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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 19 September 2017.

   5.2 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Special meeting of Bayside City Council held on 17 October 2017.

6. **Public Question Time**

7. **Petitions to Council**

   Nil

8. **Minutes of Advisory Committees**

   Nil
Executive summary

Purpose and background
To present the minutes of the Gallery@BACC Board meeting held on 9 October 2017 to Council for noting.

In accordance with Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1989, Council at its meeting in July 2016 established a Special Committee of Council known as the Gallery@BACC Board.

Council also through an instrument of delegation, delegated some powers and function to the gallery which are listed below:

The following functions, powers, and discretions are delegated to the Gallery@BACC Board:

1. To recommend a four year Strategic Plan for The Gallery@BACC, to be presented to Council for adoption, including adjustments and alterations as determined by Council. The Strategic Plan will be in accordance with the Council-adopted purpose that has been established for The Gallery@BACC.
2. Approve acquisitions, de-accessions, and the ongoing management of Council’s art & heritage collection on recommendation from the Council Executive Team member with management responsibility for the Arts & Culture programs in accordance with Council’s Art & Heritage Collection Policy, the approved Four Year strategic plan and Council’s annual budget.
3. Approve The Gallery@BACC exhibition and public program schedule with regard to the Four Year Strategic Plan.
4. Monitor performance against the Four Year Strategic Plan and provide strategic advice to Council as necessary.
5. Support staff in building of relationships and partnerships with artists, arts sector organisations, business and government agencies.
6. Approve marketing and promotion strategies as outlined in the Strategic Plan, The Gallery@BACC’s exhibition program, public programs, and its positive artistic, social, and economic impacts.
7. Provide advice and guidance on the pursuit of sponsorship, fundraising, and philanthropic opportunities, and investigation of the feasibility of establishing a Gallery@BACC Foundation to facilitate the receipt of donations, bequests, and proceeds of fundraising activities.

The Gallery Board membership consists of two Councillors appointed by Council and five ordinary members appointed through a public expression of interest process.
Key issues
A meeting of the Gallery Board was held on 9 October 2017 to consider the following matters:

- Acquisition report
- Artists Brief Martin Street Public Art
- Sponsorship, fundraising and philanthropic opportunities
- Recruitment of two additional Board Members

A copy of the 9 October 2017 minutes of the Gallery@BACC Board meeting is attached for Council’s information.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. notes the minutes of the Gallery@BACC Board meeting held on 9 October 2017; and
2. adopts the following recommendations of the Gallery@BACC Board meeting of 9 October 2017:

   Item 6.1 Acquisition Report
   1. That the Gallery@BACC Board recommends to Council the following acquisitions to the Bayside Art and Heritage collection:
      a) James Voller, Little Boxes, digiglass panels with photographic reproductions (Martin Street public art commission) Value $70,000;
      b) Robert Kelly, Chinaman’s Creek 2016 oil and acrylic on canvas (Artwork) Value $3,850;
      c) Peter Kennedy, Light as a Feather 2017, glass tubing, cathodes, noble gas (neon light), plastic clips, acrylic painted MDF surface (Visual Arts Collection) Value $20,000
   2. That a narrative be produced on the Martin Street Public Art “Little Boxes” to provide context.

   Item 6.2 Recruitment of Board Members
   That the Gallery@BACC Board recommends to Council that two additional Board members be recruited to provide additional skill set on the Board.

Support Attachments
1. Minutes - 09 October 2017 - Gallery@BACC Board
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The Gallery@BACC Board provides a social impact by providing community members with an opportunity to be engaged and provide advice on Council policies and strategies, and to consider issues and opportunities relating to the various forms of art including Bayside’s art collection.

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

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

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There are no customer service or community engagement implications associated with this report.

Human Rights
The implications of the 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 or statutory requirements associated with this report.

Finance
The cost of the three acquisitions are budgeted within the 2017/18 budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The Gallery@BACC Board has a direct link to the Council Plan with regards to connecting with the community and supporting arts and culture.
Minutes of the
Gallery@BACC Board (LGA Section 86 Committee) Meeting

held in the Mayor's Room
Council Chambers. Brighton
on Monday 9 October 2017

The Meeting commenced at 6.00pm

External Members
Ms Angelina Beninati
Mr Roger Boyce
Mr Patrick Christian

Councillors
Cr Sonia Castelli
Cr Alex del Porto (Mayor)

In attendance
Paulina Xerri Executive Manager Communications, Customer and Cultural Services
Giacomina Pradolin Arts and Culture Program Coordinator
Terry Callant Governance Manager
Michael Brennan Curator
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1. Welcome and opening of the meeting

The Chairman welcomed Board members to the meeting.

2. Present

Ms Angelina Beninati
Mr Roger Boyce
Mr Patrick Christian
Cr Sonia Castelli
Cr Alex del Porto (Mayor)

3. Apologies

An apology was received from Ms Tiziana Borghese, and Ms Charlotte Christie.

Moved Cr del Porto  Seconded Cr Castelli

That the apologies of Ms Tiziana Borghese and Ms Charlotte Christie be received and leave of absence be granted.

CARRIED

4. Disclosure of any Conflict of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest submitted to the meeting.

5. Adoption and Confirmation of the minutes of previous meeting

5.1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Gallery@BACC Board (LGA Section 86 Committee) Meeting held on 16 August 2017.

Moved: Cr del Porto (Mayor)  Seconded: Cr Castelli

That the minutes of the Gallery@BACC Board (LGA Section 86 Committee) Meeting held on 16 August 2017, as previously circulated, be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings.

CARRIED
6. Reports

6.1 ACQUISITION REPORT

Communications, Customer & Cultural Services - Cultural services
File No: FOL/16/1934 – Doc No: DOC/17/209620

The Gallery Curator briefly explained to the Board the context and connection of the art work with the Martin Street Village Shopping Centre.

James Voller’s application was unanimously selected by the Assessment Panel evaluating the Selective Tender submissions for the Martin Street Public Artwork commission.

Voller’s submission will result in a bright, playful and accessible addition to the precinct. It references some of the most iconic imagery from Bayside in the Brighton Bathing Boxes, while presenting them in such a way so that they read as colourful and dynamic abstract compositions that will enliven the streetscape. By referencing the Bathing Boxes, the work extends Voller’s practice of re-presenting local architectural structures in spaces where they aren’t usually encountered. This displacement prompts viewers to consider both the structures and their setting in a new and different way.

The proposed work will mark the gateways to the Martin Street business district – at both Asling Street and the Nepean Highway – while also activating the space between with installations on the surfaces of existing bin enclosures. Consideration has been given to both the suitability of the materials to be used and the appropriate placement of the works to ensure pedestrian movement and lines of sight are maintained.

The scale of the work and its activation of the entire precinct also represent value for money that might not be available in the work of a more senior artist.

Moved: Mr Christian Seconded: Mr Boyce

1. That the Gallery@BACC Board recommends to Council the following acquisitions to the Bayside Art and Heritage collection:

   a) James Voller, Little Boxes, digiglass panels with photographic reproductions (Martin Street public art commission) Value $70,000;

   b) Robert Kelly, Chiman’s Creek 2016 oil and acrylic on canvas (Artwork) Value $3,850;

   c) Peter Kennedy, Light as a Feather 2017, glass tubing, cathodes, noble gas (neon light), plastic clips, acrylic painted MDF surface (Visual Arts Collection) Value $20,000

2. That a narrative be produced on the Martin Street Public Art “Little Boxes” to provide context.

CARRIED
6.2 SPONSORSHIP, FUNDRAISING AND PHILANTHROPIC OPPORTUNITIES

The Chairperson raised the matter concerning the Board’s role in sponsorship, fundraising and philanthropic opportunities, given the Charter clearly outlines the Board will provide advice and guidance only on these matters.

The Board discussed the opportunity of the Board being more involved in sponsorship and fundraising for the gallery. It was suggested that the Board’s Charter including the Instrument of Delegation be reviewed including changes to philanthropic, sponsorship and fundraising opportunities and in line with the Strategic Plan be further considered at the November meeting.

Moved: Cr del Porto (Mayor)  Seconded: Mr Boyce

That the Gallery@BACC Board undertakes a review of the Charter and Instrument of Delegation with particular reference to sponsorship, fundraising and philanthropic opportunities and other administrative enhancement to the Charter at the November meeting.

CARRIED

7. General Business

7.1 Recruitment of Board Members

The Chairperson indicated the need to appoint a replacement Board member following the resignation of Cindy Carrad. It was also suggested that an additional member be sought to provide 7 ordinary board members. It was noted that the Charter provides for up to 8 ordinary Board members. The Board also suggested that the additional members preferable should have legal or philanthropic experience.

Moved Ms Beninati  Seconded Mr Boyce

That the Gallery@BACC Board recommends to Council that two additional Board members be recruited to provide additional skill set on the Board.

CARRIED

7.2 Attendance at the Art and Cultural Advisory Committee

The Chairperson indicated that she is attending the Bayside Arts and Culture Advisory Committee Meeting to be held on 18 October to share with the Advisory Committee the role of the Board and discuss future opportunities for the Gallery including an Arts Precinct. The Chairperson invited other Board Members to attend.
8. Confirmation of date of future meetings

The meeting of the Gallery@BACC Board will be held on 29 November 2017.

The Chairperson declared the meeting closed at 7.14pm.

CONFIRMED THIS INSERT 29 DAY OF NOVEMBER 2017

CHAIRPERSON: ...........................................
Executive summary

Purpose and background

To seek clarification from Councilors of the next steps in relation to Planning Scheme Amendment C151, which implements the Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016, following Council's decision at its 19 September 2017 Ordinary Meeting that Council:

1. Proceed with Amendment C151 for Precincts 1, 2 & 4 of the ACZ1 and split the Amendment to exclude ACZ1 from Precincts 3, 5 & 6; and

2. Receives a report at the October Ordinary Meeting of Council on the costs, funding options and timing of an additional study on the remainder of the Amendment; and

3. Subject to the above report, undertakes an additional study for Precincts 3, 5 & 6 to address the Panel Recommendations declining Council’s preferred mandatory height in Precinct 5 & 6 and to provide additional rationale for reducing the recommended discretionary height of 6 storeys for Precinct 3.

Key issues

Part 1 of the Council resolution

It is understood that the intent of Council’s decision is to split the amendment in two parts and to apply to the Minister for Planning for Approval of Planning Scheme Amendment C151, Part 1, in the form outlined below:

- The Activity Centre Zone be applied to Precincts 1, 2 and 4 incorporating the changes recommended by the Planning Panel;
  - Precinct 1:
    - Maximum 5 storey (17m) discretionary building height.
    - 2 metre mandatory setback from the laneway at the 4th and 5th storey
    - 5 metre discretionary setback from the street at the 4th and 5th storey
  - Precinct 2:
    - Maximum 5 storey (17m) discretionary building height.
    - 5 metre discretionary setback from the street at the 4th and 5th storey
  - Precinct 4:
    - Maximum 5 storey (17m) discretionary building height.
• Remove the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 1 from the entire centre;
• Remove the Public Acquisition Overlay from within the centre; and
• Incorporate the changes to the Clauses 21.02, 21.03, 21.06, 21.07, 21.08 and 21.09, which includes listing the Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016 as a reference document.

It is considered that whilst Council may be undertaking further work on the built form controls proposed for precincts 3, 5 and 6 of the Structure Plan, the references to the creation of the new public open space in precinct 3 will proceed in line with the recommendations of the Structure Plan.

Part 2 and 3 of the Council resolution

Council’s decision is to develop the strategic justification to reduce heights in precinct 3 and support mandatory height controls in 5 and 6. The additional study will inform a review of the Council Adopted Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016.

It is recommended that Council waits until a decision from the Minister for Planning about whether the split to the amendment is supported, before undertaking the additional study in relation to precincts 3, 5 and 6.

If the Minister approves Part 1 of Amendment C151 as discussed above, it is expected that the scope of the additional study for precincts 3, 5 and 6 will involve a review of the housing capacity analysis for Bayside. The housing capacity review will include a response to the recently released ABS data, in relation to current and future population and demographic needs to inform the revision of the proposed built form controls. The implementation of this findings will result in a review of the Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016.

A review will follow a very similar process to that undertaken during the preparation of the Structure Plan and will include the following stages:

- Background work
- Consultation and engagement on findings of background work
- Development of a draft Structure Plan
- Endorsement from Council of the Draft Structure Plan for consultation and engagement purposes
- Consultation and engagement on the Draft Structure Plan
- Review and consideration of submissions by Council on the Draft Structure Plan
- Adoption of the Final Structure Plan by Council and Planning Scheme Amendment documents for the purposes of exhibition to commence the implementation process.

The scope of works outlined above are expected to cost between $120,000 and $150,000. The costs will be utilised for community engagement, communications material, expert urban design, economic and traffic and transport advice, graphic design, postage cost, statutory fees for subsequent planning scheme amendments and Panel processes.

Waiting for a decision from the Minister of Planning will allow the additional study to be effectively integrated with Council and community aspirations as well as the extensive, existing strategic planning initiatives and future work program.
If Budget is allocated in 2018/19 for the further work, it is anticipated that this would be completed and through the Planning Panel process in 2019/20.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Submit Amendment C151 for Precincts 1, 2 & 4 of the ACZ1 for Approval by the Minister for Planning in the form outlined in this report under Key Issues, Part 1 of this Council report; and

2. Following the Minister for Planning’s decision in relation to the above receives a report that outlines the scope for an additional study for precincts 3, 5 and 6 including costs, funding options and timing.

**Support Attachments**

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Amendment C151 seeks to create a more vibrant Hampton East MAC through introducing objectives and strategies into the Bayside Planning Scheme that guide future land use, built form, access and movement and landscaping. The Amendment seeks to provide a mixture of housing types to increase housing choice and diversity in an area that is well serviced by shops and transport. In addition, the clustering of medical and health uses along Nepean Highway will provide accessible, convenient medical services for the ageing population of Bayside.

Natural Environment
Amendment C151 seeks to maintain and enhance the landscaped environment through encouraging new developments to provide canopy trees and other planting in the front and rear yards, particularly in Precincts 5 and 6. The introduction of planning controls to achieve this outcome will be delayed until part 2 of the Council resolution is implemented into the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Built Environment
Amendment C151 provides clear guidance on the expected built form outcomes in the activity centre. Removing precincts 3, 5 and 6 from the ACZ will result in limited guidance for new development in these RGZ and GRZ areas until part 2 of the Council resolution is implemented into the Bayside Planning Scheme.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Proceeding with part 2 of the Council resolution will require the preparation of a Communications and Engagement Strategy to inform the review of any recommendations to the Adopted Hampton East Structure Plan 2016.

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
Section 29(2) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 states that if a planning authority adopts a part of an amendment that part becomes a separate amendment. It is considered that the intent of Council’s decision is to split the amendment and permission for this will need to be sought from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.

Ministerial Direction 15: The Planning Scheme Amendment Process requires that Council submit the amendment to the Minister for Planning within 10 business days of adopting the amendment. An exemption to the requirements of Ministerial Direction 15 has been requested.

Finance
The scope of works outlined in this report are expected to cost between $120,000 and $150,000. The costs will be utilised for community engagement, communications material, expert urban design, economic and traffic and transport advice, graphic design, postage cost, statutory fees for subsequent planning scheme amendments and Panel processes.
Waiting for a decision from the Minister of Planning will allow the additional study for precincts 3, 5 and 6 to be integrated with Council and community aspirations as well as the existing strategic planning initiatives and future work program. Links to Council policy and strategy

**Community Plan 2025**

Amendment C151 is broadly consistent with the *Community Plan 2025*. In particular, it delivers on the following ‘domains of liveability’ and associated ‘community aspirations’:

- **Open Space**: Amendment C151 seeks to create a centrally located open space to provide a gathering space and improve the amenity of the Centre;

- **Local Economy**: Amendment C151 seeks to encourage active uses at ground levels of commercial development, improve local employment opportunities and strengthen South Road’s health focussed services; and

- **Housing and Neighbourhoods**: Amendment C151 provides a framework to manage development within the Hampton East (Moorabbin) MAC, encourages the retention of canopy trees and additional landscaping, and facilitates housing diversity.

**Council Plan 2017-2021**

Amendment C151 is also consistent with the *Council Plan 2017-2021*. In particular, it is consistent with Goal 3: Housing and neighbourhoods, which includes the strategy to “Develop and review structure plans to ensure localities are developed in line with Council’s Housing Strategy.” Implementing the Structure Plan into the Bayside Planning Scheme through Amendment C151 will enable the management of new development in the Hampton East (Moorabbin) MAC. Moving away from the adopted Structure Plan may undermine Council’s ability to accommodate growth and ensure activity centres are developed in accordance with community expectations.

**Bayside Housing Strategy 2012**

The *Bayside Housing Strategy 2012* identifies the Hampton East (Moorabbin) MAC as a major focus for future medium and high density residential development within Bayside. It recommends the preparation of a structure plan for the MAC. Amendment C151 delivers the *Bayside Housing Strategy* by providing a framework based on the Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan to manage development and deliver a wide range of housing types and sizes to meet the varied needs of the community.

**Hampton East Structure Plan 2016**

Amendment C151 implements the vision of the *Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016* by translating the objectives relating to Land Use, Built Form, Access and Movement, and Landscaping into a series of planning provisions that guide future land use and development in the Hampton East (Moorabbin) MAC. The adopted Council resolution departs from the Structure Plan and compromises the implementation of any policy direction for the area as exhibited through Planning Scheme Amendment C151.
Executive summary

Purpose
To present Council with the submissions received in relation to Amendment C150, which implements the Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016 (‘the RCE Strategy’) into the Bayside Planning Scheme.

The RCE Strategy provides policy directions on the future evolution of Bayside’s activity centres and the Bayside Business District (BBD) to ensure opportunities for business and employment growth are provided.

Background
The RCE Strategy was adopted by Council at its 16 August 2016 Ordinary Meeting. At this meeting, Council also resolved to request the Minister for Planning to approve Amendment C150 pursuant to Section 20(2) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, which would have allowed the amendment to progress without the ordinary public notice or Panel process. The rationale for this was largely due to the RCE Strategy supporting existing planning policy for activity centres without transforming the direction of planning for activity centres. However, the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning required Council to undertake public exhibition of the amendment.

Amendment C150 was publicly exhibited between 22 June and 24 July 2017 with 16 submissions received.

Key issues
Summary of Amendment C150
Amendment C150 to the Bayside Planning Scheme seeks to implement the RCE Strategy 2016 by:

- Including the RCE Strategy as a reference document in the Bayside Planning Scheme;
- Updating the economic policy relating to activity centres to clearly articulate the economic role of Bayside’s commercial areas;
- Changing the name of Bayside’s core employment area from the Bayside Business Employment Area to the Bayside Business District (‘the BBD’) and updating related policy for the precinct; and
- Effecting a range of other updates to the Municipal Strategic Statement and Local Planning Policy Framework.

Many of the actions of the RCE Strategy relating to the BBD include more specific initiatives which are referenced throughout the Municipal Strategic Statement and other Council initiatives.
Outcomes of public exhibition

The key issues and feedback raised are outlined below, however, in summary the submissions related to:

- Rezoning the BBD to allow new residential or mixed use developments to locate in the BBD (where residential uses are currently prohibited);

- Whether Council’s ‘no net loss’ of commercial floor space is a reasonable approach for activity centres, as the market should decide whether increased commercial floorspace is provided;

- Seeking clarification on the Bayside Economic Triangle concept and the implications it has on the residential areas within Highett and Cheltenham; and

- A broad range of issues relating to the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process. A number of these matters are outside the scope of the RCE Strategy.

A number of comments were also made about the Bayside Housing Strategy and the relevance of existing policy in the Planning Scheme relating to housing growth. Much of this is not relevant to the consideration of Amendment C150. A response to the submissions is included (Attachment 1).

Residential Development in the BBD

Residential zoning is not supported in the BBD by the RCE Strategy. Mixed Use zoning is also not supported, as it is by default a residential zone, because residential uses are ‘as of right’. Instead, these types of developments are encouraged in Bayside’s activity centres, with the BBD continuing to play a purely commercial role. A change to allow for residential uses would result in creation of a new activity centre rather than the continued development of the employment precinct that is encouraged by existing policy and the RCE Strategy. Many amenity impacts would arise from conflicting uses given the nature of many of the commercial and industrial uses operating in the BBD. These most likely serve over time to diminish employment related industries in the area.

Commercial Floorspace increases

Retention of current levels of ground floor retail and commercial use on Commercial zoned land is a minimum requirement needed to maintain the social and economic function of Bayside’s activity centres. The Strategy identifies a need to ensure that floorspace growth is created to service the future population. Where residential growth is a key opportunity for a centre, for example Hampton Street MAC, it is not intended that this should be at the expense of commercial development. Rather, that development needs to ensure that commercial floorspace growth is provided and allowing residential growth above commercial uses. Land for commercial uses in Bayside is limited and the RCE seeks its retention to ensure our growing population can access a wide range of services, including employment, health services and retail.

Bayside Economic Triangle

Opportunity exists to clarify how the Bayside Economic Triangle concept is delivered through the Highett Structure Plan Review and Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan processes. These projects have commenced and the first stage of community consultation completed. The RCE Strategy outlines the importance of connecting the Highett, Southland and BBD precincts given the interconnected nature of these areas. Locating residential uses in the BBD
would detract from Council’s ability to encourage those uses in their preferred locations as outlined in the *Bayside Housing Strategy* 2012.

**Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan issues**

The management of future growth and built form in the Southland/Pennydale and Highett Structure Plan areas will be dealt with as part of those structure planning processes. There is no direct impacts from the RCE Strategy as to the designation of these areas as housing growth areas and the Amendment does not impact built form or land uses in those precincts.

The *Bayside Housing Strategy* 2012 outlines Council’s approach to accommodating housing growth in Bayside, which is not altered by Amendment C150. It is not appropriate to change housing policy through Amendment C150 as this was outside the scope of the RCE Strategy. Following Council’s decision on Amendment C126 at its 19 September 2017 Ordinary Meeting, a meeting with representatives of the Pennydale Residents Action Group is being organised to discuss the activity centre hierarchy changes proposed through Amendments C126 and C150.

**Next Steps**

Pursuant to the *Planning and Environment Act* 1987, a planning authority must consider all submissions and must either:

a) Change the amendment to address the issues raised by submitters;

b) Refer the submissions to an independent Planning Panel; or

c) Abandon the amendment.

Due to the issues raised in submissions, as well as many of the submissions raising issues beyond the scope of the RCE Strategy and beyond the remit of Amendment C150, it is unlikely that Council will be able to resolve all submissions. Therefore, it is considered appropriate that Council requests the Minister for Planning to appoint an independent Planning Panel to consider the submissions. The Planning Panel will consider submissions, receive presentations from Council and submitters and then provide recommendations to Council and the Minister for Planning on any changes to be made to the amendment to respond to submissions. Changes recommended to the Amendment documents to address submissions will be presented, discussed and tested through the Panel process.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Requests the Minister for Planning appoints an independent Planning Panel to consider the submissions received to Amendment C150; and

2. Writes to all submitters to advise of Council’s decision.

**Support Attachments**

1. Response to C150 Submissions ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The RCE Strategy identifies an approach to continue to ensure vibrant commercial precincts which offer a wide range of services and a high level of amenity to meet current and future community needs. The actions to implement the RCE Strategy will ensure that Bayside’s activity centres and commercial areas are viable for businesses and attractive places to live, work and invest in.

Natural Environment
Strategies within the RCE Strategy relating to improvements to public land and greater utilisation of the foreshore may result in impacts to the natural environment. Amendment C150 provides the framework for future works in activity centres to create new connections and environments for Bayside residents to appreciate the natural environment.

