional Tennis Centre at Dendy Park.

The project consisted of three primary objectives of:
- Assessing the site and condition of Dendy Park to meet the requirements of a Regional Tennis facility.
- Developing a viable operational and funding model to operate Dendy Park as a Regional Tennis facility.
- Developing a vision and concept plan for the Dendy Park Tennis facility that is consistent with Tennis Victoria’s vision for the site, Council’s recreation and open space policies and strategies and meets the current and future needs of tennis in the community.

Tennis Australia sets the national direction for the planning and development of tennis facilities across Australia. The Tennis 2020 – Facility Development and Management Framework sets a national policy framework for associations to develop their own state level strategic, participation and facility related planning. With 85% of venues located on local government owned or managed land nationally, Tennis Australia recognises the importance of close collaboration with local government. To provide guidance and achieve mutually beneficial outcomes, Tennis Australia’s Places to Play team has developed Four Pillars of Successful Tennis Venues. The Four Pillars, briefly explained below, are a set of non-negotiable principles in the effective operation of tennis facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Community Benefit</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide community access to courts.</td>
<td>Deliver quality community programs.</td>
<td>Implement business model and practices to achieve financial sustainability.</td>
<td>Deliver and support national programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer flexible programs, playing options and scheduling.</td>
<td>Engage at all levels and with all sectors of the community.</td>
<td>Keep well managed and maintained buildings, grounds and court infrastructure.</td>
<td>Work with the tennis community to deliver agreed outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tennis Victoria’s *Places to Play Key Directions 2020* document aims to support the transition of tennis venues into vibrant, social, welcoming, inclusive, innovative, sustainable and customer focused community assets. Helping people to be physically active and socially connected make for stronger communities.

Tennis Victoria drives the support and development of tennis participation, facilities, club and venue management, coaching and events in Victoria.
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9. Key issues and findings

Access to current data and participation trends

In 2014, Tennis Victoria in conjunction with Tennis Australia introduced a new affiliation model for all Victorian tennis clubs. This model set an annual fee based on the number of courts at each individual venue, opposed to the previous model where clubs were charged per affiliated member. The changes to the affiliation with Tennis Victoria resulted in a more affordable option for clubs. And resulted in clubs reporting true membership data and opting to affiliate with Tennis Victoria.

A complete understanding of the current situation of tennis in Bayside has been difficult to determine with access to full results and current data from Tennis Australia Club Operational Health Checks not available. Without full disclosure of Club/Centre positions the recommendations of this report may not accurately reflect the current needs of venues.

In response Council will:

- Incorporate into all lease agreements the requirement of lessees to participate annually in the Club Operational Health Check and authorise release of findings directly to Council.

Tennis facilities and provision of courts.

A broad and diverse range of tennis activities are available within Bayside and are conducted across 21 venues, including 9 Council owned/managed, 4 private and 8 church owned centres. In addition to the tennis centres, there are 194 residential tennis courts located in Bayside.

The Strategy Background Paper (Attachment 2) identifies that Bayside tennis venues are highly concentrated, particularly in the areas of Brighton, Brighton East, Beaumaris, Black Rock and Sandringham where sixteen of the twenty-one centres are found. The four centres in Beaumaris are particularly close geographically and of the four centres, three are on Council owned land. When considering the broader municipality, the remaining venues are situated in Hampton, Hampton East and Highett.

Tennis Australia classifies venues according to a hierarchy (Attachment 2) based on the number of courts available with the goal of providing tennis opportunities from casual play to providing a pathway to high performance. Bayside has representation across all tiers, and predominately supports local courts at 52%.

The close proximity of the venues and high representation of local facilities has resulted in duplication of services, and created enormous competition for the same target markets limiting sustainability of Bayside venues.

In response Council will:

- Undertake condition audits of Council assets at 5 year intervals; and
- Before renewing lease agreements, ensure that clubs provide evidence of funding for relevant maintenance or renewal.
Commercial operators utilising community assets

Coaches often undertake a variety of roles at community clubs including driving participation and general facility maintenance. Coaching agreements vary between clubs, with the committee generally determining their appointment, tenure and fees. There needs to be a clear separation between commercial businesses and community club operations.

In Bayside, coach contribution to club revenue is much lower than state average at community clubs and should be addressed to increase the clubs capacity to renew assets and improve facilities available at the venue.

In partnership with Tennis Victoria, Council will:

- Consider the suitability of commercial operator agreements to provide guidance on appropriate financial contribution to court maintenance and renewal.

Dendy Park Tennis Club

The Dendy Park Tennis Club (DPTC) is a significant recreational facility with a rich Tennis history. The facilities at DPTC include 19 en-tout-cas (red porous) courts, making it one of the largest clay court facilities in Australia. The physical size and location of DPTC mean the facility has the potential to become Tennis Australia’s formally recognised Regional Tennis Centre for Melbourne’s Southern Metropolitan Region.

Dendy Park Tennis Club Inc. has operated the facility for almost 50 years. Despite an improved financial position over recent years, historic management by the Club has not resulted in regular renewal and reinvestment in the facility’s major capital assets. The poor condition of the facility has, attributed to the loss of members, creation of issues relating to equitable community access to the site and a growing list of significant asset renewals.

The current volunteer led management model has proven inadequate to operate a facility of the scale of DPTC in a sustainable manner. Significant renewal which is required in the short to medium will not be able to be funded by the Club or recouped through annual profits.

Findings and recommendations generated from the feasibility study of Dendy Park Tennis Centre (Attachment 3) are summarised below:

- Council to work with Tennis Australia/Victoria to develop concept plans for a refurbished DPTC facility and more detailed costings that be used for EOI and inform sinking fund requirements;
- Prepare an Expression of Interest (EOI) to invite interest of a professional manager for the site;
- EOI process and capacity of preferred candidate will provide key inputs for the development of a business case for investment in the site;
- Ensure the existing Dendy Park Tennis Club is embedded into any future development of the site;
- Secure funding for refurbishment; and
- Facility renewals are completed (potentially staged) and professional management is implemented.
10. Key trends

In 2015, the Victorian Government provided $250,000 to Tennis Victoria to implement the Opening up Tennis Pilot Program. The program aimed to increase participation in tennis by improving community access to facilities and maximising venue usage, while reducing the administrative burden for volunteers to coordinate casual court access.

The program consists of an online court booking system and payment gateway, linked to electronic gate access and lighting hardware.

Research indicates that sport participants (all sports) are opting for more casual unstructured recreational activities and looking for opportunities to participate at times that are more convenient to them rather than commit to the more traditional format of structured weekend sport. While clubs recognise this trend, the structure of volunteer managed community clubs limits their ability to facilitate casual access and clubs must decide whether this type of access is worth the volunteer time potentially missing the opportunities afforded by this shift in participation.

In response Council will:

- Through its capital works program install book a court system at all tennis venues and have full access to the data collected through this system.

11. Infrastructure/ assets

Court surface type and condition

Red Porous remains the predominate surface in Bayside with fifty eight of the eighty-four (69%) courts on Council owned land constructed using this surface type. Red porous is one of the preferred surfaces of Tennis Australia in terms of player pathway and development of the sport and for this reason it is important to retain courts of this nature in Bayside. Red porous courts are labor intensive, require significant amounts of water and have high maintenance costs, which is particularly challenging for a community based facility managed by volunteers.

Seventeen courts are surfaced using synthetic grass (20%), which is becoming increasingly popular with community based facilities as it has less maintenance requirements, requires significantly less water than red porous courts, places less impact on the body than acrylic surfaces, can be used year-round and fit for multi-sport purposes. Challenges of this surface type include it not being recognised as a preferred surface for player pathway by Tennis Australia, not prioritised as part of the Court Rebate Program and is not suitable for access by all abilities.

Nine courts (11%) have acrylic surfaces which can be used for all levels of coaching, training, Hot Shots programs and competition. Acrylic surfaces are compatible with access for all abilities and can be used for multi-sport purposes year-round. It is also a surface of choice for Tennis Australia which enables funding opportunities for using this surface type.

Court audits were undertaken as part of developing the Strategy providing details of court condition and renewal timelines. Just over 50% of court surfaces were identified as requiring replacement within the next five years. In accordance Council’s Leasing and Licence Policy 2018, tenant clubs are responsible for the maintenance of all tennis court and building infrastructure.
Based on the current condition reports and the financial position of some clubs, what are assets on Council owned land will continue to deteriorate to a point where they will no longer be fit for purpose.

In partnership with Clubs and Tennis Victoria, Council will:

- Support clubs to convert red porous courts to either acrylic or synthetic through the submission of grant applications to relevant funding partners.

**Court lighting**

Court lighting is an essential component to the sustainability of tennis, enabling the club to conduct year round competition or coaching at the facility particularly during the winter months, when natural light restricts play after 5.30pm. Of the 84 Council owned courts 57 (67%) are floodlit, however the lighting audits undertaken as part of the Strategy indicate that of the forty-three courts tested (not all sites participated) 53% did not meet the minimum standard. This result is particularly significant at two of the venues where no lit courts meet Australian standards.

Royal Avenue Tennis Centre and Highett Tennis Club do not have access to any lit courts, which makes the sustainability of the clubs challenging with use heavily restricted for at least six months of the year. This is particularly important at the Royal Avenue site, where the provider is paying a commercial operator rental and has invested heavily into the site which is maintained to an excellent standard, but has limited opportunity to obtain return on investment.

In response Council will:

- Commence community engagement of residents surrounding the Royal Ave Tennis Centre of the centres intent to install flood lighting; and
- Support clubs to install or improve court lighting through submission of grant applications to relevant funding partners.

**12. Review**

Review of the Bayside Tennis Strategy 2019 – 2028 to be undertaken in 2023 including condition audits of all Council owned facilities.
We acknowledge the Boon Wurrung people of the Kulin Nation as the traditional owners of this land and we pay respect to their Elders past and present. We acknowledge that together we share a responsibility to nurture this land, and sustain it for future generations.
### Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Since the club’s response to the Bayside questionnaire dated January 3, 2017 the club has changed dramatically due to the new clubhouse facilities and the new coaching team that started in January 2018. We have even grown substantially since the Operational Health Check review of 2017/18 and the Boddley Street court usage update at the start of this year.</td>
<td>Association to consider flexible fixtures to allow clubs to stagger competition across the week rather than rely on access to additional courts. Sports such as AFL, Soccer and Cricket have all undergone similar growth and have responded through flexible scheduling – competition played under lights and across multiple week days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We now have over 700 members. There are now more than 50 junior and senior teams that represent BLTC and the bayside community every weekend against other clubs. These range from beginner juniors to Men’s and Ladies playing the top grade of Tennis Victoria Pennant in the State. Coaching numbers have now grown to 469 pupils every week (students do not have to be members) and these range in standard from touring professionals training during the day to the quickly expanding Hot Shots juniors. The club now has one of the largest Hot shots programs in the State. The Coaching numbers are attached. These numbers are expected to grow by another 20% over the Summer months.</td>
<td>Fantastic outcome for the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The internal competitions are popular for social players and again participants are drawn from local residents looking for a regular, organised social hit as well as members. The Monday and Wednesday night Mixed competitions start at 7.30pm. There are full with waiting lists. The Men’s competitions are growing and nearing capacity on a Tuesday night. The Wednesday morning Ladies competition at capacity and the Friday morning competition is nearing capacity as well.</td>
<td>Great outcome by the club, consider working on a growth management strategy with Tennis Victoria and Council’s Recreation Team. Consider partnering with surrounding clubs where participations isn’t as high to manage programming and competition structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of Boddley Street

- With the growth in members, teams and coaching programs for the Community we would not have been able to cope without the Boddley Street courts. They are used right across the weekend for competition. They are used every night by coaching and members when there are just not enough courts available at BLTC from 4pm onwards. This is again highlighted in the attachment. They are also used for competition on Tuesday nights and squads during the day on Wednesday and Friday mornings when our Ladies competitions occupy all the courts at BLTC. The Boddley St courts are also used by the membership base and hired by the broader community when there is no court availability at BLTC. There have been some issues with Book a Court which I will elaborate on below so numbers are just starting to reflect real usage.

- A clubhouse is not essential at Boddley St providing players can access BLTC change rooms and showers and the BSC for socialising and post match nourishment. Boddley St would need at a minimum a shelter and toilets but our strong view is that the community would benefit far more from having access to as many courts as possible rather than making way for more public space.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 10.17 – Reports by the Organisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Page 361 of 537</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on BLTC</strong>&lt;br&gt;Without the courts from Bodley Street (or a replacement alternative), the coaching programs will have to be reduced and the number of teams we enter in competitions will have to be reduced. We would estimate that more than 150 children would have to be turned away from coaching lessons and training squads and the number of teams we would be able to enter in junior and senior competitions would have to be reduced by 20%. There is also no further capacity to continue to grow the club and encourage further community participation and engagement which I would have thought is what the Council and Tennis Victoria would want.</td>
<td>Sustainable growth is the key component. With a significant oversupply of venues within Bayside, quality of facilities and provision of infrastructure to support club activity should be the focus rather than growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of the Beaumaris Sporting Club (BSC)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Unless we can continue to have the use of the full Bodley Street facilities we will need to turn future members away and reduce current numbers substantially. This will further reduce the revenue flowing to the BSC.</td>
<td>Consider upgrade and renewal of assets at Beaumaris Lawn Tennis to better serve membership base at the existing site. Council staff to work with Club on court allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hot Shots</strong>&lt;br&gt;We are a strong advocate for this coaching program. It runs every night after school and on Saturday mornings. I am sure the program will continue to grow substantially in the coming years. Designated Hot Shots courts would be a fantastic addition for the area and we would encourage discussions about how to get some courts in at BLTC or Bodley Street.</td>
<td>Hotshot courts proposed as part of repurposing of Bodley Street by Council and consideration to additional Hot Shot Courts supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting and funding</strong>&lt;br&gt;We need to install lights on the hard courts at BLTC by next Winter. This is needed to alleviate court shortages even with Bodley Street in the Winter months. We would welcome discussions about approvals for the lights and funding options.</td>
<td>Club responsible for maintenance and renewal of assets. Council will support applications to State Government for Lighting Projects, where club is able to demonstrate matched funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In line with the Bayside Tennis Strategy we have always been a self-funding club. In 2010 we installed lights on 4 en tout cas courts at a cost of $75,460. In December 2014 we put new fencing in around the whole complex at a cost of $165,000. In February 2015 we replaced the old lights on the top 6 porous courts at a cost of $104,000. We currently have proposals in front of Council to further improve the tennis club and its surrounds. I am sure no other tennis club has even come close to reinvesting in its facilities like we have. The point being, we have always maintained and improved the club’s infrastructure from our own funds and have not asked Council for any assistance. We encourage discussions on both BLTC and Bodley Street to see what we can do together in the future.
### Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book a Court</strong>&lt;br&gt;We agree with the Council and Tennis Australia's initiative to install B2C at tennis clubs across Bayside. As you know, BLTC was one of the early adopters of the system. We have no issue with Council having access to system data. There were some teething issues (particularly with Bodley Street) and member engagement and education took some time but we are getting there. It is convenient, helps the club generate revenue from lights and allows members and casual court hirers to see when courts are available. We anticipate 75% of members are now using the system and that number is growing. Hopefully it will be getting fully utilised by the end of the year so that the system reflects court usage.</td>
<td>Great outcome for the club, Council looks forward to receiving access to the system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Court surfaces**<br>We agree with your comments on court surfaces and the upkeep on porous courts. One issue we have in Winter is the hardcourts don't dry out given a lack of slope on the courts, hollow spots and the shade on the North boundary of the courts. We will need to look at resurfacing the hard courts in time. We have no issues with resurfacing Bodley St at a future stage. A clubhouse is not essential at Bodley St providing players can access BLTC change rooms and showers and the BSC for socialising and post-match nourishment. Bodley St would need at a minimum a shelter and toilets but our strong view is that the community would benefit far more from having access to as many courts as possible rather than making way for more public space. | The Strategy recommends repurposing of Bodley Street. Importance noted |

| **Coaching fees**<br>We have put an appropriate fee structure in place so that our coaching team helps fund our reinvestment in our tennis facilities. | Noted |

| **Bayside Strategy**<br>The Strategy identifies four key focus areas: accessibility, community benefit, sustainability and accountability, recommending the following key actions. We have worked really hard as a club and Committee to achieve all of these focus areas of the strategy. We have installed Book a Court and have no issues giving Council access to all the data. We are happy to participate annually in the Club Health Check. We continue to look at ways to improve revenue so we can reinvest in facilities at BLTC and Bodley Street. We just don’t feel reducing the playing facilities at Bodley Street is in the best interests of tennis and the Community. | Comments noted |
Beaumaris Lawn Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comments</strong></td>
<td>Comments noted;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we think about what we want to achieve as a club we want to: cater for all levels of tennis and encourage participation; promote health and fitness; provide great training opportunities for the elite and competition at the highest level, giving kids something to strive for and set a great example for them; create a vibrant social hub for the community; foster the growth in tennis using recognised coaching programs including the very popular Hot Shots; provide an accessible, family friendly environment for Bayside residents and a centre that attracts people to it. We believe we are doing all these things which is why the club has experienced strong growth over the past couple of years.

We feel we are the most successful tennis club in Bayside. We have reinvested in our facilities like you have asked us to, we have implemented Book a Court already, we have engaged the community and numbers are flourishing at all levels and ages and we have an appropriate coaching model which enables us to continue to reinvest in facilities. Whilst some tennis facilities in Bayside have not done what we have done and have suffered as a result, we feel the reduction in courts at Boddle Street is not the way to go at all and not the way of the future. The use of the tennis courts by the community will far outweigh usage of the space as extra parkland. We agree that Boddle Street needs to have money spent on it and some of the proposed changes make sense such as the addition of Hot Shots courts and possible surface changes, as do alterations to the clubhouse and additional sheltering. BLTC would welcome discussions on a long term lease so we can invest in the facilities in conjunction with Council and come up with a desirable and exciting result for everyone. We would like to continue to promote health, fitness and tennis in the Bayside area and help invest in the facilities to create a truly exciting future for the sport and the two tennis venues. With some vision I am sure we could come up with a truly exciting result.
### Beaumaris Community Centre Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>We support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding for installation of Book A Court for clubs and centres to create better accessibility for both community and members for casual play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council support for tennis in future facility and reserve developments, linking to state and national funding applications where possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Retention of the Bowley Street site for tennis – preferably as is, but if it is to be redeveloped, as outlined in the draft policy with retention of two courts and a third hotshots dedicated court.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for an annual tennis promotion such as Bayside Tennis Week to promote the sport better locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual club forum for clubs to get together along with council staff and Tennis Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing audits for tennis clubs every five years and commitment to review the strategy again in five years to update recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Dendy Park Regional Tennis Centre Feasibility Study. The study offers positive recommendations to help revitalise and secure the long-term future of the tennis facility and importantly still retain the tennis club on site. This is not a venue that can be replaced so needs to be sorted out and renewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Improvements

**Policies**: We recommend a review of current leasing policy as BCCTC is currently responsible for managing and upgrading all assets such as courts, lighting and pavilion. This is a large burden for any volunteer run organisation. We would like to see greater flexibility and support in the policy for selected accessible tennis facilities that offer Book A Court and community benefit to help bring them up to minimum standards of sustainable LED lighting.

**Response**:
Review of Leasing and Licence Policy is scheduled for 2023, clubs encouraged to provide feedback to this review.

**WPCP’s expectations**: We would like to retain the red porous courts as outlined below. This support would reduce financial pressure on capital renewal planning for clubs and help secure long-term sustainability of tennis venues and help to deliver community benefit and accountability to lease requirements.

**Response**:
Council understands clubs desire to maintain red porous courts, however applications to the State Government for renewal or upgrade would be required to demonstrate sustainability of investment and red-porous courts would not effectively demonstrate this requirement.

**Future perspectives**: We would like to see more site-based recommendations for tennis venues with a council leasing arrangement based on the facility audits and consultation, as well as limited rental increases no greater than CPI. We commit as a tennis club to being more financially sustainable and accountable, providing community benefit and accessibility at tennis venues. In return we want to see Bayside Council partner with Tennis Victoria to provide specific support plans for clubs with a council leasing arrangement based on their audits to guide them towards delivering long-term viability and sustainability, for both courts and pavilions.

**Response**:
As part of the strategy clubs are encouraged to work with Tennis Victoria and Council to develop both business plans and strategic plans were site specific recommendations will be addressed.
### Beaumaris Community Centre Tennis Club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We would like Bayside Council to investigate the impact and risks of private and church based tennis venues if they were sold off in the medium to long term, support needs to help prevent this, and what the potential impact means for tennis facility provision of tennis venues on council land and the sport of tennis locally for medium to long term planning. I’m keen to believe through a past president that this may have been done 10-15 years ago and was then parked. We would also like to see the council explore future site options for tennis, such as schools as participation growth continues.</td>
<td>The strategy notes that even if all non-Council providers were to close and Council proceeded with the reduction of courts at Boley Street, the Bayside Community will still have access to a greater number of courts in ten years than required. Non-Council providers will continue to invited forums and Sports Club breakfast events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard work by previous committees and members at BCCTC has seen us maintain some of the best red porous courts in Bayside and inner Melbourne. As a result of these efforts and a plan for maintaining the courts, we would like to keep this surface and work on ways to reduce potable water usage. The red porous surface is best for teaching/coaching and is less hard wearing on the body versus other court surfaces. This helps to keep our older players playing longer, thus increasing participation and social engagement in the older population of Bayside (which is very strong at BCCTC). We feel that this planned maintenance will allow our club to maintain these to a high standard and remain fiscally sound.</td>
<td>Club preference noted and supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the BASP redevelopment, looking at harvesting water from the Arts building to help fill the tank located at BCCTC so we can help lessen our impact upon the environment with regards to water usage.</td>
<td>Referred for consideration of planning of the Arts building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in the onsite bore at BCCTC that is on council land to further reduce impact on potable water usage.</td>
<td>Clubs intent noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with updating entrance and viewing area at BCCTC to allow it to be an all abilities venue. This would tie in with the proposed all abilities access toilets attached to the Arts building redevelopment. This would enable all abilities access to all areas of the tennis club, not just outdoor areas and toilet facilities.</td>
<td>Encourage club to include intent in strategic planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the VOLUNTEER base that is required to maintain a club such as BCCTC, we would like to see support from council from a both policy perspective, as well as financial support as outlined above. This would help to strengthen the long term stability and viability of the club, especially in respect to finding new people to come on board and maintain a club when they know that council is supportive of tennis.</td>
<td>Council will seek feedback on the Leasing and Licence Policy in 2022/23 and club will again be asked to submit feedback to this document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tennis Victoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is encouraging to see:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding support for Book A Court at clubs and centres to create</td>
<td>Support Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better accessibility for both community and members for casual play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for tennis in future facility and reserve developments,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linking to state and national funding applications where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retention of Bodley Street site for tennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for an annual tennis promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual club forum for clubs to get together along with council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff and Tennis Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing audits for tennis clubs every five years and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to review the strategy again in five years to update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive recommendations from the Dendy Park Regional Tennis Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study to help redevelop and secure the long term future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the tennis facility as well as keep the club on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for opportunities to review the current Leasing Policy</td>
<td>The Leasing and Licence Policy will be reviewed in 2022/23 and all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which the Strategy clearly identifies as a barrier to venue</td>
<td>stakeholders will be invited to provide feedback to this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consideration for clubs looking to convert from</td>
<td>The Strategy encourages conversion to acrylic or synthetic surfaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘maintenance-hungry’ red porous courts to acrylic or synthetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surfaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consideration for clubs looking to Install or retrofit</td>
<td>The strategy encourages renewal of court lighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmentally sustainable LED lighting options – identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a priority for tennis to meet changing participation trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only specific facility or site based recommendations for two venues,</td>
<td>The strategy encourages clubs to work with Tennis Victoria and Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no specific support plans for other venues with a council</td>
<td>to develop strategic plans including site specific recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leasing arrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plans to investigate/monitor the future of Church sites which</td>
<td>Strategy notes that the loss of church facilities will not impact the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprise over a third of the total venues, pose a medium to longer</td>
<td>ratio for provision of courts per person in the next ten years. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term risk of being retained as tennis facilities.</td>
<td>strategy also notes continued support to these groups through access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Council staff resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executive Summary

Second paragraph — “Tennis Australia Health Club program 2015/16” should be TA’s Club Operational Health Check 2015/16.

Third paragraph — reference to oversupply of tennis courts — (see also 2 Key Issues) While there is a concentration of tennis facilities in Bayside, participation is strong and the comment about oversupply of courts is not really justified. The current average court to member ratio is 1:66, well above the industry benchmark of 1:50. In addition, the 8 church facilities are mentioned but there is nothing further on investigating or at least monitoring the future of these sites. Where the summary references the four key focus areas, perhaps make mention the 4 key focus areas (link to Tennis Australia Victoria’s 4 key pillars of successful tennis venues).

Change made

Even if all non-Council facilities were to close and Council was to reduce court numbers at Bodley Street — considering population growth there would still be an oversupply of courts. The strategy notes Council’s ongoing support of non-Council providers.
### Tennis Victoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong> Council states in the Strategy Purpose that this should be “a framework for provision that ensures long term sustainability of tennis clubs, venues, programs and activities”. The strategy recognises there is an issue with venue sustainability and the likelihood of continued decline in venue infrastructure, citing the Council Leasing Policy as an enabler to this however, there are no strategies to effectively address this. Without some funding support from council on courts, lighting and pavilions, sustainability is almost impossible, even if clubs improve current operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Possible strategy inclusions could be:  
- Noting that the Leasing Policy will be reviewed in 4 years time, this is an opportunity that should be included/referenced (include in point 9, add review of leasing arrangements for tennis clubs in Accountability section of Action Plan)  
- Tennis facility renewal projects to be prioritised in Council endorsed funding applications with preference given to those initiatives aimed at increasing participation, facility usage and improving community access (include in point 9 and update 1.3 of action plan to ‘prioritise tennis clubs’) | The Lease and Licence Policy guides Council’s priorities in investment into infrastructure |
| **Scope** The Strategy refers to “Identifying plans for renewal/upgrade, integrated and multi-use facilities that will provide opportunities for sustainable tennis centres” – not sure this is addressed in the action plan and does not mention individual venues at all apart from Dendy Park and Royal Avenue. | Reworded to state that Council will work with clubs to... |
| **Background** The inclusion of the statement regarding 194 residential tennis courts in Bayside is not relevant other than to attest to the popularity of the sport. Neither Council nor tennis clubs have any control over these facilities which are not available for public use. | Residents that have tennis courts at home are unlikely to utilise community assets for coaching or casual use. Comments are valid and will remain in the document. |
| The Bayside Tennis Strategy is noted as a key document to set priorities for asset renewal but the action plan does not reflect this (as per 6 above). | Noted and reworded to reflect that the Strategy does not provide site specific recommendations — clubs will require their own strategic plans to cover this. |
| The last 3 paragraphs of this section concerning TV are probably not relevant to the Strategy. | Removed |
| **Data and Participation Trends** Council has advised it is unable to establish the current state of tennis in Bayside without full access to the Club OHC’s due to privacy agreements. This is incorrect as not sure why this was stated. | No data from Operational Health Checks has been provided since 2015/16. |
| Tennis Victoria has provided its document to Council, current information on both the state of tennis in Victoria as well as that of Bayside, so not sure why this hasn’t been included in the Strategy? | This data has not been provided |
## Tennis Victoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tennis facilities and provision of courts  
Again the relevance of residential courts?                                                                                                                                                               | Provides context of the Bayside community and is relevant to the Strategy.                                                                                     |
| While there is a concentration of tennis facilities in Bayside, participation is strong and the comment about oversupply of courts is not really justified. The current court to member ratio is 1:66, well above the industry benchmark of 1:50. In addition, the 6 church facilities are mentioned but there is nothing further on investigating or at least monitoring the future of these sites which, comprising over a third of the total venues, pose a medium to longer term risk of being retained as tennis facilities. This could be included in the Action Plan under Community Benefit 2.2: Monitor the status of church and privately owned tennis venues and their role in tennis provision in Bayside. | Even if all non-Council courts were to close there would still be an oversupply in 10 years based on projected population growth.                                                                       |
| This section should make mention of the TA court hierarchy, as this enables provision of tennis opportunities from lifestyle through to high performance to be offered, ensuring a linked pathway for tennis and community development. It delineates the role of the facility in offering programs and services.                                                                                     | Comments included.                                                                                                                                               |
| The statement that Council will “prior to renewing lease agreements ensuring clubs provide evidence of funding for relevant maintenance or renewal” is possibly redundant as evidence of a sinking fund is already a condition of a lease.                                                                                     | This does not refer to the existence of a sinking fund, it identifies if clubs have the means of undertaking necessary maintenance and renewal to manage Council’s assets in the term of their lease agreement. |
| Noting Council’s commitment to regular court audits, is it possible to reaffirm the statement made in point 4 around prioritization of tennis projects?                                                                                                           | Council will submit applications for funding that are construction ready.                                                                                       |
| **Dendy Park Tennis Club**  
- It is suggested the following paragraphs be included in the dot points:  
  - The Remplan report commissioned by Bayside Council, prepared by leading consultants, Remplan, recommends “Dendy Park Tennis Club (DPTC) is transitioned into a Regional Tennis Centre incorporating a professional / commercial component into the management model”.  
  - The report also states “The site requires operational change to ensure sustainable financial management, however, key to this change will be ensuring it remains a home for the existing Dendy Tennis Club. The final role of the Club in site management should be determined during a market testing process.” | Comments noted – written as recommended by REMPLAN.                                                                                                           |