Built Environment
The RCE Strategy provides strategies which relate to the future built form of commercial areas in Bayside. The RCE Strategy provides a range of actions which will improve the built environment of Bayside’s commercial lands. Amendment C150 does not substantially alter built form controls specifically to any property but updates the broader policy objectives for Bayside’s commercial areas.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
At its 16 August 2016 Ordinary Meeting, Council resolved to request the Minister for Planning to approve Amendment C150 pursuant to Section 20(4) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning advised Council that public exhibition was required. As such, public exhibition of Amendment C150 occurred between 22 June and 24 July 2017. The exhibition included:

- Notice of the preparation of an Amendment published in the Bayside Leader and Government Gazette;
- Letters to the prescribed Ministers required under the Planning and Environment Act 1987, referral authorities and adjoining municipalities;
- Email notifications sent to submitters to the development of the draft RCE Strategy.

Through this process, 16 submissions were received.

Human Rights
The implications of this report have been assessed and are not likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter for Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006.
Legal
There are unlikely to be any legal implications from referring the RCE Strategy to a Planning Panel.

Finance
Budget has been allocated within the 2017/18 financial year to undertake Amendment C150 which gives effect to the RCE Strategy.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The preparation of the RCE Strategy was an action from Council’s Economic Development Strategy 2014 and the Bayside Planning Scheme review. Amendment C150 implements the Strategy into the Bayside Planning Scheme and will give effect to the Strategy in policy.
Options considered

Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Request that the Minister for Planning appoint an independent Planning Panel to consider the submissions received for Amendment C150.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Will provide the opportunity for all submitters to have their issues and concerns considered by an independent body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will allow the merits of the amendment to be considered and Council will have the benefit of understanding the recommendations of the Planning Panel. The Panel members will enquire into all aspects of the amendment and submissions and will give expert advice to Council regarding the amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After the Planning Panel hearing, a Panel report will be forwarded to Council and the Minister for Planning (usually at least 20 days after the hearing) and will be released to the public after 28 days of Council receiving the report. The Panel report will provide recommendations on how Council should proceed with the amendment and might suggest changes to the Amendment documents. The Panel’s report is not binding on the Council. However, Council must consider the recommendations of the report before any decision on how to proceed with the amendment is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The cost associated with the Planning Panel hearing has already been accounted for in the 2017/18 Budget and officer time has also been considered in the Urban Strategy department work plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Seek to negotiate with submitters to achieve an outcome that is mutually acceptable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Will provide an additional opportunity to negotiate changes with submitters and may reduce the number of submitters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Due to the range of issues and conflicting changes suggested in the submissions, a mutually acceptable outcome is unlikely to be achieved in all cases. It is likely that a Planning Panel would still be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive community consultation has already occurred as part of the development of the Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016, which was adopted by Council in August 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This would delay the amendment and would possibly require Council having to go through a further public exhibition process after making any relevant changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Abandon Amendment C150.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>There are no benefits associated with this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Council will not have a contemporary framework of strategies and actions to guide economic development related matters in the Planning Scheme, other than the <em>Industrial Areas Strategy 2004</em>, which is the current reference document. Abandoning C150 would result in Council's planning decisions having regard to an outdated reference document which may lead to poor outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.  | Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:  
1. The amendment suggests to direct medium density housing to Major Activity Centres and to DISCOURAGE the replacement and construction of single dwellings. Whilst it is council’s job to assist in providing guidance to developers to ensure they fit into the planning scheme, it IS NOT and SHOULD NOT be Councils job to tell a land owner that he/she can’t demolish their existing home and build a new one for themselves on the same block. This section of the clause should be removed.  
2. Under 21.03 page 3 it states “Apply the Development Plan Overlay to large new residential developments to simplify the development approvals process while still managing the form of development.” Council does not have a good track record at the moment with dealing with large scale developments and regularly allows the proposals to purposely lapse bringing VCAT into the mix. Council needs to get its own act together to handle and control existing development proposals and manage these ones before they think about essentially removing a large proportion of the constraints currently on developers and allowing inappropriate ones to get through simply for the sake of expediency. This section of the clause should be removed.  
3. Clause 22.02 maps on pages 5 and 6 show council accepts that Southland is | 1. State Government Policy, Plan Melbourne, provides the direction to encourage housing and population growth in areas close to transport, jobs, services and other community facilities. Plan Melbourne specifies a number of Bayside’s activity centres as areas where population growth will be accommodated. This is cemented in Council policy through the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 which nominates Council’s activity centres and strategic redevelopment sites as areas to accommodate growth.  
The RCE Strategy refers to the strategic context specified within the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 which supports housing and population growth in locations with good access to jobs, transport and services. In the Bayside context, this is primarily within Activity Centres. The RCE Strategy encourages population growth within these locations in order to support the economic role of each of the activity centres.  
2. The Development Plan Overlay (DPO) is a planning control which is used to manage and coordinate large scale development by requiring a Development Plan to be prepared to coordinate proposed use or development before a planning permit can be granted.  
A DPO is underpinned by the strategic planning framework that sets out the desired development outcomes and the overall layout of the land, including the design principles for development, major land uses, transport and open space networks.  
A Development Plan is not incorporated into the Planning Scheme. It can be introduced or changed ‘to the satisfaction of the responsible authority’ without the need for a planning scheme amendment process.  
It is not proposed to remove reference to the DPOs being Council’s preferred tool for larger sites as it provides Council with an opportunity to specify its outcomes for a particular site early in the redevelopment process.  
3. The map referred to by the submitter is at Clause 21.02. The amendment proposes to change the classification of the Southland Activity Centre from | No changes proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>the Principal Activity Centre and that it is centred on the Nepean Highway and NOT in Bayside at all and NOT centred over the Southland Railway Station. With this in mind, directing medium to high density residential development to the Pennymade are is acceptable, unwarranted and undesirable. Council should stop attempting to push the Pennymade area as a suitable location for medium and high density development.</td>
<td>a Principal Activity Centre (map on page 5) to a Major Activity Centre (Map on Page 6). The previous State Metropolitan Strategy, <em>Melbourne 2030</em>, designated Southland as a Principal Activity Centre which was a higher order centre set to attract a greater level of activity than a Major Activity Centre (MAC). The amendment proposes a minor relabelling of the centre to reflect State policy. There is no policy change proposed for the Southland Activity Centre and its surrounding residential areas under this amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The two objectives from the amendment relevant to the submitter’s comments are:
   - encouraging new specialist or higher order health businesses and institutions to collocate with existing health facilities including hospitals; and
   - providing increases to commercial floor space for redevelopment in activity centres.

   These objectives provide an appropriate response in support of specialist health services and other health services which are acknowledged as capable of providing an economic benefit to the city.

   The RCE Strategy notes that the key trends in relation to the Bayside economy include (inter alia):
   - knowledge based services as the core economic driver of the future economy;
   - health care will be the single largest growth sector of future employment opportunities.

   With Bayside’s aging population, this will generate greater demand for certain health related services. The RCE Strategy responds by including objectives relating to the provision of health related services including expansion of existing uses and the attraction of new service providers to the municipality.

5. The amendment does not propose any changes to building heights or any of the specific planning controls affecting individual developments in the major activity centres. The heights and built form controls have been...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.  | will not lock in. This is unfair treatment of one section of the community over another section of the community. Council should be immediately locking in 2 storey maximum height developments throughout the municipality outside of the MAC's as these areas DO NOT WANT highrise 3 storey or above developments.  
6.  | The heights and built form controls have been developed through Structure Plan processes which consider the individual characteristics of each centre. The RCE Strategy provides a broader approach which has not identified the individual built form controls for each activity centre.  
6.  | The heights and built form controls have been developed through Structure Plan processes which consider the individual characteristics of each centre. The areas outside activity centres are generally within the Neighbourhood Residential Zone which the State Government has imposed a maximum mandatory height control. In order to accommodate growth in the specified locations, Council has different planning controls in place for the activity centres based on their individual characteristics. The RCE Strategy provides a broader approach which has not identified the individual built form controls for each activity centre.  
7.  | Council needs to understand that it is one thing to WISH for these things but a completely different thing to actually achieve. Council should be immediately locking in 2 storey maximum height developments throughout the municipality outside of the MAC's as these areas DO NOT WANT highrise 3 storey or above developments.  
7.  | Through the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012, Council has identified a range of Strategic Redevelopment Sites where higher density development will be facilitated, including the CSIRO site in Highett. These strategic redevelopment sites will accommodate growth, as will Council’s activity centres and other designated growth areas.  
8.  | The Jack Road development referred to, being a Mirvac development located off Jack Road is an existing Development Plan that has been adopted by Council. The comments in relation to the naming of the Jack Road precinct are noted however are beyond the scope of the RCE Strategy. It is not proposed to change the name of this area without consultation with affected properties, which will not occur as part of Amendment C150.  
9.  | References to Jack Road under Clause 21.11 of the Bayside Planning Scheme already existed prior to this amendment. Updates have been made under this amendment to reflect the current situation on the ground that has occurred since rezoning of land on Jack Road from Commercial 2 to Mixed Use. There is no policy change in relation to traffic management under this amendment. The policy continues to state that Jack Road has been constructed to a residential standard and existing requirements to achieve an acceptable interface between the residential areas and commercial areas is retained. The majority of the paragraph to be deleted relates to businesses addressing Jack Road, and the need to manage this interface. Given the residential redevelopment of the Jack Road/Mirvac site, this policy has become redundant and should be removed from the Scheme. Other changes at Clause 21.11-9 relate to consolidating similar |
8. Council needs to stop using Jack Road Pennydale as a magnet for attention and a focal point. Reserve Road and Bay Road are the main focal points for the business section of Bayside, NOT a residential street. Using the name Jack Road gives a bad feeling to the local residents who live along that Road, especially as the ONLY business along this road is Lamine and this is also the buffer area between the residential zone and the business zone. The focus on Jack Road is extremely upsetting to the residents who are concerned that Council will attempt to use Jack Road not only as a focal point but entry and exit points from the Mirvac Estate and any business along the Chandos Ave section of the business centre. Council should reword these sections of the clause to Reserve, Bay or Chandos.

9. Clause 21.11 on page 27 has been changed from “Jack Road was designed and constructed primarily as a residential street, rather than an industrial or commercial street. Jack Road is used extensively as access between Bay Road and Park Road and is near its maximum recommended vehicle capacity for a residential street.” to the updated version in C150 which States “Jack Road was constructed to a residential street standard. It is used extensively as access between Bay Road and Park Road and is near its maximum recommended vehicle capacity.” Whilst this may not seem important to Council, the differences in statements and related statements. It is not intended to reverse or detrimentally affect residential amenity, but rather remove redundant or duplicated policy.

10. Whilst the statement within the RCE Strategy refers to the residential areas around the Bayside Business District as having been developed, this is in reference to the opportunity for greenfield/brownfield redevelopment. Policy encourages a diversity of housing types at higher densities in and around activity centres and areas well serviced by jobs and transport will accommodate growth. Both State and Council policy designate the area around the Southland Major Activity Centre as a growth area. A structure plan is currently being prepared to determine the level and type of growth that will be seen in the Southland/Pennydale area to manage the level of change to be experienced.

11. The review of background data which informed the RCE Strategy indicates that there are many examples of where discretionary controls are being varied without any substantial justification for such. This is particularly in relation to the BBD where there are floorspace requirements and built form guidelines which are regularly varied. In line with Practice Note 59: The Role of Mandatory Provisions in Planning Schemes, discretionary controls are the preferred mechanism in place of mandatory controls due to the opportunities for site specific solutions to be considered. The Practice Note confirms that mandatory requirements must be specified in a Zone or Overlay. In consideration of Panel Reports Council has received regarding the use of discretionary controls, which are only to be varied in exceptional circumstances, it is considered that the guidance for the application of this can be strengthened through translating this language into Clause 22.04.

12. Council is proposing to remove the expiry date from Clause 22.04 relating to the management of the interface between the Laminex site and the Pennydale area. The management of this buffer has been set out by the planning permission for the Laminex site and the expiry date specified at Clause 22.04 incorrectly allows the buffer to cease despite the planning permit continuing to be acted on. It is not within the scope of the amendment to potentially acquire this land for open space purposes however this could form part of the Structure Plan process for the area if appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>these words are very important to the residents, especially as the current version of this clause also states that &quot;... however the amenity of abutting and nearby residential areas needs to be protected. This is especially the case for those industrial operations that front or have access to Jack Road.&quot; This entire paragraph has been removed in the new C150 version and the residents feel this removal is Councils way of removing the protection buffer currently afforded it which is does not want to happen. This paragraph and the protections it affords the residents of Pennydale MUST be reinserted into the clause.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clause 21.11 also states in both the current and C150 versions on page 27 that &quot;The character and amenity of the residential areas that surround the Bayside Business District have evolved. The areas are now fully developed and have become suburbs of high value, amenity and desirability&quot;. As these are council's own words in both the current AND Draft C150 amendment version, council acknowledges that the Pennydale area is fully developed and that we have done our share for the growth of the municipality we need council to accept their own words and stop the push for medium to high density development in Pennydale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clause 22.04 states at page 5 &quot;... regarding developments in the Bayside Business district that &quot;Preferred' or discretionary controls may only be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 10.2 – Reports by the Organisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>varied in exceptional circumstances.”. This is the unfair type of control that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the residential sections of Bayside and specifically Pennydale are after. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business district is more than able and capable of holding developments of 3-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>storey WHERE APPROPRIATE as they do not overlook residential areas and damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amenity to the residents. Council should be looking at office space in medium to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high density in these areas NOT limiting it and instead affording the protections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>it wants to give the business area in height control to the residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that wants it such as Pennydale. Council should be immediately locking in 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>storey maximum height developments throughout the municipality outside of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAC's as these areas DO NOT WANT highrise 3 storey or above developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Clause 22.04 pages 8-9 taking about Jack Road advise a “30 metre setback from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Road as a buffer between the residential and business sections.” This is in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effect now although according to submissions on behalf of Laminex for C140 they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cannot find the evidence that states they must keep. This space. Council needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to find these caveat documents and lock this buffer zone in place permanently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moreover, Council has a magnificent opportunity here to pen up this space as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>linear parkland either purchasing or leasing this land from Laminex as it can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never be built upon for business purposes and would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>make a great inland corridor through the area from Highett Grassy woodland, CSIRO and down to Cheltenham Park for wildlife. I would urge Council to seriously investigate this option.</td>
<td>I would URGE council to look at modifying this amendment to incorporate the protections for the residential areas it wants to give to the business areas regarding height controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I would urge council to stop looking at Pennylade as a saviour of Bayside to take on the brunt of residential growth and start looking at other sites and options that will work for everyone.</td>
<td>1. The amendment appears to suggest that increasing housing in activity centres is somehow in opposition to preserving the viability of activity centres. The supporting documents have not demonstrated a basis for this position and there are State planning policies which specifically encourage Major Activity Centres as a preferred location for new housing growth. 2. The amendment proposes conflicting policy statements as follows (emphasis added): Clause 21.03-1 (Activity Centres): Encourage new housing in commercial areas of activity centres to provide commercial no net loss of commercial floorspace at the ground floor [sic].</td>
<td>Amend Clause 21.03-1 to reflect a 'net gain' in commercial floorspace rather than 'no net loss.' No other changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Clause 21.07-1 (Activity Centres):</strong> Residential development in activity centres needs to ensure increased retail and commercial floorspace is provided. Provide increases to commercial floorspace for redevelopment in activity centres, particularly for professional services.</td>
<td>The basis of requiring no net loss of commercial/retail floorspace or encouraging additional or increased commercial/retail floorspace is not consistent with the Strategy which, as it relates to the Hampton MAC, states: <strong>Strategy 12 – Accommodate the residential population within the Hampton activity centre and provide population serving uses.</strong> The primary role of the Hampton Street activity centre will be to accommodate a residential population which contributes to the vitality and activation of the retail environment. Supporting the residential intensification of the Hampton St Activity Centre will achieve a greater level of street activation, pedestrian foot traffic and retail demand along the street in the long term.</td>
<td>The proposed ground floor retail and commercial use on Commercial zoned land is a minimum requirement needed to achieve this outcome and in maintaining the social and economic function of Bayside’s activity centres. The Strategy identifies a need to ensure that floorspace growth is created to service the future population. In centres where population growth is a key objective, such as the Hampton Street MAC, it is not intended that this should be at the expense of commercial development. Rather, that development needs to ensure that commercial floorspace growth is provided and allowing residential growth above commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Council’s website nominates two versions of the amendment documentation – one with the tracked changes, one as a final. The only map change under the amendment is the map to Clause 21.02-5. The new map designates the Southland Activity Centre as a Major Activity Centre rather than a Principal Activity Centre under the existing map. The previous State Metropolitan Strategy, Melbourne 2030, designated Southland as a Principal Activity Centre which was a higher order centre set to attract a greater level of activity than a Major Activity Centre. The current State Metropolitan Strategy, Plan Melbourne, has removed the distinction between Principal and Major Activity Centres. Therefore the Southland Activity Centre is now designated as a Major Activity Centre (MAC) similar to Bayside’s other MACs located in Brighton, Hampton, Hampton East and Sandringham. The appropriateness of the boundary of the Southland MAC and details of planned changes to the residential area are matters to be considered as part of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Melbourne 2030 has been superseded by the current metropolitan strategy Plan Melbourne. Plan Melbourne builds on Melbourne 2030’s activity centre framework and the only change in relation to Bayside is a language change, where Southland Principal Activity Centre is now referred to as a Major Activity Centre. Notice of the amendment was provided in the Bayside Leader, Government Gazette and on Council’s website. Consultation also took place throughout the development of the RCE Strategy in 2015 and 2016. The amendment updates provisions affecting the BBD are proposed but detailed information about planned changes for residential neighbourhoods within activity centres is generally provided through the structure planning process. The impact of C150 on activity centres is broad and the amendment has been advertised to allow any submissions from the public to be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons: 1. In Clause 21.02-5 the maps are very poorly presented. Firstly, which maps are being substituted? What is the significance of the red line through the map on page 6? What is a Principle Activity Centre? - This isn't explained here. The map on page 7 uses a star symbol to demarcate 'future key focus residential growth' however this is a very crude and ill-defined cartographic feature. The Southland/Pennydale MAC should be centred on the intersection of Bay Road and the rail bridge as previously shown, rather than the future station. What is the significance of the economic triangle? This isn't explained in 21.02. It seems to cover significant neighbourhood areas. 2. Why has Melbourne 2030 been removed from the overview of activity centres in Clause 21.03-1? Does this not underpin the rationale for MACs? 3. There has been very little publicity of this significant amendment, why is this? We need much more detail about planned changes for neighbourhoods around activity centres - there is significant community unease and distrust of Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Remove mention of a ‘Principal Activity Centre’ (Southland-Cheltenham) as this</td>
<td>Under the amendment the Southland Activity Centre has been reclassified from a Principal Activity Centre to a Major Activity Centre in accordance with the current State Metropolitan Strategy, Plan Melbourne. The reason that the Southland/Pennydale area is missing from Clause 21.11 is that no structure plan has been prepared for the area at this time. It can be reasoned that once the current Structure Plan process for the Southland/Pennydale area is completed and translated into the Planning Scheme, it may be referenced at Clause 21.11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terminology is out of date (no longer used in Plan Melbourne 2017-2050). Also</td>
<td>2. Council’s adopted Housing Strategy provides the framework for managing growth in Bayside. Amendments C125 and C140 proposed implementing particular aspects of the Housing Strategy however are unrelated to the content of Amendment C150 or the Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>note that the Southland-Cheltenham MAC is located in Kingston, not Bayside. I</td>
<td>3. The nomination of areas as housing growth areas is outlined in the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 and does not form part of Amendment C150. Council is currently progressing a Structure Plan to guide any future development in the Southland/Pennydale area. This point is more relevant to the Structure Planning process than Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>note it is absent from Clause 21.11 Local Areas.</td>
<td>4. The capacity for the Southland/Pennydale area to accommodate growth is beyond the scope of Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Some of the strategic basis of this document is flawed (e.g. the 2012 Housing</td>
<td>5. Council is proposing to remove the expiry date from Clause 22.04 relating to the management of the interface between the Laminex site and the Pennydale area. The management of this buffer has been set out by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy) and sits behind a series of failed amendments over the years (e.g. C125,</td>
<td>Through Amendment C150 Council is updating the Bayside Planning Scheme to reflect the designation of the Southland Activity Centre as a MAC, in accordance with the current Metropolitan Strategy Plan Melbourne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C140). I suggest revisiting these underlying strategies and taking the time to</td>
<td>2. The nomination of areas as housing growth areas is outlined in the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 and does not form part of Amendment C150. Council is currently progressing a Structure Plan to guide any future development in the Southland/Pennydale area. This point is more relevant to the Structure Planning process than Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop a more considered and realistic approach. There is too much change too</td>
<td>3. The capacity for the Southland/Pennydale area to accommodate growth is beyond the scope of Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quickly at the moment and its impacts will cause major problems into the future.</td>
<td>4. Council is proposing to remove the expiry date from Clause 22.04 relating to the management of the interface between the Laminex site and the Pennydale area. The management of this buffer has been set out by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Maps on pages 5 and 6 need to be updated to reflect that the Southland Activity</td>
<td>1. Through Amendment C150 Council is updating the Bayside Planning Scheme to reflect the designation of the Southland Activity Centre as a MAC, in accordance with the current Metropolitan Strategy Plan Melbourne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre is a MAJOR not PRINCIPAL activity centre, and is centred on the corner of</td>
<td>2. The nomination of areas as housing growth areas is outlined in the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 and does not form part of Amendment C150. Council is currently progressing a Structure Plan to guide any future development in the Southland/Pennydale area. This point is more relevant to the Structure Planning process than Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bay Road and the Nepean Highway. (See Plan Melbourne 2050 for details)</td>
<td>3. The capacity for the Southland/Pennydale area to accommodate growth is beyond the scope of Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Per dot point 1, the area of Pennydale should not pushed for medium or high</td>
<td>4. Council is proposing to remove the expiry date from Clause 22.04 relating to the management of the interface between the Laminex site and the Pennydale area. The management of this buffer has been set out by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>density housing, given the centre of the Activity Centre and a reasonable 400m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 10.2 – Reports by the Organisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Explanatory report indicates that the Local Planning Policy Business and Employment Clause, that is, Clause 22.04, is proposed to be amended. The changes to this clause have been made available to view throughout the amendment process. Council is proposing to remove the expiry date from Clause 22.04 relating to the management of the interface between the Laminex site and the Pennydale area. The management of this buffer has been set out by the planning permission for the Laminex site and the expiry date specified at Clause 22.04 incorrectly allows the buffer to cease despite the planning permit continuing to be acted on. Although the RCE Strategy recommends transitioning the area toward professional services, the land will remain Commercial 2 Zone in order to provide for both industrial and commercial uses. Existing measures to protect the amenity of residents from industrial uses should remain in place until either the uses ceases or until a more detailed Master Plan is prepared for the BBD.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The majority of land within the Bayside Economic Triangle is zoned Neighbourhood Residential or General Residential where the use of land for an economic relationship between the areas between Highett, Southland Shopping Centre and railway station and the BBD. The strategy recommends enhancing the connections between these areas to promote</td>
<td>planning permission for the Laminex site and the expiry date specified at Clause 22.04 incorrectly allows the buffer to cease despite the planning permit continuing to be acted on. It is not within the scope of the amendment to potentially acquire this land for open space purposes however this could form part of the Structure Plan process for the area if appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Pennydale housing density is currently maximised and should not be targeted for medium to high density developments.</td>
<td>5. Council’s Housing Strategy has resulted in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone being applied to most of Bayside, and for all residential land outside of the MACs. The Neighbourhood Residential Zone has a maximum mandatory height control of two storeys. Building heights in residential precincts are beyond the scope of Amendment C150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Current open space on Jack Road (22.04, 8 &amp; 9) should be retained as a wildlife corridor, with old trees in poor condition being replaced by large indigenous trees at this location, with further plantings of orchard trees / community gardens aligned with the history of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Preferred height limits of 2 storeys outside MACs need to be retained, with a view to make this height limit mandatory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The Explanatory Report refers to a number of policies that are changing but it does not specifically mention the introduction of a changed Clause 22.04 which applied a revised policy entitled the Bayside Business District Policy. While there is much discussion about the changing nature of employment in the BBD, there remains a provision for a substantial setback of development from Jack Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The majority of land within the Bayside Economic Triangle is zoned Neighbourhood Residential or General Residential where the use of land for an economic relationship between the areas between Highett, Southland Shopping Centre and railway station and the BBD. The strategy recommends enhancing the connections between these areas to promote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The office is prohibited. The policy is unclear as to how this section of land can be transitioned into a focus for business services. 3. Further, the creation of an economic triangle is at odds with the policy to create a sensitive treatment at the interface between residential and commercial uses. 4. Clause 21.10 ‘Infrastructure’ foreshadows the preparation of a master plan for the BBD to guide the location of new commercial uses and identify the location of key infrastructure to facilitate development. For this initiative to be successful, there needs to be close involvement of key stakeholders and recognition of the importance of integrating key strategic sites into the implementation program. It is not clear whether a future master plan would be extended to include the residential land within the economic triangle. 5. Clause 21.11 ‘Local Areas’ foreshadows a future connection of Chandos St to the south. The extension of Chandos Street to the south is supported, but the need for a transitional arrangement between the BBD land and residential areas to the east is unclear as residential land to the east is also within the proposed economic triangle.</td>
<td>3. Enhancing the connections between precincts and encouraging uses which do not significantly impact residential amenity is considered to be consistent with the Strategy. A number of commercial uses are permitted within the General Residential Zone and if redeveloped, managing interfaces will be a key consideration for new development. 4. At this stage, it is not envisaged that the residential areas within the economic triangle would be subject to the future master plan for the BBD. The boundary of any future master plan will be determined as part of the process associated with its development. These areas will be planned for through the current Highton and Southland Structure Plan processes Council has underway. Any future master planning of the area under a Development Plan Overlay would involve consultation with affected landowners. 5. There is no change to this provision proposed under the amendment. Access arrangements for the Business District will be reviewed as appropriate as part of the development of a development or master plan for the BBD area. 6. The findings from the RCE Strategy indicate that the BBD is transitioning well toward a professional services precinct and performing well as a business district that continues to include industrial uses. There is no demonstrated need at this time for any residential redevelopment in the employment area. Council’s strategic framework does not support or encourage residential uses to locate in the BBD as this is a commercial precinct only. Housing growth areas and strategic redevelopment sites are outlined in the Bayside Housing Strategy. It is not proposed to rezone this site to facilitate a mixed use outcome as the site is functioning well as an employment precinct. 7. Council considers that there is no conflict between the Housing Strategy and the RCE Strategy. Housing growth is encouraged within MACs and specific areas as outlined in the Housing Strategy. The RCE Strategy does not conflict with this approach. Providing commercial uses in a Commercial 2 Zoned area is consistent with the strategic framework for Bayside. Residential growth will be accommodated in areas closest to transport and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The property at 332 Bay Road is an underutilised site that should be a prime focus for redevelopment. However, the reintroduction of the Jack Road interface policy provisions in this clause impact on the potential of the site and are contradictory, outdated and inappropriate. This site represents the largest potential development site and should be recognised as a strategic redevelopment site.</td>
<td>services. Whilst being located 450m (approx.) from Southland Station, the nomination of this site (or others in similar proximity) as suitable for residential undermines Council’s ability to locate housing growth in activity centres and other growth areas. Council’s strategic planning framework does not support housing growth in areas other than as nominated the Bayside Housing Strategy. Simply because a site is large and located close to a railway station does not automatically result in it being suitable for housing growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The RCE Strategy conflicts with the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 as it departs from the policy of intensification of residential development in close proximity to the Southland Activity Centre by promoting commercial business uses rather than residential intensification of the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Because of these anomalies, additional work needs to be undertaken before the Strategy becomes a reference document in the Planning Scheme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>As such it is submitted that the amendment is unsatisfactory and should be revised to address the following matters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Ensure that strategic objectives are related to statutory land use controls that would assist in achieving the desired outcomes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Focus on key employment and activity nodes that have the greatest potential to affect retail, commercial and employment outcomes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Identify strategic redevelopment sites that can be developed in consultation with the Council with the aim of achieving clearly defined planning objectives;

d) Ensure that strategic planning documents align with other policies and approved documentation previously approved by Council;

e) Recognise that the existing statutory zoning is an essential factor in the implementation of planning policy;

f) Identify the spatial requirements of different uses over time, and align policy measures to this end; and

g) Recognise that established patterns of land use can represent major constraints and opportunities.

d. The RCE Strategy is consistent with Council’s strategic framework and the implementation of the Strategy into the Scheme does not create any inconsistencies with policy interpretation.

e. The land use objectives Council is seeking to achieve will dictate zones applied in particular areas. If a particular zone does not align with Council’s strategic objectives, Council may rezone land or create additional policy to strengthen its ability to meet longer term objectives.

f. Council’s strategic planning framework is built primarily around the community’s long term needs as informed through the Community Plan and Municipal Strategic Statement. The needs of individual land uses are accommodated through allowing a range of commercial lot and building sizes to ensure that businesses can grow and expand to meet changing needs. This is supported by policy included in Amendment C150 at Clause 22.04.

g. A more comprehensive analysis of the BBD will occur as part of the preparation of a Master Plan for the area. A land use audit was undertaken as part of the development of the RCE Strategy and has provided guidance on the existing conditions of the centre to allow Council to prepare a future framework for the BBD.

7. Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:

1. Submitter has participated throughout the development of the RCE Strategy however little consideration appears to have been given by Council in relation to the content of previous submissions. In order for the BBD to remain economically viable and socially sustainable, a strategic shift towards a framework allowing a greater mix of uses (including residential) is necessary. This is supported by economic evidence provided in previous submissions on behalf of this submitter.

1. The SGS report indicates that the area has been transitioning well from a largely industrial precinct to a commercial employment precinct consistent with the commercial zoning of the land. Council does not agree with the submitter’s position that transitioning the area to a residential/mixed use precinct is necessary for the continued viability of the BBD. The RCE Strategy has demonstrated that the BBD is performing well with a low vacancy rate. In order to ensure the continued growth of the area, Council is proposing to update the strategic planning objectives for the area through amendment C150.

The submitter’s economic evidence failed to provide significant empirical evidence to support their contention that land in the BBD should be rezoned to enable a mixture of residential and commercial land uses.

2. Through amendment C150 Council is attempting to translate the relevant sections of the RCE Strategy into the Planning Scheme. There are a number of actions and strategies which relate primarily to Council’s economic development goals and are not best placed in the Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A discord exists between the strategies identified in the SGS reports, the amendment documents and the outcomes realistically achievable through the implementation of the amendment. Both the Issues Paper and RCE Strategy identify that a more comprehensive strategic approach to the BBD is necessary, however the amendment does little to support such an outcome beyond ‘business as usual’ with no strategic review of the land use zoning. The submitter considers that a land use zoning review is integral in any master planning for the BBD.</td>
<td>Scheme. The Strategy will be implemented in other ways beyond Amendment C150. It is envisaged that many actions will be implemented independently of C150. A variety of commercial and industrial land uses are able to locate in the BBD under its current Commercial 2 Zone. The pressure for residential development in the BBD considerably undermines Council’s strategic objectives for the precinct. Another zone is considered unsuitable for the role envisaged for the BBD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The proposed amendments to Clause 22.04 resuscitate built form policies for the Jack Road interface that expired in 2007. No strategic justification is provided for the continued inclusion of these policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The exhibited amendment documentation differs from that which was adopted at the Council meeting on 16 August 2016, with the material effect being that the local policy at Clause 22.04 seeks greater influence over built form outcomes for areas within the BBD. The relevance of these built form controls in light of the RCE is questionable, and mandating built form is more appropriate within an overlay, not within a local policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Built form outcomes have not significantly changed under the amendment except that clarification is provided regarding the intent of preferred outcomes, which is, that they be adhered to unless an exceptional circumstance can be demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The local policies relevant to the BBD were reviewed and updated as part of the implementation of the RCE Strategy. It is noted that the RCE Strategy does not disregard previous strategic work undertaken for the project and does not abandon existing policies which are working effectively. The built form controls within the policy can be reviewed following the development of a Master Plan for the BBD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The inclusion of the RCE Strategy as a reference document with no accompanying review of the local policy applying to the BBD is inappropriate and further strategic review of this policy should be undertaken.</td>
<td>1. It is indeed appropriate to implement broad policy direction prior to commencing a more detailed precinct planning of an area. Built form controls for the BBD will be reviewed where appropriate as part of the preparation of a development or master plan for the BBD area. This is an action from the RCE Strategy and will be commenced once Amendment C150 has been completed. The built form controls for the precinct were introduced following the development of the <em>Bayside Industrial Areas Strategy 2004</em> and provides guidance on the built form expectations for the precinct. 2. The documents adopted at the 16 August 2016 Council meeting have been updated following discussions with DELWP once C150 was lodged. There are limited changes to built form controls outlined in Clause 22.04 of C150. It is considered that any changes from the built form controls currently outlined in this clause can be progressed once the master plan for the BBD has progressed and is to be implemented in the scheme. Built form outcomes have not significantly changed under the amendment except that clarification is provided regarding the intent of preferred outcomes, which is, that they be adhered to unless an exceptional circumstance can be demonstrated. 3. As a proposed reference document in the Scheme, the RCE Strategy provides background information to assist in understanding the context in which Council’s policies for commercial land has been framed. The Strategy is wide ranging in content and contains information not directly relevant to specific decisions under the Planning Scheme. As the Strategy provides useful background information and assists in understanding the Scheme, it is suited to being a reference document. As such, the approach Council has undertaken by including the RCE Strategy as a reference document in the Scheme is consistent with Practice Note 13: <em>Incorporated and Reference Documents.</em></td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons: 1. Submits that a more comprehensive review of this policy is necessary as part of the implementation of the RCE Strategy. There is little to no discussion within the RCE Strategy about the built form outcomes as espoused in local policy will serve to assist in the transition of the land within the precinct towards an advanced business services cluster. If the intention is to support a transition, then the built form controls should be reviewed. 2. The exhibited amendment documentation differs from that which was adopted at the Council meeting on 16 August 2016, with the material effect being that the local policy at Clause 22.04 seeks greater influence over built form outcomes for areas within the BBD. The submitter does not object to the development of policies that guide built form, however the submitter does object to the additional emphasis given to built-form controls that have not taken into consideration current research and strategies.</td>
<td>1. It is indeed appropriate to implement broad policy direction prior to commencing a more detailed precinct planning of an area. Built form controls for the BBD will be reviewed where appropriate as part of the preparation of a development or master plan for the BBD area. This is an action from the RCE Strategy and will be commenced once Amendment C150 has been completed. The built form controls for the precinct were introduced following the development of the <em>Bayside Industrial Areas Strategy 2004</em> and provides guidance on the built form expectations for the precinct. 2. The documents adopted at the 16 August 2016 Council meeting have been updated following discussions with DELWP once C150 was lodged. There are limited changes to built form controls outlined in Clause 22.04 of C150. It is considered that any changes from the built form controls currently outlined in this clause can be progressed once the master plan for the BBD has progressed and is to be implemented in the scheme. Built form outcomes have not significantly changed under the amendment except that clarification is provided regarding the intent of preferred outcomes, which is, that they be adhered to unless an exceptional circumstance can be demonstrated. 3. As a proposed reference document in the Scheme, the RCE Strategy provides background information to assist in understanding the context in which Council’s policies for commercial land has been framed. The Strategy is wide ranging in content and contains information not directly relevant to specific decisions under the Planning Scheme. As the Strategy provides useful background information and assists in understanding the Scheme, it is suited to being a reference document. As such, the approach Council has undertaken by including the RCE Strategy as a reference document in the Scheme is consistent with Practice Note 13: <em>Incorporated and Reference Documents.</em></td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The inclusion of the RCE Strategy as a reference document with no accompanying review of the local policy applying to the BBD is inappropriate and further strategic review of this policy should be undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9.  | Opposes the amendment for the following reasons: | 1. Comment noted.  
2. Activity centres are embedded in State policy as areas to accommodate future housing growth. This does not change through, nor can it be altered by Amendment C150. The economic triangle depicted under the RCE Strategy refers to an economic relationship between the areas between Highett, Southland Shopping Centre and railway station and the BBD. The strategy recommends enhancing the connections between these areas to promote the economic role of the BBD. There is no specific planning directive associated with the economic triangle and it is expected that the opportunities for connections will be further investigated through the Highett Structure Plan review process and the development of the Southland Structure Plan. Enhancing the connections between precincts and encouraging uses which do not significantly impact residential amenity is considered to be consistent with the Strategy. A number of commercial uses are permitted within the General Residential Zone and if redeveloped, managing interfaces will be a key consideration for new development. The current Highett Structure Plan review process will determine how effective the policies guiding growth in Highett has been and will update any planning controls accordingly.  
3. The area around Southland is nominated in State policy as a MAC, where additional growth will be accommodated. The current process to develop a Structure Plan for the Southland/Pennydale area will determine how growth is managed in this area. The RCE Strategy and Amendment C150 do not direct growth into these areas as this has been entrenched in policy for a number of years, through the implementation of the Bayside Housing Strategy.  
4. As above, the RCE Strategy does not designate growth for Highett and Southland/Pennydale areas. This is existing policy which is unaltered by Amendment C150.  
5. As the amendment primarily relates to updates to the Municipal Strategic Statement, there are few tangible environmental impacts which are a direct | No changes proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The same fate awaits the streets of Cheltenham (Pennydale). The constant eroding</td>
<td>3. The same fate awaits the streets of Cheltenham (Pennydale). The constant eroding of protections for residents of these areas, whilst promoting protections for other areas, has been unceasing over the past few years. Planning in Bayside should be EQUITABLE and all increases in density should be backed by thorough, independent studies that address infrastructure issues that may constrain growth in certain areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Despite Bayside Council acknowledging that population growth is likely to result</td>
<td>4. Despite Bayside Council acknowledging that population growth is likely to result in a commensurate increase in demand for retail services, Amendment C150 fails to balance that increased need across the municipality. This Amendment will continue to push a greater percentage of growth and over-development in the narrow streets of Highett and Cheltenham, rather than balance development in all areas of Bayside equitably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>of Amendment C150. There are a range of outcomes and objectives which relate to</td>
<td>5. This Amendment does nothing to address environmental issues in Bayside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bayside’s economy which can influence future land use and development outcomes.</td>
<td>6. I would also like to object to the failure of Bayside Council to present these Amendments to the residents of Highett and Cheltenham. Despite these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The amendment relates primarily to commercial land in Bayside and does no impact</td>
<td>7. The amendment relates primarily to commercial land in Bayside and does no impact residential policy. The Bayside Economic Triangle is a concept which will be further explored through the Highett and Southland Structure Plan processes. The amendment was advertised to allow submissions to the amendment to be received. Copies of the amendment documents were made available for inspection in Council libraries, of which Highett and Cheltenham do not have Bayside libraries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential policy. The Bayside Economic Triangle is a concept which will be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further explored through the Highett and Southland Structure Plan processes. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amendment was advertised to allow submissions to the amendment to be received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of the amendment documents were made available for inspection in Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>libraries, of which Highett and Cheltenham do not have Bayside libraries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Highett Structure Plan Review process included engagement activities between</td>
<td>The Highett Structure Plan Review process included engagement activities between April and June 2016. Public exhibition of Amendment C150 commenced on 22 June 2017 and concluded on 24 July 2017. Advertising of various different processes depends on the information being conveyed. As the Highett Structure Plan review is a large project potentially affecting all Highett residents, a range of engagement methods were explored to create varied levels of awareness of the project. Given the broad nature of C150, a different approach was undertaken which complied with the statutory process outlined within the Planning and Environment Act 1987.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 10.2 – Reports by the Organisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | suburbs being the most negatively impacted by this Amendment, public displays of this Amendment were confined to other areas of Bayside that were not so adversely affected.  

7. This Amendment was advertised at the same time as the review of the Highett Structure Plan, however, it should be noted Amendment C150 was not publicly advertised to Highett residents as affecting the Highett Structure Plan. |  |  |
| 10. | Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:  
1. Once again BCC proposes in the inequitable Draft Amendment C150 to perpetuate the massively flawed Bayside Housing Strategy 2012. Having protected 87% of the Municipality of Bayside they are attempting to shoehorn all development into the remaining 13%, which unsurprisingly is all located in the periphery. The new iniquitous proposal to limit development in Hampton will place even more pressure on these unprotected suburbs. This strategy has been repeated criticised by the Standing Advisory Committee reports, but here we are again. It is worth noting that our suburb already has the highest density in the Municipality. Proposals to limit development in the streets around the Sandringham MAC, why do they get these protections, but we don’t? Once again the proposal that Southland is a Principal Activity Centre in Bayside, | 1. The implementation of the Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016 does not alter or impact the classification of the Southland/Pennydale Activity Centre as an area for future population growth. The statistics referred to in this submission are incorrect and the submitter appears to have misinterpreted the intent and strategic basis of Amendment C150. These matters are more appropriately raised through the development of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012. It is noted that all other MACs in Bayside have Structure Plans in place to guide development, however the Southland/Pennydale area does not, hence the current process. | No changes proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>even though it is wholly sited in Kingston. Bayside has been unwilling or unable to work with Kington CC to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11. | **Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:**  
1. Once again Bayside are proposing in this draft amendment massively inequitable development in unprotected areas of the Municipality, based on the acknowledged flawed Bayside Housing Strategy 2012. Proposing that all development happen on the Frankston line and ignoring the Sandringham line. Proposals to limit development in the Hampton and Sandringham MACs are wrong and unfair. These protections have not been provide to Pennydale and Highett. |  
1. The implementation of the *Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy* 2016 does not alter or impact the classification of the Southland/Pennydale Activity Centre as an area for future population growth. The statistics referred to in this submission are incorrect and the submitter appears to have misinterpreted the intent and strategic basis of Amendment C150. These matters are more appropriately raised through the development of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the *Bayside Housing Strategy* 2012. It is noted that all other MACs in Bayside have Structure Plans in place to guide development, however the Southland/Pennydale area does not, hence the current process. | No changes proposed. |
| 12. | **Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:**  
1. Revise the deeply flawed Bayside Housing Strategy. It has been repeatedly criticised by Independent Review Panels.  
2. The proposal that the Southland Principal Activity centre is the basis for growth in Pennydale is wrong. Southland is in Kingston! And the Southland railway station is a retail platform only and no reason to have Pennydale as a dumping ground for overdevelopment. |  
1. The Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 has been included in the Planning Scheme as a reference document with much of its approach to managing growth in Bayside translated into policy. The application of the residential zones in 2014 was based on the framework outlined in the Housing Strategy. Amendment C150 does not propose to alter the residential framework for Bayside.  
2. The implementation of the *Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy* 2016 does not alter or impact the classification of the Southland/Pennydale Activity Centre as an area for future population growth. The statistics referred to in this submission are incorrect and the submitter appears to have misinterpreted the intent and strategic basis of Amendment C150. These matters are more appropriately raised through the development of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the *Bayside Housing Strategy* 2012. It is noted that all other MACs in Bayside have Structure Plans in place to guide development, however the Southland/Pennydale area does not, hence the current process. | No changes proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments/Summary</th>
<th>Response to Submission</th>
<th>Proposed Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Submission on behalf of the Environment Protection Authority:</td>
<td>The EPA’s comments are noted. The comments are consistent with the policy positions of the amendment.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. EPA supports Council’s plan to transition the industrial precinct into an employment district with specific emphasis on advanced technologies. EPA encourages Council to be particularly aware of the potential for amenity issues such as dust, noise and odour from existing industrial premises during the transition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. EPA supports Council’s intentions to apply Environmental Audit Overlays to former Industrial 1 and 3 zoned land. EPA reminds Council to ensure that the recommendations of Ministerial Direction 1 in relation to potentially contaminated land have been adhered to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. EPA notes that any potential industrial land uses should meet the separation requirements as contained within Clause 52.10 and EPA publication 1518 <em>Recommended separation distances for industrial residual air emission</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. EPA advises that planning should adopt best practice environmental management approach which aims to avoid or minimise environmental degradation and hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td>1. The implementation of the <em>Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016</em> does not alter or impact the classification of the Southland/Pennydale.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Using the Southland PAC which is in Kingston as an excuse to dump overdevelopment in Pennydale under the guise of a &quot;future key focus residential growth&quot; is WRONG!</td>
<td>Activity Centre as an area for future population growth. The statistics referred to in this submission are incorrect and the submitter appears to have misinterpreted the intent and strategic basis of Amendment C150. These matters are more appropriately raised through the development of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012. It is noted that all other MACs in Bayside have Structure Plans in place to guide development, however the Southland/Pennydale area does not, hence the current process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once again Bayside is proposing to shoe horn all the overdevelopment into the borders of the Municipality whilst protecting the rest. This has been criticised by Independent Standing Advisory Committees repeatedly. We just want equal protection and good development.</td>
<td>2. Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td>1. The implementation of the Retail, Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016 does not alter or impact the classification of the Southland/Pennydale Activity Centre as an area for future population growth. The statistics referred to in this submission are incorrect and the submitter appears to have misinterpreted the intent and strategic basis of Amendment C150. These matters are more appropriately raised through the development of the Southland and Pennydale Structure Plan process and any future review of the Bayside Housing Strategy 2012. It is noted that all other MACs in Bayside have Structure Plans in place to guide development, however the Southland/Pennydale area does not, hence the current process.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Opposes the amendment for the following reasons:</td>
<td>1. The economic triangle depicted under the RCE Strategy refers to an economic relationship between the areas between Highett, Southland Shopping Centre and railway station and the BBD. The strategy recommends enhancing the connections between these areas to promote the economic role of the BBD. There is no specific planning directive associated with the economic triangle and it is expected that the opportunities for connections will be further investigated through the Highett Structure Plan review process and the development of the Southland Structure Plan.</td>
<td>No changes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Comments/Summary</td>
<td>Response to Submission</td>
<td>Proposed Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | thought out and totally unfair to the residents of Highett.  
2. I don’t believe this unfair and biased amendment was properly advertised to the affected Highett and Cheltenham residents and I strongly object to this happening. | 2. Notice of the amendment was provided in the Bayside Leader, Government Gazette and on Council’s website. Consultation also took place throughout the development of the RCE Strategy in 2015 and 2016. The amendment updates provisions affecting the BBD are proposed but detailed information about planned changes for residential neighbourhoods within activity centres is generally provided through the structure planning process. The impact of C150 on activity centres is broad and the amendment has been advertised to allow any submissions from the public to be made. |
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to present the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities (WAAA) Strategy 2017-2021 to Council for adoption.

Under Section 26 of the Public Health and Wellbeing Act (2008) all Victorian councils are required to develop a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan within twelve months of Council elections. Local governments are key public health authorities and the requirement ensures that Victoria local governments and the State government take an integrated and coordinated approach to community and public health. The WAAA Strategy is Bayside’s response to this requirement.

The WAAA Strategy is a key strategic planning tool that aims to maintain and improve public health and wellbeing at a local community level as well as to integrate planning across Council’s organisation.