## Key Trends

- Site specific recommendations will form part of club strategic plans and the background paper discusses participation and programming in detail.
### Tennis Victoria

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of consumers being exposed to high quality programs, events and services through the media and other leisure industry providers, they are expecting more and more from their sport and recreation activities. This includes a high, contemporary quality of facilities, support amenity, player and spectator comfort, quality of service, coaching and expecting the service to be provided when they want it.</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the popularity of the Hots Shots program, particularly within the Sporting Schools context, this is an opportunity to consider with future upgrades and any new installations, including those within park and multipurpose environments.</td>
<td>To be included in specific strategic plans. Agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Plan</strong> - Community Benefit 2.4 – incorporate a section of this forum to explain and encourage Tennis Clubs to apply for Bayside Annual Community Grants to increase/enhance participation opportunities. Timing of forum to match grant application timelines.</td>
<td>Very specific comment that could be a standard agenda item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Infrastructure/Assets**
  - Not sure the figures are quite correct in terms of court numbers and percentages. This section should include a statement around TA encourages diversity of court surface to cater for differing player needs and stages of development. | Data is correct |
| The abundant supply and challenge of maintaining red porous courts is highlighted along with a statement that “Council will support clubs to convert red porous courts to either acrylic or synthetic through the submission of grant applications...”, however this is not noted in the Action Plan. This could be an addition to Sustainability 3.2. | Included in the strategy |
| Note that Council has a Sustainable Infrastructure Policy whereby: “Licences and Leases will be re-negotiated when renewed to ensure that Council’s assets are managed and operated in an environmentally sustainable way, to both achieve Council’s performance standards for ESD and meet Council’s measurable targets for environmental performance. In addition, Council will negotiate with lessees for environmentally sustainable outcomes that benefit both parties, in implementing improvements in premises under existing, long-term leases.” Is there an opportunity for Council to consider assistance through this Policy to clubs wanting to convert to LED and/or solar that could be added to Sustainability 3.2? | Doesn’t form part of the Lease agreement. Proposals to renew infrastructure with sustainable products will be strongly supported by Council. |

### Management Models

**Sustainability 3.3**

Add in: Explore alternative management models and occupancy agreements for tennis facilities on a case-by-case basis. In collaboration with clubs and Tennis Victoria, Council will explore occupancy agreement options aimed at providing sustainable, accessible and fit for purpose facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease and Licence Policy to be reviewed in 2022/23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bruce Watkins – Tennis Enthusiast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Book-a-Court system is good but is not a panacea for access and revenue generation everywhere. It will work best when there is a single point of entry to the facility (usually from a car park) together with fully trained and available admin staff. This is more likely to be functional and optimised at a commercial centre than a club.</td>
<td>Valuable feedback for Tennis Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease agreements – you advise that Council has reaffirmed its historical position that lessees are fully responsible for ongoing maintenance and renewal of assets at their site. At the same time Council is requesting more oversight re reporting obligations and access to Club data without offering any new tangible support re managing and upgrading assets – courts, fencing, lights, clubhouse etc. I suggest a better balance is needed in the lease. Other Councils are more cooperative.</td>
<td>Any application for funding must be accompanied by evidence of need. Council is unable to support projects without supporting data confirming proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPTC – I agree that the current Club management operational model is outdated for the size of the facility and type of operation. I am not convinced that an EoI seeking all of a large capital injection, professional management and retaining key Club attributes will succeed in resolving this...but there is only one way to find out. Following the EoI, I predict it is likely to require many iterations to find a solution acceptable to all parties. Availability of sufficient capital has always been the limiting factor.</td>
<td>Valid feedback to provide to any process undertaken on endorsement of the Tennis Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court lighting – not convinced more is justified. I support progressive upgrades. Page 36 refers to a minimum standard of lighting, presumably based on AS2560.2.1. I contend that a good even light is acceptable and preferable to a ‘brighter’ uneven light. There is a lot more to what constitutes adequate lighting for tennis play. I support regular facility audits every 3 to 5 years to report against long term plans. I note references to attachments 2 &amp; 3. While these are not attached I assume I am au fait with them. Re attachment 3. I am unaware if the Dendy Park Regional Tennis Centre Feasibility Study has been revised/finalised since issued to DPTC last August.</td>
<td>Site’s without lighting are unable to operate year round and restrict their capacity to generate revenue. Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPTC – I agree that the current Club management operational model is outdated for the size of the facility and type of operation. I am not convinced that an EoI seeking all of a large capital injection, professional management and retaining key Club attributes will succeed in resolving this...but there is only one way to find out. Following the EoI, I predict it is likely to require many iterations to find a solution acceptable to all parties. Availability of sufficient capital has always been the limiting factor.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bruce Watkins – Tennis Enthusiast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Porous Surface Conversions</td>
<td>Independent audits were undertaken and confirm this data. Funding applications to State Government must demonstrate sustainability responses to infrastructure and red-porous-courts do not meet this criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disagree that 50% of existing red porous courts require replacement within 5 years! I request BCC also supports red porous court rebuilds as required, especially where bore water is available and the Club/Venue is willing to maintain Melbourne’s own surface.</td>
<td>Comments noted and Council supports clubs retaining and renewing courts of this surface type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red porous courts – 1. Are the most suitable surface for Melbourne’s climate and after natural lawn, the best surface to develop an all round game and hence are essential for player development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are preferred by the majority of ‘senior’ competition players in Melbourne (especially the Bayside district).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage life long play.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were invented by Melbourne tennis players for Melbourne climatic conditions to emulate European Clay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can last a very long time if properly maintained and the life expectancy can be extended with partial rebuilds; unlike hardcourts and synthetic grass/clay which can become hazardous at the end of their life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior competition players avoid or refuse to play on hardcourts due to the jarring effect on joints, especially on replacement joints. Synthetic grass is also too ‘hard’ when installed on concrete or asphalt and discourages extended rallies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dendy Park Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Club Committee has identified three areas of common ground between the Club and Bayside that we would like to see:</td>
<td>Feedback noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The benefit of further development of a great community friendly tennis environment that is accessible, affordable, inclusive and offers a full array of tennis opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Optimisation of tennis participation in the municipality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The funding, sound planning and completion of improved tennis facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dendy Park Tennis Club is traditionally a big tennis venue. At our Club there is not much scope to increase participation in the daily and weekly cycle of playing tennis during the school terms. We are at or near capacity outside work and school hours during a school week. The Club is a prolific mid-week tennis and school tennis venue with the Club utilised by St Leonard’s College, Brighton Grammar School, Halleybury College, Caulfield Grammar School, Wesley College and Brighton Secondary College. The Club has a prolific junior tennis pathway fielding 21 junior teams on weekends in the current Autumn season alone, this level of junior activity is replicated in the Spring season. The Club currently has 10 teams active in Tennis Victoria Men’s and Women’s Pennant providing a strong pathway from the beginner to the elite level.

The Club would like to see improved tennis facilities in Bayside and especially at our venue. The issue is how will this be financed? Bayside appear to be rushing to an Expression of Interest (EOI) process to commercialise the venue in the hope of attracting investment. The Club has several concerns with Bayside seeking to place management of our Club out to an EOI and is aware of:

1. Several failed commercial ventures of this nature in local community sport
2. Risk of loss of the Club culture and identity if the wrong commercial operator wins the EOI
3. A high probability of increases in user costs for access to tennis at our venue
4. These high costs creating the risk of a loss of participation at our Club

Evaluation of the existing and future use of the site was undertaken as part of the REMPLAN report.

Feedback has been provided by Council to the submitted Business Plan and after discussions with the club the EOI process will be recommended as part of the Strategy.

Concerns noted
### Dendy Park Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Remplan Report referred to in the Bayside Tennis Strategy is deeply flawed and is not credible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remplan Report does not accurately portray the current utilisation of tennis facilities at the Club, not recognising the substantial numbers of school students using the venue on a school term weekday, nor the numerous Sunday afternoons during school terms when Tennis Australia Super 10s are on site. Tournament activity is also not properly recognised in the Remplan Report with approximately 10 per cent of all tournament activity in Victoria held at our venue. This tennis activity contributes strongly to Club revenue and is reflected in our strong cash position – the cash position is the key measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remplan Report contains no industry analysis, with no insight into how to build Club membership, and no insight into current and former member user trends and tastes. Remplan were fully briefed by the Club President on these matters, they chose to overlook this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remplan Report makes no connection between its financial forecasts, the quality of human resources (e.g. Club Professional) available to staff the venue at the salaries forecast, and the quality of service offering to the tennis community – this is a most unfortunate omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remplan Report referred to in the Bayside Tennis Strategy is deeply flawed and is not credible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remplan Report does not accurately portray the current utilisation of tennis facilities at the Club, not recognising the substantial numbers of school students using the venue on a school term weekday, nor the numerous Sunday afternoons during school terms when Tennis Australia Super 10s are on site. Tournament activity is also not properly recognised in the Remplan Report with approximately 10 per cent of all tournament activity in Victoria held at our venue. This tennis activity contributes strongly to Club revenue and is reflected in our strong cash position – the cash position is the key measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The report was based on evidence of use provided by the club.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback to the credibility of the reported noted.
### Dendy Park Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Remplan Report future financial forecasts are deeply flawed with no proper assumptions provided – consequently they are not considered credible.</td>
<td>Feedback to the credibility of the reported noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Remplan Report makes no connection between its financial forecasts, the quality of human resources (e.g. Club Professional) available to staff the venue at the salaries forecast, and the quality of service offering to the tennis community – this is a most unfortunate omission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Club Committee is concerned that any organisation seeking to put $2.73 million investment into the Club will be seeking to recover the cost of debt and/or equity invested over a possible 10-year period. The amount of cash for withdrawal after the investment could be in the range $273,000 to $546,000 per annum if the cash outflows required to the external party is in the range 10% to 20% per annum of the $2.73 million investment.</td>
<td>Any submission will be thoroughly reviewed and business model and financial plan tested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These deeply flawed financial forecasts in the Remplan Report run the risk of inviting high risk financial behaviour by any party successful in the EoI process. With our knowledge of Club operations, we are deeply concerned in relation to the impact of the commercial risks to be taken, and such a substantial level of withdrawal of funds, on the long-term operations at the Dendy Park Tennis Club. The impact on our Club and community could be most unfortunate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Club's view is that Bayside should invest in a regional tennis facility as they have in sports including Australian Rules Football with regional facilities such as Trevor Barker Oval Sandringham and Elsternwick Park Oval No. 1. Bayside investment would greatly reduce financial risk in the upgrade of Dendy Park Tennis Club.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our preliminary analysis of possible investors does not identify a for-profit organisation that would be satisfactory to the Club Committee, nor do we anticipate such a for-profit investor would be satisfactory to Bayside. We base this view on previous Dendy Park Tennis Club experience with Next Generation Pacific Health Clubs and Tennis Australia tenders over the past decade rejected on two occasions by Bayside. The Club has two leads on suitable high quality not-for-profit potential co-investors we would like to engage in further discussions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each time Dendy Park Tennis Club has been agreeable to an external tender process in the past decade it has damaged Club membership and Club financial performance. We cannot allow this to take place again after all our hard volunteer work in recent years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dendy Park Tennis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Club calls on Council to adjust the draft Bayside Tennis Strategy as follows:</td>
<td>The financial plan submitted to Council was reviewed by the finance team with feedback provided on its merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Council will work with the Club to further develop the financial model in the September 2018 Business Plan to facilitate an up-front facility upgrade that allows successful upgrade in and management of the venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Council to work with the Club to encourage it to continue as head leaseholder of the venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Council will work with the Club to see it realise its potential in terms of community engagement and optimal tennis participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Council will reserve the right to conduct an Eol process seeking a commercial partner for the venue only in the event of these outcomes not being achieved in a timely manner with an appropriate level of financial risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the Club is deeply concerned the Remplan Report recommends what the Club identifies as high risk financial behaviour by any winner of an Eol process. The Club is deeply concerned with the potential loss of community, tennis heritage and memorabilia at our venue — all are irreplaceable.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to adopt the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 (Attachment 1) following a period of public exhibition.

Key issues
The current Bicycle Strategy 2013 has reached the end of its five year life and an action plan has been developed for 2019 – 2026.

The community and key stakeholders were invited to comment on the draft action plan. The consultation process commenced on 8 May 2019 and ended on 22 May 2019.

The current Footpath Treatments within The Road Reserve Policy is also being considered at this meeting. The draft Bicycle Action Plan released for public exhibition included actions for shared paths for Park, Reserve and Cheltenham Roads.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 21 May 2019, Council resolved that the aforementioned sites be removed as exceptions to the Policy. The resolution resulted in the need to remove the following actions from the Bicycle Action Plan:

- Action 2.18 – Investigate options to provide a shared path along Reserve Road;
- Action 2.19 – Investigate the feasibility of providing an off-road shared path along Cheltenham Road between Bluff Road and Reserve Road, potentially using the existing reserve on the southern side between the road and Royal Melbourne Golf Club; and
- Action 2.20 – Investigate the feasibility of constructing a shared path along the southern side of Park Road providing connectivity to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre, Cheltenham Park and the wider bicycle network.

With the above changes, the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is presented to Council for adoption.

Recommendation
That Council adopts the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 as shown in Attachment 1.

Support Attachments
1. Attachment 1 - Bayside Bicycle Action Plan 2019
2. Attachment 2 - Community Engagement Summary Report (Stages 1 and 2) - Bicycle Action Plan 2019
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Cycling provides economic and independent travel for those who might otherwise have their travel options restricted. It offers increased mobility to sectors of the population with low rates of car ownership, such as low income earners, unemployed people, and seniors, and also to those under 18 years of age.

Shared cycling and pedestrian facilities also create benefits for pedestrians and people with disabilities, by providing an increased network of paths and improved road crossings.

Cycling enables people to interact socially and feel more at home in their local community. More people cycling and walking provides additional opportunity for social interaction on the streets and this enhances a sense of community.

More bicycle use in a neighbourhood provides a safer road environment in which children can also take advantage of slower and less dangerous traffic to cycle.

Natural Environment
When people choose to ride they reduce greenhouse gas emissions, noise, and congestion, and also allow greater capacity on public transport. Cycling provides mental and physical health benefits and, with the right infrastructure, it can be great fun. More people riding saves everyone money by reducing health costs and the need for investment in public transport and roads. It is in everyone’s interest that people ride (and walk) as much as possible.

Built Environment
Provision of new bicycle paths and/or infrastructure will impact on the existing streetscape. Careful consideration will be given to at least maintain existing amenity where possible, with the goal of improving amenity through better cycling infrastructure.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Engagement activities commenced on 8 May 2019 and ended on 22 May 2019. The methods of communication included, but not limited to, the Have Your Say (HYS) platform, emails and letters to key stakeholders.

The questions asked were: ‘Have we got the Action Plan right?’ and ‘Have we missed anything?’. Details of all comments received are documented within Attachment 2.

A review of the comments received on the draft Bicycle Action Plan and Footpath Treatments within the Road Reserve Policy 2019 has resulted in establishment of the following:

New actions listed in the draft Action Plan:

- Action 1.4 – Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Cheltenham Road between Bluff Road and Reserve Road;
- Action 1.5 – Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Park Road providing connectivity to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre, Cheltenham Park and the wider bicycle network;
• Action 1.6 – Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Hightett Road, between Bridge Street and the railway crossing; and

• Action item 1.27 – Write to and continue engagement with VicRoads to advocate for the introduction of bicycle infrastructure improvements along VicRoads Strategic Cycling Corridors and principle Bicycle Network Plan, within the Bayside municipality.

Actions deleted from the draft Action Plan:
• Action 1.24 – Write to and continue engagement with VicRoads to advocate for:
  o The introduction of on-road bicycle infrastructure along Bay Road between Bluff Road and Beach Road, Sandringham
  o The introduction of on-road bicycle infrastructure on Bluff Road, Hampton

• Action 2.18 – Investigate options to provide a shared path along Reserve Road;

• Action 2.19 – Investigate the feasibility of providing an off-road shared path along Cheltenham Road between Bluff Road and Reserve Road, potentially using the existing reserve on the southern side between the road and Royal Melbourne Golf Club; and

• Action 2.20 – Investigate the feasibility of constructing a shared path along the southern side of Park Road providing connectivity to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre, Cheltenham Park and the wider bicycle network.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
Under the Road Management Act 2004, Council is responsible for the provision of appropriate bicycle infrastructure and has a duty of care for all road users within the local road network of Bayside.

Finance
Council currently allocates $1.4 million annually to new and upgraded shared paths, active transport projects, improvements to bicycle facilities and works to address high risk locations of the Bay Trail. At this funding level, there is sufficient budget allocation during the life of the action plan to deliver the actions listed.

Links to Council policy and strategy

The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is aligned with, and supports, the Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028, in particular the following Strategic Directions:

• Strategic Directions for Enabling Sustainable Transport Choices
  o SD 1: Promote and encourage sustainable transport choices to Council employees
  o SD 2: Promote and encourage sustainable transport choices to the community
- SD 3: Investigate opportunities to introduce initiatives that will improve transport choices and reduce transport emissions

- **Strategic Directions for Cycling**
  - SD 8: Develop a culture of cycling within Bayside that encourages people to ride a bicycle
  - SD 9: Improve and expand the bicycle network to support both utility cycling and recreational cycling to key destinations in Bayside
  - SD 10: Improve the integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other key amenities

- **Strategic Directions for User Friendly Streets**
  - SD13 The transport system in Bayside will be safe for all users
  - SD14 Greater priority will be given to sustainable modes of transport in terms of allocating time, space and facilities on local streets

- **Strategic Directions for Integrated Transport and Land use**
  - SD16 Development will support and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use

**Options considered**

No other options were considered relevant to this report.
Bicycle Action Plan 2019
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PART A

1. Executive Summary

Introduction

Bayside City Council has prepared a Bicycle Action Plan 2019 to guide delivery of a range of initiatives to support cycling as a convenient alternative to private vehicle trips within Bayside. The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 supersedes the Bicycle Strategy 2013.

The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is informed by Council's Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028, the Bicycle Strategy 2013, and feedback from the community and Council officers. It identifies actions to make improvements to the bicycle network and to encourage more cycling in Bayside.

Key issues and findings

The following key issues were raised by the community in relation to cycling in Bayside.

- A desire for more infrastructure: more shared paths, on-road bicycle lanes, bicycle parking and improved network connectivity.
- Safety on shared paths is a significant issue, in particular on the Bay Trail. The conflict between the different path users, i.e. pedestrians and cyclists, needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.
- Cycling on Beach Road was identified as a significant issue, with the most common concern relating to the sharing of road space.
- The behaviour of cyclists and pedestrians on shared paths, and motorists and cyclists on the road, is of concern.
- The need for more promotion of cycling and education for both cyclists and motorists.

Vision statement

Council’s vision for cycling is:

‘To increase cycle use throughout Bayside, facilitated through the development of infrastructure which is safe, well connected, convenient and attractive for cyclists and the promotion of cycling as a healthy and sustainable mode of transport.’

Objectives and strategic objectives

The Bicycle Action Plan is set around six objectives which reflect the aspirations of the community and will contribute to Council’s vision for cycling. The objectives are set out below.
**Objective 1: High quality on-road bicycle network**

Council will continue to provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside.

**Objective 2: High quality off-road bicycle network**

Council will continue to provide high quality off-road bicycle infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside.

**Objective 3: Effective maintenance of the bicycle network**

Council will effectively monitor and maintain the on-road and off-road bicycle network.

**Objective 4: Integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities**

Council will improve the integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities, through enhanced accessibility and end-of-trip facilities.

**Objective 5: Planning to support cycling**

Council will seek opportunities within planning processes to encourage and support cycling.

**Objective 6: Promotion of cycling in Bayside**

Council will raise awareness of cycling as a convenient alternative to vehicle trips in the community and support initiatives that encourage cycling.

**Objective 7: Education for safer cycling**

Council will improve safety for cyclists in Bayside through education.

2. **Action Plan**

The Action Plan is presented below, focused around the six key objectives. The actions have a nominated timeframe, cost, responsibility for implementation, and deliverable (i.e. the outcome).

**Timeframes used in the Action Plan have been categorised as follows:**

- Short 2019/20
- Medium 2020/21 - 2022/23
- Long 2023/24 - 2025/26

**Costs used in the action plan have been categorised as follows:**

- Low <$50,000
- Medium $50,000-$500,000
- High >$500,000

Bayside Bicycle Action Plan 2019
Objective 1: High quality on-road bicycle network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Implement on-road bicycle lanes on Carpenter Street</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Completed bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Implement on-road bicycle lanes on Asling Street</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Completed bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Improve access for cyclists between Sims Street and Beach Road Sandringham</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>New bicycle access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Cheltenham Road between Bluff Road and Reserve Road</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Park Road providing connectivity to the Bayside Business District, Cheltenham Activity Centre, Cheltenham Park and the wider bicycle network</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Options identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of providing on-road bicycle lanes along Highett Road, between Bridge Street and the railway crossing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Options identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Seek to improve bicycle access from Melrose Street, Sandringham, to the Bay Trail using the existing pedestrian signals</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Prioritised bicycle access across Melrose Street (and to the pedestrian crossing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Formalise bicycle access from Tramway Parade to the Bay Trail</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Improved bicycle access to Bay Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Provide sharrows along Worthing Road to indicate local bicycle route</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Implementation of sharrows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Strategic objective/s: Provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Provide sharrow along Middleton Street to indicate local bicycle route</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Implementation of sharrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Investigate feasibility of on-road bicycle lanes/off-road path on Park Street</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan for bicycle facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Should Action 1.8 be feasible, construct on-road bicycle lanes/off-road path along Park Street</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Completed bike lane/off-road path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Continue installation of bicycle storage boxes at all signalised intersections within Bayside</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Bike boxes at all signalised intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve on-road bicycle infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Seek further opportunities to improve bicycle access from the on-road bicycle network to the Nepean Highway shared trail</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve bicycle access to Bay Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve cycle access between Martin Street Activity Centre to/from the foreshore</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve cycle access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve cycle access between Hampton Street Major Activity Centre to/from the foreshore</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve cycle access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve cycle access between Sandringham Major Activity Centre to/from the foreshore</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve cycle access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Consider the options for an improved cycle route between Cheltenham Station and Sandringham Activity Centre</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve cycle access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Examine options to improve the existing on-road bicycle lane along Reserve Road between Beach Road and Bay Road, to improve connections, particularly to the Bayside Business Employment Area</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Investigate the available options of providing an on-road bicycle facility along Wickham Road, Hampton East</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve bicycle connectivity between Highett Station and the CSIRO site</td>
<td>Short to Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified cycle links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to improve bicycle connectivity between Highett Station and the Bayside Business Employment Area</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identified opportunities to improve cycle access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Investigate options to improve priority for cyclists at Martin Street/Cochrane Street roundabout</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Investigate options for local cycling route(s) through Hampton East to Moorabbin Station and provide bicycle pavement markings</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Investigate ways to improve bicycle safety and amenity along Jack Road, Cheltenham</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Concept plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic objective/s:** Provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside
### Strategic objective/s: Provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>Undertake a review of the on-road bicycle network to identify any missing links and network improvement opportunities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Bicycle network review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate to VicRoads for improvements to on-road bicycle infrastructure on the arterial road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.27     | Write to and continue engagement with VicRoads to advocate for:  
- the introduction of bicycle infrastructure improvements along VicRoads Strategic Cycling Corridors and principle Bicycle Network Plan, within Bayside municipality  
- improved on-road bicycle infrastructure along Beach Road  
- the introduction of on-road bicycle infrastructure on North Road  
- improved bicycle access between the Bay Trail and South Road  
- an early start for cyclists on the Bay Street approach at the Bay Street/New Street intersection  
- for an early start for cyclists on the South Road approach at the South Road/New Street intersection  
- for an early start for cyclists on the North Road approach at the North Road/New Street intersection | Short + ongoing | Officer time               | Sustainability & Transport            | Engagement with VicRoads to promote the benefits of this action |

| Improve conditions for 1.28 | Work in partnership with Victoria Police, VicRoads, Cycling Victoria and other stakeholders to improve conditions for cyclist safety along Beach Road | Ongoing         | Officer time               | Sustainability & Transport            | Improved crash statistics                        |
### Strategic objective/s: Provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cyclist safety on Beach Road</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for funding to implement the actions contained within the Beach Road Corridor Strategy</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety for cyclists riding on-road</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with VicRoads for the lowering of speed limits to 40km/h on the following Major Activity Centres: • Sandringham Activity Centre, Sandringham • Black Rock Activity Centre, Black Rock • Dendy Village (Hampton Street), Brighton East</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government and VicRoads through letters, applications for funding and other contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support LATM measures to create and improve safe and attractive bicycle routes on Council managed roads</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Measures implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify high risk crash locations within the municipality by conducting an annual review of available cyclist crash data for Bayside, supplemented by inspections, local knowledge and community input</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Annual review of cyclist crash data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunity to integrate the needs of cyclists in all road projects</td>
<td>Ensure that the needs of cyclists are considered in all transport infrastructure upgrades and street maintenance programs</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Integration of cycling components in projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure streetscape improvements include facilities for cyclists</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>City Assets &amp; Projects / Open Space, Rec &amp; Wellbeing / Urban Strategy</td>
<td>Integration of cycling components in projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Objective 2: High quality off-road bicycle infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic objective/s: Provide high quality off-road bicycle infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide improvements to the off-road bicycle infrastructure</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Complete the missing link of the Nepean Highway shared path between Rose Street and Gardenvale Station</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Completed section of path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Work in partnership with VicRoads to improve existing sections of the Nepean Highway shared path within the municipality</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Improvements to shared path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety on the Bay Trail including safety improvement projects at high risk sites</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>At high risk locations, seek to separate pedestrians and cyclists on the Bay Trail shared path</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>High risk locations along Bay Trail addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Bay Road, Sandringham – implement safety improvements to reduce cyclist speed along the tight corridor at the electrical substation</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Cyclist behaviour change on shared path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Rickett’s Point (northern car park), Beaumaris – seek to improve the path alignment on the southern side of the car park access road crossing point, i.e. where there is currently a 90 degree bend</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Improvements to shared path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Hampton Life Saving Club, Hampton – seek to increase the width of the path</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Improvements to shared path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Bent Parade, Black Rock – consider opportunities to improve the path alignment</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Improvements to shared path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Bridge Street, Hampton – review/improve the path alignment and clearances along the</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>Improvements to shared path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve lighting on Bay Trail</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety on cycle path in Cheltenham</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety on cycle path in Beaumaris</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high-quality infrastructure along shared paths</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high-quality infrastructure along shared paths</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high-quality infrastructure along shared paths</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Council Department</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to provide additional drinking water stations along shared paths</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Two bicycle repair stations/drinking fountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>Investigate options to continue the Nepean Highway shared trail through the Moorabbin Activity Centre</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Options identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Undertake a review of the off-road bicycle network to identify any missing links and network improvement opportunities, including along the Sandringham and Frankston railway lines</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time / Low for consultant</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Bicycle network review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for a shared path along the Frankston Railway line from Park Road to Bay Road, providing a safe and continuous route to/from Southland Railway Station and shopping Centre, Bay Road and Park Road</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for any identified shared path links along the Sandringham and Frankston rail corridor</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 3: Effective maintenance of the bicycle network

**Strategic objective/s:** Effectively monitor and maintain the on-road and off-road bicycle network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Monitor and maintain the on-road bicycle network</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Within budget</td>
<td>City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Following the completion of road works on Council managed roads, ensure that the road reinstatement does not create any unnecessary safety risks for cyclists</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Within budget</td>
<td>City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Monitor and maintain the off-road bicycle network</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Within budget</td>
<td>City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Raise awareness amongst cyclists of the reporting procedure for dealing with maintenance issues</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Provide portable bicycle parking at community events and festivals</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Bicycle parking at events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 4: Integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase bicycle parking facilities at activity hubs</td>
<td>4.1 Provide bicycle parking in public locations where there is an identified need, such as shops, libraries, sports clubs and reserves</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Provide additional bicycle parking facilities at Bay Road–Jack Road Small Neighbourhood Activity Centre</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Provide additional bicycle parking facilities at Pennoyle Park</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Open Space, Recreation &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 Provide bicycle parking as part of every foreshore car park upgrade project</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Open Space, Recreation &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 Provide portable bicycle parking at community events and festivals</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Bicycle parking at events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Provide secure bicycle parking at Council buildings, community facilities and Council controlled car parks</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 Provide additional bike parking at Livingston Community Hub</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Open Space, Recreation &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Council Department</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Provide additional bike parking at Lyle Anderson Reserve</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Open Space, Recreation &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Work with key stakeholders to ensure bicycle parking is provided at public transport hubs</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>New bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for the introduction of Parkideer bicycle cages at all train stations serving Bayside</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for improved lighting and visibility at stations and along paths to stations, including North Brighton Station, Middle Brighton Station, Sandringham Station and Gardenvale Station</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for the introduction of bike racks on all buses to integrate bicycle trips with bus trips</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Provide wayfinding signage to bicycle parking at Council buildings, community facilities and Council controlled car parks</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>New wayfinding signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Write to and continue engagement with the State Government for provision of wayfinding signage to bicycle parking at train stations</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Advocacy to State Government through letters, applications for funding and other contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic objective/s: Improve the integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities through enhanced accessibility and end of trip facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycle accessibility to Council buildings, community facilities and open spaces</td>
<td>Provide a pedestrian/cycling bridge/underpass across the railway corridor connecting Lyle Anderson Reserve to the east, in conjunction with VicTrack and Kingston City Council</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Pedestrian/cycling bridge/underpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Address cycling accessibility as part of the scope of works for any new Council developments, new or improved open spaces and community facility improvements</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Open Space Rec and Wellbeing/ City Assets &amp; Projects</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Objective 5: Planning to support cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage and support cycling</td>
<td>Seek the provision of secure bicycle parking and end of trip facilities</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through planning processes</td>
<td>for all new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Ensure any redevelopment of the CSIRO site provides public shared</td>
<td>Short to</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport /</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paths that connect Highett Road to Bay Road and Graham Road to</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Urban Strategy / Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Space &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Investigate feasibility of requiring new developments to provide</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport /</td>
<td>Recommendation in relation to Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide Green Travel Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Urban Strategy</td>
<td>Travel Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Review the state provisions associated with secure bicycle parking</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Urban</td>
<td>Review of state provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and end of trip facilities in new developments to determine if an</td>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increase in the standards is required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 6: Promote cycling in Bayside

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote and encourage cycling</td>
<td>Develop a tailored marketing campaign to celebrate cycling when new</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport/</td>
<td>Marketing campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cycling infrastructure is constructed or other improvements are made</td>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Update and distribute the Bayside Cycling Trail Map at appropriate events and other opportunities as required</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport/Communications</td>
<td>Updated map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Distribute media releases, utilise social media and promote cycling through existing community groups and local events to promote and raise the profile of cycling</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport/Communications</td>
<td>Increased ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Develop a campaign to promote the health benefits associated with cycling</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport/Communications</td>
<td>Increased ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Develop/deliver a ‘Cycling With Confidence’ Program for Bayside residents to improve bicycle maintenance and cycling skills</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Communications</td>
<td>Delivery of Cycling with Confidence program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Develop a travel behaviour change program for the Bayside community that encourages an uptake in walking, cycling and public transport</td>
<td>Short / Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Communications</td>
<td>Travel behaviour change program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Develop a Green Travel Plan toolkit to encourage and assist schools and large employers to develop Green Travel Plans</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Green Travel Plan toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Encourage all workplaces within Bayside to participate in the Ride2Work days</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Increased ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Work in partnership with those schools in Bayside participating in the Ride2School Program to identify opportunities for infrastructure improvements to support sustainable travel within the local area</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Identification of infrastructure improvements around schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strategic objective: Raise awareness of cycling as a convenient alternative to vehicle trips in the community and support initiatives that encourage cycling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote and encourage cycling amongst Council staff</td>
<td>Review, update and implement Council’s Green Travel Plan to promote and encourage sustainable travel choices amongst staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Updated Green Travel Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and report cycling levels in Bayside</td>
<td>Develop and implement a cycling monitoring program</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Annual report on cycling uptake in Bayside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 7: Education for safer cycling**

**Strategic objective: Improve safety for cyclists in Bayside through education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Council Department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety for cycling on shared paths and on-road through education initiatives</td>
<td>Develop and deliver an education campaign to raise awareness of shared path etiquette amongst pedestrians, dog walkers, cyclists and other users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Communications</td>
<td>Education campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Develop and deliver an education campaign to raise awareness and promote mutual respect between all road users</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Communications</td>
<td>Education campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Strengthen partnerships with Victoria Police, VicRoads and other relevant stakeholders to advocate for safer road and path user behaviour to improve safety for all users of the bicycle network within the municipality</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Transport / Communications</td>
<td>Improved crash statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B

3. Purpose


The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is informed by Council’s Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028, the Bicycle Strategy 2013 and feedback from the community and Council officers. It identifies actions to make improvements to the bicycle network and to encourage more cycling as a convenient alternative to private vehicle trips in Bayside.

4. Council’s Strategic Planning Framework

The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is aligned with, and supports, the Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028, in particular the following Strategic Directions:

**Strategic Directions for Enabling Sustainable Transport Choices**

- **SD 1:** Promote and encourage sustainable transport choices to Council employees;
- **SD 2:** Promote and encourage sustainable transport choices to the community; and
- **SD 3:** Investigate opportunities to introduce initiatives that will improve transport choices and reduce transport emissions.

**Strategic Directions for Cycling**

- **SD 8:** Develop a culture of cycling within Bayside that encourages people to ride a bicycle;
- **SD 9:** Improve and expand the bicycle network to support both utility cycling and recreational cycling to key destinations in Bayside; and
- **SD 10:** Improve the integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other key amenities.

**Strategic Directions for User Friendly Streets**

- **SD13** The transport system in Bayside will be safe for all users; and
- **SD14** Greater priority will be given to sustainable modes of transport in terms of allocating time, space and facilities on local streets.

**Strategic Directions for Integrated Transport and Land use**

- **SD16** Development will support and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use.
5. Methodology

The Bicycle Plan 2019 has been developed by analysing and incorporating relevant actions from the Bicycle Strategy 2013, the Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028, structure and development plans and feedback from the community. Key inputs in the development of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 are outlined below.

Strategy Review

Existing documents and strategies were reviewed to inform the development of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 including:

- Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 - 2028
- Bayside Bicycle Strategy 2013
- Urban Structure Plans
  - Bay Street Structure Plan 2006
  - Beaumaris Concourse Structure Plan 2005
  - Black Rock Neighbourhood Activity Centre – Strategic Framework Plan 2009 (2012 Addendum)
  - Church Street Centre Structure Plan 2006
  - Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016
  - Hampton Street Structure Plan 2006
  - Highett Structure Plan 2018
  - Martin Street Structure Plan 2016
  - Pennylane Structure Plan 2018
  - Sandringham Village Structure Plan 2006
- Development Plans
  - Jack Road Cheltenham Precinct Development Plan

Bay Trail Improvements

Improvement projects previously identified through the Bay Trail Safety Audit 2012 review have been incorporated into the Bicycle Action Plan 2019.

Community Engagement

In February – March 2019, Council conducted a community engagement process to provide the Bayside community the opportunity to provide input into the development of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019. The consultation comprised an online forum, face to face engagement, and surveys as follows:

- Have Your Say (HYS) Bayside website – online questions and interactive map;
- Pop-up bike stands – at the Bright n Sandy Festival, Green Point Brighton and at Sandringham Station; and
- Questionnaire survey.
A total of 146 respondents provided feedback which related to bicycle infrastructure or cycling in Bayside. The feedback has been reviewed as part of the development of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019.

The second phase of community engagement commenced in May 2019. The draft Bicycle Action Plan 2019 were publish for public exhibition for a duration of 2 weeks to determine ‘if we have got the Action Plan right’ and ‘if we have missed anything’.

The consultation comprised an online forum (HYS Bayside website) and targeted emails/letters to Victoria Walk, Bicycle Network Victoria, RoadSafe South East, Victoria Police, Neighbouring Councils (Port Phillip, Kingston and Glen Eira) and Schools within Bayside Municipality.

A total of 11 respondents provided feedback towards the draft Bicycle Action Plan 2019.

### 6. Key findings

The key issue raised by the community was the desire for more infrastructure: more shared paths, on-road bicycle lanes, bike parking and improved network connectivity.

Safety on shared paths was a significant issue identified by respondents, in particular on the Bay Trail where conflict between the different path users, eg. pedestrians and cyclists is common.

The sharing of road space was commonly raised with regard to on-road cycling, on Beach Road in particular. The behaviour of cyclists and pedestrians on shared paths, and motorists and cyclists on the road, was also a common theme.

Other feedback related to bike parking, promotion of cycling, and education. Table 1 below provides a summary of the themes raised by respondents.

#### Table 1 Feedback Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme from Community Consultation</th>
<th>No of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-road paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Highway shared path</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New path suggestions</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road crossing improvements</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road paths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Road</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Street</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Highway</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bike parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific locations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water stations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off road paths

The most frequent comment in relation to bike paths was for more paths generally, and specifically along the Frankston railway corridor. Concerns were identified in relation to pedestrian and cyclist behaviour and conflict on shared paths.

Congestion on the Bay Trail was identified, particularly between Green Point and Brighton Baths. Visibility at intersections along the Bay Trail with access paths was also an issue of concern. Numerous comments related to issues at specific locations along the Bay Trial.

Safety and connectivity issues were identified at specific locations on other shared paths, in particular the Nepean Highway shared path. There was also a number of requests for improvements at road crossings.

### On road paths

The most frequent comment in relation to on-road bike lanes was for provision of more dedicated bike lanes and for separation from parked cars. Concerns were identified with behaviour of motorists and cyclists on the road.

Cycling on Beach Road was identified as a significant issue, with the most common theme relating to the sharing of road space. Specific issues were identified on other roads, including Hampton Street, Highett Road and Nepean Highway.

Improvements to specific intersections were also requested.
Bike parking

Feedback relating to bike parking identified the need for additional secure parking at train stations, particularly at Hampton Station and Sandringham Station.

Additional bike parking at other locations in Bayside was also identified, such as at shopping centres, cafes, along the Bay Trail, at beaches/parks/reserves and at events.

Promotion and Education

There were numerous suggestions for promotion activities to encourage more cycling in Bayside.

The need for education was also identified to improve behaviour of path users (cyclists and pedestrians) and road users (cyclists and motorists).

Other

Other issues identified through the consultation process related to:

- Water fountains;
- Integration with public transport;
- Wayfinding signage; and
- Cycling to schools.

7. Objectives

The Bicycle Action Plan 2019 is developed around six objectives which have been derived through the consultation and reviews, which are set out below.

Objective 1: High quality on-road bicycle network

Council will continue to provide high quality on-road infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside through the following strategic directions:

- Provide improvements to the on-road bicycle infrastructure;
- Investigate opportunities to improve on-road bicycle infrastructure;
- Advocate to VicRoads for improvements to on-road bicycle infrastructure on the arterial road network;
- Improve conditions for cyclists on Beach Road;
- Improve safety for cyclists riding on-road; and
- Consider needs of cyclists in all road projects.
**Objective 2: High quality off-road bicycle network**

Council will continue to provide high quality off-road bicycle infrastructure that contributes to a safe, connected network for cycling in Bayside through the following strategic directions:

- Provide improvements to the off-road bicycle infrastructure;
- Improve safety on the Bay Trail including safety improvement projects at high risk sites;
- Improve lighting on Bay Trail;
- Provide services along shared paths;
- Investigate opportunities to improve off-road bicycle infrastructure; and
- Advocate to State Government for improved shared paths along rail corridors.

**Objective 3: Effective maintenance the bicycle network**

Council will effectively monitor and maintain the on-road and off-road bicycle network by ensuring ongoing monitoring and regular maintenance of the bicycle network.

**Objective 4: Integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities**

Council will improve the integration of cycling with land use development, public transport and other public amenities through enhanced accessibility and end of trip facilities through the following strategic directions:

- Increase bicycle parking facilities at activity hubs;
- Improve integration of cycling trips with public transport trips;
- Improve bicycle wayfinding; and
- Improve cycle accessibility to Council buildings, community facilities and open spaces.

**Objective 5: Planning to support cycling**

Council will seek opportunities within planning processes to encourage and support cycling by encouraging and supporting cycling through planning processes.

**Objective 6: Promotion of cycling in Bayside**

Council will raise awareness of cycling as a convenient alternative to vehicle trips in the community and support initiatives that encourage cycling through the following strategic directions:

- Promote and encourage cycling;
- Promote and encourage cycling in the workplace;
- Promote and encourage cycling in schools; and
- Promote and encourage cycling amongst Council staff.
Objective 7: Education for safer cycling

Council will improve safety for cyclists in Bayside through education through the following strategic direction by improving safety for cycling on shared paths and on-road through education initiatives.

8. Implementation and reporting

Implementation of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019 will be monitored and the progress of delivery of actions reported annually.

Key indicators of success of the Plan will be an increase in rider participation and improved safety for cyclists in Bayside. This can be measured through:

- Bicycle Network Super Tuesday and Super Sunday annual bicycle counts;
- Census data on cycling trips; and
- Reduction in cyclist crashes.
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1 Background

Over February-March 2019, Bayside City Council gathered feedback and ideas from the community to make improvements to the bicycle network and to encourage cycling as an alternative to private vehicle trips in Bayside. This document provides a summary of this phase of stakeholder and community feedback about cycling in Bayside.

Community engagement feedback from the first stage was incorporated into a draft Bicycle Action Plan (BAP). The draft BAP was also informed by the recently adopted Integrated Transport Strategy and the previous Bicycle Strategy (2013). The second stage of community engagement sought feedback on the draft BAP in particular to determine if we have got the Action Plan right and if we have missed anything.

The final draft of the Action Plan is to be presented to Council at the June 2019 Ordinary Meeting. The actions will be then implemented following the endorsement of the revised BAP.

This report provides details of the first and second stages of the community engagement process including the feedback received on the draft Plan.

2 Consultation process

2.1 Consultation purpose

The engagement process was open to all residents and any visitors/tourists to the Bayside area.

The purpose of the engagement process was to seek resident, visitor and other stakeholder feedback on:
- any recommended improvements to roads in Bayside, for the benefit of cyclists, and the location of those roads;
- any recommended improvements to off-road shared paths in Bayside, for the benefit of cyclists, and the location of those paths;
- recommended locations for additional bicycle parking in Bayside;
- any suggestions to encourage residents/visitors to cycle more often.

Stakeholders

Within this document, reference is made to stakeholders. The project stakeholders are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Victoria Walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td>Bicycle Network Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Council staff</td>
<td>RoadSafe South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbouring councils (Port Phillip, Kingston and Glen Eira)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools within Bayside Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The engagement negotiables and non-negotiables for this project are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiables</th>
<th>Non-negotiables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New bike infrastructure on Council managed roads</td>
<td>New bike infrastructure on Council managed roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of new bicycle parking facilities</td>
<td>Location of new bicycle parking facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions to encourage more people to cycle more often</td>
<td>Suggestions to encourage more people to cycle more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour change / awareness raising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Consultation methodology

The following activities were undertaken:
- project information and survey hosted on the on-line engagement platform Have Your Say;
- two listening posts/pop-up sessions held at the Bright n Sandy festival and Sandringham Train Station;
- distribution of hardcopy surveys to local community facilities (for return by mail);
- promotion of the project using Council communication channels including social media;
- comment on the draft Bicycle Action Plan document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 February to 18 March 2019</td>
<td>‘Have Your Say’ on-line engagement portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 contributors</td>
<td>Bicycle location map (119 contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 contributions</td>
<td>Bicycle survey (199 contributions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 project followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2019</td>
<td>These contributions include both feedback provided on-line, and data entry of completed hardcopy surveys received via mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March 2019</td>
<td>Listening post/pop-up engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 contributors</td>
<td>Bright n Sandy Festival, Green Point, Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 contributions</td>
<td>Questionnaire distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 project followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2019</td>
<td>Listening post/pop-up engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 contributors</td>
<td>Sandringham Train Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 contributions</td>
<td>Questionnaire distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 project followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2019</td>
<td>A total of 21 completed questionnaires were received by Council following both the listening post sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 February to 18 March 2019</td>
<td>Social media Bayside Council Facebook page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 contributors</td>
<td>Facebook posts made in response to key messages and promotion of feedback opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 project followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 respondents</td>
<td>‘Have Your Say’ on-line engagement portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 contributions</td>
<td>Comment box – has Council got the Action Plan ‘right’ and has anything been missed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 project followers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
8 May to 22 May 2019 Correspondence with Council officer/s
1 e-mail

3 Participant profile

On-line survey respondents

Gender was only recorded for registered members of the Have Your Say engagement tool. Only 10 registered members (7 males, 3 females) participated in this engagement process.

4 Consultation findings

The following section summarises the key themes which arose in community feedback on cycling in Bayside. In the interest of stakeholder and community privacy, individual quotes have not been included within this public document. Where there was more than one mention of a topic or item, the number of mentions has been specified in brackets.

This engagement process has identified a wide range of community concerns and suggestions to improve cycling infrastructure and encourage cycling in Bayside. The results of the consultation will inform and assist in the development of the Bicycle Action Plan 2019.

4.1 First stage of engagement - cycling on roads

The majority of comments received in relation to on-road cycling were of a general nature or related to Beach Road. Specific comments were also received in relation to other streets.

It is noted that many comments received were in relation to roads under VicRoads control, such as Beach Road, Nepean Highway, Hampton Street, Bluff Road and South Road.

Specific concerns/suggestions in relation to on-road cycling are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Community feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue-specific, not location-based comments</td>
<td>Provide (more) dedicated bike lanes; wider / safer bike lanes; separate bike lanes from parked cars (18)&lt;br&gt;Parking in bike lanes is an issue/ don’t allow (6)&lt;br&gt;Separate car, bikes and pedestrians (5)&lt;br&gt;Get cyclists off roads and onto bike paths (3)&lt;br&gt;Restrict cycling to bike paths during peak periods (3)&lt;br&gt;Dooring issue (3)&lt;br&gt;Cycling on roads too dangerous / conflict between cars and cyclists (2)&lt;br&gt;Cycling on road with parked cars is dangerous&lt;br&gt;There are limits to how far you cater for cyclists on-road&lt;br&gt;Provide commuter routes through back streets to shopping centres, station etc. (2)&lt;br&gt;Reduce vehicle speeds (2)&lt;br&gt;Maintenance, pot holes (2)&lt;br&gt;Parking on street generally issue for cyclists (2)&lt;br&gt;More bike lights&lt;br&gt;Encourage cycling on less busy routes/times&lt;br&gt;Bike lanes on all VicRoads roads&lt;br&gt;On-road bike path to city&lt;br&gt;Safer bike lanes, particular at intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stop putting in roundabouts, kerb outstands – they make it harder for cyclists
Ban cyclists on road
Limit parking to one side of street to allow space for cyclists
Cyclists on-road should follow road rules
Bike lanes should be provided between footpath and parked cars
Rule for 1m clearance to cyclists bad idea and can be frustrating to drivers eg in strip shopping areas
Bike lanes should not be allowed to be blocked for construction activities
Make bike lanes wide enough for 2 abreast
Use Dutch style roundabouts for cyclists
Separate bicycle lanes at roundabouts
Extend No Stopping times during peaks
Police poor behaviour of motorists

Beach Road
Restrict cyclists to two abreast/no riding in packs (5)
Restrict cycling to defined time slots (eg. no cycling in AM peak) (4)
Ban parking and dedicate lane to cyclists (3)
Make clearway during peak periods/early mornings to improve safety for cyclists (3)
Stop heavy vehicles using Beach Road (3)
No cycling on Beach Road/provide alternative for speed cycling (3)
Restrict cyclists to single file (2)
Provide signs for cyclists eg. stay left, two abreast (1)
Dedicated cycling lane (2)
Improve road near Middle Brighton Baths and Bay Trail
Opportunities for cyclists to turn right off Beach Road
Separate vehicles and bikes, provide marked bike lanes
Cyclists not obeying road rules
Poor behaviour of cyclists
Reduce speed limit
Connection to Nepean Highway
Dendy Street intersection – cyclist run red light or jump onto footpath
Provide alternative cycle route using quieter streets
Improve safety for cyclists, too narrow
Cycling reduces road to one lane in each direction for cars
At Beaumaris Hotel – improve road near kerb
Provide pedestrian crossing near Normanby Street
Bluff Road
Too narrow for cars and cyclists
Advocate to VicRoads for dedicated bike lane

Thomas Street
Repair damage done by NBN

Hampton Street
More speed control
Request for dedicated bike lanes (3)
Bike lanes are dangerous (2)
Improve traffic signals at Beach Road for cyclists
Advocate for road resurfacing – irregular surfaces and potholes dangerous to cyclists
Doorings issues around Hampton Activity Centre – cyclists riding in the centre of the road frustrates motorists
Nepean Highway
Level surface, lines and lighting
Bike lanes south of Glen Huntly Road (2)
Cars encroaching bike lane north of Glen Huntly Road
### Bay Road
- Too narrow - safety concern
- Doorway issues - provide separated bicycle lanes or a painted buffer zone
- Do not make a cycling corridor - too dangerous for cyclists (high volumes and heavy vehicles), existing series of routes provide east-west connection

### Hightett Road
- Provide safe bike route from Hightett to Hampton/Sandringham/beach
- Too narrow - safety concern (2)
- Place sharrows (shared-lane marking)
- Requires safer bicycle access near Hightett Activity Centre
- Poor surface for cycling
- Give priority to cyclists specially during peak hours
- Provide alternative cycling route without parallel parking along Linacre Road or David Street

### South Road
- Cycling near Haileybury and St Leonards schools dangerous at school drop off/pick up times (3)
- Dangerous pinch points at Hampton Street intersection (2)
- Advocate to VicRoads for a signal-controlled crossing near Glencarrn Avenue facilitating Brighton Secondary School cyclists to safely cross South Road

### Dendy Street
- Needs dedicated right turn lane at Burwah Ave
- Provide bicycle only slip lane onto Church Street
- Closing of on-road bike lanes without signage or alternative routes near construction sites

### Weatherall Road
- Provide wider bike lanes (2)

### Cheltenham Road
- Poor clearance between cyclists and cars – provide bike lane
- Upgrade footpath to shared path
- Provide a zebra crossing at Black Rock Primary School

### Balcombe Road
- Provide bike lane
- Zebra crossing at St Joseph's Primary School

### Tulip Street
- Cars parked along bike lanes
- Too narrow – widen carriageway

### Abbott Street
- Pinch point near Station Street – add chevron and bike road marking

### New Street
- Close level crossing near Beach Road intersection – very unsafe for cyclists
- Upgrade roundabout to improve cyclist’s safety

### Black Road shopping precinct
- Reduce speed limit from 60km/h to 40km/h (2)

### Request for bike lanes locations
- Ludstone Street, Bridge Road, Abbott Street (2), between Hampton and South Road/Nepean Hwy
- Park Road

### Intersections locations
- Bike lanes between left turn and through lanes - poor solution
- Introduce safer roundabout for pedestrians and cyclists Ludstone Street/Earsfield Road (2)
- Construct a roundabout to facilitate access to pedestrians and cyclists at Hampton Street/ Thomas Street

---

Needs resurfacing between South Road and North Road
Improved crossing at Chapel Street
Better connections with New Street
Roundabout at Hampton Street/Small Street to facilitate pedestrian crossing and road sharing
Upgrade roundabout at New Street/Dendy Street, improving cyclists safety (3)
Unsafe intersection for pedestrians and cyclists at North Road/ St Kilda Street

4.2 First stage of engagement - cycling on off-road shared paths

The majority of comments received in relation to on-road cycling were of a general nature or related to the Bay Trail. There were numerous suggestions for new paths.

Specific concerns/suggestions in relation to off-road cycling are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Community feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue-specific, not location-based comments</td>
<td>Provide more bike paths (14) Improve bike paths/make safer (4) Provide network of cycling routes/routes between shopping centres (3) Make more use of public land for bike paths (2) Connectivity of paths/provide missing links (2) Provide dedicated bike paths following railway lines (2) Shared paths are great (5) Remove rumble strips from paths Better maintenance, sweeping, remove bumps (4) Better signage (4)/Bilingual signage at tourist spots (1) Pedestrian crossings of paths (2) Cyclist behaviour/speed on shared paths (6) Pedestrians walking across entire path (2) Allow riding on footpaths/make shared paths (5) Stop adults riding on footpaths (3) Provide insurance cover for riding on shared paths Separate paths for pedestrians and cyclists/shared paths not safe (12) Provide fast path for higher speed cyclists Paths should be for walkers only, cyclists on road Need speed restrictions/cyclists ride too fast (3) When repairing/replacing paths make suitable for truck access to beach Cyclists don’t give way to pedestrians (2) Pedestrians on shared paths walking with headphones/unaware (2) Cycle only paths should be clearer Liaise with other Councils to connect existing bike paths Shade (2) Provide back road routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>Happy with trail (7) More Keep Left pavement signage between Green Point and Brighton Baths for international visitors (4) Congestion makes it unsafe to ride on Congestion between Green Point and Middle Brighton Baths Need to slow cyclists near Green Point exit as motorists don’t slow down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need to slow motorists at shared path crossing at Green Point exit and Trevor Barker Oval (2)
Crossings dangerous where beach access roads cross bike path
Regular sweeping of path (2)
Provide exercise stations
Cyclists ride too fast (3); Use bell when passing
Widen path (3)
Separate pedestrians and cyclists (4)
Prohibit cycling - restrict to Beach Road
Encourage cyclists to use instead of Beach Road
Proposal for works to Bay Trail on crown land contrary to previous agreements
Police path - dogs off lead (2), pedestrians on bike path
Don’t let path be closed during upgrade/maintenance works
Provide/improve lighting (2) (Elwood Bath to Brighton Baths very dark)
Give Way to Pedestrian signage is ambiguous
Focus on Bay Trail instead of a series of mini projects. Undertake remedial program and design for attributes like roads
Improve connections between Bay Trail and other paths
Facilitate access to Trail from side streets
Sections of path are bumpy eg. Sandringham (3)
Seal gravel driveway at Sandringham Footy Club
Vegetation growing over path (3)
Visibility at intersections of paths along Bay Trail (eg. Head Street), cut back vegetation, provide signage (5)
Provide priority to shared path at intersections
Increase awareness / provide warning signs for pedestrians and cyclists (2)
Work with adjacent Council’s for continuity/extension, eg. south of Mordialloc (4)
Need café in Hampton section
Big bump north of Bay Street
Smoothen gutter crossing North Boat Ramp
Improve alignment at the bridge south of Sundown Street – conflict between pedestrians and cyclists
Smooth gutters near Middle Brighton Pier
Conflict with pedestrians near Dendy Street
Dangerous for pedestrians to cross path at Small Street
Hampton Life Saving Club - Install signs and/or rumble strips to alert approaching cyclists of potential hazards/pedestrians
Conflict between pedestrians and cyclists near Sandringham Beach Park Reserve (2)
Provide surface marking and signage where cycling path crosses walking path
Provide pram ramp opposite Haydens Road
Too narrow and dangerous between Dendy Street and Green Point provide suspended walkway

Nepean Highway path
Poor condition between South Road and North Road, requires maintenance (2)
Signage to segregate pedestrians and cyclists
### Safer and more convenient connection for cyclists between Elster Canal Path and Nepean Highway
Requires signed connection with South Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New path suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along the Frankston Rail corridor (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Street or Willis Street and Small Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff Road (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Bluff Road and Beach Road (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock to station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along Elwood Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Hightt Reserve Road – pave existing dirt path for children to ride to school (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean Highway, North Road to Elsternwick Advocate to Glen Eira and Kingston to provide an off-road shared path or bicycle path along the entirety of Nepean Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Golf Course (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect Glebe Avenue and Cheltenham Recreation Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-road bike path between Cheltenham Train Station and Tulip Street Reserve via Cheltenham Park Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared path between Southland Train Station and Hightt Train Station with grade separation at Bay Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road crossings
| Hampton St - provide lights to cross at the railway, more crossing points (3) |
| Bluff Road - provide zebra crossing around hospital |
| Bluff Road - zebra crossing at FG Trick Reserve |
| Tulip Street - provide a zebra crossing west of Duff Street |
| Beaumont St / Abbott St - provide pedestrian crossing for children |
| Were Street - provide zebra crossings near Moffat Street and Roslyn Street |
| Charman Rd / Weatherall Road - difficult to cross as a pedestrian and turn right from Weatherall – investigate and find a solution |
| Provide crossing for cyclists at Ludstone Street east of Hampton Street – unsafe for children |
| Improve car/bike intersections |

### Mountain bike trails
| Elsternwick Park and Nature Reserve ideal location for mountain bike trails |

### Elsterwick Park
| Trim branches overhanging at head height |

### Tulip Street Reserve
| Difficult to perform a right turn from Spring Street to shared path |

### Merindah Park
| Upgrade sandy substrate at Spring Street/Talinga Road linkage, making it safer for cyclists |

### Dendy Park
| Maintain bike path |

---

### 4.3 First stage of engagement - bicycle parking locations

Respondents provided suggestions for additional bicycle parking - their responses are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Community feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue-specific, not location-based comments</td>
<td>More bike parking generally (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More bike parking at cafes (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More parking at shopping centres/ strips (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More parking at supermarkets (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike parking not necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 4.4 First stage of engagement - other suggestions provided

A range of other concerns/suggestions were provided during the consultation and are summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Community feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>Reduced transport fares to cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodate bikes on trains and buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water stations</td>
<td>Provide water fountains along bike paths (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water fountains with bottle refill option for cyclists (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide water stations near bike parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmets</td>
<td>Helmet use not being policed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Cyclists should be more respective of pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforce and issue tickets to motorcyclists riding along shared paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Run / promote events (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage/promote cycling (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bike parking at major bus stops (2)

Need more secure parking (4)

Bike racks at car parks and lookouts

Bay Trail

Almost no parking near Hampton Beach

Bike racks don't accommodate bike with wagon

Provide bike racks between Beaumaris Life Saving Club and teahouse

Stations

More parking / secure parking at Hampton Station (9)

More upgraded parking at Sandringham Station (9)

More parking / secure parking at stations (7)

More parking / secure parking at Middle Brighton Station

Undercover and secure parking at North Brighton Station

Parking at Sandringham Station is poorly maintained

Specific locations

More parking near North Road Foreshore/end of North Road (2)