Key issues

Strategy Development
The WAAA Strategy was developed following extensive research, analysis and consultation with the Bayside community. The process included:

- Review of previous plan: A review of the previous Strategy was undertaken in late 2016 where activities were identified to inform the future direction of the WAAA Strategy. The review highlighted the success of the WAAA framework as an integrated approach to community health and wellbeing.

- Literature review: An in-depth review of Council’s policies and strategies was conducted and an analysis of key Commonwealth, State and Local Government policies was undertaken. A review of other local government Public Health and Wellbeing Plans was also completed.

- Data Analysis: Comprehensive data analysis was undertaken using census data, Victorian Population Health data, Victorian Health Indicators as well as other relevant sources to develop a Bayside Health and Wellbeing Profile.

- Survey: A door-to-door survey was conducted in November 2016 with a representative sample of 400 residents across the Bayside municipality. The survey focused on understanding local health and wellbeing priorities and behaviours.

- Community consultation: 532 Bayside residents participated in targeted consultation activities between January and March 2017. A new approach to consultation was adopted which involved attending already organised Council and non-Council events, workshops and information sessions. The wider Bayside community was also invited to provide input into the strategic direction for health and wellbeing through online tools, with an additional 163 residents completing an online survey. A total of 695 community members were involved in the consultation process.
• Stakeholder workshop: A Discussion Paper was developed which provided an opportunity for local health services, organisations and groups to provide input into the development of the WAAA. External stakeholders were invited to attend a workshop ‘Planning for a Healthier Bayside’ in June 2017 to identify partnership opportunities to address health priorities over the next four years. A total of 50 individuals attended the workshop including representatives from local schools, senior groups, community health, early years, community centres and disability organisations.

• Internal working group: An internal working group was established comprising of Council staff from various areas of Council including: early years, youth, aged and disability, MetroAccess, arts and culture, libraries and environmental sustainability. This ensured a collaborative approach was undertaken to identify opportunities to improve health and wellbeing.

**Goals and objectives**

The extensive research, analysis and consultation has led to the development of the WAAA Strategy (attachment 1). The WAAA Strategy outlines three goals and twelve objectives.

**Goal 1: An engaged and supportive community**

1.1 Improve mental health and resilience
1.2 Support opportunities that build social networks and community connections
1.3 Strengthen volunteerism
1.4 Improve access to affordable, appropriate and inclusive services

**Goal 2: A healthy and active community**

2.1 Increase physical activity opportunities
2.2 Increase healthy eating
2.3 Increase participation in health assessments and self-care

**Goal 3: Safe and sustainable environments**

3.1 Reduce family violence
3.2 Reduce consumption of alcohol and other drugs
3.3 Improve community safety
3.4 Improve environmental sustainability
3.5 Improve community resilience to extreme weather events

**Action Plans**

Four Action Plans will be developed to support the implementation of the WAAA Strategy. These plans will be developed collaboratively across relevant Council departments and stakeholders and will target identified high priority population groups and wider population health themes. Activities targeting people with disabilities will be integrated across each action plan:

• Early Years;
• Youth;
• Healthy Ageing; and
• Healthy Community.

Action Plans will outline how Council and partner organisations will address the relevant goals and objectives identified for each population group. Action Plans will be implemented in partnership with networks, organisations and groups who contributed to its development and
with the broader community, in line with Council’s Community Engagement Policy. Each Action Plan will include comprehensive evaluation measures and will be reviewed annually.

The four action plans are planned to be presented to Council for endorsement in February 2018.

**Recommendation**


**Support Attachments**

1. Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**

Council has a key role in ensuring that health and wellbeing of the community is a priority. The WAAA Strategy is driven by the social model of health with key principles including addressing the broader determinants of health, acting to reduce social inequities, empowering individuals and their community and enabling access to health care.

The WAAA Strategy influences not only health and wellbeing programs and services available in the local area but can prompt action across other traditionally ‘non-health’ related areas. The Social Model of Health will be used to guide the development of actions across the four environments that are most important for wellbeing; the built, natural, social and economic environments.

**Natural Environment**

The WAAA Strategy acknowledges that open space and the natural environment play an important role in contributing to community health and wellbeing. This is evident in objectives 3.4 and 3.5.

**Built Environment**

The WAAA Strategy influences the built environment with a particular focus on affordable housing, safe and appropriate playgrounds, accessible walking paths and facilities.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**

Data was collected in November 2016 from a door to door household survey. This was the third health and wellbeing survey of residents from across the Bayside municipality. The survey focused on understanding local health and wellbeing priorities and behaviours.

Five hundred and thirty-two Bayside residents participated in targeted consultation activities between January and March 2017. A new approach to consultation was adopted which involved attending already organised Council and non-Council events, workshops and information sessions. The wider Bayside community was also invited to provide input into the strategic direction for health and wellbeing through online tools, with an additional 163
residents completing an online survey. A total of 695 community members were involved in the consultation process.

As part of the final phase of community consultation a Discussion Paper was developed and distributed to external agencies, organisations, partners, groups, clubs and the general public for comment in June 2017. A communication and engagement plan was developed to ensure all relevant external stakeholders were involved in the process.

Council also held a ‘Planning for a Healthier Bayside’ Workshop on 23 June 2017 with 50 external stakeholders in order to collaborate on potential partnership opportunities in delivering the WAAA Strategy.

The draft WAAA Strategy was released to the community as an exposure document prior to this report being prepared for Council.

**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 WAAA Strategy addresses Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family”.

**Legal**

All Victorian local governments are required under Section 263 of the Public Health and Wellbeing Act (2008) to develop a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan (MPHWP) within 12 months of Council elections. As a part of this requirement all Victorian councils must complete an examination of data relating to health status and health determinants in the municipality as well as involve local residents in the development of the plan. The WAAA Strategy is Council’s response to this requirement.

**Finance**

There are no direct financial implications for Council associated with the recommendation included in this report. Any future changes to service needs or costs associated with the Action Plans being developed will be subject to budget and funding considerations at the time.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The WAAA Strategy will be a key strategic document, along with the Council Plan and Community Plan which strongly links to the ‘Liveability’ domain in the Better Place Approach Framework.

The WAAA Strategy will support the current Community Plan aspirations and the 2017-2021 Council Plan goals and objectives to ensure the vision of working together to ‘make Bayside a better place’ is achieved. In particular, the WAAA directly aligns with Goal 7 in the Council Plan, “Bayside’s community will be supported and engaged to live an active and healthy lifestyle regardless of age, geographical location, personal circumstance or physical abilities”.
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Executive Summary

Bayside’s Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan known as the ‘Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy’ 2017-2021 outlines the health and wellbeing priorities for Bayside City Council over the next four years. The Strategy builds upon strengths from the previous plan and is a key strategic planning tool to maintain and improve public health and wellbeing at a local community level.

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy meets the requirements of the Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 whilst streamlining and integrating Council’s planning across services. The Strategy has been developed aligned with the Bayside City Council Plan 2017-2021 and the Bayside Community Plan 2025 and is one of three major strategic plans aimed at improving Liveability in Bayside.

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy has been developed in close consultation with the local community and through wide-ranging collaboration with key agencies, partners and stakeholders.

Implementation of the Strategy will be driven by four Action Plans which will be designed and delivered in partnership with key stakeholders. Progress against the Action Plans will be monitored, with reports made to Council and the community on the achievements.
The following three goals and twelve objectives have been identified:

**Goal 1**

**An engaged and supportive community**

1.1 Improve mental health and resilience
1.2 Support opportunities that build social networks and community connections
1.3 Strengthen volunteerism
1.4 Improve access to affordable, appropriate and inclusive services

**Goal 2**

**A healthy and active community**

2.1 Increase physical activity opportunities
2.2 Increase healthy eating
2.3 Increase participation in health assessments and self-care

**Goal 3**

**Safe and sustainable environments**

3.1 Reduce family violence
3.2 Reduce consumption of alcohol and other drugs
3.3 Improve community safety
3.4 Improve environmental sustainability
3.5 Improve community resilience to extreme weather events
Background information

All Victorian councils are required under Section 26 of the Public Health and Wellbeing Act (2008) to develop a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan within twelve months of Council elections.

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy is a key strategic planning tool that aims to maintain and improve public health and wellbeing at a local community level. The Strategy will be utilised by Council, local health service providers and community organisations to set policy and partnership priorities for the next four years, focusing on health issues that have the greatest impact on the community.

Integrated planning for wellbeing

Council takes an integrated planning approach to community health and wellbeing through the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy. The Strategy sets out goals and objectives with specific Action Plans for different population groups including: early years, youth and older people. Underpinning values such as diversity, gender equity, inclusion and disability are reflected across each action plan and address the Disability Act 2006 (refer to figure 1).

The development and delivery of each Action Plan will be the responsibility of the following areas of Council: Early Years, Youth, Aged and Disability, and Community Wellbeing. This will ensure a collaborative approach is undertaken to identify and deliver opportunities to improve health and wellbeing across population groups and service delivery areas.

FIGURE 1: INTEGRATED PLANNING FOR WELLBEING FRAMEWORK
Bayside City Council Planning Framework

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021 sits within the Bayside Planning Framework and is one of three major strategic plans that directly aligns with the Council Plan 2017-2021 and Community Plan 2025 to improve Liveability in Bayside.

Figure 2 illustrates the relationship between Council’s Community Plan 2025, Bayside Council Plan 2017-2021, Municipal Strategic Statement, Environmental Sustainability Framework and the Wellbeing for all Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021.

### Bayside Community Plan 2025
#### Domains of Liveability

- Open Space
- Local Economy and Activity Centres
- Environment
- Infrastructure
- Transport
- Housing and Neighbourhoods
- Community Health and Participation

### Big Picture Influences

- **State and Federal Policy**
  - Funding, infrastructure, planning
- **Demographic Drivers**
  - Aaging population, new communities
- **Technological Advances**
  - Virtual world, online business
- **Sustainable World**
  - Finding resource solutions
- **Diminishing Habitats**
  - Protecting land and biodiversity
- **Consumer Expectations**
  - Experiences and social relationships

### Elected Council Priorities

- **Council Plan 2017–2021**

#### Major Strategic Plans

- **Natural**
  - Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025
- **Built**
  - Municipal Strategic Statement
- **Social**
  - Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021
Close proximity to the beach, access to open space and a strong sense of community are key factors for living in Bayside.
Bayside community profile

The City of Bayside is located 16km south-east of Melbourne along the coastline of Port Phillip Bay. The municipality is characterised by its stunning foreshores, beautiful parks, open spaces and vibrant retail centres.

Bayside’s 97,087 residents enjoy the leafy surrounds of the municipality and have previously identified the close proximity to the beach, access to open space and a strong sense of community as key factors for living in Bayside.

Many Bayside households are family households (36.5 per cent) comprising couples with children. This is followed by couples without children (24.2 per cent) and lone person households (23.3 per cent) with this number expected to increase over the next four years with an ageing population.

Bayside is an ‘older’ community compared to metropolitan Melbourne with the average age of 44 years compared to 36 years in metropolitan Melbourne. There is also a substantially higher percentage of frail aged persons in Bayside (85 years and over) when compared to metropolitan Melbourne. However Bayside has fewer younger adults (25 to 34 years) residing in the area, as reports show those aged 25-34 tend to leave Bayside seeking more affordable housing or areas closer to work and entertainment opportunities.

Overall, the Bayside community is relatively advantaged in socio-economic terms with 35.8% of households earning $3000 or more per week. However, it is recognised that Bayside has small scattered areas experiencing substantial disadvantage, which are masked by the influence across the municipality. Almost all disadvantaged areas in Bayside are consistent with public housing estate locations, with most residents receiving a pension or benefit as their income sources.

It is anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of people with a disability over the next four years in Bayside. About 4 per cent of residents reported that they needed assistance in their day-to-day lives due to disability, long-term health condition or old age. Currently, 9,800 Bayside residents are also providing unpaid care to family members or others because of a disability or illness.

Bayside community characteristics are further explored in the City of Bayside: Health and Wellbeing Profile 2017-2021.

We are mostly very healthy...

**LIFE EXPECTANCY**

84 87

**YOUTH RESILIENCE**

Young people in Bayside:

- Feel safe and secure: 95%
- Adult role model: 85%
- Socially responsible: 92%
- Keep fit: 75%

**HEALTH**

- Low smoking rates: 15.4% male, 10.3% female

**ACTIVE LIFESTYLES**

- 1.7 serves per day, Victorian average 1.6
- 2.5 serves per day, Victorian average of 2.2

- High screening rates for breast cancer, cervical cancer and bowel cancer.

But did you know...

**WEALTH**

- Bayside is one of the wealthiest municipalities.
- A large proportion of households earn over the weekly Victorian average.

**GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES**

- 7,800+
- Bayside residents use an age pension concession card.
- 1,232
- Public housing properties.
- Just under 3,000 residents have healthcare cards.

**OUR POPULATION**

- 3.6% Bayside: High percentage of frail aged persons.
- 1.6% Melbourne: High proportion of families with secondary school aged children.
- High proportion of retirees and pre-retirees.
We know that we need to work on...

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Areas of concern for Bayside youth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of purpose</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep deprived</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late night texting</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating disorders</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIVE CONCERNS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayside males ranked number 1 for being overweight (pre obese) among local government areas in Victoria.</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in Bayside considered overweight (pre obese) or obese.</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in Bayside sit for at least 7 hours per day. HIGHER THAN THE VICTORIAN AVERAGE</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY**

With an ageing population there is an increase in mobility and disability issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Concerns</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents are at risk of short-term harm from alcohol. VICTORIAN ESTIMATE 20.4%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>Increase in the number of reported cases of family violence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How this strategy was developed

The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021 was developed following extensive research, analysis and consultation with the Bayside community. The process included:

**JULY 2016**
Internal working group

An internal working group was established comprising of Council staff from various areas of service delivery including: early years, youth, aged and disability; metro access, arts and culture, libraries and environmental sustainability. This ensured a collaborative approach was undertaken to identify opportunities to improve health and wellbeing through Council’s services. Members of the working group are now responsible for implementing action plans and strategies relevant to their area.

**AUGUST 2016**
Review of previous plan

A review of the previous Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy was undertaken in late 2016 where recommendations were identified to inform the future direction of the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy. The review highlighted the success of the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities framework as an integrated wellbeing approach to community health and wellbeing.

**OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 2016**
Literature review

The evaluation of the 2013-2017 Strategy was followed by a comprehensive review of Council’s key policies and strategies. An in-depth review of relevant literature was conducted and an analysis of key Commonwealth, State and Local Government policies was undertaken. A review of other Council’s Public Health and Wellbeing Plans was also completed.

**NOVEMBER 2016**
Data Analysis

Comprehensive data analysis was undertaken using census data, Victorian Population Health data, Victorian Health Indicators as well as other relevant sources to develop an updated Bayside Health and Wellbeing Profile. For a full report on the Bayside Health and Wellbeing Profile please contact Council.

532 residents participated in a targeted consultation in early 2017.
The process ensured a collaborative approach.

**Survey**

A door-to-door survey was conducted in November 2016 with a representative sample of 400 residents across the Bayside municipality. The survey focused on understanding local health and wellbeing priorities and behaviours. All survey data was analysed and used to inform the development of the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy. For a full report on the responses please contact Council.

**Community Consultation**

532 residents from Bayside participated in a targeted consultation process between January and March 2017. A key objective was to engage targeted community members (early years, young people, those with a disability or long term illness, older adults and vulnerable people) to provide a clear direction on planning for key life stages.

A new approach to consultation was adopted which involved attending already organised Council and non-Council events, workshops and information sessions. A range of engagement tools were used during this consultation process.

The wider Bayside community were also invited to provide input into the strategic direction for health and wellbeing through online tools. A total of 163 residents completed an online survey.

**Stakeholder workshop**

A Discussion Paper was developed which provided an opportunity for local health services, organisations and groups to provide input into Council's strategic direction regarding health and wellbeing in Bayside. External stakeholders were invited to attend a workshop "Planning for a Healthier Bayside" in June 2017 to help identify partnership opportunities to address health priorities over the next four years. A total of 50 attended the workshop including representatives from local schools, senior groups, community health, early years, community centres and disability organisations. Council also worked closely with the Southern Melbourne Primary Care Partnership which consists of community health, local government, women's health services and other state and commonwealth funded organisations responsible for promoting public health and coordinating health services outside hospitals in the region.
Government policy and legislation context

The issues included in the Wellbeing for all Ages and Abilities Strategy are all complex areas of public policy, with different levels of responsibility, funding and regulation by all tiers of government as well as private sector and not-for-profit community sector involvement.

Victorian government legislation places particular emphasis on the role of local government in community wellbeing. Council is required by the Local Government Act 1989, the Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008, the Disability Act 2006 as well as by its own Council and Community Plans to advocate and plan for community wellbeing.

The Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 (Vic) outlines the role of Council to ‘protect, improve and promote public health and wellbeing within the municipal district’. Councils are required to develop a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan every four years. The plan must be based on evidence, involve the community in its development, and set out goals and strategies for people to achieve maximum health and wellbeing, in partnership with the Department of Health and other community agencies.

Councils are also required to consider the Climate Change Act 2017 and Recommendation 94 from the Victoria Government’s Royal Commission into Family Violence. Both of which play a key role in defining actions for the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy.

The Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2015–2019 establishes a population health vision for Victoria aiming to reduce inequalities in health and wellbeing. To achieve this vision, the Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2015–2019 identifies place-based approaches as a key platform for change to support action on a range of key priorities. This Plan supports a systems approach to prevention to tackle the underlying determinants of poor health and health inequity, and advocates a collective effort by multiple stakeholders to address the complex issues facing communities.
Underlying principles and concepts

Six principles underpin the goals and objectives in the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy and will guide implementation of the Action Plans.

1. Addressing the broader determinants of health, recognising that health is influenced by more than genetics, lifestyles and provision of health care, and that political, social, economic and environmental factors are critical.

2. Basing activities on the best available data and evidence, both with respect to why there is a need for action in a particular area and what is most likely to impact sustainable change.

3. Acting to reduce social inequities and injustice, helping to ensure every individual, family and community group may benefit from living, learning and working in Bayside.

4. Emphasising active community participation, to enable and encourage people to have a say about what influences their health and wellbeing and what would make a difference.

5. Empowering individuals and communities, through information, skill development, support and advocacy to be able to mobilise resources necessary to take control of their own lives.

6. Working in collaboration, through partnerships, to build on the capacity of a wide range of sectors to deliver quality actions and to reduce duplication and fragmentation of effort.

Goal 1

An engaged and supportive community
Objectives

1.1 Improve mental health and resilience
1.2 Support opportunities that build social networks and community connections
1.3 Strengthen volunteerism
1.4 Improve access to affordable, appropriate and inclusive services

An engaged and supportive community allows people from all ages and abilities access to services and resources that enhance their wellbeing and enable them to live full lives.

At one level it represents the degree to which individuals feel connected with their community, however more broadly it is the strength and resilience within communities that sustains positive mental health. Social connectedness and social inclusion have also been identified as key contributing factors to ensuring an engaged and healthy community.

Why is this important for Bayside?

- A key community aspiration identified in Bayside’s Community Plan 2025 is that members of the community feel connected and involved regardless of age, gender, cultural background, abilities or relative income.
- Bayside has an ageing population and it is anticipated that there will be an increase to the number of lone person households in Bayside over the next four years.
- Older residents and those with a disability or long term illness reported low scores for community connectedness and were more likely to report isolation compared to the general population.
- Mental health is a key issue for young people within Bayside. Youth Resilience Survey results show that many young people in Bayside are losing sleep through worry, do not feel good about themselves and have poor management of stress compared to the national average.
- Bayside has 1,232 public housing dwellings and 3,000 residents with healthcare cards.
- Community feedback from consultation activities in early 2017 show a need for better access to information, education and support about programs and services.
- Bayside residents expressed the importance of opportunities for social connections including intergenerational activities, programs for vulnerable population groups and young people.
- The community expressed a strong interest in taking a coordinated approach to volunteering in Bayside. Currently, there is a wide range of volunteer opportunities that connect people together and also promote activity outdoors in the natural environment.
Objectives

2.1 Increase physical activity opportunities
2.2 Increase healthy eating
2.3 Increase participation in health assessments and self-care

Eating well and being physically active is important to maintain and protect the longevity of good health and wellbeing.

Regular physical activity provides people of all ages and abilities substantial physical, social and mental health gains. It also reduces the risk of premature mortality and chronic diseases such as: Type 2 diabetes, heart disease, depression, osteoporosis, stroke and some cancers. Good nutrition benefits people of all ages and helps the body function at optimal efficiency and maintain a healthy weight.

Why is this important for Bayside?

- A key community aspiration identified in Bayside’s Community Plan 2025 is that members of the community feel supported and engaged to live an active and healthy lifestyle regardless of geographic location, personal circumstance or physical ability.
- Bayside residents have high levels of weekly physical activity, however sedentary activity is a concern with many residents sitting for over seven hours per day.
- The daily consumption of fruit and vegetables could be improved to ensure all residents are meeting national guidelines.
- There is room to improve breastfeeding rates with a focus on support during the antenatal and postnatal period.
- With an ageing population, there is a need to create opportunities to maintain and support independence of older people.
- There are bodyweight issues in Bayside which predominantly concern adult males.
- There is an increase in diabetes and cardiovascular cases within Bayside.
- There is strong evidence that supports contact with nature and the importance of outdoor activities.
Goal 3
Safe and sustainable environments
Objectives

3.1 Reduce family violence
3.2 Reduce consumption of alcohol and other drugs
3.3 Improve community safety
3.4 Improve environmental sustainability
3.5 Improve community resilience to extreme weather events

A safe environment where people can live, work and play has a direct impact on the community’s physical, social and emotional wellbeing.

Whilst Bayside is one of the safest municipalities in Victoria, issues relating to crime, family violence, and safety in the home and in public places do occur and can have an impact on individuals, families and the broader community.

Extreme weather events relating to climate change may also impact on the safety of the community, specifically vulnerable groups such as older adults and disadvantaged residents. Health impacts of increasing temperatures may include; increases in heat stress and dehydration and changes in fresh food and production and consumption.

Why is this important for Bayside?

- A key community aspiration identified in Bayside’s Community Plan 2025 is that both community and Council be environmental stewards, taking action to protect and enhance the natural environment and balance appreciation and use with the need to protect natural assets for future generations.
- Perception of safety is relatively high, however women and older people are less likely to feel safe. The general community is more likely to feel unsafe at foreshores, parks and reserves at night.
- Family violence incident reports continue to increase in Bayside, a trend reflected across Victoria. Young people, non-English speaking households and those aged over 75 years were less likely to be aware of how to best help someone experiencing violence.
- Bayside has a higher than average proportion of persons who consume alcohol at risky levels, of particular concern is consumption of alcohol by females.
- Climate change may affect Council infrastructure and property (i.e. community centres, libraries and sporting pavilions), which may restrict access and impact on the community’s ability to use Council assets for social and physical activities.
- With increasing temperatures predicted, trees play an important role in the provision of shade and respite in Council’s parks and streetscapes.
Health and wellbeing is everybody’s business. The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy provides direction for the whole of community.

Actions will involve or be led by a wide range of stakeholders, including: health organisations; care and education providers; and community centres and volunteer groups.

Council’s role in implementing the Strategy and Action Plans will include direct programs and services, facility planning and coordination, partnerships and strengthening community capacity, and advocacy and information.

**FIGURE 1: INTEGRATED PLANNING FOR WELLBEING FRAMEWORK**

- Four Action Plans will support the implementation of the Strategy: Early Years, Youth, Healthy Ageing and Healthy Communities. Activities targeting people with disabilities will be integrated in each Action Plan. The Action Plans will outline how Council and partners will address the relevant goals and objectives of the Strategy for particular groups. Each Action Plan will include comprehensive evaluation measures. Reporting on the action plans will occur annually.

- The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy and Action Plans will be implemented in partnership with networks, organisations and groups who contributed to its development and with the broader community, in line with Council’s Community Engagement Policy.

- The Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy will be reviewed annually, in conjunction with Action Plans and will respond to any emerging health and wellbeing needs. A detailed evaluation will be conducted in 2021 at the end of the four-year strategy and will be used to inform the next four-year plan.
Working together, Council and the community will use this strategy to achieve the highest standard of health and wellbeing in Bayside
Executive summary

Purpose and background
For Council to consider a request from the Brighton Beach Bowls Club Inc. to act as guarantor for a loan up to $100,000 for the replacement of the natural green with synthetic turf and installation of floodlights.

Council approved the initial budget for this project in 2015/16 which included a funding contribution of $200,000 from the club towards the project. The funding contribution from the club included a loan of $100,000 to be guaranteed by Council. While the initial loan guarantee application received from the club was assessed in accordance with the policy at the time, the application was put on hold as the project was delayed by unfavourable tender results and the availability of the contractor to complete the work. In September 2016 Council approved an increase in the budget of $112,000 so the project could proceed and awarded a contract for the works which were completed in January 2017.

Key issues
The Brighton Beach Bowls Club (BBBC) was formed in 1905 and is located on the corner of Beach and South Roads. BBBC has a current nine year lease with Council and boasts just under 100 members. The natural turf green at BBBC only facilitated play for eight months of the year and was unable to support regional competitions or allow members to play year round. The renewal of the natural green to a synthetic surface and installation of floodlights has enabled the club to offer year round access to the facilities and will provide fit for purpose facilities to the Bayside community.

The synthetic green will reduce the Club’s ongoing water consumption and maintenance costs by up to $22,000 per annum. The project also includes lighting to allow the Club to conduct evening training and social bowls for non members, which is a growing trend and will generate additional revenue. The maintenance savings as well as additional revenue will be used to service the loan guaranteed by Council.

Assessment of the application against the loan guarantee policy criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Where it is demonstrated that the project will provide essential services or a clear benefit to the community.</td>
<td>✔ The renewal of the natural green to a synthetic surface and installation of floodlights will enable the club to offer year round access to the facilities and will provide fit for purpose facilities to the members and Bayside community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The Applicant will provide a minimum of 20% of the capital cost of the project excluding government grants and other external funding.</td>
<td>✔ The total cost of the project is $398,300. The club is contributing 52% $200,00 of the project funding and has secured grants from Sport &amp; Recreation Victoria totalling $60,000 and Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development $18,500.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii) The guarantee term is within the Council agreed benchmark terms (Refer Loan Guarantee Policy).

iv) The Applicant has completed and agreed to all items in the Loan Guarantee Compliance Statement.

v) Borrowings are only to be used for the construction and/or acquisition of capital assets on Council owned or controlled land that will be vested in and ultimately controlled by Council.

vi) The Applicant is a “not for profit” organisation and has an incorporated status.

vii) The life of the asset exceeds the life of the loan guarantee

viii) The term of the loan shall not exceed the term of the existing lease agreement. The lease agreement refers to the agreement between Council as landlord and the community organisation.

ix) The loan must not include a redraw facility

Although the loan term exceeds the lease agreement by 2 years it is expected that the club will remain at this site beyond the current lease term and the loan balance at the end of the lease term will be $24,495. All applicable documentation has been received including the last two year’s financial statements, a 9 year financial model covering the loan period, and a signed loan guarantee compliance statement.

Assessment of the business model by the evaluation review panel

In accordance with Council’s loan guarantee application procedure the Evaluation Panel have conducted a review of the application based on the evaluation criteria. The review has concluded that the information received including last two year financial statements as well as the 9 year business model covering the term of the loan supports the club’s view that they are in a strong financial position and will be able to service the loan over the 9 year period from the annual financial surplus generated by the club.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. resolves to act as loan guarantor for the Brighton Beach Bowls Club Inc for $100,000 for a maximum of 9 years to assist with the funding of the replacement of the surface and installation of floodlights; and

2. approves the necessary loan guarantee documentation being signed and affixed with the Bayside City Council common seal.
Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The endorsement of this loan guarantee by Council, in support of the Brighton Beach Bowls Club’s replacement of the surface and installation of floodlights will have positive benefits for the community by supporting sporting activities and social connectedness.

Natural Environment
No Implications for this report

Built Environment
No Implications for this report

Customer Service and Community Engagement
There is no community engagement required for this report.

Human Rights
The implications of this report 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 loan guarantee documentation requires Council’s Common Seal. This requires a specific resolution of Council.

Finance
Council’s Loan Guarantee Policy requires Council’s loan guarantee commitments to be no greater than 1.5% of the annual revenue of rates and charges. Loan guarantees are measured on the basis of the outstanding balance of loans guaranteed by Council. The threshold based on the 2017/18 rates and charges budget is $1.330 million. The balance of the outstanding loan guarantees as at 30 June 2017 was $176,925. A loan guarantee for the Beaumaris Sports Club for $700,000 has been approved but not yet drawn. Council has the capacity to approve loan guarantees of $453,075. Approving this loan guarantee will take Council’s commitment to $976,925 which is within the policy threshold.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The loan guarantee application has been considered in accordance with Council’s Loan Guarantee Policy and Loan Guarantee Application Procedure.
10.5 EARLY YEARS INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

City Planning & Community Services - Family Services
File No: PSF/17/71 – Doc No: DOC/17/192656

Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a progress report on the development of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan.

At the 27 April 2017 Ordinary Meeting of Council, Council resolved:

1. to undertake a broader scope of enquiry and develop a 10-year Early Years Infrastructure Plan inclusive of maternal and child health and other early years’ services as opposed to an exclusive Kindergarten Improvement Plan;

2. to commence consultation to determine the need for an early years precinct in the Black Rock area and include this information in a 10-year Early Years Infrastructure Plan;

3. to continue to allocate previously approved and unspent monies of up to $380,000 from the Early Years Reserves Fund to address necessary short term renewal works in Council buildings that improve kindergarten functionality; and

4. to receive a ten-year Early Year’s Infrastructure Plan at the 21 November 2017 Council Meeting.

Key issues

A request for quotes to provide consultancy support for the development of the Early Years Infrastructure Plan was issued in June 2017. Council received one submission, with other consultants noting that the timeframes for achieving a quality outcome was unachievable. The one submission that was received did not satisfy the evaluation panel.

In response to the market feedback, a request for quotes was re-issued in August with a more detailed scope and revised timeline to allow for quality outcomes. Four submissions were received by Council, with two proceeding to interview. Based on an assessment against criteria of cost, methodology, skills and experience, the preferred consultant has been selected.

The project methodology is proposed to include the following steps:

- a project definition meeting, literature review, review of contemporary practice in the design and location of early years facilities (November);

- an audit of the facilities, an assessment of the distribution of facilities (December);

- an early years facilities demand assessment, assessment of capacity of facilities (January / February);

- development of a discussion paper (March); and

- draft plan (March) and final plan (June).
The preferred consultant conveyed an understanding of the importance of community and stakeholder engagement and is cognisant of the risk of community consultation fatigue in the early year’s sector.

Community consultation will be targeted and include:

- 1:1 interviews, surveys, meetings and/or workshops. Key messaging to the community will be in the infrastructure plan to demonstrate enhanced service delivery.

- The consultancy has an extensive background in early year’s infrastructure planning for local government based on a current and future needs analysis of early year’s services that are local area focused. Examples of past projects include: the Monash City Council’s Early Years Facilities Plan; Brimbank City Council’s Preschool Facilities Plan; and Mornington Peninsula Shire Council Preschools Facilities Review and Universal Access Assessment.

Short term works have continued to be delivered during the tender process, including:

- outdoor play space works at North Brighton and Olive Phillips Kindergartens;

- State Minor Infrastructure Grant applications have been submitted for Jack and Jill Kindergarten for an indoor/outdoor art studio and an outdoor upgrade including remodelling of the existing access ramp at Livingston Kindergarten.

Consideration of the most equitable distribution of Maternal and Child Health services has also been considered during the tender process. As a result, the Sandringham Maternal and Child Health service will re-locate to Black Rock in the first half of 2018, which will provide improved distribution and access for the community.

**Recommendation**

That Council receives a further report including a draft Early Year’s Infrastructure Plan at the March 2018 Council meeting.

**Support Attachments**

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social

Early years services play an important role in supporting children's social and emotional development, and kindergartens are critical in providing a strong foundation for primary education.

Natural Environment

An Early Years Infrastructure Plan will demonstrate Council's commitment to achieving positive environmental opportunities and outcomes by applying environmentally sustainable principles to infrastructure planning and development and by increasing the capacity of open spaces for children and the community.

Built Environment

Works continue to be undertaken in the short term. All kindergartens are compliant with regulation requirements and the performance of kindergarten facilities in supporting quality service provision, as well as providing an improved level of amenity for children and families.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

Families and committee members currently accessing kindergartens were consulted regarding future service needs. Understanding broader early years' service needs will necessitate engagement and exploration beyond community based kindergarten stakeholders. Broader consultation and evaluation is recommended as part of the development of an Early Years Infrastructure Plan.

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 short term works undertaken have assisted in supporting kindergarten access for children with additional needs.

Legal

There are no legal implications associated with this report.

Finance

Council allocated expenditure of up to $500,000 for short term renewal works at the 23 August 2016 Council meeting. To date, $130,000 has been expended.

Consultancy costs will be approximately $70,000 (including GST). There is not a current budget allocation due to the project being initiated after the budget cycle was completed, however, there will be a focus on offsetting the costs with broader efficiencies.

Links to Council policy and strategy

Bayside City Council has existing policies guiding the planning of early year's services and infrastructure including:

- Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017 - 2021
10.6 YOUTH RESILIENCE SURVEY 2017
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Executive summary

Purpose and background
To report on the results of the 2017 youth resilience survey undertaken on Council’s behalf by Resilient Youth.

The annual youth resilience survey provides important insights on primary and secondary school students, which then guide Council’s youth health and wellbeing programs.

The 2015 Youth Services Strategic Review recommended undertaking a three year partnership with Resilient Youth to determine the level of resilience of Bayside young people. Resilient Youth is an organisation directed by Dr Andrew Fuller, a renowned clinical psychologist specialising in the wellbeing of young people and their families.

The youth resilience survey is an evidence based online survey which indicates the self-reported strengths of young people between years 3 and 12. The 99 questions provide an overall measure of resilience. Data is compared to 180,000 students across more than 750 schools in Australia.

There are three resilience pathways that include ten domains that comprise the resilience framework:

- Safe pathway: empowerment, belonging, boundaries and expectations, adult support.
- Healthy pathway: hope, healthy mind and healthy body.
- Fulfilling pathway: educational engagement, social skills, positive identity, positive values.

In 2017, 16 primary schools and 8 secondary schools participated in the survey achieving 6,404 valid responses for the Bayside area. This represents an increase from 2016 of 761 valid responses and an additional two schools.

Results are compared to the 2016 data and a summary of recent actions undertaken to improve the resilience of young people is provided.

Key issues

Bayside youth resilience levels
Of the 3,046 students in years 3 to 6 that submitted a valid response, 68% reported good or excellent levels of resilience. This is 8% higher than the national average of 60%. The 2017 results are the same as in 2016.

Of the 3,358 students in years 7 to 12 that submitted a valid response, 43% reported good to excellent levels of resilience. This is 5% higher than the national average of 38% and represents a 5% increase from 2016.

The key strengths are consistent with those identified in 2016 and with national data. Bayside students reported:

- Feeling safe in their home (91% primary and 91% secondary), school (88% primary and 84% secondary) and in their neighbourhood (90% primary and 88% secondary).
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- Being engaged in learning (97% primary and 88% secondary), felt their parents helped them succeed (91% primary and 90% secondary) and were able to trust others (82% primary and 67% secondary).

- Being involved in clubs and groups (89% primary and 70% secondary), keeping physically fit (87% primary and 72% secondary) and eating well (89% primary and 70% secondary).

The key challenges are also consistent with those identified in 2016 and with national data. Bayside students reported:

- Experiencing bullying in the last 12 months (51% primary and 33% secondary).

- Feeling unhappy and depressed (20% primary and 34% secondary).

- Feeling constantly under strain (20% primary and 41% secondary), losing confidence (17% primary and 21% secondary) and feeling worthless (14% primary and 32% secondary).

- Using alcohol (5% primary and 30% secondary), unhealthy attitudes to violence (18% primary and 20% secondary).

- Not feeling good about themselves (20% primary and 40% secondary), not feeling in control of their life (29% primary and 40% secondary) and not feeling positive about their future (19% primary and 37% secondary).

Detailed results of strengths and challenges are shown at attachment 1 and include a comparison between primary and secondary years; and between 2016 and 2017 results.

Improving resilience in Bayside

Council’s Youth Services has delivered a range of health and wellbeing programs to improve the resilience of young people living in Bayside, such as:

- Transition programs for the year six students in managing stress associated with change.

- Self-esteem and confidence building programs for years five and six students.

- Anti-bullying and skill building programs for years five and six students.

- Anti-bullying and skill building programs across year levels in primary and secondary schools.

- Therapeutic programs for years 9-11 students experiencing anxiety and depression.

- Awareness raising programs to reduce the use of alcohol, drugs and anti-social behaviours such as illegal graffiti.

- Opportunities to participate within the broader community through committees including the Bayside Youth Ambassadors and the FReeZA committee.

- Recognition of contribution of young people within the Bayside community through initiatives such as Bayside Youth Awards.

Each participating school receives a confidential report that outlines their students reported strengths and challenges.
Follow up actions

In order to maximise the value of the survey results, Council and Resilient Youth will continue to assist schools to interpret their data and prioritise actions in response to identified strengths and challenges. Council will also continue to collaborate in a regional network to share information with other Victorian local governments who are participating in the Youth Resilience Survey.

The survey results will inform the Youth Action Plan that is being developed as part of the Wellbeing for all Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017-2021. This will occur in partnership with key stakeholders who are also working toward improving the resilience of young people in Bayside, such as primary and secondary schools, Victoria Police, and community service organisations.

A communication plan will be developed that identifies further opportunities to share the survey results and the Youth Action Plan initiatives with the broader community.

Recommendation

That Council notes the results of the 2017 Youth Resilience Survey.

Support Attachments

1. Youth Resilience Survey 2017 Strengths and Challenges ↓

Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social

The youth resilience survey provides a youth voice in Bayside that will assist schools and Council to plan appropriate programs and services to improve the resilience of young people.

Natural Environment

There are no natural environment implications associated with this report

Built Environment

There are no built environment implications associated with the report.
Customer Service and Community Engagement
All primary and secondary schools within Bayside were provided with the opportunity to participate in the Youth Resilience Survey. A total of sixteen primary schools and eight secondary schools participated in the survey.

Human Rights
Improving the levels of youth resilience will contribute to the entitlement of families to protection included in Section 17 of Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities. This includes children and young people who have the same rights as adults with added protection according to their best interests.

This report will not breach or infringe upon the human rights contained in the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2016.

Legal
Resilient Youth is the owner of the data and any use of the data must have its permission.

Finance
Council has allocated $55,000 over three years to conduct the Youth Resilience Survey in 2016, 2017 and 2018. This expenditure has been accounted for within the Youth Services operational budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The data from the youth resilience survey is being used to develop the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities Strategy 2017 – 2021 Youth Action Plan. The Youth Action Plan will guide annual service delivery priorities for Youth Services and target the key challenges identified in the youth resilience survey, such as experience with bullying, feeling under pressure and unhealthy attitudes to violence.
## Youth Resilience Survey 2017

### Attachment 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified strengths</th>
<th>Yrs 3-6 2016</th>
<th>Yrs 3-6 2017</th>
<th>National average 2017</th>
<th>Yrs 7-12 2016</th>
<th>Yrs 7-12 2017</th>
<th>National Average 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe at home</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe at school</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling safe in neighbourhood</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically active</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat well</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in learning process</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel parents help them succeed</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to trust others</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in clubs and groups</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Yrs 3-6 2016</th>
<th>Yrs 3-6 2017</th>
<th>National Average 2017</th>
<th>Yrs 7-12 2016</th>
<th>Yrs 7-12 2017</th>
<th>National Average 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying at school in the last 12 months</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantly under strain</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy and depressed</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losing confidence</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling worthless</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhealthy attitude towards violence</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t feel good about self</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not feeling in control of life</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not feeling positive about future</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.7 BAYSIDE TOURISM NETWORK MEMBERSHIP 2017-2019
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Executive summary

Purpose and background

To recommend membership appointments to the Bayside Tourism Network to fill current membership vacancies.

Key issues

The BTN is an advisory group established by Council to facilitate the development of the tourism industry in Bayside. The BTN assists Council on tourism related matters and with the implementation of the Bayside Tourism Strategy (2013). The primary objective of the BTN is to develop and promote Bayside as an attractive and desirable destination for tourists (visitors) in order to generate local employment and increased business activity.

This matter is being referred to Council following the expiry of the two year tenure period of seven members resulting in ten vacancies.

Membership

The BTN can comprise up to fifteen members. The membership term is two years for each member, with terms staggered to commence on alternate years to ensure continuity of membership. The BTN is currently comprised of 12 members. Seven members are completing their two year term, leaving a total of 10 vacancies to reach the maximum of 15 memberships available.

The current membership of the BTN is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Jessica Derham</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kel Costello</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Debbie Tizi</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Jane Cox</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Susan Carden</td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members whose terms are expiring (October 2017)</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jason Douglas</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Elias</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Maureen Griffiths</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stephen Le Page</td>
<td>2015-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members can re-nominate as part of the expression of interest process.

Ms Michele Waddington has chosen to retire after a move to country Victoria following a lengthy service contribution to the BTN. Ms Karen Sedgwick has decided not to renew her BTN membership due to her relocation to the Mornington Peninsula and a growing and successful business to manage. A letter of thanks from the BTN and Council has been forwarded to both Ms Waddington and Ms Sedgwick.

**Expression of Interest process**

An expression of interest to fill the vacancies was advertised in the Bayside Leader in July 2017. Two applicants were interviewed to assess their suitability for the role.

- **Ms Gair Miller** - Has extensive tourism experience having managed marketing programs for visitor centres, museums and other organisations. A local, Ms Miller is passionate about tourism and understands how it can positively impact on the local economy. Ms Miller is also passionate about education and contributing to her community.

- **Mr Peter Brearley** – Lives in Bayside and is a passionate community member, particularly as a member of the Bayside Lifesaving Club. Working part time as a tour guide in Melbourne, Mr Brearley has demonstrated a strong understanding of Bayside’s local history, and has completed a Certificate III in Guiding at Holmesglen TAFE as well as being an active member of the Professional Tour Guides Association of Australia (PTGAA). Mr Brearley also has a Business Marketing Degree.

Both candidates would bring significant experience, skills and volunteer capacity to the BTN and are recommended for appointment.

Five existing members have renominated for a further two year term. Given their past contributions and ongoing commitment, the five existing members who have renominated for an additional two year term are all recommended for reappointment. Members who have renominated are:

- Mr Jason Douglas
- Mr David Elias
- Ms Maureen Griffiths
- Mr Stephen Le Page
- Mr Michael Lee

**Terms of Reference**

The BTN is governed by a Terms of Reference. Under the terms of reference, the BTN can comprise up to fifteen local tourism representatives and two Councillors (currently Cr. Grinter and Cr. Heffernan). The BTN is supported by staff from the Economic Development team. Meetings are generally held bi-monthly, while the BTN’s sub-groups meet more frequently depending on projects being explored and developed.
Recommendation

That Council:

1. Reapoints to the Bayside Tourism Network the following renominating members each for a two year term:
   - Mr Jason Douglas
   - Mr David Elias
   - Ms Maureen Griffiths
   - Mr Stephen Le Page
   - Mr Michael Lee;

2. Appoints the following new members to the Bayside Tourism Network each for a two year term:
   - Ms Gair Miller
   - Mr Peter Brearley;

3. Thanks the retiring Bayside Tourism Network members for the contribution to the Bayside Tourism Network; and

4. Writes to the unsuccessful nominees to thank them for their interest in the Bayside Tourism Network.

Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The past and present membership of the BTN has been an effective model in developing community connections. It has also resulted in a significant volunteer contribution to the local community and to Council, assisting with the implementation of the Tourism Strategy 2013.

Natural Environment
Bayside’s natural features are a significant tourism and visitor drawcard. BTN members are typically local residents with expertise in tourism that bring a balanced and informed approach in their recommendations to Council in sensitively promoting and developing the local environment.

Built Environment
The BTN’s expertise builds on the findings of the Tourism Strategy and supports the implementation of the following key action areas: build Bayside tourism strengths, develop and investigate new tourism products and opportunities, brand market and position Bayside and foster community and industry ownership of tourism development.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
A successful expression of interest process was undertaken. Two applicants were interviewed to assess their applications against the requirements of the membership role. In addition, as BTN members are from the local community they better inform Council on how to service and engage the local tourism industry.

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

Legal
There are no legal implications associated with this report.

Finance
The support of the BTN is provided within existing operating budgets and work plans.

Links to Council policy and strategy
To date, the BTN has been successful, generously making available to Council a significant volunteer capacity and considerable tourism industry knowledge. The BTN plays an important role in assisting Council in delivering the Tourism Strategy 2013.

Bayside City Council Plan 2017-2021
The BTN is active in supporting the Council Plan 2017-2021, in particular the strategic objectives where:
• Shopping villages are vibrant, attractive and interesting places where the community comes together, providing a variety of innovative, dynamic and convenient services;

• Local opportunities for business and employment are protected and enhanced, and opportunities for economic innovation are embraced; and

• The foreshore generates optimum economic, social and environmental return.

Tourism Strategy (2013)

Section 4.4 of the Tourism Strategy (2013) identifies the crucial role that the BTN plays in assisting Council with ‘the provision of a robust and creative sounding board on the development and implementation of tourism priorities.’
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of the report is to advise Council of the status of the Corporate Cleaning Services Contract No: 091009 and to recommend an extension to the current Contract for a period of one year.

Key issues

Corporate cleaning services for Council buildings have been delivered for Council under the current cleaning contract since January 2010 by Bluegum Services Group Pty Ltd. Bluegum Services Group held the previous cleaning contract from September 2005 to January 2010.

Council buildings included in this contract are as follows:

- Corporate Centre
- Brighton Town Hall and Bayside Arts and Cultural Centre
- Libraries
- Council Chambers
- Community Halls
- Black Rock House
- Senior Citizens’ buildings
- Sandringham Leisure Centre
- Maternal and Child Health buildings
- Youth Service Centres

The services provided under the current contract include:

- General office cleaning
- Cleaning of toilets (excluding public toilets), hand basins, showers etc.
- Cleaning of kitchens
- Vacuuming
- Steam cleaning
- Window cleaning
- Hard surface restoration and cleaning
- Emptying recycling and general waste bins
- Cleaning of telephones and handsets
- Other cleaning tasks as specified in work schedules

The work schedules and buildings for the current contract are subject to continual review and assessment to ensure that they meet current needs.

Contract No: 091009 commenced on 5 January 2010 for an initial period of 3 years, which expired on 5 January 2013. The Contract provides an option for Council to extend for up to seven one-year extensions. Council last exercised its option to extend Contract No: 091009 for one year from 6 January 2017 until 5 January 2018.
The Contract requires that the contractor meets specific performance targets in the areas of responsiveness, customer satisfaction, regular quality audits, environmental sustainability and safety. Regular Contract meetings are held to ensure that these targets are met. Bluegum Services Group has demonstrated over the past seven years (and the previous five year contract) that it is committed to a partnering approach and has provided consistent sponsorship of, and support for, Council and community events and initiatives.