More parking at Cochrane Street north of Bay Street

More parking at Beaumaris Concourse

Bike parking at beach boxes

Black Rock LSC

Along Middleton Road - Wickham Road route from Bay Road to Nepean Highway

Undercover parking at Middle Brighton Pier

Parking north of Sandringham Beach Reserve

Parking near Highett Tennis Club

Parking at Tulip Street Reserve

Parking at FG Tricks Reserve

Provide parking near Sandringham Hospital

North of Merindah Park

Bayside City Council Corporate Centre

Balcombe Park Reserve near the toilets

Parking at Donald MacDonald Reserve near the cricket nets

Parking at the north-eastern corner of Gramatan Avenue and Gareth Avenue

At the upper car park on Gerberus Way

Other

Ratepayers would have to pay for designated parking not cyclists

Parked bikes block footpath access at Black Rock shops

Need more bike parking for events (including signage) (2)

Events parking is good
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Item 10.18 – Reports by the Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycling culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices/newsletters (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote fitness through doctors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QANTAS frequent flyer points for activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council discount on rates for cyclists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction signage**
- Don't erect signage, doesn't make road safer
- Better signage to follow paths
- Signage to cafes, facilities etc
- Provide controlled crossings along Beach Road where there is directional signage

**Education**
- Education for cyclists (5)
- Education for motorists (5)
- Signage to warn drivers of cyclists
- Cycle 'buses' for kids

**General**
- Recognise/provide for three forms of cycling – commuter cycling, active fitness/road cycling and leisure/recreational/trail cycling
- Provide better network of connected bike paths and on-road lanes
- Consider investment in off-road training facilities
- Cyclists should have registration / license (4)
- Provide weather shelters along Beach Road
- Prefer not to wear helmet / helmet deters cycling (3)
- Many don't wear helmets / fit helmets correctly
- Opportunity to make women feel safer and increase participation in conjunction with other organisations
- All bikes should have bells
- Provide more bicycle infrastructure (generally) (2)
- Car-free periods around sports events
- Share cars in key locations
- Restrict densification to within 400m of railway stations
- Ban cars near schools during school pick ups and drop offs allowing children to ride and walk to and from schools

**Schools**
- Too busy around schools/discourages cycling
- Make safer to ride to schools (2)

**Toilets**
- Provide a public toilet at the Mooroobin Activity Centre, south of Nepean Highway

**4.5 Second stage of engagement – comments on the draft Action Plan**

Comments received on the draft Action Plan are documented below:

**Paths and lanes**
- All road markings need to be better maintained and repainted as required
- Bicycle improvements not to obstruct traffic flow
- Bicycle infrastructure on Hampton Street, between South Road and Beach Road requires improvement
- Bicycle only paths are used by non-cyclists
- Shared paths are too crowded
- Motorised bicycles speeding concerns
- Bicycle priority and sharrows to be provided on every road
- Bicycle path along Bay Road should be abandoned as it is dangerous
- Bicycle path along Nepean Highway from South Road to the northern boundary of Bayside municipality is in need of urgent maintenance attention
  - Investigate on bicycle improvements for Highett Road
  - Do not build hard surfaced track along Cheltenham Road
**Parking**
- More bicycle parking at Middle Brighton Station
- Bicycle parking needs to be available for cyclists use, not to secure pets
- Provision of Parkiteer cage at Sandringham Railway Station is a priority
- Bicycle racks on bus

**Council project management and implementation**
- Evaluation of proposed bicycle infrastructure to determine if they are needed or wanted before progressing to design and construction
- Most of the infrastructure identified should be deliver within 6 months, not over a 5 year period
- Recommendation for movement and place framework to be adopted
- Council to explore funding opportunities in conjunction with other developments i.e. Big Build Projects
- Bayside bicycle map is out-of-date
- Insufficient time given to properly review the content
- Inclusion of VicRoads Strategic Cycling Corridors and Principle Bicycle Network Plan

### 4.6 Facebook posts during first and second stages of engagement

During both engagement stages of the project there were 27 Facebook posts on the Council’s Facebook page, in response to the promotion of the opportunity to ‘Have Your Say’ and the project’s key messages. Social media posts can be a combination of questions to Council, comments, suggestions, complaints or discussions between users. The verbatim posts have been summarised below:

**Help us develop a new Bicycle Action Plan**
- Less pedestrians sharing cycle lanes would definitely help to keep cyclists off the road - the shared lanes along the Ocean Road can be treacherous (pedestrians just step out in front of cyclists, don’t move when you ring the bell due to headphones). Would prefer to use the road on the Ocean Road rather than the cycle lane - too nerve racking.
- Timely action plan after (de-identified) episode on Saturday Ride in slip lanes alongside roads or bike paths – connect the two
- Want a way to report poor bike riding on roads, report faulty paths, need fines for parking in bike lanes

**We welcome your ideas and suggestions**
- Fine cyclists who use the road where path is provided eg Beach Rd (2)
- Separated cycle lanes along priority routes. Connected off-road trails between shopping centres. Safe cycling to schools. Winter sun and summer shade on trails. Densification restricted to within 400m of rail stations to maximise active transport and minimise cars on roads. Share cars parked in key locations to incentivise non-car ownership. 
- Ban bikes on roads
Make Nepean Hwy bike path useable - is like riding on a corrugated dirt track
Make it easier for cyclists to navigate the south-bound road crossings from the slip road - is the main reason they ride on the main highway
Make Beach Road from Black Rock to Elwood bike-free from 7am until 8.30am Monday to Friday so cars can actually drive at the desired road speed and not dodge cyclists (2)
Mordialloc to Elwood: Cleanways and cyclist free during peak times morning and afternoon. allow smoother traffic flow and less accidents
How much money has the Council spent on bicycle paths along Beach Rd? Encourage cyclists to use it instead of the road
More bike racks outside Sandy station / the Parkiteer at Sandy has it as one of the busiest - a few bike racks outside would solve the problem
Take notice of what your cyclists want
Safe and secure bike racks at stations
Car-free periods around sports facilities to facilitate safe active travel to facilities and improve air quality during sports events
Don’t forget there are disabled people who need car access
Make cyclists pay registration like other road users and use that money to create more bike paths
Separation is the answer - make the Beach Road cycleway wider and safer, move them off the roadway
Stop the bikes using the Brighton Elwood path - much too fast and too close to pedestrians

Thanks to everyone who came and talked to us
Lots of people having their say - most of them would probably say “ban cyclists from the road”
Put 1000s of cars back on the road for them to queue behind

4.7 Project Evaluation

In terms of stakeholder reach, no specific targets were set for the first stage of community engagement. The ‘Have Your Say’ on-line engagement portal attracted 114 contributors (319 contributions) and 35 project followers during February-March 2019.

For the second stage of community engagement, it was proposed that the engagement activities would attract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% followers return 20 responses</td>
<td>There were 76 visitors to the Have Your Say platform, with 11 contributors and 3 followers</td>
<td>Measure not met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation debrief workshop will be held following presentation of the report to Council, to identify any process improvements.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to present the finalised Bayside Road Safety Strategy 2019 – 2024 (Attachment 1) to Council for adoption, following a period of public exhibition.

Key issues
The current 2014 Road Safety Strategy has reached the end of the five year period and a new strategy is required for 2019 – 2024.

The Road Safety Strategy sets the direction and actions that Council will take to improve the safety of all users of the roads and transport system within Bayside. The purpose of the strategy is to reduce the number and severity of road crashes within the municipality.

The vision of the Road Safety Strategy 2019-2024 is:

‘Reducing the number of fatalities and injuries on our road and path network so that people of all ages and abilities can travel safely, easily and confidently within Bayside’.

The community and key stakeholders were invited to comment on the draft. The strategy was realised for public exhibition in May 2019 for a 2 week period and attracted 34 submissions.

A summary of the feedback received, together with an officer response to the submissions provided, is presented in Attachment 2.

A review of the feedback received on the draft Strategy has resulted in only a minor amendment to Key Response 6 - ‘Work in partnership with Victoria Police, VicRoads, Cycling Victoria and other relevant stakeholders to improve conditions for cyclists within Bayside Municipality.’

Recommendation
That Council adopts the Road Safety Strategy 2019 contained in Attachment 1.

Support Attachments
1. Attachment 1 - Road Safety Strategy 2019 - 2024
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Increased road safety saves lives. Reducing the number of fatalities and injuries on our road and path network to zero is the aim of this revised Strategy, aligning with the Victorian Government’s 'Towards Zero' 2016-2020 Road Safety Strategy. People of all ages and abilities should be able to travel safely, easily and confidently within Bayside.

Natural Environment
The installation of signage and the distribution of road safety messaging, communications and resources, will have some impact on the natural environment. Careful consideration will be given to maintain and improve the existing amenity where possible.

Built Environment
Delivery of physical safety treatments, i.e. the installation of signs, bicycle paths, kerb outstands, etc. will have some impact on the built environment. Careful consideration will be given to maintain the existing naturestrip assets and trees where possible.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Engagement activities started on 8 May 2019 and ended on 22 May 2019. The method of communication includes the following but not limited to ‘Have Your Say’ (HYS) platform, emails and letters to road safety stakeholders.

The questions we asked were: ‘Have we got the Strategy right?’ and ‘Have we missed anything?’. Details of all comments received are documented within Attachment 2.

The HYS platform attracted 216 visits, 31 contributors and 13 followers. In addition, 3 emails were received. In total, there were 27 themes to the feedback identified. They consist of: 5 potential improvements; 6 addressed within the Key Response Area, 8 that were not applicable for this Strategy; and 8 site specific issues. Brief responses to the feedback received are documented within Attachment 2.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.

Legal
Bayside recognises that road safety is an individual responsibility that must be accepted by the community, as well as a Government responsibility. There is a need for physical infrastructure improvements to make roads and vehicles safer, and behaviour change programs to raise community awareness.

Finance
Delivery of this strategy and its actions is predominantly through Council officer time and through expenditure of grants from the VicRoads Community Road Safety Grants Program. As such, there is no specific budget allocated to delivery of the Strategy.
Should physical road safety treatments be required, funding would be considered in future capital budgets.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

**Bayside Community Plan 2025**

The Bayside Community Plan 2025 sets the long term vision and goals for the community. The community aspiration is:

‘By 2025, it will be safe and convenient for the Bayside community to choose their preferred mode of transport. Bayside will be more easily accessed on foot and on bike, and road users will consider the safety of others when sharing the road network.’

**Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 – 2028**

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy sets Council’s direction for transport planning for the next 10 years and beyond. The Integrated Transport Strategy recognises that the streets within Bayside provide access for a range of users, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and private vehicles, and need to be managed to provide the safest and most efficient transport system possible. Ensuring the safety of street users is considered to be the most important aspect of any user friendly street. The goals of the Integrated Transport Strategy are:

- Enabling Sustainable Transport Choices;
- Improving Local Accessibility;
- Better Public Transport;
- User Friendly Streets;
- Integrated Transport and Land use; and
- Optimising Parking Opportunities.

User friendly streets are those which incorporate measures such as reduced vehicle speeds and volumes, enable greater sharing between users of streets and public spaces and provide various transport modes and users with a balanced and appropriate level of priority. However, ensuring the safety of street users through the reduction of traffic conflicts and crashes is considered to be the most important aspect of any user friendly street.

**Bayside Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017 - 2021**

The Road Safety Strategy will complement Council’s Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy by addressing trauma on the road and path network, and will assist in achieving safer environments for people of all ages and abilities within Bayside.

**Options considered**

No other options were considered as part of this report.
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1. Executive Summary

Purpose and Alignment

The Bayside City Council’s strategy to reduce the number and severity of road crashes within our municipality is a commitment to meeting community expectations that are addressed by Goal 2 – Transport of the Council Plan 2017 - 2021:

“Sustainable transport is the mode of choice, facilitated through the creation of a well-connected, safe, accessible and convenient transport system that positively contributes to a strong economy, the health and wellbeing of the community and a low-carbon future within Bayside.”

Reducing road trauma by improving road and path safety and promoting safer user behaviour with the community is a demonstration of the Bayside Better Place Approach, whereby Council’s dedicated professional staff, with an ongoing focus on efficiency, provide core services to improve liveability for the Bayside community.

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS), which was adopted by Council in 2018, also identifies road safety as a strategic objective to influence Council’s operations, and scheduled the review and development of a revised Road Safety Strategy as a high priority deliverable to achieve this objective.

The Problem

Road safety affects the lives of drivers, cyclists, passengers and pedestrians within our community. Although Council routinely undertakes works on roads and footpaths to ensure they provide a high level of service for users, incidents of injury and fatal crashes still do occur. The analysis of actual crash data compiled between 2013 and 2018 has been used to inform the goals and actions within this Strategy.

Vision

The following vision has been set for this strategy:

“Reducing the number of fatalities and injuries on our road and path network so that people of all ages and abilities can travel safely, easily and confidently within Bayside.”

Council is committed to improving the safety of all users of the transport system within Bayside and is well placed to assist in reducing road trauma given its strong community links. Council will coordinate its efforts internally across Council departments, and externally with both local and state-wide stakeholders who can play a role in road safety.
Key Response Areas and Goals

This vision is described further by seven key response areas that are supported by goals. These have been used to guide the development and implementation of the Road Safety Strategy, and are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Key Response Areas and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key Response Areas</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordination and leadership of road safety planning and action</td>
<td>In partnership with key agencies, provide strong direction, leadership, coordination and service in road safety, for the benefit of all residents and visitors to Bayside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Young children and their families</td>
<td>Encourage parents and carers to protect young children when they are in vehicles / within the street environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developing and maintaining a safe road and path network</td>
<td>Ensure that the current and future road and path network across the municipality is as safe as possible for all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Older road users and road users with limited mobility</td>
<td>Reduce the incidence of road trauma in older road users and road users with limited mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Safety for pedestrians including mobility scooter users</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and motorised scooter safety and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Safer cycling</td>
<td>Improve bicycle safety and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Safer driving, safer vehicles</td>
<td>Promote safer driving and motorcycling, and safe operation of Council’s fleet vehicles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of the Strategy

While most of the actions listed to achieve the vision and goals of the Strategy are considered core business for Council and involve officer time, projects to deliver infrastructure improvements will be considered as part of the deliberations for the annual capital works budget.
2. Introduction

2.1 Why have a Road Safety Strategy?

The purpose of a Road Safety Strategy is to set the direction and corresponding actions that will have the greatest impact on reducing the number and severity of road crashes within our community.

This Strategy links directly to the Integrated Transport Strategy and will guide the implementation of road safety activities to improve safety for all road users within Bayside.

2.2 The role of Bayside City Council in road safety

Bayside City Council recognises the need to provide a safe, well connected, accessible and convenient transport system that positively contributes to a strong economy, the health and wellbeing of the community and a low carbon future within Bayside and Council is committed to undertaking activities that encourage safe travel behaviour.

All members of the community must take responsibility for improving safety on our roads, whether they be drivers, cyclists, passengers or pedestrians. Local government is well placed to advocate for and promote road safety messages to their communities in order to reduce the number and severity of road crashes.

Whilst traffic engineering has an important role to play in improving road safety, a complementary program of education and social marketing activities is also required to address the behaviour of road users. This Strategy will be a tool for sharing knowledge with the wider community and encouraging the development of a culture of responsibility and shared beliefs, resulting in the creation of safer roads and safer road user behaviour.

The ‘Sphere of Influence’ below shows examples of Council’s extent of control and influence in relation to road safety but not limited to the following:

Figure 1. Council’s extent of control and influence in road safety

- External funding of federal or state governments
- Improvements on roads not managed by Council
- Responsibility for safe driving
- Promote road safety and the safe use of the road network
- Infrastructure we maintain and build
- Measures to improve safety for all road users.

Road Safety Strategy 2019 – 2024
2.3 Vision and objectives for safer travel within Bayside

The Bayside Road Safety Strategy provides specific actions aimed at achieving our vision:

"Reducing the number of fatalities and injuries on our road and path network so that people of all ages and abilities can travel safely, easily and confidently within Bayside."

Council is committed to improving the safety of all users of the transport system within Bayside and is well placed to assist in reducing road trauma given its strong community links. Council has led the development of the Strategy as part of its civic leadership role, and will also lead its implementation. Council will coordinate its efforts internally across Council departments, and externally with both local and state-wide stakeholders who can play a role in road safety.

2.4 Goals and strategic objectives

The main objectives of the Strategy are to:

- Reduce the number of people killed or injured in road crashes within Bayside;
- Enhance safety and accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users, as they are the most vulnerable users of our transport system; and
- Focus on the safety needs of school children, young drivers and older members of the Bayside community.

The vision and objectives will be addressed by:

- Providing road safety education programs that encourage road users to make safe transport decisions;
- Providing social marketing and behavior change activities to encourage the community and visitors to adopt safe travel behavior through their own actions;
- Advocating to State and Federal Government to bring about policy, legislative and infrastructure improvements for road safety; and
- Establishing and fostering strong relationships with stakeholders who can assist Council in delivering road safety programs.
3. Planning and Policy Context

The Road Safety Strategy is informed by existing plans and strategies at both the State and local government level, as outlined within this section.

3.1 State Government Context


The Road Safety Strategy incorporates the key elements of the Towards Zero Safe System approach, including the following four main aspects listed below in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Government and community actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Road Users</td>
<td>Road users have an obligation to follow the road rules to ensure their own safety and the safety of other road users. At local level, this involves raising awareness of the risks people face and the steps they can take to reduce the risks, supported by enforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Vehicles</td>
<td>Achieved at state-wide and national level through a market driven and regulatory approach, with government and manufacturers working together, and at local level through fleet safety policies and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Roads &amp; Safer Speeds</td>
<td>Making local and busy places safer including intersection improvements, speed calming measures on local streets where appropriate and more bike and pedestrian paths to make neighbourhoods more people-friendly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Local Government Context

Bayside Community Plan 2025

The Bayside Community Plan 2025 sets the long term vision and goals for the community. The community aspiration is:

"By 2025, it will be safe and convenient for the Bayside community to choose their preferred mode of transport. Bayside will be more easily accessed on foot and on bike, and road users will consider the safety of others when sharing the road network."

Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 – 2028

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy sets Council’s direction for transport planning for the next 10 years and beyond. The Integrated Transport Strategy recognises that the streets within Bayside provide access for a range of users, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and private vehicles, and need to be managed to provide the safest and most efficient transport system possible. Ensuring the safety of street users is considered to be the most important aspect of any user friendly street.
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The following are the goals of the Integrated Transport Strategy:

- Enabling Sustainable Transport Choices;
- Improving Local Accessibility;
- Better Public Transport;
- User Friendly Streets;
- Integrated Transport and Land use; and
- Optimising Parking Opportunities.

User friendly streets are those which incorporate measures such as reduced vehicle speeds and volumes, enable greater sharing between users of streets and public spaces and provide various transport modes and users with a balanced and appropriate level of priority. However, ensuring the safety of street users through the reduction of traffic conflicts and crashes is considered to be the most important aspect of any user friendly street.

*Bayside Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017 - 2021*

The Road Safety Strategy complements Council’s Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy by addressing trauma on the road and path network, and assisting in the achievement of safer environments for people of all ages and abilities within Bayside.
### 3.3 Road Safety Stakeholders

The roles of the main partners in road safety in Bayside are set out as per table below:

**Table 3. Road Safety Stakeholders and their roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Main roles in road safety improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayside City Council</td>
<td>Civic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Setting directions, considering safety in all decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Undertaking advocacy for road safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic planning, land use planning, social planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To coordinate, drive, administer and monitor implementation of the Road Safety Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration of road safety into Council’s policies, plans and general programs to provide a ‘whole-of-Council’ approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fleet vehicle safety program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing and maintaining a safe local municipal road and path network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Helping to establish and maintain partnerships with, and between, agencies to support road safety initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public education, road safety promotion, advocacy and advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicRoads (South Eastern Metropolitan Region)</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction and maintenance of highways and declared arterial roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of funding for engineering improvements on declared arterial and local municipal roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information, advice and guidance material on a range of road safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internet Crash Stats and other information relating to crashes occurring within the municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Police</td>
<td>Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moorabbin Highway Patrol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community policing through Moorabbin Proactive Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public education, media promotion, advocacy, advice and training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoadSafe South East</td>
<td>Support for Local Government Road Safety Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement community programs that will target the behaviour and attitudes of road user groups, vehicles or road environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Development of the Road Safety Strategy

The Road Safety Strategy 2019 – 2024 has been developed through the following stages:

- Review of relevant State Government and Council strategies and policies;
- Analysis of road crash data using VicRoads Interactive Crash Stats 2013 – 2018 contained in section 4 of the strategy;
- Review actions and measures listed in the preceding Road Safety Strategy 2014 – 2019;
- Evaluate the success of the preceding Strategy and identify improvements on previous actions and measures;
- Discussion with key internal Council staff selected from the following functional units that relates to safe travel on roads within Bayside; and
  - Disability Inclusion
  - Healthy Ageing
  - Urban Design
  - Infrastructure Delivery
  - Youth and Family Services
  - Transport Planning
  - Fleet
  - Traffic Management;
- Development of action plans.

Based on consultation with key stakeholders and the crash data analysis, 7 key response areas with associated action plans have been developed to address the main road safety challenges and opportunities facing Bayside and its key partners in road safety – Victoria Police, VicRoads and RoadSafe South East.
4. Key Response Areas, Goals and Actions

The findings presented in the appendix have been used to develop key response areas and corresponding goals presented below in Table 4.

The actions to achieve these goals are directed at various aspects of the issues, and take account of the needs of all sections of the community from newborn infants to older people and people with disabilities. As far as possible, multi-faceted and multiagency actions are proposed, as these have been proven to generally be more effective than one-off or single-action approaches.

Table 4. Road Safety Strategy Key Response Areas (KRA) and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key Response Areas</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordination and leadership of road safety planning and action</td>
<td>In partnership with key agencies, provide strong direction, leadership, coordination and service in road safety, for the benefit of all residents and visitors to Bayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Young children and their families</td>
<td>Encourage parents and carers to protect young children when they are in vehicles / within the street environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developing and maintaining a safe road and path network</td>
<td>Ensure that the current and future road and path network across the municipality is as safe as possible for all users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Older road users and road users with limited mobility</td>
<td>Reduce the incidence of road trauma in older road users and road users with limited mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Safety for pedestrians including mobility scooter users</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and motorised scooter safety and accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Safer cycling</td>
<td>Improve bicycle safety and accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Safer driving, safer vehicles</td>
<td>Promote safer driving and motorcycling, and safe operation of Council’s fleet vehicles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Action Plans

### KRA 1: Coordination and leadership of road safety planning and action

**Strategic objective:** Council will partner with key agencies to provide strong direction, leadership, coordination and service in road safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In partnership with key agencies, provide strong direction, leadership, coordination and service in road safety, for the benefit of all residents and visitors to Bayside</td>
<td>Bayside City Council to take a proactive lead role in implementing the Road Safety Strategy in collaboration with stakeholders, the community and other council officers.</td>
<td>Strategy adopted by June 2019</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport</td>
<td>Adoption of Road Safety Strategy (RSS) by Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate and implement community road safety programs and planning in conjunction with RoadSafe South East, Victoria Police and other road safety partnerships.</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual evaluation of RSS to assess implementation of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek opportunities within the various strategic planning cycles to ensure that road safety is appropriately incorporated into all relevant strategies and plans including, but not limited to, the Council Plan, Municipal Strategic Statement and the Bayside Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy.</td>
<td>In accordance with Council planning cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend meetings with key stakeholders as required and collect data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure road safety is reinforced in all relevant strategies, plans and policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**KRA 2: Young children and their families**

**Strategic objective:** Council will encourage parents and carers to protect young children when they are in vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage parents and carers to protect young children when they are in vehicles.</td>
<td>Promote to parents/guardians to make use of regular child restraint checks by a qualified restraint fitter, resourced through Council’s Maternal Child Health service.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Community Services (Family Services) Maternal child health services distributing child restraint resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA 3: Developing and maintaining a safe road network

Strategic objective: Council will ensure the current and future road and path network across the municipality is as safe as possible for all users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the current and future road and path network across the municipality is as safe as possible for all users.</td>
<td>Advocate to VicRoads for the lowering of speed limits to 40km/h on the following Major Activity Centres: Sandringham Activity Centre, Sandringham Black Rock Activity Centre, Black Rock Dendy Village (Hampton Street), Brighton East</td>
<td>At least one street per year from 2019/2020 throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td>Officer time and subject to capital budget proposals</td>
<td>Advocate on 40km/h speed limit reduction to VicRoads for centres identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and rank high risk crash locations within the municipality by conducting an annual review of available crash data, traffic speed and volume data for Bayside, supplemented by inspections, local knowledge and community input.</td>
<td>For those high risk crash locations on Council managed roads, investigate and implement measures to improve safety for all road users.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td>Officer time and subject to capital budget proposals</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport</td>
<td>Number of Local Area Traffic Management measures implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA 4: Older road users and road users with limited mobility

| Strategic objective: Council will reduce the incidence of road trauma in older road users and road users with limited mobility |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal** | **Actions** | **Timeframe** | **Costs** | **Responsible** | **Deliverable** |
| Reduce the incidence of road trauma in older road users and road users with limited mobility | Provide and promote relevant information to encourage aged persons to become safer drivers. Examples of programs that will be delivered in Bayside include 'Wiser Driver'. Provide information to older people about the range of transport options and support services available for them to remain confident, safe and | Throughout the lifespan of the strategy | Officer time | Community Services (Healthy Ageing) | Number of programs delivered subject to funding from VicRoads grant. |
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KRA 5: Safety for pedestrians, including motorised mobility scooter users

**Strategic objective:** Council will improve pedestrian and motorised scooter safety and accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Department Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and motorised scooter safety and accessibility.</td>
<td>Seek to deliver the ‘Safer Scooter and Wiser Wheelchair’ education program to wheelchair users and motorised scooter users. This program covers issues such as road rules and legal requirements, choosing the right mobility scooter and developing safe travel routes. The caveat of delivering this action will be dependent on the continuity of a Metro Access/Disability Inclusion Officer at Bayside and success of obtaining the program grant from VicRoads.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Open Space, Recreation and Wellbeing</td>
<td>Number of programs delivered subject to funding from VicRoads grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that the needs of motorised scooter users are considered in streetscape design.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Urban Strategy, Sustainability and Transport, and City Assets and Projects</td>
<td>Needs of motorised scooter considered and, where required, addressed within projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### KRA 6: Safer cycling

**Strategic objective:** Council will improve bicycle safety and accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Department Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve bicycle safety and accessibility</td>
<td>Provide and promote relevant information to educate cyclists in relation to road safety and the safe use of the road network.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One article per year to be included within ‘Let’s Talk Bayside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work in partnership with Victoria Police, VicRoads, Cycling Victoria and other relevant stakeholders to improve conditions for cyclists within Bayside Municipality.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of coordinated activities delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote bicycle safety leading up to summer and at the end of daylight savings, aimed at increasing visibility, helmet wearing and responsible behaviour on the shared path network.</td>
<td>April / October 2019. Repeated annually.</td>
<td>Officer time</td>
<td>Sustainability and Transport</td>
<td>Include an article within ‘Let’s Talk Bayside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through the Bayside Bicycle Action Plan, improve safety for cyclists at those locations on the Metropolitan Bicycle Network where cyclist crashes / relevant safety issues have been identified.</td>
<td>Coordinated through the implementation of the Bayside Bicycle Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sites treated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA 7: Safer driving and safer vehicles

Strategic objective: Council will promote safer driving and motorcycling, and safe operation of Council’s fleet vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Department Responsible</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote safer driving and motorcycling, and safe operation of Council’s fleet vehicles.</td>
<td>Provide and promote information to young drivers about the responsibilities of safe driving, including but not limited to mobile phone use when driving and vehicle confiscation legislation, through schools, sporting clubs and young people’s venues and networks.</td>
<td>Throughout the lifespan of the strategy</td>
<td>Community Services (Youth Services)</td>
<td>Distribution of information to relevant young people’s venues and networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assist learner drivers to gain supervised experience safely through programs and resources such as L2P.</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Community Services (Youth Services)</td>
<td>Number of learner drivers assisted in L2P program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that all new fleet vehicles comply with a minimum 5 star Australian New Car Assessment Program (ANCAP) safety rating.</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Finance Department (Fleet Management)</td>
<td>Number of new fleet vehicles complying with ANCAP 5 star safety rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote the use of VicRoads car door sticker packs to remind drivers and passengers to look out for bike riders before getting in and out of vehicles.</td>
<td>Immediate and ongoing</td>
<td>Finance Department (Fleet Management) / Sustainability and Transport</td>
<td>Number of sticker packs distributed All council fleet vehicles to display stickers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Appendix

Using data obtained from VicRoads Interactive Crashstats 2013 - 2018, a detailed crash analysis has been undertaken for Bayside managed roads. The roads managed by Bayside include: laneways; service lanes; local, collector and secondary arterial and limited arterial roads; located within the Bayside municipality.

Crashes resulting only in vehicle and/or property damage, and those where the police did not attend, have not been included in this analysis.

The definitions of fatal crashes, fatality and injury are defined as below:

- Fatal Crashes – Number of crashes where a fatality occurs.
- Fatality – Number of people killed as a result of a crash.
- Injury – An instance of being injured

6.1 Fatal Crashes, 2008 - 2018

The number of fatal crashes that have occurred in Bayside has reduced during implementation of the Road Safety Strategy 2013 - 2018. During this period, 4 fatal crashes were recorded on Bayside managed roads. In comparison, there were 11 fatal crashes recorded in Bayside in crash analysis from 2008 to 2012. This data is represented below in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Number of Fatal Crashes in Bayside (2008 - 2018)](image-url)
6.2 Fatalities by Road User Category, 2008 - 2018

As shown in Figure 2, there were 4 fatalities recorded on Bayside managed roads in 2013 - 2018 in contrast to 11 fatalities recorded in 2008 - 2012. Drivers are the user group representing the highest number of fatalities occurring on Bayside managed roads during 2013 - 2018. In comparison to 2008 - 2012 crash analysis, pedestrians and motorcyclists were the highest user groups at 3 fatalities.

FIGURE 2: ROAD USER CATEGORY OF FATALITIES 2008 - 2018

6.3 Age of Fatalities and Road User Category, 2008 - 2018

Elderly drivers represent the road user group most involved in fatal accidents on Bayside managed roads between 2013 and 2018. In the 2008 - 2012 crash analysis, elderly pedestrians were the road user group with the highest number of fatalities Age groups that are not reflected in Figure 3 have not been involved in fatalities in Bayside during 2008 - 2018.

FIGURE 3: AGE OF FATALITIES AND ROAD USER CATEGORY 2013 - 2018
6.4 People Injured by Road User Category, 2008 - 2018

As shown in Figure 4 below, drivers and cyclists are the group of road users most injured on Bayside managed roads in 2013 - 2018. This is similar to crash data analysed for 2008 - 2012. However, the reduction in the number of people injured across all groups of road users in 2013 - 2018 is a significant improvement.

![Figure 4: Number of People Injured in Bayside (2008 - 2018)](image)

6.5 Pedestrian Injuries by Age, 2008 - 2018

Elderly pedestrians, in particular females, represent the highest pedestrian group injured on Bayside managed roads. This is consistent with the crash data findings for 2008 - 2012. The highest cluster of injuries occurred in Brighton within the proximity of Church and Bay Streets activity centres. Age groups that are not reflected in Figure 5 have not been involved in any pedestrian injuries in Bayside during 2008 - 2018.

![Figure 5: Number of Pedestrians Injured in Bayside (2008 - 2018)](image)
6.6 Analysis of Injuries by Age and Gender, 2013 - 2018

A comparison between crash statistics data for 2008 - 2012 and 2013 - 2018 is not possible as data for 2008 - 2012 is no longer available within the current VicRoads Interactive Crashstats records. As such, the following figures 6 to 12 are limited to reporting on the 2013 - 2018 period.

Cyclists

As shown in Figure 6, the highest number of cyclists injured were in the 40 to 49 year old age group, with 28 injuries on Bayside managed roads. The highest cluster for cyclist injuries occurred along New Street. It is noted these injuries occurred before the on-street bicycle lane treatments were delivered in 2015.

Drivers

As shown in Figure 7, female drivers injured on Bayside managed roads outnumbered male drivers for the 5 year period, with middle-age drivers aged 30 to 39 sustaining the highest injury count. The highest cluster of injuries occurred north of South Road, within Brighton and Brighton East.

Road Safety Strategy 2019 – 2024
Motorcyclists

As depicted in Figure 8, male motorcyclists injured on Bayside managed roads outnumbered female motorcyclists for the 5 year period, with motorcyclists aged 18 to 25 sustaining the highest injury count. The highest cluster of injuries occurred in Brighton.

![Figure 8: Number of Motorcyclist Injured in Bayside (2013 - 2018)]

Passengers

As shown in Figure 9, female passengers injured on Bayside managed roads outnumbered male passengers for the 5 year period, with young people aged 18 to 25 and elderly passengers aged 80+ sustaining the highest injury count. The highest cluster of injuries occurred in Brighton.

![Figure 9: Number of Passengers Injured in Bayside (2013 - 2018)]
6.7 Analysis of Fatalities and Injuries by Gender and Location 2013 - 2018

Figures 10 and 11 show the fatalities and injuries that occurred on Bayside managed roads by gender in 2013 - 2018.

Figure 12 shows the location of fatalities and injuries on VicRoads managed roads, and Bayside managed roads, within the Bayside municipality.
6.8 Identified Trends and People at Risk as Per VicRoads Road Safety Performance Ranking, 2013 – 2017

The following points describe the trends from the data presented.

- The majority of the recorded casualty crashes on Bayside managed roads occurred on a clear day, during day time.
- The highest type of crashes recorded on Bayside managed roads were side impact crashes at intersections, followed by rear end crashes, with the lowest crash type due to overtaking.
- In comparison with neighbouring Councils such as Port Phillip, Glen Eira and Kingston, Bayside scored the second lowest number of fatal accidents.
- The majority of accidents occurred on a road with an operating legal speed limit of 60km/h, followed by 50km/h and 40km/h. These speed limits are the typical speed limits within Bayside managed roads.
- Most accidents on Bayside managed roads occurred during normal business and commuting hours.
- The following user / age groups travelling on Bayside managed roads are at high risk of accidents:
  - Bicycles: aged 40 to 59
  - Pedestrians: aged 60 to 79
  - Passengers: aged 18 to 25 and 80+
  - Drivers: aged 30 to 49
  - Motorcyclists: aged 18 to 25
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1 Background

Bayside City Council’s five-year Road Safety Strategy 2014 has been reviewed to determine if the actions in the Strategy are still relevant, have been completed or require further input from the community.

Council has now developed a draft Bayside Road Safety Strategy (RSS) 2019 – 2024, to guide the implementation of road safety activities within Bayside for the next five year period. The aim of the Strategy is to reduce the number of fatalities and injuries on our road and path network so that people of all ages and abilities can travel safely, easily and confidently within Bayside.

The community and key stakeholders were invited to comment on the revised strategy in draft form, to ensure ‘we have got the Strategy right’ and determine ‘if we have missed anything’. It is anticipated the final draft will be presented to Council at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 25 June 2019. Actions will be then be implemented following the endorsement of the RSS.

This report provides details of the community engagement process and the feedback received on the draft Strategy. Council’s proposed response to the issues identified during the engagement phase are also noted in this report.

2 Consultation process

2.1 Consultation purpose

The engagement process was open to all residents and any visitors/tourists to the Bayside area. The purpose of the engagement process was to seek resident and stakeholder feedback on the draft RSS, in particular how Bayside Council can be supported to educate road users and enforce road safety, and any site-specific or issue-specific actions not identified in the draft document. The engagement negotiables and non-negotiables for this project have not been identified, given its limited scope.

Stakeholders

Within this document, reference is made to stakeholders. The project stakeholders are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillors</td>
<td>Victoria Walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td>Bicycle Network Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Council staff</td>
<td>RoadSafe South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbouring Councils (Port Phillip, Kingston and Glen Eira)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools within Bayside municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Consultation methodology

The following activities were undertaken:

- project information hosted on the on-line engagement platform Have Your Say;
- promotion of the project using Council communication channels including social media;
- comment on the draft Strategy collected via the Have Your Say engagement platform.
Attachment 2

Item 10.19 – Reports by the Organisation

3 Consultation findings

The following section summarises the key themes which arose in the community feedback about road safety in Bayside. Council’s proposed response to the issues identified are also noted in this section. In the interest of stakeholder and community privacy, individual quotes have not been included within this public document.

3.1 Feedback from the general public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Received</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A target date to achieve Strategy vision is unknown</td>
<td>Feedback noted. A target date for the Road Safety Strategy vision is deemed not required. However we aim to deliver the Key Response Areas 1 - 6 identified throughout the lifespan of this strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost associated with the delivery of speed limit reduction in Major Activity Centres needs to be reviewed</td>
<td>Black Rock and Dendy Village Activity Centres are located along the arterial road network. Funding the delivery of speed limit reduction in these areas is the responsibility of the state government. As such the action listed for KRA 3 is to advocate. In relation to Sandringham Activity Centre, the cost for delivery have been updated to suggest ‘officer time and subject to capital budget proposals’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of drivers to use their signalling indicators when turning left/right</td>
<td>Feedback will be addressed via KRA 1 ‘Develop and implement an annual communication plan to support the Road Safety Strategy and to promote road safety messages and education within the municipality’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of road users’ priority at roundabouts</td>
<td>Feedback will be addressed via KRA 1 ‘Develop and implement an annual communication plan to support the Road Safety Strategy and to promote road safety messages and education within the municipality’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage sustainable modes of transport</td>
<td>Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Integrated Transport Strategy, Walking Strategy and Bicycle Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10.19 – Reports by the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with the administration at local schools concerning road safety</td>
<td>Feedback will be addressed via KRA 1 'Coordinate and implement community road safety programs and planning in conjunction with RoadSafe South East, Victoria Police and other road safety partnerships'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing along Holyrood Street, adjacent to the railway tracks requires extension</td>
<td>It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council's Traffic Management Unit for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore vegetation adjacent to New Street and Beach Roads requires ongoing maintenance</td>
<td>It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council's Open Space, Recreation &amp; Wellbeing Department for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of lowering speed limits on safer outcomes</td>
<td>Safer speeds are well discussed within Transport Accident Commission (TAC) campaign and it forms part of the Safe System Approach as documented within the State Government Toward Zero Campaign, page 30 'What the research tells us? - Reduced travel speeds and traffic calming in local streets'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve bicycle treatments at roundabouts</td>
<td>Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Bicycle Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve cycling support for other streets, not just Beach Road</td>
<td>Feedback adopted to KRA6 'Work in partnership with Victoria Police, VicRoads, Cycling Victoria and other relevant stakeholders to improve conditions for cyclists within Bayside Municipality'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve maintenance and upgrade road surfaces and footpaths</td>
<td>Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Walking Strategy and Bicycle Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian crossing signs on Milroy Street, Brighton East</td>
<td>It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council's Traffic Management Unit for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian safety on Park and Reserve Roads</td>
<td>It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council’s Traffic Management Unit for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve road safety education for all road users</td>
<td>Feedback will be addressed via KRA 1 'Develop and implement an annual communication plan to support the Road Safety Strategy and to promote road safety messages and education within the municipality'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce speed limit reduction in New Street, between Rusden Street and Nepean Highway</td>
<td>It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council’s Traffic Management Unit for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce speed limit reduction in Black Rock, Sandringham and Brighton shopping precincts</td>
<td>Feedback will be addressed via KRA 3 'Advocate to VicRoads for the lowering of speed limits to 40km/h on the following Major Activity Centres: Sandringham Activity Centre, Sandringham Black Rock Activity Centre, Black Rock'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10.19 – Reports by the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dendy Village (Hampton Street), Brighton East’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Introduce speed reduction treatment on Well Street, Brighton | It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council’s Traffic Management Unit for consideration. |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|

| Introduce Road Safety Award as part of Bayside’s Australia Day awards | Suggestion noted and shall be passed on to Governance Department for consideration. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|

| More pedestrian crossings facilities | Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Walking Strategy |
|--------------------------------------|

| No mention of Council’s Neighbourhood Character Study | Not applicable for this strategy |
|------------------------------------------------------|

| Provide safer paths for cyclists | Feedback will be addressed via KRA 6 ‘Through the Bayside Bicycle Action Plan, improve safety for cyclists at those locations on the Metropolitan Bicycle Network where cyclist crashes / relevant safety issues have been identified’ and the Bicycle Action Plan |
|----------------------------------|

| Review doesn’t address the uptake of cycling/walking for school-age children in Bayside | Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Bicycle Action Plan |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| The way of the future will include autonomous car not necessarily public transport | Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Integrated Transport Strategy |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Traffic/pedestrian signal adjacent to Melrose Street and Beach Road intersection requires review | It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council’s Traffic Management Unit for consideration. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Traffic/pedestrian signals required on Wellington Street, intersecting with Esplanade | It is a site specific issue. Concern noted and shall be passed on to Council’s Traffic Management Unit for consideration. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Undertake audit of best way pedestrians and cyclist actively get to destinations, map these routes to prioritise funding | Not applicable for this strategy. It is however covered within the Walking Strategy and Bicycle Action Plan |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

In summary, there were 27 issues identified in the feedback received - 5 are potential improvements, 6 are addressed within the Key Response Area, 8 were not applicable for this particular Strategy and 8 site-specific issues.

### 3.2 Project Evaluation

In terms of stakeholder reach, it was proposed that the engagement activities would attract:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 responses received via <em>Have Your Say</em> platform</td>
<td>There were 216 visitors to the <em>Have Your Say</em> platform, 31 contributors and 13 followers</td>
<td>Measure not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback received to either acknowledge the findings, goals and actions or improvements identified to add to the list of actions.</td>
<td>3 emails received in addition of the 31 contributors from the <em>Have Your Say</em> platform</td>
<td>Measure met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the consultation will inform and assist Council’s decision making towards the endorsement of the revised RSS.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to present community feedback on the proposed introduction of parking technology in Church Street, Brighton.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 19 February 2019, Council resolved to:

1. **Note the available technology options and costs associated with the introduction of parking technology within the Church Street Major Activity Centre (MAC);**
2. **Undertake community engagement activities associated with the introduction of parking technology as identified in Option 1 (in-ground vehicle detection sensors) in March 2019; and**
3. **Receive a further report regarding the findings from the community engagement activities at the June 2019 Council meeting.**

Key issues
Providing car parking to satisfy the demands of all road users is one of the biggest challenges faced by Council. The demand for parking often outweighs the supply, particularly in activity centres, meaning that there are not enough parking spaces available in some of the high demand areas. Maximising the efficient use of existing spaces can improve the parking experience for users.

Many Councils are opting to install intelligent parking systems to improve parking management to deliver greater public benefit. Parking technology is used to both maximise the utilisation of existing parking spaces by guiding drivers to vacant spaces.

Data Collection
The introduction of parking technology would allow the ongoing and ‘real-time’ collection of car parking data. This data could be used to inform Council’s future car parking policy approach for the provision of additional car parking spaces in the Church Street Major Activity Centre (MAC). Key data able to be collected includes:

- **Occupancy rate** – the ratio between the number of parked vehicles and the number of available car parking spaces, or parking capacity;
- **Average parking time** – the average time each vehicle spends in a parking space; and
- **Turnover rate** – the average number of vehicles using the same car parking space over a specific period.

**Church Street Major Activity Centre**
The intent of introducing parking technology within the Church Street MAC is to provide drivers with ‘real-time’ information on parking availability.
The scope of the project is to introduce in-ground vehicle detection sensors in:

- Church Street, between Male Street and New Street;
- 21–27 Well Street car park;
- Car park behind 115 Church Street;
- Black Street car park; and
- 5 Well Street car park.

Signs that display parking availability using data from the sensors would guide drivers to available parking spaces.

Community Engagement Findings

On 18 March 2019, Council commenced engagement with the community on whether Council should introduce parking technology to assist motorists to find parking spots in and around Church Street, Brighton. The engagement ended on 26 April 2019.

Details on the feedback received are provided in Attachment 1 and in the Customer Service and Community Engagement section of the report.

There was a mixed response with a slim majority of respondents supporting the project.

The top 3 key concerns raised were:

- Waste of money;
- Revenue Raising; and
- Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape.

All of these issues can be addressed through providing information on the project.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Introduces in-ground vehicle detection sensors to provide real-time data to motorists about the number of vacant spaces in the area via electronic signs, and a smartphone application in:
   
   - Church Street, between Male Street and New Street;
   - 21–27 Well Street car park;
   - Car park behind 115 Church Street;
   - Black Street car park; and
   - 5 Well Street car park.

2. Notes that funding for the project design and delivery has been allocated in the 2019/20 Budget.

3. Receives a report at a Council meeting at least 12 months after the signs and smartphone application are active on:
   
   - the evaluation of the introduction of in-ground vehicle detection sensors in the Church Street Major Activity Centre; and
   - if the project has proven successful, the development of a multi-year program to install parking management technology (i.e. parking sensors) in Bay Street, Hampton Street, Sandringham Village, Martin Street, Beaumaris Concourse and the Black Rock Activity Centres in both on and off-street parking spaces.
Support Attachments

1. Attachment 1 - Church Street Parking Technology Community Engagement Report
2. Attachment 2 - Letter of Support from Church Street Traders Association, Parking Technology in Church Street Major Activity Centre
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The introduction of parking technology within the Church Street Major Activity Centre (MAC) will provide motorists with real-time information on parking availability within the core precinct. This directs motorists to available off-street car parking. Alternatively, if all off-street car parking is full, it will inform them to seek parking in streets within a short walk to the Church Street MAC. Parking surveys show that there is existing capacity for parking in these streets.

The use of parking technology will deliver greater public benefit through increased equity of access to parking. Decisions on travel mode to the Church Street MAC could potentially be made in advance using the smartphone application.

Natural Environment
Car drivers circling in search of a vacant space within the Church Street MAC add to localised congestion within the core precinct. The provision of real-time parking data will reduce the number of drivers searching for a space within the core precinct at times of low parking availability.

Any reduction in localised vehicle congestion will have a positive impact on the natural environment through a reduction in vehicle emissions.

Built Environment
The introduction of parking technology in the form of in-ground vehicle detection sensors will have a minimal impact on the built environment.

The introduction of electronic signs within the activity centre will impact the existing streetscape and may result in the loss of some existing footpath trading, dependent on their location. However, the proposed location of the electronic signs will be carefully considered with any impacted traders to minimise impact on the existing streetscape.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Engagement activities commenced on 18 March and ended on 26 April 2019. The methods of communication included the following but was not limited to:

- Website
- Website news stories on home page
- Social media
- Let’s Talk Bayside
- Advertising – Leader and Facebook
- Postcard survey
- Display materials at Brighton Library
- Have Your Say platform
- Information session materials/display
- Electronic direct mail (EDM) – key stakeholders
The three questions asked were:

- Is parking in and around Church Street a problem for you/others in your household?
- Do you support the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations? Please note that both are related and necessary to make the technology work and identify free spaces.
- If you have concerns or do not support the proposal, please explain.

Feedback Summary

The feedback received from members of the public, including Church Street Traders Association is summarised below.

- The majority of the respondents acknowledged that parking in and around Church Street is a problem.
- The majority of the respondents supported the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations:
  - Church Street, between Male and New Streets;
  - 21–27 Well Street car park;
  - Car park behind 115 Church Street;
  - Black Street car park; and
  - 5 Well Street car park.
- The top three key concerns raised were:
  - Waste of money;
  - Revenue Raising; and
  - Concern with the potential impact to the Church Street streetscape.

The following table provides responses to these concerns.

Further details of the community engagement findings are documented in the Community Engagement Report (Attachment 1).
Key Concerns Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Discussion/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money</td>
<td>Council has investigated and analysed the cost of parking management technologies to improve car parking around Church Street at the defined locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The parking sensor technology considered for this project provides the following value:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It facilitates the ongoing collection of car parking data, which can be used to inform Council’s future car parking policy approach for the provision of additional car parking spaces around Church Street at the defined locations. Key data collected would include occupancy rate, average parking time and turnover rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It provides accurate information about how parking is being used by the community, including peak periods of the day and seasonal trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It allows Council to better manage the existing time limited parking restrictions, evaluate other parking options as well as having the capacity to redirect the community to underutilised parking areas using either the physical signs or a consumer parking guidance app (which is already used by over 29,000 Bayside residents) based on the length of parking time required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximising the use of existing parking space prolongs the need for the construction of extra parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue raising</td>
<td>The primary objective for the introduction of parking sensors and electronic directional signage around Church Street at the defined locations is to maximise the utilisation of existing parking spaces and to ensure that sufficient parking opportunities exist for drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking sensors and electronic directional signage can deliver improvements in managing traffic congestion, traffic flow, provide fairer access to parking by all the community and considerably improve parking turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While the parking sensors do detect the length of stay of a vehicle, this is not the primary purpose of the sensors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape</td>
<td>The technology considered for this project will have minimal impact on the Church Street streetscape. The sensor technology is buried underneath the road, and not visible. The proposed location of the electronic signs will be carefully considered to minimise impact on the existing streetscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Human Rights**

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**

There are no legal implications associated with this report.
Finance
Indicative costs have been obtained in relation to the in-ground sensor parking technology as well as the cost of providing nine electronic signs. It should be noted that the installation of parking technology would attract an ongoing monthly maintenance fee as long as the technology is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost (Approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-ground vehicle detection sensors (approx. 456 units)</td>
<td>$40,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly support and maintenance (ongoing)</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic signs x 9 (supply and install)</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains and power installation</td>
<td>$153,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management fees</td>
<td>$45,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone app (one off fee)</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (excluding monthly support, maintenance and smartphone app one off fee)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$353,140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the installation of in-ground vehicle detection sensors and the installation of electronic signs within the Church Street MAC, the provisional cost estimate is $353,140, with ongoing maintenance cost of approximately $5,472 per month.

The above costs are early estimates and subject to change based on the final design of the system and the tender response from the market.

A sum of $680,000 has been allocated in the proposed 2019/20 budget for this project.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The introduction of parking technology in Church Street MAC contributes to Goal 2 ‘Transport’ within the 2017-21 Council Plan. It addresses the specific action to ‘update and implement the Integrated Transport Strategy to reflect the new Council’s priorities, including, opportunities for increased parking capacity in activity centres and ‘private car park sharing’ for residents.’

The Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy 2018 also contains actions to:
- ‘Ensure that parking in activity centres is managed so available spaces are used more efficiently to enable appropriate turnover’ (Action item 58);
- ‘Install parking sensors in Bay Street, Church Street, Hampton Street, Sandringham Village, Martin Street, Beaumaris Concourse and the Black Rock Activity Centres in both on and off-street parking spaces.’ (Action item 66);
- ‘Develop a mobile app to provide real-time information on parking availability within activity centres’ (Action item 69); and
- ‘Provide real time information on parking availability on Council’s website (subject to Action No. 66 being implemented)’ (Action item 70).

Options considered
No other options have been considered in the preparation of this paper.
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1 Background

In October 2018, Bayside City Council resolved to investigate an “electronic parking data collection system integrated with real-time parking availability signage”, following an earlier community engagement process about car parking in the Church Street Activity Centre.

In March 2019 Council then commenced a second phase of community engagement on the proposal to introduce in-ground parking sensors, in and around Church Street, to identify vacant car spaces. The sensors will communicate with electronic variable message parking signs, displaying the number of car spaces available for a given location.

The initiative is designed to maximise car parking for shoppers, tourists, traders and commuters and ensure that the Church Street Activity Centre remains vibrant and accessible. The new technology will also be used for data collection and compliance to supplement existing methods, and to inform strategic and infrastructure planning of the Church Street activity centre precinct.

There are no plans to introduce paid parking in the area. Additional information on this proposal is documented within the Report to Council (item 10.4) from the Ordinary Meeting held on 19 February 2019.

This document provides a summary of stakeholder and community feedback on the parking technology proposal for the Church Street Major Activity Centre.

2 Consultation process

2.1 Consultation purpose

The consultation was conducted to gauge the community views concerning the introduction of in-ground vehicle detection sensors within the Church Street Major Activity Centre (MAC). The stakeholders identified are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Councillors</td>
<td>• Traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior Leadership Team</td>
<td>• Church Street Traders Association via Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Council staff</td>
<td>Development and Kieran Cromie, Church Street Traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate residents – close to Church Street (200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metres radius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Broader residents – rest of Bayside community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoppers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Visitors/tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The areas that stakeholders can influence and inform are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiables</th>
<th>Non-negotiables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future use of sensors and</td>
<td>Sensors must be install for each car space, in on- and off-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signs</td>
<td>street locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not introducing paid parking

No change to parking restrictions immediately planned
Electronic parking availability signage locations indicated by preliminary plan is driven by technical requirements

Electronic parking availability signage design to be driven by VicRoads guidelines

Internet connection for sensor signaling

Gateways and relays are small and multiple of them are required. It is intended for the hardware to go on existing infrastructure or electronic parking availability signage

Car park locations specified in Council report to be included

Data gathered through sensors will be used to inform overhead electronic signage for nominated parking availability, user app and enforcement purposes.

The three questions for the community engagement were:

- Is parking in and around Church Street a problem for you/other in your household?
- Do you support the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations? (please note that these questions are related and necessary to make the technology work and identify free spaces); and
- If you have concerns or do not support the proposal, please explain.

The engagement process formally commenced on 18 March 2019 and concluded on 26 April 2019.

2.2 Consultation methodology

The table below outlines the consultation activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 March to 26 April 2019</td>
<td>‘Have your say’ on-line engagement portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Respondents</td>
<td>Questionnaire (comprising three questions noted above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 March to 26 April 2019</td>
<td>Hardcopy surveys – collected via engagement events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 Respondents</td>
<td>Hardcopy form of questionnaire (comprising three questions noted above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
<td>‘Have your say’ pop-up session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30am - 11:30am</td>
<td>Church Street near the Palace Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 50 attendees with 42</td>
<td>Questionnaire distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2019</td>
<td>‘Have your say’ pop-up session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12pm - 2pm</td>
<td>Church Street outside Woolworths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 70 attendees with 50</td>
<td>Questionnaire distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>survey respondents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 April 2019
6 - 7.30pm
6 attendees with 3 survey respondents

Community Information session
Brighton Town Hall, Corner of Carpenter & Wilson Streets
Presentation of detailed information/technology to interested community members. Attendees’ verbatim comments were documented in writing by Council officers.
Questionnaire distributed

20 – 29 March 2019
3 Facebook posts
26 comments mainly on alternative transport options, the need for additional parking and support for the proposal

Social media – Bayside Council Facebook page
Facebook posts made in response to key messages and promotion of feedback opportunity

12 March – 26 April 2019
2 emails were received

Correspondence with Council officers

A total of 92 survey forms were completed during the pop-up sessions.
There were a total of 306 contributions towards this engagement process.

3 Consultation findings

The following section summarises the key themes which arose in community feedback on parking technology in the Church Street Major Activity Centre.

In the interest of stakeholder and community privacy, individual quotes have not been included within this public document. Where there was more than one mention of a topic or item, the number of mentions has been specified in brackets.

3.1 Feedback from the general public

Out of 306 respondents, 212 respondents acknowledged that parking in and around Church Street is a problem and, 155 respondents supported the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street.

(Refer to the tables and charts for details)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Responses / Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is parking in and around Church Street a problem for you/others in your household?</td>
<td>Yes, often (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, sometimes (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you support the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to proposal</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>No of mentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Support – Strongly/Somewhat | ▪ Anti-signage  
▪ Revenue raising  
▪ Pro infringement  
▪ Impact on surrounding residents  
▪ Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape  
▪ Available spaces filled due to time delay between availability shown on sign and arrival into the car park  
▪ Additional car parking spaces required  
▪ Other | ▪ 2  
▪ 7  
▪ 3  
▪ 5  
▪ 4  
▪ 2  
▪ 9  
▪ 5 |
| Oppose – Strongly/Somewhat | ▪ Anti-signage  
▪ Waste of money  
▪ Revenue raising  
▪ Pro infringement  
▪ Impact on surrounding residents  
▪ Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape  
▪ Available spaces filled due to time delay between availability shown on sign and arrival into the car park  
▪ Additional car parking spaces required | ▪ 2  
▪ 43  
▪ 32  
▪ 1  
▪ 2  
▪ 23  
▪ 13  
▪ 20 |
| Neutral | ▪ Pro infringement  
▪ Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape  
▪ Additional car parking spaces required  
▪ Other | ▪ 1  
▪ 1  
▪ 3  
▪ 1 |
3.2 Feedback from Church Street Traders Association

The Church Street Traders Association made of 110 members out of 190 retail businesses have also responded. They acknowledge parking in and around Church Street is a problem and are in support for the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Church Street Traders Association Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is parking in and around Church Street a problem for you/others in your household?</td>
<td>Yes, often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations?</td>
<td>Strongly support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Feedback Summary

In light of the data presented for item 3.1 and 3.2, the following trends are identified:

- Majority of the respondents are acknowledging parking in and around Church Street is a problem.
- Majority of the respondents support for the installation of sensors and signage in and around Church Street at the defined locations:
  - Church Street, between Male and New Streets;
  - 21 – 27 Well Street car park;
  - Car park behind 115 Church Street;
  - Black Street car park; and
  - 5 Well Street car park.
- The top 3 key concerns raised are:
  - Waste of money;
  - Revenue Raising; and
  - Concerned with potential impact to Church Street streetscape.

3.4 Project Evaluation

In terms of stakeholder reach, it was proposed that the engagement activities would attract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 30 participants per session drop in</td>
<td>A total of 120 attendees and 92 participants across two sessions</td>
<td>Measure meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50 attendees for the information session meeting;</td>
<td>A total of 6 attendees</td>
<td>Measure not meet, considerably less attendees than expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 500 visits, 150 contributors and 50 followers to the on-line engagement platform Have Your Say</td>
<td>A total of 542 visits, 57 contributors and 39 followers</td>
<td>Whilst the number of visits to the Have Your Say platform is meet, the number of contributors and followers are less than expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consultation process has identified a wide range of community concerns towards the proposal.

The results of the consultation will inform and assist Council’s decision making towards the introduction of parking technology in Church Street Major Activity Centre.
26/04/19

Dear Henry,

Thank you for meeting with Scully and myself on Thursday 18th April to discuss Council’s proposed installation of Parking Pods and associated Digital Car Space Signage.

I am pleased to report that the Church Street Traders Association are of the opinion that this proposal should be supported by Council.

Key to this project is the data that will be available to clearly identify the parking demands in Church St, Brighton. We note that this is a pilot program that Council wish to implement throughout Bayside. We believe this data will be an invaluable asset in determining future strategies for parking in the area.

The proposed new car parks have proven a divisive issue to the Brighton community, Council have deferred their decision due to this impasse, by gaining accurate data we will all be in better position for future planning.

We are hopeful that this initiative will not result in a negative sentiment toward Council as a revenue producing enterprise.

Digital signage is proposed which will make it easier for shoppers to locate a place to park which should create a more positive experience when visiting our precinct.

We hope for a positive outcome and applaud Council’s considered approach to this issue.