Bluegum Services Group has performed satisfactorily and met all performance targets during the course of the current contract. Key performance indicators, targets and results are as follows:

**Key performance indicator**

- Provide a normal cleaning service with structured routine daily and periodic schedules of cleaning;
- Any justifiable complaint attended to within 24 hours;
- Demand services performed on required date and time;
- Achievement of all specified reporting and recording requirements;
- Safe work practices and all incidents reported - 100% and no incidents; and
- Bluegum Services Group has also appointed a full time quality auditor to ensure that service standards are met and exceeded where possible.

Given the price competitiveness of the existing contract and the fact that the service has been delivered satisfactorily over the last seven years, an extension of the existing contract is considered most advantageous to Council as it results in:

- No financial increase for existing services (other than a CPI increase); and
- Continuation of a contract that has met the requirements of the specification.

There are no identified impediments to the extension of this Contract and it is considered appropriate for Council to exercise its option to extend Contract No: 091009 for one year, from 6 January 2018 until 5 January 2019.

**Recommendation**

That Council authorises the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to extend the current Corporate Cleaning Services Contract No. 091009 with Bluegum Services Group Pty Ltd (ABN: 34 103 118 118) for the period 6 January 2018 to 5 January 2019 and to execute this in accordance with the terms of the current contract.

**Support Attachments**

Nil

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

The provision of cleaning services of Council owned buildings assists in providing appropriate and hygienic places for Council staff to undertake their work, as well as providing appropriately maintained spaces and facilities for community groups and the broader community to use for activities and services that help make Bayside a better place.
Social
The cleaning contract provides services to a range of Council facilities to ensure that they are fit for their intended use. Council facilities support the social environment by providing Council services or places for community groups to meet. Customer service and responsiveness, performance indicators and customer satisfaction surveys are an integral part of the current contract.

Bluegum Services Group meets all performance indicators, and is subject to constant monitoring by both Bluegum and Council officers.

Natural Environment
The current contract stipulates that environmentally friendly products are used wherever possible. Bluegum Services Group complies with this criterion.

Built Environment
The Corporate Cleaning Contract ensures that Council owned and managed buildings are clean and presentable.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Bluegum Services Group has met the customer satisfaction levels required under the contract.

Services provided under this contract are constantly reviewed to ensure that cleaning schedules meet customer/community expectations within the budget provided.

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 current contract allows up to seven one-year extensions at Council's discretion. This report considers the sixth extension.

Finance
When the contract was awarded in 2010, Bluegum Services Group offered the best value for the works specified as well as a very competitive hourly rate for additional work. The Contract is subject to rise and fall in accordance with CPI provisions and changes to the regular cleaning regime as directed by Council.

Ongoing benchmarking against two nearby Councils has confirmed that Bluegum Services Group’s current normal hourly rate is still highly competitive for similar works.

The proposed extension to the Contract will be under the same terms and conditions as the current Contract, with individual building cleaning schedules being regularly reviewed and updated according to approved user needs.

It is expected that overall, the Contract price will be in line with current and future budgets. The total cleaning budget for 2017/18 is $431,085.

Links to Council policy and strategy
An extension to this contract is compliant with Council’s Procurement Policy and in accordance with the terms of the Contract.
Options considered

Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Exercise one year option in contract. Given the price competitiveness of the existing contract and the fact that the service has been delivered satisfactorily over the last seven years, and that there are no identified impediments to the extension of this contract, it is considered appropriate for Council to exercise its option to extend Contract No. 091009 for one year until 5 January 2019.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>No financial increase for existing services (other than CPI provisions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Re-tender Corporate Cleaning Contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Test the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>It is considered that re-tendering the contract will not provide a more cost effective service due to the current contract price increases being restricted to an assessment of CPI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of the report is to advise Council of the status of the Building Maintenance Contract No. CON/14/69 and to recommend an extension of the current contract.

Key issues

The services provided under the current contract include:

- Plumbing
- Electrical
- Carpentry and general maintenance
- Air conditioning servicing and maintenance
- Passenger lift maintenance and inspections
- Painting
- Graffiti removal
- Handyman and general labour services
- Essential safety measures inspections and maintenance
- Programmed inspections, asset management reporting and audits
- Provision of general labour
- Pest control
- Out of hours call out response

The current contract was awarded to Campeyn Group Pty Ltd and commenced on 1 July 2015 for an initial period of three years, which expires on 30 June 2018, together with an option to extend for a further term of three years.

The contract requires that the contractor meets specific performance targets in the areas of responsiveness, customer satisfaction, compliance, quality and safety. Regular contract meetings are held to ensure that these targets are met.

Campeyn Group Pty Ltd has demonstrated over the past three years that it is committed to a partnering approach to the contract, and has provided consistent sponsorship of, and support for, Council events and initiatives. Campeyn Group Pty Ltd has also assisted Council in the provision of home handyman services for the aged and disadvantaged.

Campeyn Group Pty Ltd has performed satisfactorily and met all performance targets during the course of the current contract.

Key performance indicators

- Service levels – response times for emergency, urgent, routine requests and out of hours response;
- Quality of work – compliance, courtesy, problem solving and quality of completed works;
- OH&S – signage and safety barriers, safe work methods, compliance, cleanliness of work area, no work injuries; and
• Communication and documentation – clear accurate documentation: invoices, reports, site specific information, trade based advice, clear communication with customers, 24 hour availability, notification of defects or problems.

The Building Maintenance Service has been delivered satisfactorily over the last three years, an extension of the existing contract is considered most advantageous to Council as it results in:

• No financial increase for existing services (other than CPI increases); and
• Continuation of a contract that has met the requirements of the specification.

There has been no changes in the market for building maintenance services that are likely to have an impact on contract costs that would warrant retendering this contract at this time.

There are no identified impediments to the extension of this contract and it is considered appropriate for Council to exercise its option to extend Contract No. CON/14/69 for three years until 30 June 2021.

**Recommendation**

That Council authorises the Chief Executive Officer, or his delegate to extend the current Building Maintenance contract CON/14/69 with Campeyn Group Pty Ltd (ABN 33 006 818 051) for the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2021, in accordance with the provisions of the current contract.

**Support Attachments**

Nil

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

The provision of building maintenance services for Council owned buildings is essential to ensure that appropriate, safe, fit for purpose places are available for staff to undertake their work, as well as providing appropriately maintained spaces and facilities for community groups and the broader community to use for activities and services that help make Bayside a better place.

**Social**

The Building Maintenance Contract provides building services to the range of Council facilities to ensure that they are safe and fit for their intended use. Council facilities support the social environment by providing Council services or places for community groups to meet.

Customer service and responsiveness, performance management and customer satisfaction surveys are an integral part of the current contract. Campeyn Group meets all performance targets, and is subject to constant monitoring by both Campeyn and Council officers to ensure that high standards are the norm, and that continual improvement in all aspects of the service is a constant goal.
Natural Environment
The current contract stipulates that environmentally friendly products are used wherever possible. Campeyn complies with this criterion, and is constantly seeking more sustainable methods and materials.

Built Environment
Campeyn Group assists Council with the sourcing and implementation of building related sustainability initiatives. The building maintenance service is critical to making sure that the condition of Council buildings enhance the built environment.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Customer service, responsiveness KPIs and customer satisfaction surveys are an integral part of the current contract.

Regular customer surveys are conducted and the results demonstrate that the needs of the users and occupiers of Council buildings are met.

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 current contract allows for an extension of one term of three years. This report considers this extension.

The building maintenance services provided by Council are the subject of a strategic service review as part of the Strategic Service Review Program. The review is currently scheduled to be completed in April 2018. Any recommendations from the review that have implications on this Contract will be incorporated through a variation agreement process. The Contract contains provisions to allow variations directed by Council. It has been assessed that extending the current Contract will not disadvantage any outcomes or recommendations of the strategic service review.

Finance
When the contract was awarded in 2015, Campeyn Group offered the most attractive total cost for the works required. Since that time, in accordance with the terms of the contract, lump sum and schedules of rates have increased by the Melbourne All Ordinaries CPI.

The proposed extension to the contract will be under same terms and conditions as the current contract, with minor adjustments made to some components of lump sum activities based on revised workload indicators, as appropriate.

It is expected that, overall, the contract value for building maintenance will be in line with the current budget. The total building maintenance budget for 2017/18 is $2,004,762.

Links to Council policy and strategy
An extension to this contract is compliant with Council’s Procurement Policy, and in accordance with the terms of the Contract.
### Options considered

**Option 1**

| Summary | Exercise option in contract. Given the price competitiveness of the existing contract and the fact that the service has been delivered satisfactorily over the last three years, and that there are no identified impediments to the extension of this contract, it is considered appropriate for Council to exercise its option to extend Contract No. CON/14/69 for three years until 30 June 2021. Any recommendations from the Strategic Services Review of the Building Maintenance Service would be able to be accommodated in the current Contract via a variation. |
| Benefits | No financial increase for existing services (other than CPI increase) |
| Issues | Nil |

**Option 2**

| Summary | Re-tender contract. |
| Benefits | Test the market |
| Issues | It is considered that re-tendering the contract will not provide a more cost effective service due to the current contract price increases being restricted to CPI. Any recommendations from the Strategic Services Review of the Building Maintenance Service would be able to be accommodated in the current Contract via a variation. |
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to recommend the appointment of a contractor to undertake the Dalgetty Road Drain Renewal Project, Beaumaris under Contract CON/17/75. This project is for the construction of stormwater pipes and pits at Dalgetty Road, Herbert Street and Agnes Street, Beaumaris, including the following works:

- Construction of approximately 300 metres of 600mm diameter drain and several pits along the south side of Herbert Street and Agnes Street from Dalgetty Road and Herbert Street junction to 12 Agnes Street;
- Construction of box culverts and several pits at No 98 Dalgetty Road next to the School;
- Excavation of roads, footpath, nature strip and backfilling with reinstatement.

After the completion of the project the frequent flooding problems at No. 98 Dalgetty Road, in front of the School and the Dalgetty Road and Herbert Street junction are expected to be minimised.

Key issues
A public tender was advertised in The Age and released through TenderSearch on Saturday 12 Aug 2017 and closed on Wednesday 6 September 2017 with the following submissions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenderers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Adept Drainage Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) CDN Constructors Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Jaydo Construction Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Kalow Holdings Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Lander Civil Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Metroplant &amp; Civil Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Plumbtrax Infrastructure Services Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Vcrete Contractors Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the initial evaluation, Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd and Plumbtrax Infrastructure Services Pty Ltd were shortlisted and invited for interview. A number of clarifications on items were requested prior to the interviews.
At interview, Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd demonstrated a good understanding about the scope of the project and explained the methodology very well. Also Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd have identified the risks involved in the project and explained risk control measures very well. They have completed many projects of a similar nature in the past and are committed to complete the work within the specified timeframe.

Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd has also completed a number of successful projects for Councils, such as:

- Banyule City Council:
  - Para Road easement drainage works, Montmorency - $195k
  - DeWinton Stormwater Harvesting Rosanna - $1.089m
  - Swanston Street drainage works, Heidelberg (on going) - $300k
- Bayside City Council - Waterloo Street drainage works, Brighton - $100k
- Melbourne City Council - Queen Victoria & Alexandra Gardens Stormwater Harvesting System - $1.75M

Reference checks with previous clients were positive. A financial assessment was also requested and Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd was deemed financially capable of completing the works.

As shown in Confidential Attachment 1 – Evaluation Matrix, the tender evaluation panel concluded that Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd offer the best value for money and recommends that the contract be awarded to Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Awards contract CON/17/75 Dalgetty Road Drain Renewal Beaumaris to Evergreen Civil Pty Ltd for the lump sum price of $311,753.00 (excl. GST) and $342,928.30 (incl GST);
2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to sign all necessary documentation related to CON/17/75 Dalgetty Road Drain Renewal Beaumaris; and
3. Advises the unsuccessful tenderers accordingly.

**Support Attachments**

1. Confidential Attachment 1 - CON/17/75 Tender Evaluation Matrix (separately enclosed) (confidential)

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**

These works are aimed at improving drainage system at Dalgetty Road, Herbert Street and Agnes Street and mitigating flooding issues at 98 Dalgetty Road, the nearby School and the Dalgetty Road and Herbert Street junction for major rainfall events. This project is included in Council's Drainage Upgrade Strategy.
Natural Environment
Damage to the natural environment from flooding and storm water runoff will be minimised after completion of the project. Frequent debris collection from flood water on nature strip, kerb and channel and footpath will also be minimised.

Built Environment
Flood mitigation will help to reduce deterioration of road, footpath, and kerb and channel. It will lessen the frequency of flooding of private property and the road close to the School. The drainage infrastructure is predominately underground so will have minimal visual impact on the area.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Together with the contractor, Council will provide further advice prior to commencement of the work and will maintain contact with key stakeholders during the construction period.

The works have been planned in consultation with the relevant residents.

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 Request for Tender was undertaken in accordance with the Bayside City Council’s Quotation and Tendering Procedure and section 186 of the Local Government Act 1989.

Finance
The Capital Works Budget for 2017/18 has an allocation of $475,000.00 (ex GST) for this project. The following table summarises the project budget. Note prices are excluding GST.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract cost</td>
<td>$311,753.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies and project management costs</td>
<td>$33,247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost (ex GST)</td>
<td>$345,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected project cost is $345,000.00 (ex GST), which is within the allocated budget. Any savings in budget will be used to offset any projects within the capital program that are over budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
This project is listed in Council’s Drainage Upgrade Strategy.

This project is consistent with the 2017/2021 Council Plan as identified under Goal 4: Open Space – Strategy: Protect and ensure the quality of our open space including beaches and foreshore.

Options considered
Not applicable to this report.
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is to present the key findings, issues and recommendations for discussion arising from the Strategic Service Review of Council’s Recycling and Waste Management Service. An executive summary of the report on the findings and recommendations of the service review is attached (Attachment 1). Attachment 2 provides an overview of the Victorian Waste Management System and statutory requirements.

This review was undertaken as part of Council’s ongoing program of strategic service reviews, which ensure that Council is delivering the most effective mix of services in an efficient way.

The review has been informed by community consultation, research and analysis and has considered the role and function of Recycling and Waste Management at Bayside now and into the future to ensure the service is aligned to community needs, operating efficiently and delivering public value. The review was informed by targeted benchmarking and research, analysis of performance and financial data and stakeholder interviews to increase efficiency and improve the customer service experience.

The recycling and waste management activities that have been examined in this review include:

- Kerbside residential collection and disposal of general waste;
- Kerbside residential collection and processing of recyclables and green waste;
- Leasing of 144A Talinga Road Cheltenham for the purposes of providing a Bayside Recycling and Waste Transfer Station;
- Street, park and foreshore recycling and waste collection;
- Booked green and hard waste collection;
- Corporate Centre and Council owned facilities waste and recycling collection and community recycling stations;
- Compost products sale;
- Waste education and communication; and
- Customer service (relating to recycling and waste).

The Recycling and Waste Management Service is one of four programs under the Sustainability and Transport Department and is delivered by an established staffing structure of 4.2 EFT and an annual (2017/18) budget of $6,974,277. The cost of the recycling and waste service is fully recovered through the residential waste charge.

Key issues

The Recycling and Waste Management Service is faced with several strategic challenges, including a reduction in the availability of low cost landfill, increased transport costs to landfills in the western suburbs, an increasing population and increased consumption by households with rising affluence. Preparation of a Recycling and Waste Management Strategy (the Strategy) has commenced to guide Council’s decision making and influence through advocacy on these matters over the next 10 years. The Strategy will be presented to Council separately to this Service Review.
The Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group is currently investigating how alternatives to landfill, such as alternate waste technologies, can be introduced so that cost effective and low emission waste disposal sites are available for domestic waste.

Council’s Environmental Sustainability Framework provides direction and guidance for environmental planning including waste management for Council. It includes the following targets relevant for this service:

- Increase diversion of waste from landfill to recycling to 60% by 2020, and to 75% by 2025; and
- By 2020 a 60% reduction in Council generated waste to landfill and 90% by 2025.

Fourteen service-related recommendations and another 12 operational improvement recommendations have been made which are expected to achieve:

- Council’s landfill diversion targets of 60% in 2020 and 75% in 2025 via the introduction of food organics collection and a change to size or frequency of general waste bin collection;
- Improved local amenity by engaging with local traders to minimise congestion on the kerbside;
- Increased recycling rates and reduced contamination rates though the provision of additional community recycling stations for residents to deposit items not accepted within the kerbside service (such as batteries and soft plastics); and
- Better street, park and foreshore recycling and waste service by reviewing collection frequency to cater for peak usage and upgrading ageing bins with innovative waste solutions.

A cost comparison of the current outsourced service with an equivalent in-house delivery model confirms that Recycling and Waste Management at Bayside (garbage, recycling, garden waste, hard waste and litter bins) is a comparatively low cost service delivering value for money. An equivalent in-house delivered service has been assessed and estimated to cost Council around $1.2 million per annum (or 14%) above the current costs of the outsourced model.

The outcomes of this service review will inform the development of a new Recycling and Waste Strategy for Council.

**Recommendation**

That Council adopts the Recycling and Waste Management strategic service review and considers budget related items in its forthcoming budget process, in accordance with the review’s recommendations.

**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Executive Summary - Recycling and Waste Service Review Report ➤
2. Attachment 2 - The Victorian Waste Management System and Statutory Requirements ➤
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Residential domestic recycling and waste management services help residents to keep their property safe and hygienic through regular removal of waste. Greater efficiencies and income generated by increased resource recovery from the municipal waste stream can be invested into other services for the community.

Natural Environment
Appropriate recovery of resources and disposal of waste to landfill assists to keep the natural environment, including our beaches and waterways, free of litter and waste. The Environmental Sustainability Framework sets waste reduction targets over the next 8 years. The current collection contract arrangements will enable future changes to accommodate changes in collection services to include food waste in the garden organics bin.

Built Environment
Appropriate waste management services contribute to the amenity of urban streetscapes by ensuring they remain free of waste, safe and tidy for the community.

Impacts to the community neighbouring the Bayside Recycling and Waste Transfer Station on Talinga Road, Cheltenham from dust and litter nuisance caused by tipping, transfer and compaction operations on windy days will need to be addressed by future upgrades to the facility, including a new structure to enclose and manage dust at the tipping pit.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

Maintenance of a regular kerbside recycling waste collection service to the community is a core service of Council and any disruption would be highly undesirable. As the current residential domestic recycling and waste collection services are not affected by the matters raised in this report, there has been no need for community consultation. The development of the Waste and Recycling Strategy will include a consultative approach.

Council reports on the number of missed bins and this information is presented on the Know Your Council website to help the community informed on service performance.

A number of recycling and waste education campaigns are coordinated by Council to drive more sustainable waste practices in the community, such as Don’t Feed the Bin, Plan Buy Cook, Garage Sale Trail and a Sustainable Schools Festival.

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 issues relevant to this matter. Current contracts exist for both collection and disposal of residential recycling, garden organics and domestic waste. Participation in Metropolitan Waste and Recycling Recovery Group (MWRRG) contracts meets the requirements of Section 186 of the Local Government Act 1989.

Item 10.11 – Reports by the Organisation
Finance

Current changes in landfill location and increased collection and transport costs have been factored into the 2017/18 recycling and waste management operational budget, which in turn sets the residential waste charge.

The budget allocations for Recycling and Waste services are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection</td>
<td>$2,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage disposal</td>
<td>$1,920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling collection</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of recycling (income)</td>
<td>$560,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden organics collection</td>
<td>$721,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden organics disposal</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard waste and dumped rubbish collection and disposal</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategic service review has recommended a number of actions as part of the development of a Recycling and Waste Strategy. These actions are likely to have some future financial implications for Council. Those implications, and their effect on the Waste Charge, will be fully assessed as part of the development of the Recycling and Waste Strategy. Any budget related items will be referred for consideration as part of annual budget processes.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The provision of a recycling and waste management service that is aligned to community needs, operating efficiently and delivering public value aligns with Goal 5 of the Council Plan 2017-21: we want a Bayside where our environmental impact is decreased through reduced community waste and efficient water and energy usage in Council operations.

The Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework highlights the responsible management of waste by Council.

The continuation of responsible resource recovery, collection of kerbside waste and landfill disposal will ensure Council achieve these goals and strategies.
Executive Summary

A Service Review has been undertaken to assess the role and function of Bayside City Council’s Recycling and Waste Management Service to ensure the service is aligned to community needs, is operating efficiently and is delivering public value. Council’s aim for the Recycling and Waste Management Service is that it delivers public value by:

- Improving liveability by keeping Bayside clean, tidy and safe.

The Recycling and Waste Management Service does this through:

- Delivering an effective, efficient and environmentally sustainable recycling and waste service;
- Educating the community to avoid, reduce, reuse, recycle and enable recovery of resources to reduce the rate of waste to landfill; and
- Effective leadership and advocacy to influence strategic direction at a state and federal level.

The Service Review has involved targeted benchmarking and research, analysis of performance and financial data, and stakeholder interviews. An assessment of options and recommendations for eight aspects of Council’s Recycling and Waste Management Services were considered, as well as further operational improvement opportunities.

Following this Service Review, a 10 Recycling and Waste Strategy will be developed that will be informed by a comprehensive community engagement process.

Overview of recommendations for Council’s Recycling and Waste Management Service

1. Kerbside collection
Council provides a residential kerbside collection service for general waste, recycling, garden organics, and commercial/industrial general waste and commercial recycling service. Approximately 90 percent of households in Bayside use the kerbside collection service with large-scale multi-unit developments (MUDs) required to arrange their own private waste management as stipulated in the Bayside Planning Scheme.

The kerbside collection service meets community expectations evidenced by positive feedback from the annual community survey. The service is comparatively cost effective against other councils and contractors are generally performing well against KPI’s in their respective contracts. A preliminary analysis of the costs of providing a comparable service utilising an in-house model rather than the current out-sourced model demonstrates that changing service modes would likely see a substantial increase in operational service costs, due to the need to incorporate service contingency that is inherent within large service provider organisations that are contracted to multiple municipalities.

Currently, Bayside sends about 51 percent of material collected from the kerbside to landfill and this rate has not significantly changed in the last decade. Change is required for Council to meet its commitment to divert 60 percent of waste away from landfill by 2020 and 75 percent by 2025.¹

¹As referenced in Council’s Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-25
A key way to increase the diversion of waste to landfill is to provide an alternative for food waste. Food organics make up approximately 40 percent of a Bayside resident's general waste bin. There is an opportunity to reduce this amount through community education and to divert food organics from landfill by collecting it in the garden organics bin by changing to a service known as FOGO (Food Organics Garden Organics).

Council’s bins do not comply with the preferred Australian Standard (AS 4123.7-2006 Mobile Waste Containers). Research suggests that councils using standard bin colours may expect a 4 to 5 percent reduction in landfill waste per household, increase in recyclables yield and reduction in contamination in both recycling and organics bins which results in a reduction in landfill costs.2

Council’s standard garbage bin is 140L which is a greater volume than that of most other Melbourne metropolitan council bins which are commonly 120L. Bayside residents can request a smaller 80L bin and receive a reduction in their waste charge, however only 3.5 percent of households have the smaller bin.

Most large scale multi-unit developments (MUDs) use private commercial contractors and are not part of Council’s kerbside service. MUDs generally have lower levels of recycling as compared to other households. Council does not currently have access to recycling and waste information from MUDs and landfill diversion rates from MUDs are not included in the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework.

Some commercial businesses have multiple Council bins as it may be less expensive than using a private provider. The number of commercial bins used can negatively impact the local amenity and can restrict access to footpaths and laneways within some activity centres.