All the best,

Tim Purton Smith
Committee Member

Keiran Cromie
President
10.21 CARBON NEUTRALITY ACTION PLAN 2018-2020 UPDATE

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure - Environment
File No: PSF/19/955 – Doc No: DOC/19/156523

Executive summary

Purpose and background
At the Ordinary Meeting on 20 March 2018, Council resolved to receive further report on progress of the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan 2018-2020 at a Council meeting in the first half of 2019, including the feasibility of battery technologies for power storage.

The purpose of this report is to reschedule this matter until Council's Ordinary Meeting in August 2019.

Key issues
Council’s approach to achieving carbon neutrality is outlined in the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan. A major action to bring Council closer to achieving its carbon neutrality commitment is to procure energy from large scale renewable energy projects.

Participating in a renewable energy Power Purchase Agreement allows Council to address Action 3.5 within its Carbon Neutrality Action Plan, by switching from fossil fuel non renewable energy sources to renewable sources.

At its Ordinary Meeting on 19 February 2019, Council resolved to:

1. Commit to the procurement of renewable electricity through a Power Purchase Agreement with Procurement Australia, for Council’s Public Lighting and Large Market sites; and
2. Commit to the procurement of renewable electricity through the South East Melbourne Renewable Energy Project, for Council’s Small Market sites.

The development of contracts for the procurement of renewable electricity is in progress and has direct relevance to the report on progress of the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan. As such, it is recommended to defer the report on progress of the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan until the Ordinary Meeting in August 2019, so that a more informative report can be presented to Council.

Recommendation

Support Attachments
Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community
There are no community implications from the recommendation in this report.

Natural Environment
There are no implications on the natural environment from the recommendation in this report.

Built Environment
There are no implications on the built environment from the recommendation in this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There are no customer service or community engagement implications from the recommendation in this report.

Human Rights
There are no human rights implications from the recommendation in this report.

Legal
There are no legal implications from the recommendation in this report.

Finance
There are no financial implications from the recommendation in this report.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025
Carbon Neutrality Action Plan 2018-2020

Options considered
There are no options presented to the recommendation to Council.
10.22 STATUTORY REVIEW PROCUREMENT POLICY 2019

Corporate Services - Commercial Services
File No: PSF/19/965 – Doc No: DOC/19/146792

Executive summary

Purpose and background
Council’s Procurement Policy was first adopted by Council on 13 September 2011. It is a requirement under section 186A of the Local Government Act 1989 that this policy be reviewed at least once per annum. The current policy was adopted by Council on 19 June 2018.

Council’s Audit Committee endorsed the proposed changes to the policy at its meeting on 29 May 2019.

Key issues
The purpose of the Procurement Policy is to ensure that Council’s procurement processes and procedures achieve the following overall objectives:

1. Provide best value for money in the procurement of goods, services and works;
2. Are conducted, and are seen to be conducted, in an impartial, fair and ethical manner;
3. Provide a robust, accountable and transparent audit trail;
4. Comply with legislation, other Council policies, Council’s Environmental Sustainability Framework and relevant external standards; and
5. Support and provide a key element in delivering Council’s Plans and Strategies.

The Policy has been amended to incorporate two changes.

The first change, outlined in Clause 6.3.6, aligns the CEO delegations with Council’s decision of 19 March 2019. The second amendment, as outlined in Clause 6.3.5, responds to internal and external audit findings. This amendment now mandates that, for purchases under $500 where no purchase order is raised, the invoice requires co-signing thus strengthening internal control.

It should be noted that a more thorough review of the policy will be conducted during the next financial year.

Recommendation
That Council adopts the amended Procurement Policy contained in Attachment 1.

Support Attachments
1. Procurement Policy ↓
**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**
The Procurement Policy requires that Council consider community building as a criteria in the procurement of goods, services and works where appropriate.

**Natural Environment**
The Procurement Policy requires that Council considers sustainability as a criteria in the procurement of goods, services and works where appropriate.

**Built Environment**
The Procurement Policy contributes to the built environment by providing a framework for the engagement of suppliers who contribute and build Council assets.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**
The Procurement Policy reinforces Council’s commitment to ensuring all community views are considered through inclusive deliberations and active involvement of the community.

**Human Rights**
The implications of this report and the Procurement Policy have been assessed an are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**
The Procurement Policy was prepared and approved under section 186A of the *Local Government Act 1989*. Under section 186A (7) of the *Local Government Act 1989*, Council’s Procurement Policy must be reviewed at least once each financial year.

**Finance**
One of the main objectives of the Procurement Policy is to ensure best value for money in the procurement of goods, services and works.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**
The Procurement Policy links to other policies and strategies where those policies and strategies rely on the engagement of external suppliers to perform functions or achieve outcomes on behalf of Council.
1. Policy intent
The intent of the Procurement Policy is to ensure high standards of probity and accountability in Council’s procurement activities while obtaining best value for money outcomes when purchasing goods, services and works and managing contracts and supplier relationships.

2. Purpose/Objective
The purpose of this Policy is to ensure that all Council’s procurement activities:

1. Achieve best value for money in the procurement of goods, services and works;
2. Are conducted, and are seen to be conducted, in an impartial, fair and ethical manner;
3. Provide a robust, accountable and transparent audit trail;
4. Comply with legislation, other Council policies, Council’s Environmental Sustainability Framework and relevant external standards; and
5. Support and provide a key element in delivering Council’s Plans and Strategies.

3. Scope
The Local Government Act 1989 (the Act), section 186A, requires Council to prepare and approve a Procurement Policy. This Policy must be considered in all aspects of Council’s procurement of goods, services and works. Council must also review the Procurement Policy once every financial year and make it available for public inspection at Council offices and on Council’s website.

4. Roles & Responsibilities
The responsibility for implementing, monitoring, evaluating and reviewing the Policy sits with the Director Corporate Services.
All Council staff\(^7\) and Councillors are required to comply with this Policy\(^8\).

Probity Advisor – A probity advisor, where deemed appropriate, provides expert knowledge or understanding throughout the process for reasons of probity risk management. They provide advice on how to improve probity of a process or advise on probity issues as they arise.

Probity Auditors – A probity auditor provides independent audit and objective opinion on probity issues after a process is completed.

5. Monitoring, evaluation & review

The Act requires that the Procurement Policy be reviewed by Council once every financial year. Council’s Audit Committee also provides additional oversight through regular reports.

In reviewing this Policy, Council will consider current best practice approaches to procurement.

6. Policy statement

6.1 General Requirements

6.1.1 Application

The application of this Policy needs to be considered in the overall context of achieving best value for money outcomes for Council and the Bayside community. A key message is that the purchasing of goods, services and works at Bayside needs to be sensitive to customer needs and expectations, market demand and supply and any other relevant market conditions to achieve the best possible procurement outcomes.

To achieve the best value for money, purchasing of goods, services and works at Bayside should consider the cost including acquisition and ongoing maintenance costs. Purchasing should also seek to continuously improve our service delivery, by embracing innovation and technology to find better ways to deliver value for money.

All purchasing, expressions of interest, quotation and tender processes must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of this Policy, Council’s Procurement Procedures and Contract Management Procedures.

6.1.2 Ethics and Probity

In all dealings, the Council will observe the highest standards of probity. Probity is achieved when a defensible process is put in place which is able to withstand internal and external scrutiny. All processes must achieve both accountability and transparency and provide tenderers with fair and equitable treatment. The community expects business in the public sector to be conducted ethically, displaying honesty, integrity, diligence, trust and respect when dealing with others.

\(^7\) Council staff excludes independent contractors and employees of third parties.

\(^8\) Sub-section 186A (9) of the Local Government Act 1989.
The key probity fundamentals are:

**Compliance with Legal and Policy Requirements**
Compliance with the relevant legislation, Council policy and procedures is fundamental to probity.

**Use of a Competitive Process**
A competitive procurement process is used at all times unless an authorised exemption is in place.

**Fairness and Impartiality**
Potential suppliers and contractors competing for works, goods and services are to be treated equally and must have the same opportunity to access information.

**Consistency and Transparency of Process**
Tenderers are to be evaluated in a systematic manner against explicit predetermined evaluation criteria.

**Security and Confidentiality**
The processes adopted for receiving and managing information from suppliers must ensure the security and confidentiality of intellectual property and proprietary information.

**Identification and Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**
If any conflict of interest arises in relation to a procurement process then the person with that conflict must declare that in accordance with legislation and Council policy.

The procurement process should be applied with common sense with flexibility in process design, where appropriate, so that the task of selecting the best submission is fair and equitable.

In an increasingly complex and constrained operating environment there may be times where the procurement plan requires a significant divergence from establishing procedures to deliver the best value for money. If any significant risks to probity fundamentals above can be identified then this points to the need to consider engaging a probity advisor up front.

In some cases, to demonstrate rigour in a procurement process a Probity Auditor may be engaged. This may include projects impacting a broad range of the community where strong divergence of opinion exists, politically sensitivity or very high value in nature. It is up to staff involved in all procurement activity to consider whether a probity advisor or probity auditor should be appointed.

**6.1.3 Conduct of Councillors and Council Staff**
Councillors and Council Staff must at all times conduct themselves in ways that are, and are seen to be, ethical and of the highest integrity. Such conduct must:

- Treat potential and existing suppliers with equality and fairness;
- Not seek or receive personal gain;
- Maintain confidentiality of commercial-in-confidence matters and other sensitive information;
Present the highest standards of professionalism;
Deal with suppliers in an honest and impartial manner;
Provide all interested suppliers with the same information and equal opportunity; and
Be able to account for all decisions and provide feedback on them.

Council Staff are prohibited from either being engaged by a Council contractor or performing any works under a Council contract.

6.1.4 Conflict of Interest
Councillors and Council Staff must avoid situations in which their private interests conflict, or might reasonably be perceived to conflict, or have the potential to conflict, with their public duties.

Councillors and Council Staff must not participate in any action or matter associated with a procurement or management of a contract or purchase (i.e. evaluation, negotiation, recommendation, or approval), where that person or any member of their immediate family has a direct or indirect interest, or holds a position of influence or power in a business undertaking tendering for the work.

The onus is on the Councillor and the member of Council Staff involved being alert to and promptly declaring an actual or potential conflict of interest to Council.

6.1.5 Fair and Honest Dealing
All interested parties must be afforded an equal opportunity to tender. Impartiality must be maintained throughout the procurement process so that it can withstand public and audit scrutiny.

The commercial interests of existing and potential suppliers must be protected. Confidentiality of information provided by existing and prospective suppliers must be maintained at all times, particularly commercially sensitive material.

6.1.6 Accountability and Transparency
Accountability in procurement means being able to explain and evidence what has happened. The test of accountability is that an independent third party must be able to see clearly that a process has been followed and that the process is fair and reasonable.

6.1.7 Gifts and Hospitality
Councillors and members of Council staff must not, either directly or indirectly solicit or accept gifts or presents from any person who is involved, either directly or indirectly, with any matter that is connected with the duties of the officer, or in which the Council is interested.

Councillors and Council staff must exercise the utmost discretion in accepting hospitality from contractors or their representatives, or from organisations, firms or individuals with whom they have official dealings.
Offers of bribes, commissions or other irregular approaches from organisations or individuals (no matter how insubstantial they might seem to be), must be promptly brought to the attention of the Chief Executive Officer.

6.1.8 Endorsement

Council staff must not officially endorse any products or services without approval from Council. Individual requests received for endorsement must be referred to a Director or CEO.

6.1.9 Disclosure of Information

It is Council’s general policy to consider reports recommending the awarding of contracts in open Council meetings. However, Council is committed to not disclosing information that is commercial-in-confidence. Commercial-in-confidence information must not be disclosed and is to be stored in a secure location. Councillors and Council staff must protect information to the extent that it is commercial-in-confidence by refusing to release or discuss it with others. Council may declare that a report recommending the awarding of a contract be heard in camera where the information or matter is so sensitive or where the Council report, by necessity, contains confidential information so that if the report were considered in open Council it would likely cause harm or damage to Council or harm or damage to any tenderer who submitted for that tender and the extent of that harm or damage outweighs the requirement for transparency.

Councillors and Council staff are to avoid references to current or proposed contracts in discussion with acquaintances or outside interests. Discussion with potential suppliers during tender evaluations should not go beyond the extent necessary to resolve doubt about what is being offered by that supplier.

At no stage should any discussion be entered into with any tendering party or its representative or agent which could have potential contractual implications prior to the contract approval process being finalised (other than authorised pre-contract negotiations).

6.1.10 Governance Structure

Council will:

- Maintain a procurement management responsibility structure and delegations ensuring accountability, traceability and auditability of all procurement decisions made over the life of all goods, services and works purchased by Council;
- Ensure that the Council’s procurement structure:
  - Is flexible enough to purchase in a timely manner the diverse range of goods, services or works required by Council but only to the extent that it does not compromise probity, legal requirements or fundamental auditing principles;
  - Ensures that prospective contractors and suppliers are afforded an equal opportunity to compete for Council opportunities;
  - Encourages competition; and
  - Ensures that other policies that impinge on the purchasing policies and practices are communicated to all potential suppliers.
6.1.11 Responsible Financial Management

The principle of responsible financial management must be applied to all procurement activities. This includes ensuring that existing funds within an approved budget, or source of funds, is established prior to the commencement of any procurement action for the supply of goods, services or works.

Council funds must be used efficiently and effectively to procure goods, services and works and every attempt must be made to contain the costs of the procurement process without compromising any of the procurement principles set out in this Policy.

Delegations define the limitations within which Council staff can make financial commitments.

6.2 Sustainable Procurement

In accordance with the Council Plan procurement decisions and initiatives will be based on clear and transparent evidence, informed economic, environmental and social considerations. To achieve sustainable procurement and the objectives and targets in Council's Environmental Sustainability Framework, Council will continue to develop a sustainable procurement approach incorporating economic, environmental, financial and social considerations.

6.2.1 Economic Sustainability

Council’s procurement method and assessment will be carried out on the basis of obtaining value for money. This means controlling the total cost of ownership over the lifetime of the procurement while not compromising on accepted levels of quality, reliability and delivery requirements. Lowest price is not the sole determinate of value for money. To help ensure value for money, the following factors will be considered:

- Developing, implementing and managing procurement strategies that support the coordination and streamlining of activities throughout;
- Effective use of competition;
- Using panel contracts and Standing Offer Agreements where appropriate;
- Identifying and rectifying inefficiencies in procurement processes;
- Developing cost efficient tender processes including appropriate use of e-solutions;
- Appropriate Council staff responsible for providing procurement services or assistance in terms of available products and existing agreements; and
- Working with existing and potential suppliers to create relationships that are professional and productive, and are appropriate to the value and importance of the goods, services or works being required.

6.2.2 Environmental Sustainability

Through the objectives and targets in Council’s Environmental Sustainability Framework, Council is committed to achieving sustainability and ensuring it monitors and reports on Council activities and programs that have an impact on, or improve, the environment.

These activities include but are not limited to:
- Waste management;
- Recycling;
- Energy management;
- Greenhouse gas emission management;
- Water conservation;
- Building design; and
- Sustainable procurement.

Council is committed to enhancing the environment by supporting the principles of sustainable procurement to provide value for money.

Council prefers to purchase environmentally sustainable products and services whenever they achieve the same function or better, and value for money outcomes. Council aspires to demonstrate to the community that the purchasing decisions of Council endeavor to enhance environmental sustainability and improve markets for recycled and environmentally sustainable products.

Where practical and operationally efficient, Council will integrate the following sustainable purchasing practices into its operations and encourage its suppliers and contractors to adopt the same.

- Avoid negative environmental impacts from the purchase of goods, services and works, where possible.
- Reduce resource consumption and waste production by selecting energy efficient and water efficient products and services, where possible.
  - As an indication for products where labelling standards are applied, energy-efficient and water efficient products are to have star ratings of four star and above. Vehicles are to have a high Green Vehicle Guide star rating.
- Reuse where possible:
  - This practice requires the provision of re-use and recycling as part of the project planning process, including the consideration of whole-life cycle analysis, where available.
- Favour Recycled content:
  - The purchase of recycled or part recycled products is favoured, to reduce the need for new resource consumption, be efficient with existing resources, stimulate demand for recycled products, and products with recycled content, and minimise waste.
- Reduce the environmental impact of the supply chain:
  - This practice means encouraging suppliers of products and services to Council to adopt good environmental practices, to minimise the environmental footprint of Council’s extended activities.

Council will show preference to suppliers who actively adopt good environmental practice using tender and procurement evaluation criteria.
6.2.3 Social Sustainability

In accordance with the Council Plan and Community Engagement Framework Council is committed to improving the quality of life in Bayside through the involvement of the Bayside community in a range of factors including the provision of goods, services and works. Council is also committed to ensuring that all views are considered through inclusive deliberation and active involvement of the community.

Council will therefore consider community building in the procurement of goods, services or works as appropriate. The criteria may include the following:

- Consulting and engaging with the community;
- Building community involvement in the ways services are delivered or works undertaken;
- Enhancing partnerships with community stakeholders and other service providers;
- Generating local employment (particularly among disadvantaged residents);
- Improving gender equity, diversity and social inclusion; and
- Providing a range of other social benefits including community amenity and public health and well-being.

Council will also consider the social impact of procurement beyond our municipality.

6.3 Planning & Methodology

6.3.1 Role of Specifications

Specifications used in expressions of interest, quotations and tenders are to support and contribute to the Council’s objectives through being written in a manner that:

- Ensures impartiality and objectivity;
- Encourages the use of reliable and proven products;
- Encourages sustainability;
- Reduces bureaucracy and encourages innovation; and
- Wherever possible specifies requirements in terms of service outcomes and key performance standards.

While it may be appropriate in certain circumstances to specify inputs, care must be taken to ensure that innovative solutions may still be encouraged.

6.3.2 Purchasing Methods

Council’s standard methods for purchasing goods, services and works are:

- Petty cash or corporate credit card for low value simple purchases (please refer to Council’s Credit Card Policy for more information about using a Council credit card);
- Purchase order;
- Contract following a quotation process;
- Contract following a tender process;
- Collaborative purchasing arrangements with other Councils, approved contractual arrangements put in place by the State Government (State Purchase Contracts and
Whole of Victoria Government Contracts), Procurement Australia and the Municipal Association of Victoria; and
➢ Other arrangements authorised by the Council or the CEO due to abnormal circumstances such as emergencies.

6.3.3 Procurement Thresholds and Competition

Council’s Procurement Procedures details the minimum thresholds and the associated procurement methods. These thresholds are determined by this Policy and are detailed below.

6.3.4 Public Tenders

The acquisition of goods and services for which the estimated expenditure is $150,000 or above, and building and construction works for which the estimated expenditure is $200,000 or above must be undertaken by public tender as per the Act.

However to avoid any confusion regarding the definition of ‘services’ versus ‘works’ and to ensure compliance with the Act, Council adopts a public tender threshold of $150,000 for all purchases. This threshold applies to the value of contracts that may be for a number of years. As a general rule the $150,000 threshold should be determined by estimating the value of the goods, services or works with a single supplier for a reasonable contract period, inclusive of GST and all option periods under the proposed contract.

The Council may, at its discretion and based on the complexity and cost of the project, conduct one stage or multi-stage tenders. Typically a multi-stage tender process will commence with an expressions of interest stage followed by a tender process involving the suppliers selected as a consequence of the expressions of interest stage.

Expressions of interest may be appropriate where:
➢ The extent of the market is relatively unknown;
➢ The requirement is complex; or
➢ Tendering costs are likely to be high and Council seeks to ensure that suppliers incapable of supplying the requirement do not incur unnecessary expense.

6.3.5 Quotations

Purchase of goods, services and works having a value less than $150,000 must be undertaken using a quotation method as described below:

➢ Value between $0 and $500 – Minimum one verbal quotation must be obtained

An invoice must be obtained and ideally a purchase order will be raised as well. Where no purchase order is raised, the invoice must not be self-authorized. It must be co-signed by a second officer with delegated authority to ensure good governance and effective fraud controls are maintained.

➢ Value $500 or above but below $2,000 – Minimum of one verbal quotation must be obtained
A purchase order must be raised unless the purchase is of a type that is exempt from raising a purchase order (for guidance see 7.2.8 of the Procurement Procedures)

➢ Value $2,000 or above but below $15,000 – Minimum of one written quotation must be obtained
A purchase order must be raised unless the purchase is of a type that is exempt from raising a purchase order (for guidance see 7.2.8 of the Procurement Procedures)

➢ Value $15,000 or above but below $150,000 Minimum of three written quotations must be sought

Officers must complete the Procurement Initiation and Assessment form to establish if a Request for Quotation or Request for Tender process is the recommended process. A tender process may be recommended for complex procurements in this range.

Council will request a minimum of three quotations by issuing a written Request for Quotation to suppliers reasonably expected to provide the goods, services or works. Details of the suppliers contacted, their quotations, evaluation notes, recommendation, approval, declarations of whether any conflicts of interest exists, communication of award and the contract must be recorded.

Quotations returned by the nominated closing date must be evaluated and a recommendation made to consider the supplier offering the best value for money outcome.

➢ Public Advertising.

Quotations may be advertised when judged to be sufficiently advantageous to Council. This may occur when a field of potential Respondents has not been established, or an innovative approach is required, or the project has broad appeal that may attract very competitive prices. The minimum placement requirements include Council’s e-tender portal and, where judged appropriate, use of any newspaper approved by Council for such purpose. The relevant Manager must consider the potential benefits of public tendering for any purchases over $100,000 and a considered and conscious decision must be made by the Manager that three quotes will achieve the best value for money outcome where the value is over $100,000 and it is decided that it will not be publically advertised. Evidence of this must be filed in the relevant contract file in Council’s record management system

6.3.6 Delegation of Authority
Delegations define the limitations within which Council staff are permitted to work. The Council has delegated to the Chief Executive Officer authority to approve contracts up to $500,000 for capital works contracts and $500,000 for goods and services contracts provided the contract is less than 5 years and annual spend does not exceed $150,000. The Chief Executive Officer has in turn delegated authority to Council staff. This Instrument of Sub-delegation is titled ‘Financial Delegations’ and is made by the Chief Executive Officer under the authority of an Instrument of Delegation authorised by resolution of Council.
The Financial Delegations allow specified Council staff to approve certain purchases, without referral to the Council. These Delegations identify the Council staff authorised to make such procurement commitments in respect of goods, services and works on behalf of the Council. This enables Council to conduct procurement activities in an efficient and timely manner whilst maintaining transparency and integrity.

The financial delegations for Council staff are detailed in Council’s Instrument of sub-delegation – financial delegations.

Proposed commitments which exceed the CEO’s delegation and which must be approved by the Council are:

- Awarding contracts where the total contract value exceeds $500,000 for capital works or award a contract exceeding the value of $500,000 for goods and services or, in the case of multi-year goods and services contracts awarding a contract exceeding an averaged value of $150,000 per annum and/or for a period exceeding 5 years; and
- approve a contract variation exceeding 20% of the original contract sum, where the original contract sum is $500,001 or greater and where the contract variation amount will result in the adopted budget allocation being exceeded.

6.4 Evaluation & Engagement

6.4.1 Quotation & tender evaluation

All quotations and tenders must be evaluated in a consistent manner against pre-determined evaluation criteria listed in order of importance. The use of a weighted matrix analysis is the recommended method for analysing and comparing tenders in a detailed and consistent manner. The full cost of the good, service or works over its estimated life must receive a weighting of between 30% and 60%.

The evaluation criteria must be determined prior to inviting proposals and should be listed in the invitation documents in order of importance. Apart from total cost over the estimated life some typical examples of criteria that may be considered are:

- Relevant Experience;
- Past Performance;
- Methodology;
- Resources;
- Management skills and systems;
- Environmental Performance; and
- Technical skills.

A due diligence analysis of the preferred or short-listed suppliers for all high value or highly complex projects must be undertaken to ensure that the suppliers have the capacity and stability to comply with the requirements of the contract.

6.4.2 Post tender negotiations

The conduct of negotiations after the close of a tender or quotation as part of the process for recommending the preferred supplier may be conducted as ‘fine tuning’ activity prior to entering into a contract. Matters for post tender negotiations may include:
Clarifying the robustness of the lump sum price or schedule of rates;
Additional value adding options;
Specific contract management arrangements;
Identifying key personnel for various stages of the contract;
Intellectual property transfer opportunities; and
Service supply arrangements.

The objective of post tender negotiations is to obtain the optimal solution and commercial arrangements and not merely the lowest price. Negotiations must also be mindful not to alter the scope or intent of a tender or proposal. Altering the contract in a way that materially changes the contract to that which was released is not permitted.

6.5 Contract Management & Administration

6.5.1 Corporate Records

The Responsible Officer authorised to make procurement commitments in respect of the relevant goods, services and works, must ensure timely and accurate corporate records are kept. Records include but are not limited to the following:

- All documents required by the Procurement Procedures generated in the sourcing phase;
- The contract;
- Contract term extensions (within authorised budget);
- Contract amendments and variations (financial and non-financial);
- Signed exemptions from this Policy, the Procurement Procedures or Contract Management Procedures.

6.5.2 Internal Controls

The Council will install and maintain a framework of internal controls over procurement processes that will ensure:

- There is clear accountability and responsibility for all transactions;
- Transparency in the procurement process;
- A clearly documented audit trail exists for procurement activities;
- Appropriate authorisations are obtained and documented; and
- Systems are in place for appropriate monitoring and performance measurement and that all Council staff use those systems.

6.5.3 Risk Management

Risk Management sits in the context of all projects and ongoing services being properly planned and carried out in a manner that will protect and enhance the Council’s capability to prevent, withstand and recover from interruption to the supply of goods, services and works.

The provision of goods, services and works by contract potentially exposes the Council to risk. Council seeks to minimise its risk exposure by utilising measures such as:

- Standardising contracts to include current, relevant clauses;
- Requiring bank guarantees where appropriate;
Referring specifications to relevant experts;
- Requiring written contractual formation before allowing the commencement of work;
- Use of or reference to relevant Australian Standards (or equivalent); and
- Effectively managing the contract including monitoring and enforcing performance.

A risk management plan is required to be developed for all projects. The risk management plan should consider the following factors:
- Risk identification;
- Risk assessment: likelihood versus consequence;
- Risk mitigation: actions to reduce, replace or eliminate risks;
- Risk allocation: allocate a responsible officer or external party to manage each risk;
- Monitoring and control.

6.5.4 Occupational Health and Safety

Council must ensure that all its contractors and suppliers share Council’s commitment to providing a safe and healthy environment, so far as is reasonably practicable, within the municipality for the Bayside community, staff and contractors. Preferred suppliers will need to demonstrate that they have appropriate systems and processes to manage risks and hazards and that they have provided appropriate education and training for all their staff.

6.5.5 Contract Terms

All contractual relationships must be documented in writing based on Council’s standard terms. A written contract must be entered into by the supplier and Council before works or services commence or goods ordered.

Where this is not possible, for example in situations where community safety dictates an urgent necessity, subsequent approval must be sought from the appropriate member of Council staff with delegated authority. A request for such an approval must be supported with procurement and legal advice.

To protect the best interests of the Council, terms must be agreed in advance of any commitment being made with a supplier. Any exceptions to doing this expose the Council to risk and must be authorised by the appropriate member of Council staff with delegated authority.

6.5.6 Dispute Resolution

All Council contracts should incorporate dispute management or alternative dispute resolution provisions to minimise the chance of disputes escalating to legal action.

6.5.7 Contract Management

The purpose of contract management is to ensure that Council, and where applicable its clients, receive the goods, services or works provided to the required standards of quality and quantity as intended by the contract by:

- Nominating a responsible officer to manage each contract;
- Establishing a system reinforcing the performance of both parties’ responsibilities and obligations under the contract; and
- Providing a means for the early recognition of issues and performance problems and the identification of solutions.

All Council contracts are to include contract management requirements and key performance indicators.

Furthermore, contracts are to be proactively managed by the member of Council staff responsible for overseeing the delivery of the contracted goods, services or works to ensure the Council receives value for money and that quality and cost standards are met.

6.5.8 Contract Performance Reporting

Evaluation and reporting can provide a basis for effective control and stewardship of resources. There are a wide range of indicators that responsible officers can use to measure and report on the performance of the contract(s) they manage. These typically include, but are not limited to:

- Volume of orders/contracts;
- On-time delivery/completion;
- Defect rates and variations;
- Cost of raising order/processing contracts;
- Results of customer satisfaction questionnaires.

However, the recommended focus should be on an evaluation process which leads to the implementation of continual improvement to Council’s significant high value procurements.

There are three key procurement areas which should be measured, evaluated and reported on an annual regular basis:

- Contractor performance;
- Opportunities to improve processes;
- Incorporation of process improvements.

6.6 Procurement Performance Reporting

A list of performance indicators will be used to measure procurement performance. They will include criteria such as:

- Contract compliance and performance (through annual review/audit of a selected sample of current contracts);
- The proportion of expenditure against corporate contracts;
- User and supplier feedback;
- The percentage of Council purchases that have considered sustainability; and
- Measuring the success of projects and programs.

These criteria will be used as the basis for regular performance reports to the executive team and Council.
6.7 Continuous Improvement

Council is committed to continuous improvement as part of its Business Excellence Program and will review this Procurement Policy on an annual basis, to ensure that it continues to meet the corporate objectives.

Procurement procedures, practices and costs will be benchmarked externally. Internal service standards will be agreed within Council and performance against these targets will be measured and reviewed regularly to support continuous improvement. The performance measurements developed will be used to:

- Highlight trend and exceptions where necessary to enhance performance;
- Improve the internal efficiency of the procurement process and where relevant the performance of suppliers; and
- Facilitate relevant programs to drive improvement in procurement to eliminate waste and inefficiencies across key expenditure categories.

6.8 Exemption from this Policy or the Procurement Procedures

The Chief Executive Officer may only approve an exemption from this Policy or Procurement Procedures if the following is satisfied:

- The exemption does not arise because of a lack of planning; and
- The exemption does not seek, as its primary motivation, to lessen or avoid competition.

Please note: This policy is current as at the date of approval. Refer to Council’s website (www.bayside.vic.gov.au) or staff intranet to ensure this is the latest version.
7. Related documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Council’s Risk Management Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Occupational Health and Safety Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Delegations to Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument of sub-delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts and Hospitality Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Council Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Council’s Procurement Procedures and Contract Management Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Definitions & Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of GST</td>
<td>All monetary values stated in this policy include GST except where specifically stated otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Local Government Act 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial in Confidence</td>
<td>Refers to information provided that is commercially sensitive and if released could cause commercial detriment or disadvantaged in the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probity</td>
<td>In the context of a procurement process probity is a defensible process which is able to withstand internal and external scrutiny – one which achieves both accountability and transparency, providing tenderers with fair and equitable treatment. Probity is about ensuring the procedural integrity of the procurement process (Victorian Local Government Best Practice Procurement Guidelines, Department of Planning and Community Development, 2013, p.51).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for Money</td>
<td>A measure covering quality and quantity levels, performance standards, risk exposure and other policy measures (e.g. environment impacts), as well as price. Value for money is assessed on a ‘whole of life’ or ‘total cost of ownership’ basis, which includes the transitioning-in, contract period and transition-out phases of a contractual relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and background

In July 2016, Council approved a planning application for a 4 storey mixed use development comprising 8 residential units and 1 retail shop at 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham. The plans include several window openings onto a piece of Council owned freehold land.

The applicant subsequently applied to the Building Appeals Board (BAB) to have a further matter heard in relation to the development. The matter included the dispensation of fire protection to several window openings adjoining Councils land (Attachment 1).

In July 2016, the BAB made a determination (Attachment 2) that stated, amongst other things, the applicant could construct windows on the boundary adjoining freehold Council land without the required fire protection stipulated under the Building Code of Australia (code). The determination further stated that if or when Council deals with the land adjoining the development, the owner of the title(s) that enjoy the benefit of the determination will be required to bring the openings to compliance with the code at their expense.

Attachment 3 shows a computer generated image identifying the windows in question.

Council has sought legal advice on the jurisdiction of the BAB to make a determination of this nature. The advice confirmed that the BAB did have jurisdiction to make the direction as outlined in the determination. Part of the legal advice is that Council may be responsible for costs incurred by the tenant associated with any further delay.

Accordingly, this report proposes that Council enter into a Section 163 Agreement of the Building Act 1993 with the landowner of 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham.

Key issues

Future Title Holders

The Section 163 Agreement runs with the title and puts the onus on the owner of the title to rectify any compliance issues outlined in the Agreement. In summary, this means the developer executes the Section 163 however, once they sell the title (apartment) to another party, the obligation is passed to the owner of the title at the time Council deals with the adjoining land. The purchaser would therefore need to understand this requirement at the time of purchase. It does mean however that the developer may gain an uplift in price from additional light and views afforded by the determination / windows and the potential liability is passed onto future owners.

Costs

Council’s legal advice is that it may be responsible for the costs incurred by the developer if a decision is unnecessarily deferred.
**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Notes the report concerning property 58-60 Station Street Sandringham; and
2. Resolves to sign and affix the seal of Council to the Section 163 Agreement in accordance with the Building Act 1993, noting that the Section 163 Agreement runs with the property and is attached to the title.

**Support Attachments**

1. 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham - S163 Window Location
2. 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham - S163 Determination
3. 58-60 Staiton Street, Sandringham - Window Computer Generated Picture
4. 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham - Section 163 Agreement
Considerations and implications of proposition

Liveable community

Social
No social implications to executing the agreement.

Natural Environment
No Natural Environment implications to executing the agreement.

Built Environment
In the event Council deals with its land abutting the development, any current or future owners of the apartments impacted will be required to make the window openings compliant with the Building Code of Australia. This will most likely result in the covering of the window openings with a fire retardant material.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There is no Customer Service or Community Engagement implications with the execution of this Agreement.

Human Rights
No Human Rights implications to executing the Agreement.

Legal
Council sought legal advice on this matter that can be made available to Councillors if required.

Attachment 4 is the full Section 163 Agreement that this report recommends be executed under Council seal.

Finance
No current financial implications to executing the agreement.

Links to Council policy and strategy
No links to Council policy or strategy in executing the agreement.
**Options considered**

**Option 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary</strong></th>
<th>Execute the Section 163 Agreement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>The matter is resolved in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td>Potential future ramifications if Council chooses to deal with its freehold land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary</strong></th>
<th>Do not execute the Section 163 Agreement and apply for the Building Appeals Board to reconsider the matter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>Potential for the Board to reverse its decision and not allow the reduction in compliance levels with the Building Code of Australia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Issues**        | Potential for the Building Appeals Board to reject Councils request, this may also incur further costs both Councils and the applicants.  
                    | Discussion with the Building Appeals Board did not provide a strong sense that the decision would be amended. |
SECTION 163 AGREEMENT – 58-60 STATION STREET, SANDRINGHAM

Windows not to BCA Fire Protections Standards location indicated by red square
Building Act 1993

DETERMINATION OF THE BUILDING APPEALS BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>City of Bayside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>58-60 Station Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandringham 3191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Richard Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of Building</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation/s to be Determined</td>
<td>CP2, CP8 (C3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of modification of building regulations (S160)

1. CP2, CP8 (C3.2)
   To permit window openings W18, W34, W46 (located on the south western wall) to be located on the boundary without the required fire protection.

Decision/s of the Panel

1. The Board determines to grant the modification(s) or variations(s) specified in the application subject to a Section 163 agreement being entered into in accordance with the following:
   
   (a) The owner of the building shall enter into a Section 163 agreement with the City of Bayside.
   
   (b) The City of Bayside is directed to enter into the agreement specified above.
   
   (c) The owner of the lot or any future owner shall bring the openings into compliance with the regulations of the day should any development of the site which directly affects the subject openings occur within 3m of the openings.
   
   (d) The agreement shall –

   - be under seal;
   - recite this determination in full or have attached to it a copy of this determination;
   - precisely describe the lot/land/building to which the agreement applies to and, if the owner's obligations relate to works or events on other lots, precisely describe the other lots;
   - require the owner of the lot to pay the reasonable costs incurred by the City of Bayside in relation to the agreement (including the Titles Office fees and notification of adjoining owners);
   - describe the owner's obligations in accordance with this determination;
   - provide for the agreement to lapse upon:
     - the demolition or removal of the building work, or
     - the building being brought into conformity with the building regulations prevailing at the time (whichever occurs first).
Building Act 1993

DETERMINATION OF THE BUILDING APPEALS BOARD

> provide that, otherwise than by one of the events described above, the agreement shall not be terminated or varied unless with the approval of the Board;

> specify that, for the purposes of determining whether the agreement lapses, the building is not considered to be brought into conformity with the building regulations by reason only of a building surveyor exercising a discretion under regulations 562 or 608 of the building regulations;

> specify that the burden of any covenant in the agreement (whether positive or negative) runs with the lot, even though there may be no lot benefited by the covenant and that the covenant may be enforced as a restrictive covenant and binds the owner of the lot and the owner's successors in title.

(e) The modification(s) or variation(s) hereby granted shall have no force or effect unless the agreement specified above is entered into prior to issue of the Occupancy Permit and/or certificate of final inspection.

(f) The City of Bayside must –

- lodge a copy of the agreement with the Board;
- provide a copy of the agreement to the affected adjoining property owner(s);
- give notice to the Board if the agreement lapses;
- enter a record or memorial of the agreement (as the case may be) on the title or memorial to the land.

(g) The agreement does not give or imply any rights of access to, above or below the adjoining lot/property and it is the owner's responsibility in entering into this agreement to ensure the requirements of the agreement can be fulfilled including achieving the required Fire Resistance Level or any other relevant considerations under applicable building or planning legislation.

(h) The Relevant Building Surveyor must reference this determination and details of the agreement on the Occupancy Permit and/or Certificate of Final Inspection for the building.

Panel Members

Warren Knight, Dang Hodinh

Date of Hearing 21/07/2016

Chairperson, Building Appeals Panel

Date signed: 01/08/2016

Registrar

OFFICE USE Ref: KM: 448953

Note: This determination made pursuant to section 162 of the Building Act 1993 must not be construed as an approval or endorsement relative to any other Act, regulation control or matter pertaining to the nature to which this determination relates.

In particular the determination shall not be taken to authorise any departure from approved documents or other matters that have been or are able to be the subject of other approval processes pursuant to the Planning and Environment Act, Occupational Health and Safety Act, Disability Discrimination Act, Heritage Act, Health Act and not limited to any other relevant Acts.
BAYSIDE CITY COUNCIL

and

RICHARD IAN HOWARD

AGREEMENT MADE PURSUANT TO
SECTION 163 OF THE BUILDING ACT 1993

58-60 Station Street, Sandringham
THIS AGREEMENT is made on 2019

PARTIES

1 BAYSIDE CITY COUNCIL
   of 76 Royal Avenue, Sandringham VIC 3191
   (Council)

2 RICHARD IAN HOWARD
   of 40 Young Street, Kew VIC 3101
   (Owner)

RECITALS

A The Owner is, or is entitled to be, registered as proprietor of the Land.
B Pursuant to the Determination, the Board has determined to allow modifications of the
   Building Regulations (which include the BCA), pursuant to section 160 of the Act.
C The Determination specifically allows modification of Part C3.2 of the BCA, namely:
   to permit window openings W16, W34 and W46 located on the south-western
   wall of the Building to be located on the boundary without the required fire
   protection.
D This Agreement has been entered into in order to meet the requirements of the
   Determination.
E This Agreement is made under Division 5 of Part 10 of the Act.

THE PARTIES AGREE THAT:

1 DEFINITIONS
   In this Agreement:
   1.1 Act means the Building Act 1993.
   1.2 Agreement means this Agreement including the recitals and any annexures to
       this Agreement.
   1.3 BCA means the Building Code of Australia as it applied to the Land on
       1 August 2016.
   1.4 Board means the Building Appeals Board.
   1.5 Building means the building located at the Land which at the date of the
       Agreement was a class 2 building pursuant to the BCA.
   1.6 Building Regulations means the Building Regulations 2016.
   1.7 Building Work means the building work in terms of the Act that was the subject
       of the Determination.
   1.8 Business Day means Monday to Friday excluding public holidays in Victoria.
1.9 Determination means the determination of the Board of 1 August 2018 concerning the Land. A copy of the Determination is attached to this Agreement as Annexure A.

1.10 Land means the land known as 58-60 Station Street, Sandringham, being the land more particularly described in certificate of title volume 09717 folio 225.

1.11 Other Land means the land known as:

1.11.1 Lot 1 TP80804T, being the land more particularly described in certificate of title volume 09409 folio 545; and

1.11.2 Lot 1 TP126794S, being the land more particularly described in certificate of title volume 09381 folio 988.

1.12 Window Openings means the window openings W18, W34 and W46 that were the subject of the Determination.

2 COMMENCEMENT

This Agreement comes into force on the date it was made as set out above.

3 TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT

3.1 Approval of the Board

Subject to clause 3.2 below, this Agreement must only be terminated with the approval of the Board and in accordance with the Act.

3.2 Termination

3.2.1 This Agreement terminates upon the earlier of either:

(a) the demolition or removal of the Building Work; or

(b) the Building Work being brought into conformity with the Building Regulations prevailing at the relevant date.

3.2.2 For the purposes of clause 3.2.1(b) above, the Building is not considered to be brought into conformity with the Building Regulations at the relevant date by reason of a building surveyor exercising a discretion under regulation 64, 66 or 233 of the Building Regulations or the equivalent regulations in the Building Regulations prevailing at the relevant date.

3.3 Cancellation of recording

As soon as reasonably practicable after this Agreement has been terminated, the Council must, at the request and at the cost of the Owner, give notice of the termination of the Agreement to the Board and apply to the Registrar of Titles under section 165(1) of the Act to cancel the recording of the Agreement on the Register.

4 OWNER’S COVENANTS

4.1 The Owner covenants and agrees that the Window Openings must be brought into compliance with the Building Regulations prevailing at the time immediately upon any development on the Land or on the Other Land that is within three
metres of the Window Openings, which directly affects the Window Openings in terms of the Act or the Building Regulations prevailing at the time.

4.2 The Owner covenants and agrees that the modifications allowed by the Determination shall have no force or effect unless the Agreement is entered into prior to the issue of an occupancy permit or certificate of final inspection and referred to in any current or future occupancy permit or certificate of final inspection, as may be applicable.

4.3 Successors in title

Until this Agreement is recorded on the folio of the Register which relates to the Land pursuant to section 165 of the Act, the Owner must ensure that the Owner’s successors in title give effect to and do all acts and sign all documents which will require those successors to give effect to this Agreement including requiring the successors in title to execute a deed agreeing to be bound by the terms of this Agreement. Until that deed is executed, the Owner, being a party to this Agreement, remains liable to perform all of the Owner’s obligations contained in this Agreement.

4.4 Further assurance

The Owner must do all things necessary (including signing any further agreement, acknowledgment or document) to enable the Council to record this Agreement on the folio of the Register which relates to the Land.

4.5 Payment of Council’s costs

The Owner agrees to pay on demand to the Council the Council’s costs and expenses (including any legal fees incurred on a solicitor-client basis) of and incidental to the preparation, execution, recording and enforcement of this Agreement.

4.6 Mortgagee to be bound

The Owner covenants to obtain the consent of any mortgagee to be bound by the covenants in this Agreement if the mortgagee becomes mortgagee in possession of the Land.

4.7 Indemnity

The Owner covenants to indemnify and keep the Council, its officers, employees, agents, workmen and contractors indemnified from and against all costs, expenses, losses or damages which they or any of them may sustain incur or suffer or be or become liable for or in respect of any suit action proceeding judgement or claim brought by any person arising from or referable to this Agreement or any non-compliance with this Agreement by the Owner.

4.8 Covenants run with the Land

The Owner’s obligations in this Agreement are intended to take effect as covenants which shall be annexed to and run at law and in equity with the Land and every part of it, and bind the Owner and its successors, assignees and transferees, the registered proprietor or proprietors for the time being of the Land and every part of the Land.
4.9 Owner's warranty

The Owner warrants and covenants that:

4.9.1 the Owner is the registered proprietor (or is entitled to become the registered proprietor) of the Land and is also the beneficial owner of the Land;

4.9.2 there are no mortgages, liens, charges or other encumbrances or leases or any rights inherent in any person other than the Owner affecting the Land which have not been disclosed by the usual searches of the folio of the Register for the Land or notified to the Council;

4.9.3 no part of the Land is subject to any rights obtained by adverse possession or subject to any easements or rights described or referred to in section 42 of the Transfer of Land Act 1997; and

4.9.4 until this Agreement is recorded on the folio of the Register which relates to the Land, the Owner will not sell, transfer, dispose of, assign, mortgage or otherwise part with possession of the Land or any part of the Land without first disclosing to any intended purchaser, transferee, assignee or mortgagee the existence and nature of this Agreement.

5 COUNCIL COVENANTS

5.1 As soon as reasonably practicable after this Agreement has been entered into, the Council must, at the cost of the Owner, lodge a copy of this Agreement with the Board and apply to the Registrar of Titles under section 165(1) of the Act to record this Agreement on the Register.

5.2 As soon as reasonably practicable after this Agreement has been entered into, the Council must, provide a copy of the Agreement to any affected adjoining property owner.

6 GENERAL

6.1 No fettering of Council's powers

This Agreement does not fetter or restrict the Council's power or discretion under any legislation administered by Council.

6.2 Governing law and jurisdiction

This Agreement is governed by and is to be construed in accordance with the laws of Victoria. Each party irrevocably and unconditionally submits to the non-exclusive jurisdiction of the courts and tribunals of Victoria and waives any right to object to proceedings being brought in those courts or tribunals.

7 NOTICES

7.1 Service of notice

A notice or other communication required or permitted, under this Agreement, to be served on a person must be in writing and may be served:

7.1.1 personally on the person;
7.1.2 by leaving it at the person's address set out in this Agreement;
7.1.3 by posting it by prepaid post addressed to that person at the person's current address for service; or
7.1.4 by facsimile to the person's current number notified to the other party.

7.2 Time of service

A notice or other communication is deemed served:

7.2.1 if served personally or left at the person's address, upon service;
7.2.2 if posted within Australia to an Australian address, two Business Days after posting;
7.2.3 if served by facsimile, subject to the next clause, at the time indicated on the transmission report produced by the sender's facsimile machine indicating that the facsimile was sent in its entirety to the addressee's facsimile; and
7.2.4 if received after 5.00pm in the place of receipt or on a day which is not a Business Day, at 9.00am on the next Business Day.

8 INTERPRETATION

In this Agreement, unless the contrary intention appears:

8.1 the singular includes the plural and vice versa;
8.2 a reference to a document or instrument, including this Agreement, includes a reference to that document or instrument as novated, altered or replaced from time to time;
8.3 a reference to an individual or person includes a partnership, body corporate, government authority or agency and vice versa;
8.4 a reference to a party includes that party's executors, administrators, successors, substitutes and permitted assigns;
8.5 words importing one gender include other genders;
8.6 other grammatical forms of defined words or expressions have corresponding meanings;
8.7 a covenant, undertaking, representation, warranty, indemnity or agreement made or given by:
8.7.1 two or more parties; or
8.7.2 a party comprised of two or more persons,
is made or given and binds those parties or persons jointly and severally;
8.8 a reference to a statute, code or other law includes regulations and other instruments made under it and includes consolidations, amendments, re-enactments or replacements of any of them;
8.9 a recital, schedule, annexure or description of the parties forms part of this Agreement;

8.10 if an act must be done on a specified day that is not a Business Day, the act must be done instead on the next Business Day;

8.11 if an act required to be done under this Agreement on a specified day is done after 5:00pm on that day in the time zone in which the act is performed, it is taken to be done on the following day;

8.12 a party that is a trustee is bound both personally and in its capacity as trustee;

8.13 a reference to an authority, institution, association or body ("original entity") that has ceased to exist or been reconstituted, renamed or replaced or whose powers or functions have been transferred to another entity, is a reference to the entity that most closely serves the purposes or objects of the original entity;

8.14 headings and the provision of a table of contents are for convenience only and do not affect the interpretation of this Agreement.
EXECUTED as an agreement under Division 5 of Part 10 of the Act.

THE COMMON SEAL of BAYSIDE CITY COUNCIL was affixed this day of 2019 in the presence of:

Mayor/Councillor

Chief Executive Officer

SIGNED SEALED AND DELIVERED by RICHARD IAN HOWARD in the presence of:

Witness
### Building Act 1993 - VICTORIA

**DETERMINATION OF THE BUILDING APPEALS BOARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>City of Bayside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>58-60 Station Street Sandringham 3191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Richard Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of Building</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation/s to be Determined</td>
<td>CP2, CP8 (C3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of modification of building regulations (S166)**

1. CP2, CP8 (C3.2)
   - To permit window openings W18, W24, W46 (located on the south western wall) to be located on the boundary without the required fire protection

**Decisions of the Panel**

1. The Board determines to grant the modification(s) or variation(s) specified in the application subject to a Section 163 agreement being entered into in accordance with the following:
   
   (a) The owner of the building shall enter into a Section 163 agreement with the City of Bayside.
   
   (b) The City of Bayside is directed to enter into the agreement specified above.
   
   (c) The owner of the lot or any future owner shall bring the openings into compliance with the regulations of the day should any development of the site which directly affects the subject openings occur within 3m of the openings.
   
   (d) The agreement shall:
       - be under seal;
       - relate this determination in full or have attached to it a copy of this determination;
       - precisely describe the lot(s) and building to which the agreement applies to and, if the owner’s obligations relate to works or events on other lots, precisely describe the other lots;
       - require the owner of the lot to pay the reasonable costs incurred by the City of Bayside in relation to the agreement (including the Titles Office fees and notification of adjoining owners);
       - describe the owner’s obligations in accordance with this determination;
       - provide for the agreement to lapse upon:
         - the demolition or removal of the building work, or
         - the building being brought into conformity with the building regulations prevailing at the time (whichever occurs first).
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provide that, otherwise than by one of the events described above, the agreement shall not be terminated or varied unless with the approval of the Board;

specify that, for the purposes of determining whether the agreement lapses, the building is not considered to be brought into conformity with the building regulations by reason only of a building surveyor exercising a discretion under regulations 502 or 608 of the building regulations;

specify that the burden of any covenant in the agreement (whether positive or negative) runs with the lot, even though there may be no lot benefited by the covenant and that the covenant may be enforced as a restrictive covenant and binds the owner of the lot and the owner’s successors in title.

(a) The modifications(s) or variation(s) hereby granted shall have no force or effect unless the agreement specified above is entered into prior to issue of the Occupancy Permit and/or certificate of final inspection.

(f) The City of Bayside must—

• lodge a copy of the agreement with the Board;

• provide a copy of the agreement to the affected adjoining property owner(s).

• give notice to the Board if the agreement lapses;

• enter a record or memorial of the agreement (as the case may be) on the title or memorial to the land.

(g) The agreement does not give or imply any rights of access to, above or below the adjoining lot/property and it is the owner’s responsibility in entering into this agreement to ensure the requirements of the agreement can be fulfilled including achieving the required Fire Resistance Level or any other relevant considerations under applicable building or planning legislation.

(h) The Relevant Building Surveyor must reference this determination and details of the agreement on the Occupancy Permit and/or Certificate of Final Inspection for the building.

Panel Members

Warren Knight, Dang Hocinh

Date of Hearing 21/07/2018

Chairperson, Building Appeals Panel

Registrar

Date signed: 6/08/2018

OFFICE USE Ref: KM 448993

Note: The determinations made pursuant to the determination of the Building Act 1993 must not be construed as an approval or consent under the Building Act 1993 and will not be a basis for a building permit or approval. The determinations are for information only and do not confer the right to do any acts in relation to the subject of the determination.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report provides a summary and analysis of Council’s financial performance for ten (10) months to 30 April 2019.

The report is designed to analyse actual results against the 2018/19 Adopted Budget to ensure consistency and compliance with the Budget, and to measure Council’s overall financial performance.

Key issues

2018/19 Year-to-date operating result
The April 2019 result is a surplus of $27.0M which is $8.1M favourable to budget.

2018/19 Forecast operating result
The current forecast for the year is a surplus of $27.8M which is $6.09M favourable to Budget.

The underlying forecast is favourable to budget by $3.08M.

It should be noted that Council budgets for a surplus in its operating budget each year so as to fund capital works. Any end-of-year surplus that is favourable to budget is quarantined in Council’s infrastructure reserve which is used to fund capital works in future years or other unavoidable projects. There will be a significant drawdown on these cash reserves over the next 4 years to fund an expansion of major capital projects.

Victorian Auditor General’s Office (VAGO) Indicators
Current forecasts indicate that Council will achieve VAGO indicator targets.

Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF) Indicators
Current forecasts indicate that Council will achieve LGPRF indicator targets.

Capital Result
Capital expenditure is forecast to be underspent by $22.2M for the year driven mainly by the forecast carry forward of project budget to 2019/20 including $9 million for the purchase of the CSIRO site. Excluding the $9 million allocated to purchase the CSIRO site, the forecast at the end of April indicates that 73% of the 2018/19 adjusted budget will be spent by June 2019.

Recommendation
That Council notes the operating and capital financial report for ten months to 30 April 2019.

Support Attachments
1. Bayside City Council April 2019
**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**
There are no social impacts associated with this report.

**Natural Environment**
There are no natural environmental impacts associated with this report.

**Built Environment**
There are no built environmental impacts associated with this report.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**
There are no impacts to customer service.

No community engagement has been undertaken in preparing this report.

**Human Rights**
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon, the human rights contained in the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

**Legal**

Section 138 of the *Local Government Act 1989* prescribes that, at least every three months, a financial report of revenue and expenditure be presented to Council.

**Finance**
The year-end forecast operating result is a surplus of $27.8M which is $6.09M favourable to budget. Taking into account one-off and timing issues, the underlying operating result is forecast to be $3.08M favourable to budget.

Capital expenditure is forecast to be underspent by $22.2M for the year driven mainly by the forecast carry forward of project budget to 2019/20 including $9 million for the purchase of the CSIRO site. Excluding the $9 million allocated to purchase the CSIRO site, the forecast at the end of February indicates that 73% of the 2018/19 adjusted budget will be spent by June 2019.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**
The monthly financial report is identified within Goal 8 Governance in the Council Plan 2017-2021. We want an organisation that is financially stable and with decision making that is open, transparent and informed by the community.
Bayside City Council Financial Report 30 April 2019

Operating Result

The Adjusted Budget for 2018/19 of $21.7M has increased by $2.1M from the Adopted Budget of $19.6M and includes the following adjustments for projects to be delivered in 2018/19:

- $1.663M Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment.
- $575k Elsternwick Park No. 1 Oval precinct.
- ($74k) Name and Address (NAR) Administrator.
- ($45k) Graffiti Prevention.

2018/19 Year to date operating result
The April 2019 result is a surplus of $27.0M which is $8.1M favourable to budget.

2018/19 Forecast operating result
The current forecast for the year is a surplus of $27.8M which is $6.09M favourable to Budget.

The underlying forecast is favourable to budget by $3.08M and excludes the following one off or timing items totalling $3.01M:

- $3.0M additional income from developers related to open space contributions.
- $1.11M additional income from developers relating to drainage contributions.
- $700k Sandringham Library capital grant received in advance.
- $619k sale of discontinued Council owned laneways.
- $175k additional grant funding in 2018/19 for ‘Safe Travel in Local Street Program’.
- $129k increase in the grant funding for school crossings in 2018/19
- $100k additional income Sustainability Victoria for E Waste Shed.
- ($1.5M) lease surrender costs.
- ($259k) additional costs associated with the purchase of new smaller bins
- ($257k) reduction in net income for the sale of one Bathing Box as this is unlikely to proceed in 2018/19.
- ($115k) for the development and implementation of the state election advocacy campaign.
- ($110k) expenditure related to the timing of grant funding for Aged & Disability Regional projects.
- ($585k) decrease in grant funding for HMVS Preservation Works, project postponed to future years.
### Operating Services & New Initiatives Budget

#### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget Variance</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Year End Forecast</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget less forecast variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates and Charges</td>
<td>79,481</td>
<td>78,605</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95,416</td>
<td>95,531</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10,878</td>
<td>11,117</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>7,358</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/Loss on Disposal of assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>109,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>117,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>132,985</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,069</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Costs</td>
<td>36,509</td>
<td>35,102</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>44,929</td>
<td>43,884</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>38,663</td>
<td>39,481</td>
<td>(819)</td>
<td>47,306</td>
<td>50,328</td>
<td>(3,022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>15,341</td>
<td>15,316</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,211</strong></td>
<td><strong>652</strong></td>
<td><strong>111,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>113,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,971)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Operating Result - Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Result - Surplus</td>
<td>18,911</td>
<td>27,050</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>21,720</td>
<td>27,818</td>
<td>6,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operating Result by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division (in '000s)</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget Variance</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Year End Forecast</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget less Forecast</th>
<th>2018/19 Adjusted Budget Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>8,429</td>
<td>8,523</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Rec. &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>30,170</td>
<td>29,685</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>36,294</td>
<td>36,548</td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning &amp; Amenity</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>(539)</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Customer Experience</td>
<td>9,577</td>
<td>8,067</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>12,601</td>
<td>11,788</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Finance</td>
<td>(2,524)</td>
<td>(1,661)</td>
<td>(863)</td>
<td>(3,057)</td>
<td>(3,057)</td>
<td>(832)</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,085</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,883</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,357</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,109</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>(79,828)</td>
<td>(79,984)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>(95,950)</td>
<td>(96,951)</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Income</td>
<td>(2,711)</td>
<td>(6,265)</td>
<td>3,554</td>
<td>(4,903)</td>
<td>(4,903)</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>-91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>15,341</td>
<td>15,316</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(18,911)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(27,056)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,139</strong></td>
<td><strong>(21,720)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(27,818)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,098</strong></td>
<td><strong>-28.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive forecast favourable $205k**
- $205k decrease in project expenditure costs.

**Corporate Services unfavourable ($95k)**
- ($150k) additional costs associated with increased sale of discontinuances, leases and Sandringham Driving Range.
- ($103k) consulting fees relating to Black and Well St consultation & traffic study and Sandringham Golf Course redevelopment proposal.
- $55k additional funding from Department of Treasury and Finance for the transition of the centralised Valuations contract.
- $33k sale of discontinued Council owned laneways, offset by additional property staff
- $50k reduction in software licences required.