In order for Council to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill, the following recommendations are proposed. Any changes to service delivery will include comprehensive community engagement and education. A Recycling and Waste Management Strategy is being developed to guide service changes. The Strategy is scheduled to be completed by June 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Council considers supporting the introduction of Food Organics Green Organics Collection (FOGO) by 2020 and commences an assessment of the implementation and benefits of such an approach in the Recycling and Waste Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2*</td>
<td>Encourage a reduction of waste to landfill at the source by considering reducing the size of the standard bin offering or altering the frequency of service for residential general waste as part of the Recycling and Waste Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3*</td>
<td>Address waste stream contamination and avoidance of resource loss by considering changing the bin lid colours to meet Australian Standards as part of the Recycling and Waste Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>Engage with businesses and traders who have multiple Council bins to determine the best options to suit their waste needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.5</td>
<td>Engage with all commercial food premises to encourage them to arrange for private collections of food scraps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3.1.2 and 3.2.3 are high cost items and the benefits of investing money on these changes will need to be assessed as part of the Recycling and Waste Strategy.

---

2. **Bayside Recycling and Waste Transfer Station**

The Bayside Recycling and Waste Transfer Station (the Transfer Station) in Cheltenham is operated by a private operator, Copper Rock, under a commercial lease agreement with Council (expiring in August 2023). It benefits the Bayside community by providing a deposit point for materials that cannot be catered for in the kerbside collection service in close proximity to Bayside residents (other municipal transfer stations are over 16kms away). The Transfer Station receives an estimated 26,000 tonnes of waste per annum. Little data other than anecdotal information is available on the community needs for and the service satisfaction levels for the Transfer Station.

There are problems with the Transfer Station in that it requires an upgraded enclosed tipping pit to manage dust nuisance impacts to neighbours under windy conditions. Customer service reliability is impacted when the site closes on windy days to mitigate this impact. Further maintenance and renewal is also required in the lease conditions. Council has allocated $80,000 in 2017/18 to plan and design an enclosure for the tipping area that will control dust under all weather conditions.

Given the complex issues with the Transfer Station, it is considered that any service recommendations are deferred until after the feasibility study is completed by June 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Council awaits the outcomes of the planning and design of the Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upgrade to be completed by June 2018 to further explore future options regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Transfer Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Collect feedback to ascertain the community need for and service satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the Transfer Station from the community as part of the Recycling and Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Street, park and foreshore recycling and waste collection**

Council provides a street, park and foreshore recycling and waste collection service that is important for maintaining local amenity and reducing litter entering the underground drainage system that can lead to pollution of Port Phillip Bay.

The contractors providing this service are meeting performance indicators. However, Council can better manage the waste generated in peak times (such as summer or weekends) in public places. This could include increased collection frequency, larger bins or additional bins. Given the existing bin infrastructure is ageing there is an opportunity to replace them with innovative public waste bins which cater for peak usage. There are also operational improvement opportunities, such as improving internal contract management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>Investigate opportunities to increase frequency of public bin collection during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peak and seasonal times and in the major activity centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Upgrade the ageing bin infrastructure within shopping centres, parks and foreshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with innovative public waste solutions, and include in the Recycling and Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Booked green and hard waste collection**

The booked hard waste and bundled branches service was introduced in Bayside in 2012 with the aim of reducing the amount of hard rubbish sent to landfill, increasing recycling, reducing safety risks, and reducing the cost of hard rubbish collections.
The hard waste booking approach is considered industry best practice and has now been adopted by most municipalities in Victoria. The bookings are actioned promptly and receives relatively few complaints from users. The system provides greater separation of hard waste collected with more recycling, and it reduces professional scavenging, which creates nuisance and noisy disturbance to residents, and results in material scattered over footpaths and roadways. The booked service compared to the single annual Bayside-wide collection saves Council over $260,000 per year.

Given the service review findings, retaining and maintaining the booked hard rubbish and bundled branches collection service is supported. The current contract expires in year 2019, with the option of three 1 year extensions to the contract period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>Maintain the current booked hard waste and bundled branches service and promote its benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Corporate Centre and Council-owned facilities waste and recycling collection

Waste and recycling is collected at the Bayside Corporate Centre and Council-owned facilities (such as sporting clubs, community centres and lifesaving clubs) through contracted services. Apart from some operational improvement identified, the service is largely working effectively but there are inconsistencies with the waste provisions specified in some leases for sporting and recreational facilities that need to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Review community facility leases to ensure appropriate waste management and recycling provisions are included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Community recycling stations

Council provides community recycling stations at the Bayside Corporate Centre and Beaumaris Library for items currently not collected in the kerbside recyclable collection, such as fluoro tubes/lightbulbs, batteries, soft plastics (bread bags, chip packets, grocery carry bags, fresh produce bags, cling wrap) in addition to cans and bottles, mobile phones and chargers. While demand for the service is growing, the service is not promoted and the majority of the community is not aware of the service, with the current two sites only servicing the southern part of the municipality. The current cost of the service for two sites is approximately $16,000 per year and yields approximately six tonnes of recycled material. The cost of expanding the service to five sites is estimated at $48,000 and it is estimated to yield around 15 tonnes of recyclables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>Expand the Community Recycling Station service to other Council owned facilities and refer to 2018/19 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>Increase the frequency of the soft plastics collection service at the Community Recycling Stations to cater for demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Composting products sale

Council provides a discretionary service selling composting products to Bayside residents at cost price to encourage a reduction in food waste to landfill. Only Bayside residents are eligible and the products are home delivered by Council’s Waste Management Field Officer.
As the service is not promoted, the Bayside community is generally not aware that this service exists as indicated by the low sales rates. There are commercial providers for the products including providers that deliver at no cost. Given this, it is recommended that Council exit the sale of composting products. It is estimated the withdrawal from the service will save Council approximately $5,000 in staff time and vehicle costs that can be redirected into other service areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1</td>
<td>Withdraw from selling composting products by December 2017, however continue to promote the benefits of composting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Waste education and communication

Council spends around $100,000 a year on waste and recycling education programs to support the community to recycle and reduce waste, evaluating kerbside waste and recycling behaviour through conducting bin audits. These activities are delivered through a commercial contract. In 2016/17, there were over 31 school programs, seven workshops, four community tours and a successful social media campaign.

The results from the education vary and landfill diversion results have plateaued over time. Council's current staffing levels and structure limits consistent delivery of waste education. However, additional resources may need to be procured to create, execute and manage a comprehensive, evidence based waste education and communications plan to change community behaviour around waste with the aim to reduce waste to landfill, increase quality and quantity of recyclables and include a facility at the transfer station. This will be examined in detail within the Recycling and Waste Management Strategy.

Operational improvement recommendations

The following operational improvement opportunities were identified in the Service Review and are recommended to be included in the Recycling and Waste Strategy and as part of a continuous improvement program.

Service improvements

1. Develop a comprehensive communications and marketing plan to promote all recycling and waste services provided by Council including hard waste and bundled branches, community recycling stations and kerbside collection services to increase utilisation and reduce contamination rates. This includes providing additional information on the website – both transactional and educational – to increase community awareness and understanding;
2. Review signage on kerbside collection trucks to promote Council’s commitment to recycling and waste management;
3. Improve implementation and enforcement of the Bayside Planning Scheme in relation to recycling and waste requirements for multi-unit developments;
4. Work with Council staff and contractors to reduce contamination and volumes of waste generated in the Corporate Centre and other satellite sites such as libraries and Maternal and Child Health Centres. This includes providing larger paper recycling bins next to shredder bins and soft plastics bins around the Corporate Centre to improve recycling rates;
5. Review of waste and recycling generated by Council operations, including Council-run events and determine improvement opportunities in the Recycling and Waste Strategy;
6. Explore the feasibility of marking bin collection areas, including parking restrictions on collection days in major activity centres and identified ‘hot spots’ to manage congestion and access to laneways;
7. Improve the level of service between cleaning and waste collection contractors at the Corporate Centre to ensure the handling of waste stored in the bin corral area on the south side of the corporate centre does not become a source of windblown litter to the car park and surrounding parkland; and

8. Address the quantity of waste generated by MUDs not included in Council’s reporting framework to drive awareness and improvement in this area.

People improvements

9. Consider the resources required to create, execute and manage a comprehensive, evidence based waste education and communications plan to prepare and manage implementation of FOGO program; and

10. Develop a clear succession plan for the Recycling and Waste Management Unit to ensure effective service delivery and business continuity.

Efficiency improvements

11. Embed process improvements for key recycling and waste management activities to support efficient service delivery; and

12. Where appropriate, bundle contracts together to reduce administration costs.

The recommendations are expected to improve customer satisfaction, service accessibility and will divert more waste from landfill.
ATTACHMENT 2

The Victorian Waste Management System and Statutory Requirements


Figure: Victoria's wastes hierarchy

In August 2014, the EP Act was amended to establish the Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Planning Framework. The Framework facilitates strategic planning for waste and resource recovery that integrates planning at the state level with planning for local and regional communities. Under the EP Act:

- Sustainability Victoria must prepare a State-wide Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan to provide "strategic direction for the management of waste and resource recovery infrastructure in Victoria for a period of 30 years"; and

The Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group (MWRGG) established under the EP Act supports Melbourne's 31 metropolitan councils to work with their communities to minimise waste and maximise resource recovery across metropolitan Melbourne. The MWRGG has prepared a Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Implementation Plan 2016 (Metro Implementation Plan) that focuses on identifying Melbourne's waste infrastructure needs and how these will be met over the next 10 years. The Metro Implementation Plan's objectives are to:

- Reduce waste sent to landfill;
- Increase organic waste recovered;
- Deliver community, environmental and economic benefits; and
- Plan for Melbourne's growing population.
Key actions in the Metro Implementation Plan relevant to Bayside City Council are:\(^1\)

- Support local government to progressively increase recovery of materials from municipal waste streams;
- Build the metropolitan organic recovery and processing network and maximise the network’s productivity; and
- Encourage best practice operations for the resource recovery and waste network.

Section 508H of the EP Act requires that “a council must perform its waste management functions consistently with the Regional Waste and Resource Recovery Implementation Plan applying to the council’s municipal district”.

Under the Local Government Act 1999 (LG Act), a council must ensure the most efficient and effective use of resources, and ensure that it provides services in accordance with best value principles. A council may undertake a range of recycling and waste management roles, including:\(^2\)

- Providing and procuring waste and recycling collections, transport, reprocessing and/or disposal to landfill services for the local communities either directly or through contractors;
- Undertaking strategic land use planning and assess development applications, including applications for waste and resource recovery facilities, high-rise and multi-use developments and the associated waste infrastructure under a Planning Scheme;
- Delivering a range of waste and resource recovery related projects on behalf of government;
- Educating local communities on waste and resource recovery and litter; and
- Purchasing goods made from recovered material streams.

Under the LG Act, a Council can also pass local laws that reinforce land use planning and municipal waste and resource recovery strategies. Clauses 29 and 59 of Bayside City Council's Local Law No.2. Neighbourhood Amenity sets out the rights and obligations of residents, businesses and community and Council for waste management.

---

\(^1\) Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan 2016, p.16.

\(^2\) Roles as listed in the Statewide Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan 2015-44.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to present an opportunity for Council to apply for State government funding that will support the installation of additional pedestrian crossings at the roundabouts in the Church Street and Bay Street Major Activity Centres. A requirement of the funding application eligibility is for Council to support a co-funding arrangement in 2018/19 and 2019/20.

On 26 July 2016 Council resolved (in part) to:

- Undertake planning to develop a multi-year program of pedestrian crossing works at the roundabouts in Church and Bay Street Major Activity Centres as part of Council’s 2016/17 Active Transport Facility Improvement Program; and
- Explore other potential State government funding opportunities to facilitate the implementation of zebra crossings at each of the subject sites.

The order of priority for treatment at the roundabouts has been determined as follows:

1. Church Street / Male Street;
2. Church Street / Carpenter Street;
3. Church Street / St Andrews Street;
4. Bay Street / Asling Street; and
5. Bay Street / Cochrane Street.

Under the multi-year program, one roundabout site is proposed to be treated in each of the financial years from 2017/18 as part of Council’s Active Transport Facility Improvement Program with the roundabout at Church Street/Male Street the first to be treated in 2018. The multi-year program of pedestrian crossing works at each of the roundabouts within the Church Street and Bay Street Major Activity Centres is scheduled to be completed by 2022.

KEY ISSUES

The Safe Travel in Local Streets Program is a $35 million investment opportunity funded through the State government’s Towards Zero Road Safety Strategy 2016 – 2020, with up to $1 million funding available for Council’s who agree to provide an equal contribution. The program aims to reduce road casualties in metropolitan Melbourne and assist Councils to create a healthy and liveable environment by lowering vehicle speeds on the local road network. The eligibility criteria for funding from the program requires that:

- Councils commit to joint funding of traffic calming treatments on a 50:50 basis;
- Projects must be on council managed roads;
- All projects need to be endorsed by the State government by June 2019; and
- All works associated with projects need to be completed by June 2020.
It is proposed to pursue the State government grant program to facilitate the implementation of zebra crossings at each of the subject roundabout sites. If successful, the multi-year program of pedestrian crossing works at roundabouts in the Church and Bay Street Major Activity Centres will be implemented ahead of schedule by June 2020 with significant cost savings for Council.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Supports an application for State government funding from the Safe Travel in Local Streets Program for the implementation of raised zebra crossings at the roundabouts in the Church and Bay Streets Activity Centres; and

2. Refers an allocation of $200,000 to both the 2018/19 and 2019/20 Active Transport Facility Improvement Program as part of the capital works budget deliberations to match the proposed contribution from the State government, if successful in the grant application process.

**Support Attachments**

Nil

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**

The design of roundabouts and the road rules governing their use currently prioritises the flow of traffic over the safe cross street movement of pedestrians. The provision of pedestrian crossings at roundabouts, particularly at locations with high volumes of pedestrians such as Major Activity Centres, will improve pedestrian safety, prioritise pedestrian movement and establish a pedestrian friendly streetscape.

**Natural Environment**

Improved pedestrian priority at roundabouts in both the Bay Street and Church Street Major Activity Centres will result in pedestrian friendly streetscapes. This approach aligns with a key aim of the Bayside Walking Strategy which is to encourage walking for more short trips within Bayside. A reduction in private vehicle trips will result in more walking journeys and assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

**Built Environment**

The provision of a pedestrian crossing at a roundabout will improve pedestrian priority and establish a pedestrian friendly streetscape. Whilst it is acknowledged that the introduction of a pedestrian crossing would change the appearance of the streetscape, should any project proceed, consideration will need to be given as to how the provision of such a facility would link to its adjacent surrounds as part of the design phase.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**

No community consultation has been undertaken as a part of this report. Community consultation will be undertaken as part of the development and implementation of additional pedestrian crossings at the roundabouts located within both the Bay Street and Church Street Major Activity Centres.
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
The 2017/18 four-year capital works program contains a proposed allocation of $622,000 as part of the Active Transport Facility Improvement Program to implement pedestrian improvements at five roundabouts.

The estimated costs of the five roundabouts to be treated as part of this funding program is $775,000. Should Council’s grant application be successful and 50% of these costs be met by the Safe Travel in Local Streets Program, Council has the opportunity to invest the remainder of the funding foreshadowed in the four-year capital works program in other pedestrian improvement works such as pedestrian crossings in other locations, refuge islands, kerb outstands and pram ramps.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The provision of additional pedestrian crossings at roundabouts within both the Bay Street and Church Street Major Activity Centres contributes to Goal 2 ‘Transport’ within the 2017-21 Council Plan.

Options considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>An application is made to the State government for funding from the Safe Travel in Local Streets Program and support is provided for an increased allocation within the Active Transport Facility Improvement Program in 2018/19 and 2019/20 as part of capital works budget deliberations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>If successful with a grant application, the multi-year program of pedestrian crossing works at roundabouts in the Church and Bay Streets Major Activity Centres will be implemented ahead of schedule by June 2020 with significant cost savings for Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td>An increased funding allocation is required for Council’s Active Transport Facility Improvement Program in 2018/19 and 2019/20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Do not proceed with an application to the State government for funding from the Safe Travel in Local Streets Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits</strong></td>
<td>There are no benefits associated with this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td>This approach does not align with Council policy to improve pedestrian priority at roundabouts on key walking routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and background
A report to Council on 22 August 2017 outlined the background to the establishment of the Metropolitan Partnerships program, and further detail about the Inner South-East Partnership specifically. Local Government CEOs have been appointed by the Minister for Suburban Development as representatives of their Councils and are expected to facilitate ongoing dialogue and joint action between local government networks and the Metropolitan Partnerships to progress a common set of regional priorities. The brief includes consolidating and representing the views of their councils on issues and projects of interest to the partnerships.

The municipalities of Bayside, Glen Eira, Stonnington and Boroondara comprise one of the 6 regional areas defined under the State Government’s new Metropolitan Partnerships program. Each Partnership is required each year to conduct a community consultation exercise in the form of an Annual Assembly of interested community members. The first Annual Assembly for the South-East partnership was conducted on 30 August 2017 at the Glen Eira Town Hall, Caulfield. This report outlines the outcomes and action taken to date by the Partnership in response.

Key issues
The 2017 ‘Inner South-East’ Assembly saw 103 people participating in discussions; 88 attendees and 15 table hosts. Included in the attendees were 12 Councillors/Mayors/CEO’s and one State Minister. The agenda for the event included reviewing and evaluating the Partnership priorities presented on the night and developing and evaluating ideas for how these priorities can be achieved.

In considering the contributions made by the event and how these might best be put to government, the Partnership has identified 6 priority areas for further focus. These are:

Environment – Provide green open spaces and regional sporting facilities;

Transport/Infrastructure - Improve connectivity of transport modes to cover sustainable, low-cost travel including north-south coverage;

Education - Improved access to quality education for disadvantaged young people;

Economy, Industry and Jobs - Encourage local hubs that support strong, local economies by fostering collaboration, innovation and education for small businesses, to enable people and businesses to work flexibly, close to home;

Community Health and Well-being - Prioritise community health needs to ensure the health and well-being of the region in both aged care and alcohol related issues; and
Affordable / Social Housing - Advocate for a minimum requirement for affordable and social housing and deliver services to locals driving social inclusion outcomes – underpinned by Mayors’ high-level Statement of Intent
These priorities are currently under a process of further development in preparation for formal submission through government processes with ultimate consideration by the State government being the objective.

Recommendation
That Council notes this report on the 2017 Annual Assembly of the Inner South-East Metropolitan Partnership.

Support Attachments
Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social, Natural and Built Environments
The Inner South-East Metropolitan Partnership 2017 Annual Assembly has considered a range of issues impacting upon Liveability for the region comprising the municipalities of Boroondara, Stonnington, Glen Eira and Bayside. The partnerships are required to work with communities to identify opportunities for improved social, economic and environmental outcomes. The range of opportunities identified in the Assembly process spans these key areas and also has many implications for the built environment in the region.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The 2017 Annual Assembly was an initiative designed to fulfil the Partnerships’ obligation to undertake community engagement in the process of developing priorities. In addition to participation in the Assembly event itself, interested community members were invited to participate by Answering ‘pre-engagement’ questions online.

Human Rights
This matter relates to the opportunity for citizens and residents to participate in the consideration of matters that have a significant impact upon their well-being. Citizen participation in contributing to government programs and priorities is an important human right, and to this extent the Annual Assembly provides further opportunities for such participation.

Legal
There are no evident legal implications for the conduct of the Annual Assembly or for any matters that have arisen from the Assembly’s proceedings.

Finance
The Assembly had no implications for Council financially. Indirect support was provided through Council’s encouragement of Bayside community members to participate in the event.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Attendance at the Assembly and the CEO’s participation provided the opportunity to contribute Bayside’s policy, strategy and Council Plan priorities toward the development of regional priorities and proposals. These are clearly reflected in the priorities emerging from the Assembly process, in a number of ways. That these matters are being raised through an additional forum, to the State government, assists Council’s own advocacy work on these matters.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to approve a submission to the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee regarding proposed planning scheme changes affecting the New Street Estate at Brighton. The Amendment is proposed by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

In December 2016, the Victorian Government, as part of its commitments to increase the state’s public housing stock, launched the $185 million Public Housing Renewal Program (PHRP) to redevelop public housing at 9 nominated sites across Melbourne.

The redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton is a welcome opportunity to provide an improved standard of living for existing and future public housing tenants that is fit for purpose, safe and accessible.

Amendment C157, to the Bayside Planning Scheme seeks to facilitate and guide the redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton. The site is currently zoned General Residential Zone (GRZ1) with a maximum building height of 11 metres and three storeys. A Design and Development Overlay (DDO2) and a Special Building Overlay (SBO) also applies. The Amendment proposes to rezone the site to a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) and apply a Development Plan Overlay (DPO) and Parking Overlay (PO).

Key issues
Council has prepared a Draft submission to the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee. The submission is provided in Attachment 1 to this report and states Bayside City Council’s position in relation to the process and proposed changes.

In summary the submission:

- Supports the Government’s commitment to renew the New Street Estate in Brighton, including an increase in social housing on site;

- Does not support the rezoning of the land to a MUZ;

- Supports the use of a DPO and an appropriate schedule as the most appropriate mechanism to provide clarity and certainty about the future use and design response for the Site;

- Does not support the proposed DPO3 in its current form and asks that the Design Framework and associated planning controls are redrafted to include a further level of detail, which is outlined in the submission;

- Seeks further detailed work to inform the DPO in the form of a social impact assessment and economic impact assessment;

- Queries the value capture proposition in response to the value uplift created through the rezoning and increased densities of the land;
• Does not support the Minister for Planning as Responsible Authority in the Schedule to Clause 61.01;

• Does not support the proposed planning scheme amendment in its current form. It lacks any sound strategic basis for the changes that it is making; and

• Requests that further and meaningful community consultation and engagement is undertaken as the process progresses.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Adopts the submission to the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory committee advising that Council does not support Amendment C157 in its current form for the reasons outlined in Attachment 3; and

2. Authorises the Director City Planning and Community Services to make any further minor editorial changes to the submission document prior to submission of the adopted Council submission to the Standing Advisory Committee.

Support Attachments

1. New Street, Brighton, Public Housing Renewal Program, Information Sheet (separately enclosed)
2. Amendment C157, Explanatory Report (separately enclosed)
3. Amendment C157, Draft Submission to the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee
**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**

Bayside City Council welcomes the initiatives outlined in the Strategy for increasing and renewing housing stock. However, it submits that in its current form, the proposal does not demonstrate how it is responding to the future social housing needs of Victoria and the Region.

Social housing remains a scarce resource in Victoria and the Region with the volume of housing applicants exceeding the number of available dwellings. Based on the findings of the *Victoria’s Social Housing Supply requirements to 2036 report*, over 30,000 additional dwellings need to be added in the next 20 years if Victoria is to maintain long-term social housing at the current rate of 3.5 percent.

The redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton is an opportunity to deliver fit for purpose and additional needed dwellings in a location that is well serviced to provide housing choice and affordability in accordance with the Government’s broader strategic aims. Bayside City Council submits that it is a reasonable expectation to seek an increase in the number of public housing dwellings considering the land value uplift that will be realised through rezoning of the land and sale of the site to a private developer in one of Melbourne’s most highly sought suburbs in Victoria.

**Natural Environment**

The retention of significant trees on site has been raised as in issue in the submission. The provision of trees is increasingly understood to provide multiple benefits particularly for public health and well-being.

The proposed DPO does not consider existing trees. The proposed density of buildings on site suggest that there may be limited space for future trees and opportunities to increase canopy cover.

**Built Environment**

The proposed massing and built form for the site established in the DPO does not respond to the neighbourhood context or established character. There is no material that explains the rational for the proposed heights or the application of commonly applied urban design principles and rules of thumb in terms of site-lines diagrams to upper components of buildings.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**

It is the responsibility of the Department of Health and Humans Services (DHHS) and the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP) to consult with key stakeholders. All information and documents are available on the DELWP website.