**Environment, Recreation and Infrastructure unfavourable ($254k)**
- ($259k) additional costs associated with the purchase of new smaller bins due to the “Shrink your bin and save” campaign.
- ($217k) increase in Utilities for Public Lighting, Electricity and Gas charges as a result of the new contracts negotiated after budget approval and effective 1 July 2018. The new contract is an aggregated portfolio across the majority of Metropolitan Local Councils and is significantly cheaper than the default market rate for energy. This is offset by water usage to date $151k.
- ($250k) additional expense mainly relating to the Maintenance Service contract review.
- ($112k) increase in new Beach Cleaning contract rates.
- ($64k) additional cost relating to the commuter bus trial approved by council.
- ($65k) increase in the number of green waste collections.
- $240k savings in the kerbside recycling waste disposal contract as a result of a better price per tonnage negotiated with the recycling processor.
- $139k savings in landfill tipping fees due to a lower disposal rate and lower tonnage volumes
- $133k additional income mainly associated with Open Space permits issued for filming activities within the municipality.
- $65k increase in legal point of discharge income.
City Planning and Amenity favourable $1.209M
- $1.09M increase in parking fines.
- $407k increase in parking fees due to higher patronage along foreshore.
- $373k increase in infringement court recoveries related to parking fines.
- $150k higher number of skip bin permits.
- $129k increase in the grant funding for school crossings subsidy for 2018/19.
- ($300k) reduction in statutory planning application income due to the economic uncertainty and downturn in the housing market.
- ($278k) contract and consultation costs for Hampton Community Infrastructure feasibility Assessment and Master Plan.
- ($222k) increase in number of infringement lodgement fees due to higher number of parking fines.
- ($148k) expenditure for Customer Journey mapping for City Planning.

Community & Customer Experience favourable $1.01M
- $1.15M net savings expected in Aged & Disability predominantly due to clients transitioning to NDIS.
- $172k savings in Customer Experience employee costs due to staff vacancies.
- $135k savings in Youth employee costs due to staff vacancy.
- ($115k) development and implementation of the state & federal election advocacy campaigns.

Corporate Finance unfavourable ($832k)
- ($1.5M) lease surrender costs.
- ($257k) net reduction in income due to a bathing box unlikely to be sold in 2018/19.
- $414k sale of discontinuance of Council owned laneways
- $645k increase in interest income from general bank accounts and term deposits mainly due to a favourable opening cash position for the year.
- $107k savings in 2018/19 workcover premium due to improved claims history.

Rates favourable $361k
- $454k increase in supplementary rates in excess of the budget.
- $245k interest charged on late payment of rates.
- ($354k) reduction in rates and charges resulting from requests from rate payers for smaller bins.
Cash and Investments

The cash position of $112.7M has increased by $21.5M from the 2017/18 ending balance of $91.2M.

The YTD favourable variance to budget of $30.2M as at April 2019 is mainly due to:
- $13.5M greater opening cash balance than budgeted as of 1 July 2018:
  - Favourable capital works underspend including Rollover of 2017/18 capital projects
  - Favourable operating result in 2017/18 resulting in $2M transferred to the Infrastructure Reserve, an increase of unspent grant funds $1.6M, as well as additional resort and recreation and drainage levy income $1.5M transferred to reserves.
- $7.0M favourable variance in operating activities and $9.7M YTD favourable variance in investing activities.

Restricted funds include trust funds and reserves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</th>
<th>30-Jun-18</th>
<th>30-Apr-19</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated &amp; unrestricted</td>
<td>37,412</td>
<td>60,375</td>
<td>39,182</td>
<td>21,199</td>
<td>23,756</td>
<td>41,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>53,835</td>
<td>52,353</td>
<td>43,284</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>37,042</td>
<td>61,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91,247</td>
<td>112,728</td>
<td>82,466</td>
<td>30,262</td>
<td>60,797</td>
<td>102,654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash & cash equivalents (including investments) consists of:
- Total banks: 85,526, 100,037
- Community banks: 4,000, 8,000
- Cash on hand and at bank: 1,721, 4,701
- Total cash and cash equivalents: 91,247, 112,728

**Statutory Reserves**
- Recreational Land Reserve: 17,905, 20,800, 16,506
- Drainage Contribution Reserve: 394, 394, -
- Total Statutory Reserves: 18,706, 21,601, 16,924

**Funds Subject to Intended Allocation**
- Infrastructure Reserve: 8,235, 8,235, 6,333
- Deedy Street Beach Improvement Reserve: 2,157, 2,157, 2,748
- Community Facilities Enhancement Reserve: 968, 968, 986
- Early Childhood Facilities Reserve: 5,550, 5,550, 5,375, 175
- Defined Superannuation Shortfall: 2,500, 2,500, 2,917, (417)
- Unspent Conditional Grants Reserve: 1,620, 1,620
- Capital Works Carried Forward Reserve: 9,564, 5,534, 3,195
- Street and Park Tree Management Carried Fc: 110, 110, 110
- Total Funds Subject to Intended Allocation: 30,704, 26,664, 21,064

**Total Other Reserves**
- 49,410, 48,206, 38,588
- 9,617, 32,325, 56,500
- 24,183

**Committed Funds**
- Trust Funds and Deposits: 4,425, 4,148, 4,696
- 4,717, 4,545
- (172)
- Total Committed Funds: 4,425, 4,148, 4,696
- 4,717, 4,545
- (172)

**Total Restricted, Committed and Allocated funds**
- 53,835, 52,353, 43,284, 9,069
- 37,042, 61,053
- 24,011
### Victorian Auditor – General’s Office (VAGO) Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>VAGO Target (to maintain low risk)</th>
<th>Forecast Performance</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>The ability to pay liabilities within the next 12 months. (current assets/current liabilities)</td>
<td>&gt; 150%</td>
<td>562.56%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financing</td>
<td>The ability to replace assets using cash generated from day to day operations (net operating cash flow/underlying revenue)</td>
<td>&gt; 20.0%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement</td>
<td>To ensure sufficient spending on capital renewal and new capital works. (Total capital spend: Depreciation)</td>
<td>&gt; 150%</td>
<td>189.62%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>The ability to repay debt from own source revenue being revenue not tied to specific projects. (not current liabilities / own source revenue)</td>
<td>&lt; 40.0%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying result</td>
<td>Sufficient operating income to cover operating expenses (new surplus/revenue)</td>
<td>&gt; 0%</td>
<td>18.54%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal gap</td>
<td>To ensure sufficient spending on existing capital assets. (Renewal capital spend: depreciation)</td>
<td>&gt; 100%</td>
<td>133.43%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Government Performance Reporting Framework Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGPRF Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Expected Range</th>
<th>2018/19 Forecast</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average residential rate per residential property assessment*</td>
<td>$700 to $2,000</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per property assessment</td>
<td>$2,000 to $5,000</td>
<td>$2,468</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash compared to current liabilities</td>
<td>10% to 300%</td>
<td>255.7%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings compared to rates</td>
<td>0% to 70%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings repayments compared to rates</td>
<td>0% to 20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted underlying surplus (or deficit)</td>
<td>-20% to 20%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to adjusted underlying revenue</td>
<td>30% to 80%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to property values**</td>
<td>0.15% to 0.75%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The 2018/19 forecast for average residential rate includes the additional waste levy required to fund increases in recycling costs
**Reduced rates due to the take up of smaller garbage bins
June 2019 capital forecast expenditure - under budget $22.2M includes:

- $1.33M Recycling and Waste Transfer Station Pit Enclosure – Project scope unachievable within current budget. Review of future needs being undertaken.
- $1.2M Sandringham Village Activity Centre Streetscaping – Detailed design now in 2019/20 with the funds required in 2020/21 and 2021/22 to deliver project.
- $389k Drain Renewal Howell Avenue Beaumaris – Current scope not feasible without Melbourne Water upgrades.
- $339k Basketball Stadium – Design works completed. Planning process underway. Works subject to additional external funding.
- $818k HMVS Preservation Works – Final scope yet to be determined. Further discussions with funding bodies required prior to progressing with any works.
- $544k Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation – some delays, expected to be carried forward 2019/20.
- $370k B9 & B13 Car Park Renewal Construction – Savings expected due to favourable tender price.
- $302k Highett Road Activity Centre Streetscaping – Require PTV approval and funding. Works proposed to be carried out in 2020/21
- $284k Brighton Beach Oval Precinct Redevelopment – Project on hold until 20/21, scope not approved with club.
- $244k Red Bluff to Half Moon Bay Masterplan Implementation – Project on hold. Masterplan in consultation and scope unclear.
- $220k Sportsground Reconstruction Simpson Reserve – Savings due to favourable tender results.
- $210k Drain Champion Street Brighton – Work was not required due to other improvements.
- $166k Boss James Reserve – Project delayed until at least 2020/21.
- $145k Drain Myrtle Street Brighton – Favourable tender results.
- $140k Cricket Net Renewal William Street Reserve – Construction will now be part of pavilion.
- $131k B6 Car Park Renewal Design –Favourable tender price received.
- $121k Balcombe Road Retaining Wall – Funding available for minor works in 19/20.
- $120k Drain Murphy Street Brighton – Melbourne Water upgrades required prior to any Council works.
- $114k Public Toilet Elsternwick Park South – Savings due to favourable tender results.
- $103k Laneway Construction-Behind Hampton Street – savings due to favourable tender results.
- ($1.01M) Durrant St Drainage, Pavement & Tree Improvements – unfavourable tender results received through selective re-tender process in late April 2018.
- ($740k) Active Transport Facility Improvement Program – two roundabouts to be completed in 2018/19 of which funding will be received in 2019/20. An additional $175k grant income from Vic Roads expected in 2018/19 for project completed in 2017/18 (Church St/Male St roundabout raised zebra crossing).
- ($250k) Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve Remediation – Preliminary works to be carried out.
- ($200k) New Telecommunication Solution – variations for line connection and changes to headsets.
- ($180k) Beach Access Paths Upgrade Dendy Street Beach – Project cost underestimated at planning stage
($148k) Playground Renewal Projects – Completion of project in 18/19, unfavourable tender results and some delays due to the delivery of equipment and weather conditions.

($111k) Drain Hawthorn Road – Vic Road no longer carrying out required drainage works. Waiting on streetscape design to be completed.

Forecast carry forward of projects $15.8M to be completed in 2019/20

- $2M Dandy St Beach Masterplan Implementation – VCAT and remediation works.
- $789k Destructor Reserve Pavilion Redevelopment – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $966k William Street Reserve Pavilion Redevelopment – Planning approval required, construction is not anticipated to commence until 2019.
- $640k Sandringham Library Redevelopment – additional approvals required and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $277k AW Oliver Reserve Pavilion Redevelopment – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $244k 7 Well Street Brighton-Conversion to Car Parking – Awaiting rezoning of land, anticipated to be completed in 2019/20.
- $230k Activity Centre Masterplan – Hawthorn Road Village
- $220k Drain The Esplanade and Grosvenor Street Brighton – awaiting VicRoads and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $169k Integrated Water Management Strategy Implementation Yr1 – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $138k Invoice Scanning & Civica Authority Workflow – Project on hold expected to proceed in 2019/20.
- $129k Church Street Shopping Centre Pedestrian Improvement – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $120k Customer Data Management – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $114k Cricket Net Renewal Banksia Reserve – project on hold expected to proceed in 2019/20.
- $100k HMVS Preservation Works – Further planning is required and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $100k Netball Indoor Court – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $100k New Street Bridge & Brickenwood Street Bridge Renewal – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $85k Contract Management System – Project on hold expected to proceed in 2019/20.
- $75k Drain Myrtle Street Brighton – delayed due to underground service issues expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $75k Bi-Directional Integration with REX and Intramaps – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $55k Public Art Collection – delayed due to consultation with conservation society and local traders expected to be commence in 2019/20.
- $56k Planning Building & Asset Protection Application, Software – Project on hold expected to proceed in 2019/20.
- $51k MagIQ Powerbudget Reporting and Analysis Upgrade – Project on hold expected to proceed in 2019/20.
- $50k Basketball Stadium – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
- $25k Recycling and Waste Transfer Station Pit Enclosure – project currently underway and expected to be carried forward to 2019/20.
### Detailed Schedules

1. **Income Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>2018/19 YTD Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>2018/19 Year End Budget Forecast</th>
<th>2018/19 Year End Actuals</th>
<th>2018/19 Year End Actuals Variance</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget less variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Services &amp; New Initiatives Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and Charges</td>
<td>79,481</td>
<td>79,605</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95,416</td>
<td>95,531</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td>7,025</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>10,878</td>
<td>11,117</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>7,358</td>
<td>4,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Profit (Loss) on Disposal of assets</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>109,775</td>
<td>117,261</td>
<td>7,487</td>
<td>132,985</td>
<td>141,054</td>
<td>8,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Costs</td>
<td>36,509</td>
<td>35,102</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>44,929</td>
<td>43,884</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>38,663</td>
<td>39,481</td>
<td>(819)</td>
<td>47,300</td>
<td>50,328</td>
<td>(3,022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>15,341</td>
<td>15,316</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>18,416</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Costs</strong></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>90,863</td>
<td>90,211</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>111,265</td>
<td>113,236</td>
<td>(1,971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Result - Surplus</strong></td>
<td>18,911</td>
<td>27,050</td>
<td>8,139</td>
<td>21,720</td>
<td>27,818</td>
<td>6,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Statement of Capital Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>9,581</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>14,979</td>
<td>7,633</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>4,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Improvements</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant &amp; Equipment Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures, Fittings and Furniture</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems, Network, Servers and Communication</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assets</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore and Conservation</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Car Parks</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>(478)</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Infrastructure</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>9,819</td>
<td>(598)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>31,693</td>
<td>23,296</td>
<td>8,397</td>
<td>57,117</td>
<td>34,921</td>
<td>22,196</td>
<td>15,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

|                               |                  |                     |                  |                          |                      |                             |          |
| Grants - Capital              | (725)            | (1,005)             | 280              | (1,370)                  | (2,020)              | 650                         | (60)     |
| Other Income                  | (320)            | (15)                | (305)            | (320)                    | (15)                 | (305)                       |          |
| Contributions - Csh- Capital  | (1,666)          | (5,245)             | 3,579            | (3,213)                  | (7,558)              | 4,145                       |          |
| **Total Revenue**             | (2,711)          | (6,285)             | 3,554            | (4,303)                  | (9,393)              | 4,490                       | (60)     |

Total: 28,982 17,031 11,951 52,214 25,528 26,686 15,769
### 3. Statement of Cash Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cashflow Statement - period ended 30 April 2019</th>
<th>30-Jun-18</th>
<th>30-Apr-19</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflows</td>
<td>Outflows</td>
<td>Inflows</td>
<td>Outflows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from operating activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td>88,961</td>
<td>84,127</td>
<td>83,374</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory fees and fines</td>
<td>7,969</td>
<td>4,745</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>(770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>9,444</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>7,530</td>
<td>1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental income</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>(398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - monetary</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>3,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>11,231</td>
<td>8,932</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>(224)</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>(339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net GST refund</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>5,553</td>
<td>(693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>(41,581)</td>
<td>(36,177)</td>
<td>(36,120)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to suppliers</td>
<td>(54,378)</td>
<td>(46,081)</td>
<td>(46,453)</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities</td>
<td>44,464</td>
<td>44,635</td>
<td>37,593</td>
<td>7,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from investing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>(40,378)</td>
<td>(23,154)</td>
<td>(32,830)</td>
<td>9,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(57,117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from term deposit investments</td>
<td>(9,500)</td>
<td>(18,591)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(14,501)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used in investing activities</td>
<td>(49,878)</td>
<td>(41,555)</td>
<td>(36,830)</td>
<td>(4,825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(42,117)</td>
<td>(43,921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from financing activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from borrowings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of borrowings</td>
<td>(2,126)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used in financing activities</td>
<td>(2,250)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net increase/(decrease) in cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>(7,664)</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>2,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the beginning of the period</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>(1,956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposits</td>
<td>88,526</td>
<td>108,027</td>
<td>78,026</td>
<td>30,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</td>
<td>91,247</td>
<td>112,728</td>
<td>82,466</td>
<td>30,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated and unrestricted</td>
<td>37,412</td>
<td>60,375</td>
<td>39,182</td>
<td>21,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>53,835</td>
<td>52,353</td>
<td>43,284</td>
<td>9,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91,247</td>
<td>112,728</td>
<td>82,466</td>
<td>30,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 4. Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>8,207</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>(2,056)</td>
<td>9,064</td>
<td>8,043</td>
<td>(1,051)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial assets</td>
<td>84,526</td>
<td>103,027</td>
<td>78,026</td>
<td>25,001</td>
<td>58,026</td>
<td>90,526</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current assets classified as held for sale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>(307)</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>96,235</td>
<td>111,268</td>
<td>88,332</td>
<td>22,936</td>
<td>72,173</td>
<td>108,224</td>
<td>36,051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, infrastructure, plant and equipment</td>
<td>3,730,154</td>
<td>3,738,133</td>
<td>3,419,442</td>
<td>318,691</td>
<td>3,442,157</td>
<td>3,516,309</td>
<td>74,152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Held for Sale</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-current assets</strong></td>
<td>3,738,688</td>
<td>3,746,665</td>
<td>3,419,896</td>
<td>326,769</td>
<td>3,442,011</td>
<td>3,527,266</td>
<td>84,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>3,834,921</td>
<td>3,857,933</td>
<td>3,508,228</td>
<td>349,705</td>
<td>3,514,784</td>
<td>3,635,490</td>
<td>120,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other payables</td>
<td>11,308</td>
<td>6,126</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>(1,174)</td>
<td>10,062</td>
<td>10,953</td>
<td>(891)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>(548)</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>7,974</td>
<td>9,708</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>8,510</td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>(620)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>24,252</td>
<td>20,072</td>
<td>21,302</td>
<td>(1,230)</td>
<td>24,085</td>
<td>24,628</td>
<td>(543)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>(443)</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>(443)</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>25,047</td>
<td>21,009</td>
<td>22,682</td>
<td>(1,673)</td>
<td>25,509</td>
<td>25,647</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td>3,809,874</td>
<td>3,836,924</td>
<td>3,485,546</td>
<td>351,378</td>
<td>3,489,275</td>
<td>3,609,843</td>
<td>120,566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity**

- Accumulated surplus: 875,870
- Asset revaluation reserve: 2,884,594
- Other reserves: 49,410

**Total equity**

- 3,809,874
- 3,836,924
- 3,485,546
- 351,378
- 3,489,275
- 3,609,843
- 120,566
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10.25 COUNCIL ACTION AWAITING REPORT

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/155015

Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report presents to Council a schedule of actions pending for the period to 25 June 2019.

Key issues
This report contains resolutions of Council that require a further report to Council.

Recommendation
That Council notes the Council Action Awaiting Report.

Support Attachments
1. Action Awaiting Report - June 2019 ↓
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Sandringham Village Streetscape Masterplan</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>In the event that the bus route changes in Bay Road, Beach Road, Melrose Street and Station Street does not proceed and the Village Square feature not be achievable, a revised Master Plan without the Village Square concept will be presented to a future Council meeting for adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Children's Sensory Garden Investigation</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A future report will be provided to a future Council meeting detailing the implications of including a sensory garden in the planning of the one hectare passive open space in the CSIRO site. The timeline of this report will be subject to the transfer of land (one hectare passive open space) is confirmed and planning can commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Amendment C151 – Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report was submitted to the Minister on 2 May 2018. Council is currently awaiting the Minister’s decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/17</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>HMVS Cerberus – Heritage Works Permit Update</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A future report will be presented to Council if the permit approved method concrete infill proves problematic or beyond the current Council approved budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/6/18</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td><strong>Building Inclusive Communities Funding Update</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council receives a further report no later than 30 June 2019, with options for Council's ongoing role in relation to disability inclusion, advocacy and planning beyond the cessation of the Building Inclusive Communities funding in June 2019.</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td><strong>Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025 - Annual Progress Report</strong>&lt;br&gt;3. Receives a further report in the first quarter of the 2019/20 financial year detailing progress against targets, the overall success of actions and reviewing issues and risks.</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to the Council Meeting in August 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8/18</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td><strong>Early Years Infrastructure Plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt;4. receives a further report detailing options for the long term use of the Brighton South Playhouse, once temporary relocations for displaced services undergoing redevelopment works are completed;&lt;br&gt;7. receives a further report following a review of the Infrastructure Plan in year five.</td>
<td>C&amp;CE</td>
<td>A report will be provided to Council on the completion of the development works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council receives a further report no later than August 2019 from the Management Committee summarising activities, including the financial position of the Brighton Secondary College Hockey Facility Management Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) receives a further report in August 2019 on the success of the trial; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10/18</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Update on the mid-century Modern Heritage Voluntary Inclusion Process</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Notes the revised timeframes for the proposed nomination process stages as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Stage 1 Nominations for Heritage Listing: November 2018 – March 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Stage 2 Assessing Heritage Properties: March 2019 – May 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Stage 3 Planning Scheme Amendment: June 2019 – September 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Develops a communication strategy to assist in the implementation of Stage 1; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Receives a report at the June 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council on which mid-century modern properties to pursue a planning scheme amendment deemed to be of heritage significance through the voluntary expression of interest process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td><strong>CSIRO - Legal Agreements Update</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt;Sees a report following the execution of the Deed of Agreement with the CSIRO which outlines the details of the Deed agreement and next steps.</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to Council following the execution of the Deed of Agreement with the CSIRO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/12/18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td><strong>Tulip Street Basketball Courts Extension - Project and Funding Update</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt;2. Sees a further report at a future meeting detailing State Government grant opportunities and preferred funding model for the Tulip Street Basketball Courts Extension project;</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to a future meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/12/18</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td><strong>Community Engagement Plan for Wilson Reserve and Brighton Recreational Centre Masterplan</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt;2. Sees a report detailing the outcomes of the community engagement and the draft Masterplan by June 2020.</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to Council by June 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/2/19</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td><strong>Community Engagement Approach for Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve Masterplan</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Sees a report detailing the outcomes of the community engagement on the Elsternwick Park Nature Reserve at the 25 June 2019 Council meeting.</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/2/19</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Parking Technology - Church Street Major Activity Centre 3. Receives a further report regarding the findings from the community engagement activities at the June 2019 Council meeting.</td>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/3/19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Response to Notice of Motion - 277 - Single-Use Plastics Associated with Council Premises 5. Receive a report at the June 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council on the merits of the introduction of a local law banning the single-use of plastic similar to the Hobart City Council model.</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/3/19</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Hampton Community Infrastructure Feasibility Assessment and Masterplan That Council notes this report and receives a further progress report at or before the 23 July 2019 Ordinary Meeting.</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to the July 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/3/19</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Proposal for an Urban Forest Strategy 2. Receives a further report at the 17 December 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council reporting on the outcomes of the case study.</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to the December 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/3/19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment C126 - Small Activity Centres Strategy 2014 4. Present a report to Council in June 2019 with the outcomes of the study.</td>
<td>CP&amp;A</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23/4/19         | 10.1  | **Response to Petition - To Ban Smoking in and around Ricketts Point Marine Sanctuary**  
2) Receives a progress report on the various stages of developing the Local Law following the completion of the engagement, research and risk assessment process, to determine specific areas proposed to be declared as smoke free. | CP&A     | A report will be submitted to a future meeting.                                  |
<p>| 23/4/19         | 10.3  | <strong>Update on Nursery Management and Bushland Maintenance Model</strong>                      | ERI      | A report will be submitted to the September 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting.       |
|                 |       | 1. Receives a further report at or before the September 2019 Council meeting on the merits and costs of providing Nursery and/or bushland services via an in-house service delivery model. |          |                                                                                 |
| 23/4/19         | 10.4  | <strong>2019 Bright n Sandy Food and Wine Festival Service Review</strong>                        | ERI      | A report will be submitted to a future meeting, following the 2020 Bright n Sandy Food and Wine Festival. |
|                 |       | 4. Provides a report on an event review following the 2020 Bright n Sandy Food and Wine Festival. |          |                                                                                 |
| 21/5/19         | 10.8  | <strong>Bayside Planning Scheme Review 2019</strong>                                            | CP&amp;A     | A report will be submitted to a future meeting in the 2019/2020 financial year (at or before June 2020) |
|                 |       | • Considers the proposed changes to the local and state sections of the Bayside Planning Scheme proposed under the Smart Planning Program in a further report to be presented to Council in the 2019/2020 financial year. |          |                                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>CFSA</td>
<td>Notice of Motion - 278 - Proposed changes to Beaumaris Concours StreetScape Masterplan 2017</td>
<td>21/5/19</td>
<td>A report is included in this Agenda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   1. Receives a report at the June Ordinary Council Meeting on the implications and costs associated with the following works currently underway at the Beaumaris Concours:

   a. Removal of the newly laid asphalt footpath (South Concours - Western end and outside the recuprant) and replacement of all proposed asphalt paths shown in the Beaumaris Concours StreetScape Masterplan to the East of the Beaumaris Concours.

   b. Removal of the granular sand under the seats and the path on the north and south side of the Village Green shown in the adopted Beaumaris Concours StreetScape Masterplan.

   2. 21/5/19 Notice of Motion - 279 - Proposed changes to Draft Footpath Treatments Within the Road Reserve Policy 2019 | 21/5/19 | A report is included in this Agenda |

   3. Receives a report at the June Ordinary Council Meeting on the implications and costs associated with the following works currently underway at the Beaumaris Concours:

   a. Removal of the newly laid asphalt footpath (South Concours - Western end and outside the recuprant) and replacement of all proposed asphalt paths shown in the Beaumaris Concours StreetScape Masterplan to the East of the Beaumaris Concours.

   b. Removal of the granular sand under the seats and the path on the north and south side of the Village Green shown in the adopted Beaumaris Concours StreetScape Masterplan.
11. Reports by Delegates

1. Association of Bayside Municipalities – Cr Laurence Evans
2. MAV Environment Committee – Director Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure
3. Metropolitan Transport Forum – Director Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure
4. Municipal Association of Victoria – Cr Alex del Porto
5. Inner South Metropolitan Mayors’ Forum – The Mayor Cr Michael Heffernan
6. Metropolitan Local Government Waste Forum – Cr Clarke Martin

12. Urgent Business
13. Notices of Motion

13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - 280 - VEGETATION PROTECTION OVERLAY

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/156953

I hereby give notice that I intend to move at the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held on 25 June 2019 at 7pm at the Council Chambers, Civic Centre, Boxshall Street, Brighton the following Notice of Motion:

Motion

That Council:

1. Receives a report at the 23 July 2019 Ordinary Meeting of Council on the below mechanisms to ensure the intent of the Vegetation Protection Overlay, Schedule 3 (VPO3) are achieved, with the report addressing the following aspects and associated impact:

   a) Review of the current auditing program in relation to compliance with tree replanting and landscape plans requirements;

   b) Identify areas and actions to improve compliance with tree replanting and landscape plans requirements;

   c) Investigate the benefit of ecological reports in considering statutory tree removal applications in response to the effect on fauna and vegetation corridors; and

   d) A high level evaluation on the ability to introduce a bond framework on private property to ensure the implementation of landscape plans.

2. Notes that as per Council resolution of 19 March 2019, a suburb case study, looking at Beaumaris, is currently being developed to assist to define the scope of a Future Urban Strategy. The case study benefits, limitations and opportunities will be reported to the Ordinary Meeting of Council of 17 December 2019.

Cr Laurence Evans

Support Attachments
Nil
13.2 NOTICE OF MOTION - 281 - PROTECTING THE VALUED NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER OF BEAUMARIS AND BLACK ROCK

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/19/960 – Doc No: DOC/19/157001

I hereby give notice that I intend to move at the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held on 25 June 2019 at 7pm at the Council Chambers, Civic Centre, Boxshall Street, Brighton the following Notice of Motion:

Motion

That Council:

1. Notes that the neighbourhood character of Beaumaris and Black Rock is highly valued by many residents.

2. Recognises that development pressure, primarily single dwelling development that is not subject to planning approval and therefore an assessment on neighbourhood character, is progressively undermining the highly valued character of the area.

3. Notes that the Neighbourhood Character Study Review is to commence in 2019/2020 with the purpose to:
   a) Review all Neighbourhood Character Precincts in Bayside to assess and describe how the features of an area come together to give that area its own particular character;
   b) Identify key characteristics, threats and strategies for maintaining each precinct’s character;
   c) Establish a preferred future character statement that aligns to the role and key characteristics of each precinct; and
   d) Provide direction for future development of residential areas in the municipality.

4. Receives a report at the 17 December 2019 Ordinary meeting of Council that provides a preliminary assessment of all neighbourhood character precincts in Bayside and the community engagement approach to test key characteristics, threats and strategies for maintaining each precinct’s character.

Cr Clarke Martin

Support Attachments

Nil
I hereby give notice that I intend to move at the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held on 25 June 2019 at 7pm at the Council Chambers, Civic Centre, Boxshall Street, Brighton the following Notice of Motion:

**Motion**

That Council receives a report on the construction methodology and resulting pedestrian and traffic impacts of the roundabout works at Church / St Andrews Streets and Bay / Cochrane Streets, Brighton proposed in 2019/2020 before contracts are awarded for these construction works.

Cr Rob Grinter

**Support Attachments**

Nil
14. Confidential Business

That pursuant to Section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989, the Council resolves that so much of this meeting be closed to members of the public, as it involves Council consideration of matters coming within some or all of the following categories listed in Section 89(2) of such Act.

(a) Personnel matters;
(b) The personal hardship of any resident or ratepayers;
(c) Industrial matters;
(d) Contractual matters;
(e) Proposed developments;
(f) Legal advice;
(g) Matters affecting the security of Council property;
(h) Any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person;
(i) A resolution to close the meeting to members of the public.

14.1 HISTORIC PROPERTY MATTER
(LGA 1989 Section 89(2)(g) and (h) matters affecting the security of Council property and matters which the Council considers would prejudice the Council or any person.)

As Chief Executive Officer, I hereby declare that the contents of this agenda relating to the closed meeting of the ordinary meeting of Council are deemed confidential and accordingly members of Council are reminded that the contents of the agenda are not to be disclosed to any other party.

Mick Cummins

Chief Executive Officer