Public exhibition commenced on 11 September 2017 and closed on 16 October 2017. Directly and indirectly affected owners and occupiers were notified by DELWP on the week of 11 September 2017 and invited to make a submission.

DHHS has held a number of information sessions to inform stakeholders and the community about the process and proposed changes, however, community members have expressed concerns with the proposed planning controls in relation to little clarity of the outcomes for...
the neighbourhood and the lack of consideration of the local context and neighbourhood character.

Further and meaningful consultation and engagement is essential to inform the framework plan and resultant DPO on the site.

**Human Rights**

Providing housing diversity in the site at New Street, Brighton can contribute to a sustainable development that will balance social, economic and environmental benefits to the community. This cannot be achieved if the majority of dwelling stock is one and two bedroom dwellings. There are many families, women and children who seek long term accommodation, who will require three bedroom apartments to support their large families. The site at New Street, Brighton is located in an area that provides access to schools, open spaces and community facilities. Families living in disadvantage will benefit from the use of these services and facilities that enable social integration.

**Legal**

The Minister for Planning established the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee to report on the suitability of planning proposals to facilitate new social housing outcomes under Section 151 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

The Minister for Planning is proposed to become the Responsible Authority for the Site. The proposed Amendment is the responsibility of the DELWP.

**Finance**

The costs associated with this submission are contained within the existing budget. Cost relating to legal representation at the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee hearing informed by expert advice have not been considered within the 2017/18 budget allocation.

Given the implications that a proposal of this nature could have on Bayside’s and future site residents liveability, it is recommended that budget savings from the City Planning and Community Services division are allocated to fund this process. It is expected that the Advisory Committee hearing costs including preparation and representation will be up to a total value of $80,000.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

**Community Plan 2025**

Amendment C157 has not taken into consideration the Bayside *Community Plan 2025*. Consideration has not been given on how the proposal will deliver on the following ‘domains of liveability’ and associated ‘community aspirations’:

- Open Space
- Impact on the Local Economy
- Housing and Neighbourhoods
The exhibited DPO does not respond or contribute to the neighbourhood context or established street character. The proposed heights and building footprints proposed in the DPO are establishing excessive yield expectations.

**Council Plan 2017-2021**

Amendment C157 provides an opportunity for Council to meet some of the strategic objectives of the Council Plan 2017-2021. In particular, Goal 3: Housing and neighbourhoods, which includes a strategy to improve housing affordability (including social housing) and housing needs of various life stages through advocacy.

**Bayside Housing Strategy 2012**

The Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 identifies the site as a location for future moderate residential growth.

The material accompanying the amendment provides no justification to rezone the land to the Mixed Use Zone. The application of the Residential Zones in Bayside are supported by a robust Strategic Planning Framework.

**Bayside Retail Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016**

*Bayside Retail Commercial and Employment Strategy, 2016* found that the retail and commercial mix in Bayside is currently meeting the demands of the municipality and the region and that additional floorspace to meet any future demand could be accommodated within the existing hierarchy of centres. The material accompanying the amendment provides no justification to rezone the land to the Mixed Use Zone and no consideration has been given to explore the implications of the proliferation of services into an out of centre location in the Bayside context.
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1. Introduction

Bayside City Council appreciates the opportunity offered by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to make a submission regarding the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment C157 to the Bayside Planning Scheme. Amendment C157, seeks to facilitate and guide the redevelopment of land at New Street, Brighton that is currently used for public housing.

The Amendment seeks to make the following planning control changes applying to the site:

- Rezone from a General Residential Zone – Schedule 1 (Future Moderate Residential Growth Areas: Southland, Elsternwick, Hampton East (Moorabbin) and Cheltenham Activity Centres (GRZ1) to a Mixed Use Zone – Schedule 2 (New Street, Brighton);
- Apply a Development Plan Overlay – Schedule 3 (New Street, Brighton, DPO3);
- Remove the Design and Development Overlay – Schedule 2 (Building Height Control – Inland Areas, DDO2);
- Apply a Parking Overlay – Schedule 1 (New Street, Brighton, PO1); and
- Add the Minister for Planning as Responsible Authority in the Schedule to Clause 61.01.

This submission to the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee (the Standing Advisory Committee) responds to the Terms of Reference of the Standing Advisory Committee (May 2017).

Bayside City Council looks forward to presenting its case at a public hearing.

2. Background

In December 2016, the Victorian Government, as part of its commitments to increase the state's public housing stock, launched the $185 million Public Housing Renewal Program (PHRP) to redevelop public housing at sites across Melbourne.

The redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton as a Stage One redevelopment is a welcome opportunity to provide an improved standard of living for existing and future public housing tenants that is fit for purpose, safe and accessible.

Council sees this opportunity as a catalyst project to demonstrate exemplary public and private residential redevelopment to facilitate a greater supply of social and affordable housing in Bayside, the Region and metropolitan Melbourne.

The PHRP is intended to grow and sustain the supply of public housing and improve the quality and sustainability of homes in public housing states. By building new, modern buildings on site, in partnership with the private sector, the PHRP will enable a 10% increase in the number of public housing properties on site.

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) describes the New Street Renewal Project as follows:

The estate on New Street has older, rundown buildings that cost a lot to maintain.
The project will build new, modern buildings and increase the number of social housing properties on the estate by at least 10 per cent. The estate will include private housing, which will help fund the project.

The renewed estate will have:

- More social housing
- A mix of social and private housing
- New accessible homes that suit older residents, people with disabilities, and families
- A range of housing sizes
- Better landscaping, outdoor facilities and community spaces.

The new homes will be:

- Built to modern standards
- Accessible for all
- Sustainable homes that are cheaper to cool, heat and maintain
- Better suited to the ongoing needs of Victorians.

3. **Response to the Advisory Committee Terms of Reference**

3.1 **Appropriateness of the proposal in light of key strategies including Homes for Victorians and Plan Melbourne 2017**

**Plan Melbourne 2017**

Plan Melbourne 2017 emphasises the role of planning to facilitate and deliver social and affordable housing. This role is reiterated in the following policy directions:

Outcome 2 of Plan Melbourne: Melbourne provides housing choice in locations close to jobs and services. Of relevance to this submission are the following directions:

- 2.1 Manage the supply of new housing in the right locations to meet population growth and create a sustainable city.
  - 2.2.2 Focus on opportunities for new social and affordable housing on sites across Melbourne.
- 2.3 Increase the supply of social and affordable housing.
  - 2.3.1 Utilise government land to deliver additional social housing and regenerate existing public housing sites.
  - 2.3.4 Capture a proportion of the value uplift created through rezoning for broader public benefit such as social and affordable housing.
- 2.5 Provide greater choice and diversity of housing.
  - 2.5.1 Facilitate housing that offers choice and meets changing household needs.
Homes for Victorians

Homes for Victorians seeks to address many of the housing issues facing Victorians and provide particular emphasis on:

- Renters are struggling with high rents or living in unsuitable housing;
- Many Victorians, particularly young Victorians, are unable to break into the housing market;
- The number of Victorians who need public and community housing is growing, waiting lists are long and many properties are no longer fit for purpose.

In addressing the above issues the Strategy focuses on six actions:

- Buying a house in Victoria;
- Housing Supply and Planning;
- Renting;
- Social Housing;
- Housing Services; and
- The future

Bayside City Council welcomes the initiatives outlined in the Strategy for increasing and renewing housing stock. However, it submits that in its current form, the proposal does not demonstrate how it is responding to the future social housing needs of Victoria and the Region.

The projections for the amount of social housing required over the next two decades based on the Victoria in Future (VIF) report prepared by the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP), shows that 1,700 more social housing homes are needed each year over the next 20 years to maintain social housing at its current share of the total homes in Victoria.

Social housing remains a scarce resource in Victoria and the Region with the volume of housing applicants exceeding the number of available dwellings. Based on the findings of the Victoria’s Social Housing Supply requirements to 2036 report, over 30,000 additional dwellings need to be added in the next 20 years if Victoria is to maintain long-term social housing at the current rate of 3.5 percent.

The redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton is an opportunity to deliver fit for purpose and additional needed dwellings in a location that is well serviced and to provide housing choice and affordability in accordance with the Government’s broader strategic aims. Bayside City Council submits this is a reasonable expectation to seek an increase in the number of public housing dwellings, considering the land value uplift that will be realised through rezoning of the land and sale of the site to a private developer in one of Melbourne’s most highly sought suburbs in Victoria.

Providing housing diversity in the site at New Street, Brighton can contribute to a sustainable development that will balance social, economic and environmental benefits to the community. This cannot be achieved if the majority of dwelling stock is one and two bedroom dwellings. There are many families, women and children who seek long term accommodation and who will require three bedroom apartments to support their large families. The site at New Street, Brighton is located in an area that provides access to schools, open spaces and community facilities. Families living in
disadvantage will benefit from the use of this services and facilities that enable social integration.

3.2 The appropriateness of the proposal against the objectives of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and any other relevant provisions of the planning scheme

- Zoning of the land

Bayside City Council does not support the rezoning of the land to a Mixed Use Zone (MUZ).

The site at New Street, Brighton is within the General Residential Zone (GRZ1). The purpose of the General Residential Zone is to:

- Encourage development that respects neighbourhood character;
- Encourage a diversity of housing types and housing growth particularly in locations offering good access to services and transport; and
- Allow educational, recreational, religious, community and a limited range of other non-residential uses to serve local community needs in appropriate locations.

A maximum building height of 11 metres and three storeys applies to this zone and a planning permit is required for the construction of two or more dwellings on a lot.

In addition a Design and Development Overlay (DDO2) Building Height Control Inland Areas and the Special Building Overlay (SBO) apply to the site.

The purpose of the MUZ is to enable new housing and jobs growth in mixed use areas. The ‘Principles in applying zones’ contained within Planning Practice Note 79 (PPN79), state that the MUZ should be applied in areas encouraging a range of residential, commercial, industrial and other uses, and areas to provide for housing at higher densities and built form that responds to the existing and preferred neighbourhood character. There is no strategy whether at local or state level that suggests that this location is an area where jobs growth is to be encouraged or which suggests that it is a mixed use area.

The Land Use section of the Requirements for Development of Schedule 3 to the Development Plan Overlay (DPO3) outlines the provision for small scale retail, commercial or community uses to meet the needs of the local community. It includes for instance the following:

To provide retail, commercial or community uses to meet an identified local need or stimulate local activity and participation.

However, no planning economic assessment has been provided in the supporting documents which identifies, let alone explores, the implications of the proliferation of services into an out of centre location in the Bayside context. Consequently, there is no strategic support for this element of the proposal.

The material accompanying the amendment provides no justification to rezone the land to the Mixed Use Zone. The application of the Residential Zones in Bayside are
supported by a robust Strategic Planning Framework. The *Bayside Retail Commercial and Employment Strategy*, 2016 found that the retail and commercial mix in Bayside is currently meeting the demands of the municipality and the region and that additional floor space to meet any future demand could be accommodated within the existing hierarchy of centres.

The SBO identifies land that is liable for flooding by overland flows from the urban drainage systems and ensures that future development does not cause any significant rise of flood level or flow velocity. Amendment C153 to the Bayside Planning Scheme seeks to update the SBO to reflect Melbourne Water most updated flood model. The revised SBO increases the extent of the site covered by the overlay. Therefore it is imperative that the design of the site includes integrated water management strategies and not exacerbate flooding issues to surrounding properties. The Development Plan Overlay Schedule should be amended to provide for this.

- **Development Plan Overlay (DPO)**

Bayside City Council supports the use of a DPO and an appropriate schedule as the most appropriate mechanism to provide clarity and certainty to the community and prospective development partners about the future use and design response for the site at New Street, Brighton.

However, Bayside City Council has significant concerns regarding the form of the proposed DPO 3 schedule and the scale of development and design response that is anticipated by the proposed planning controls established in the exhibited DPO.

In relation to the form of the exhibited DPO 3, Bayside City Council submits that the current form of the schedule is unlawful. We note the following inclusion:

> “A permit may be granted for use or to subdivide land or to construct a building or to construct or carry out works that is not in accordance with the development plan.”

In purporting to enable a planning permit to be granted which is not in accordance with the approved Development Plan the DPO 3 schedule is inconsistent with the head clause which requires a permit to be generally in accordance with an approved development plan and therefore exceeds its authority. This is impermissible and results in an invalidity in the schedule or at least the invalidity of the offending text.

Furthermore certain of the language used in the exhibited DPO 3 lacks any common meaning and is not appropriate for a planning control. For example, references such as:

> To balance issues of equity in the successful delivery of social and private housing that is ‘tenure blind’

is meaningless in a statutory planning context.

Bayside City Council also notes that the drafting of the DPO 3 schedule includes a Development Concept Plan (diagram) but the DPO 3 schedule does not make any reference to the Development Concept Plan. One would have thought that a development plan, for instance must be in accordance with the Development Concept Plan included within the schedule.
The exhibited DPO3 and supporting documents in its current form are cursory and unreasonably constrained by the design brief from DHHS and do not enable a proper assessment of the site context or the Design Principles developed to guide the redevelopment of the 9 sites within the PHRP, which include:

- To maximise the social, economic and environmental ‘return’ of public land assets and ensure the economic viability of the project.
- To deliver a sustainable and high quality development that contributes to the longevity of housing stock and reducing the cost of living.
- To create safe buildings and spaces throughout the site.
- To respond to the features of the site, such as context, aspect, topography, significant vegetation.
- To integrate with the surrounding area by responding to existing or preferred neighbourhood character, enhancing the public realm and existing networks and delivering ‘good neighbour’ outcomes.
- To balance issues of equity in the successful delivery of private and social housing that is ‘tenure blind’.
- To provide retail, commercial or community uses to meet an identified local need or stimulate local activity and participation.
- To prioritise pedestrian and bicycle access within the site.
- To establish legible access and address points for the site, buildings and spaces, including defining private, communal and public spaces.
- To foster social connections between residents and the wider community.
- To provide high levels of residential amenity and liveability.
- To provide landscaping and communal open space that is resilient and enhances the sense of place, sustainability and liveability of the site and local area.
- To deliver buildings and spaces that are accessible and practical for people of all abilities and readily adaptable to respond to the future needs of residents.

It is submitted that there is no material that explains the rational for the proposed heights or the application of commonly applied urban design principles and rules of thumb in terms of site-lines diagrams to upper components of buildings. There has been no view shed analysis nor exploration of the impact on existing or preferred neighbourhood character of building mass and taller forms. Nor has there been a proper assessment that explores the broader implications of the removal of the existing DDO that applies to the land and broad areas beyond the land that has been in place for many years and which has been instrumental in protecting the character of Bayside.

It is suggested that the design framework and associated planning controls be redrafted to include a further level of detail that:
• Takes into account Bayside City Council adopted policies and strategies.

  Provides built form envelopes with reduced heights that responds and contributes to the local context and existing and preferred neighbourhood character as identified in the Bayside Planning Scheme.

• Secures the retention of significant trees and define areas for deep soil planting to ensure tree replacement when necessary to remove.

• Identifies vehicle access points and introduces a network of pedestrian connections through the site.

• Mandates the provision of basement car parking to ensure high amenity within the site and interfaces along all streets.

• Secures the provision for community facilities and usable open space recreation areas for residents.

• Stipulates the number of social and affordable housing units to ensure a diverse range of housing types.

• Provides detailed analysis of how the proposed built form on the site at New Street, Brighton relates to the other side of the street and adjoining properties.

• Defines articulation zones through massing strategies to avoid interpretation through façade treatments that do not achieve the intended outcome.

• Defines how built form interfaces respond to open spaces and pedestrian connections.

The DPO3 schedule should require for instance that all open space and communal areas on the site should be publicly accessible with clear points of accessibility.

Parking Overlay

It is considered that the Traffic Engineer assessment was determined after car parking rates had been determined, retrospectively justifying parking rates. It is unclear how the original rates have been determined.

Responsible Authority

 Council does not support the Minister for Planning as Responsible Authority in the Schedule to Clause 61.01. The change results in a lack of transparency in the application of the planning framework for the site and also results in a split of statutory responsibilities between two authorities with the Minister being responsible for administration of the scheme and Bayside City Council being responsible for the enforcement of the scheme. This is inefficient.

Value capture in response to the value uplift created through rezoning of the land

The proposed Planning Scheme Amendment will create value by facilitating greater densities and built form outcomes than what is currently permitted under the Bayside
Planning Scheme. The proposed DPO3 appears to capture all improvements in value for the State Office of Housing. However, there is no indication in the DPO3 schedule of what contribution this significant redevelopment will make in relation to the upgrading of infrastructure external to the site such as road and drainage infrastructure within the area. The DPO3 schedule should explicitly contemplates the need to undertake works external to the site to augment any infrastructure which requires augmentation.

Furthermore, there is no social impact assessment which identifies the likely population and the additional demand that will be created for social services leaving Bayside City Council blind as to the need to plan for the additional demand. The number of dwellings proposed is uncertain with a range of between 140 and 350 dwellings but no information is provided in relation to the likely composition of the residents.

3.3 Whether the Minister for Planning should Act as Responsible Authority for the development site(s) and if this would expedite the future planning approvals.

Bayside City Council is open to work with the Victorian Government to deliver a process and project that can be a demonstration of a collaborative approach and best practice design that provides much needed public housing and the best outcome for our community.

It is submitted that Bayside City Council should remain as the Responsible Authority for the site at New Street, Brighton. Established close connections with the community, understating of community aspirations reflected in the Council Plan, the Community Plan, Bayside’s Municipal Strategic Planning Framework, Bayside’s Housing Strategy and Bayside’s Retail Commercial and Employment Strategy in relation to housing and neighbourhoods is likely to deliver social integration through an inclusive development that is sustainable and remains this way for future generations.

The proposed changes present potential damaging implications to the liveability of Bayside if the design response does not satisfactorily address the site and context.

Council can appreciate that DHHS is seeking to expedite the redevelopment of this site, however Council submits that a redevelopment of this scale and nature is a rare opportunity that if not well thought and considered could have detrimental implications not just for Bayside residents but potentially constrain the future viability of the Public Housing Renewal Program.

3.4 Whether the proposed changes to the planning scheme and/or planning permits should be approved, subject to any recommended changes.

The approval of Amendment C157 to the Bayside Planning Scheme in its current form is premature. Bayside City Council does not support the proposed planning scheme amendment in its current form.

Bayside City Council supports the renewal of the site at New Street, Brighton and a minimum increase of ten percent in public housing dwellings.
However, whilst we understand that the delivery of high quality and additional social housing is a high priority, we are concerned with the limited timeframes allocated for consulting with the local community and for the formulation of the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment. Bayside City Council received multiple complaints from residents, including public housing tenants in relation to the uncertainty provided by the proposed DPO. Meaningful engagement is essential to inform the design framework for the site and DPO.

The redevelopment of the New Street, Brighton site is a unique opportunity. It is considered that if the DPO3 schedule and the planning scheme provisions were revised to address the issues discussed above it will enable high quality outcomes by ensuring the design quality expectation is ready for inclusion in the procurement documentation required as part of the Public Private Partnership Process (PPP) intended for the site.

Bayside City Council submits that the Office of the Victorian Government Architect’s Design Review Panel is involved throughout the next stages of this process to ensure that the design quality is maintained, delivered and retained following completion of the project.

Bayside City Council would like to be kept actively involved in the next stages of this process to support DHHS in the delivery of a high quality and sustainable outcome that enhances the liveability of Bayside residents.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Bayside City Council welcomes the opportunity to participate in the Social Housing Renewal Standing Advisory Committee process in relation to the planning proposal for New Street, Brighton.

Council is open to work with the Victorian Government to deliver a process and project that can be a demonstration of a collaborative approach and best practice design that provides much needed public housing and the best outcome for our community.

Based on the reasons outlined in this submission it is considered that the Planning Scheme Amendment documents presented for comment require substantial revision. Further work is required to demonstrate that the proposed changes are justified and to provide certainty to the community and Council in relation to the expected outcomes to be delivered on site.

The approval of Planning Scheme Amendment C157 to the Bayside Planning Scheme in its current form is premature. Bayside City Council does not support the proposed planning scheme amendment in its current form. Its lacks any sound strategic basis for the changes that it is making.

Further consultation needs to be undertaken as this process progresses. It is important that any recommended changes that seek to facilitate the redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton are tested with Council, the community and other key stakeholders to ensure that they respond to the State and Local Planning Policy Framework and address the needs and liveability expectations of Bayside residents.
Bayside City Council can appreciate that DHHS is seeking to expedite the redevelopment of the site at New Street, Brighton, however Council submits that a redevelopment of this scale and nature is a rare opportunity that if not well thought and considered could have detrimental implications not just for Bayside residents but potentially limit the future viability of the Public Housing Renewal Program.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The Beaumaris Sports Club Pavilion Project (the Project) brings together three clubs: football, cricket and tennis into a single pavilion facility at Banksia Reserve. The Project was initiated by the clubs and Council has taken a leadership role in partnership with the Beaumaris Sports Club (BSC) to deliver the Project.

This report provides Council with an update on the Beaumaris Sports Club pavilion project including a construction timelines, project costs, Bendigo Bank loan conditions and BSC total cash contribution.

Key issues

Beaumaris Sports Club Construction
Construction has progressed well and an official opening of the new sports club pavilion is being planned for November 2017. Once tenant sporting groups have relocated from the current buildings into the new building (expected late October) the existing football/cricket pavilion will be demolished and car park and cricket net works will commence.

Beaumaris Sports Club project costs
At its 27 January 2016 meeting Council resolved for the project scope to be reduced to ensure total project costs did not exceed $5 million. In meeting this target a number of items including commercial kitchen fit-out, furniture, fittings and equipment were removed prior to tender and became the responsibility of the BSC. At the time (January 2016) the scope of fit-out for a sports club such as this was under specified by the BSC and the costs of these items were underestimated. Subsequently actual costs recently incurred by BSC have been higher than anticipated.

BSC has provided Council with details showing $403,000 has been spent by BSC on fit-out of the new building (as set out in Attachment 1). This exceeds the original estimate by $278,000.

Loan Guarantee
Council has approved in-principle to act as loan guarantor for an amount of $700,000. Subject to the finalisation of the lease and resolution regarding any future BSC contributions, Council will complete the loan guarantee process.

As part of Bendigo Bank’s loan requirements, BSC is required to hold a $100,000 deposit prior to commencing operations. This amount was not accounted for in the original project costings.

Beaumaris Sports Club total cash contribution
With a total project cost of $5 million, BSC was required to raise $1.43 million in cash contributions towards the project. During recent meetings with Council staff, BSC representatives have advised that they are unable to meet 100% of the cash contribution requirement of $1.43 million with a current shortfall of $213,000. This deficit is due to higher than expected fit-out costs as detailed above and cash holdings required by the Bendigo Bank.

There are three options available to Council to meet this funding shortfall:
1. Deferred BSC payment of the outstanding $213,000: Once BSC has established its ongoing viability and is generating profit, BSC forwards the $100,000 ‘start up’ funds it is holding (to meet Bendigo bank loan conditions) to Council. To meet its obligation for the remaining $113k, the rental payable by the BSC will increase at a future date;

2. Council does not permit the BSC to enter the building until payment is made; or

3. Council contributes the shortfall of $213,000 and does seek repayment of this amount from BSC.

Given the significant community interest in the project and considerable third party funding including $650,000 from the State Government, option 2 is not considered to be an appropriate option.

Option 1 is considered to be the most appropriate given that Council is already making a substantial contribution to the project ($3 million) and the Beaumaris Sports Club is expected to generate an operating surplus once the facility is fully operational.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Defers Beaumaris Sports Club’s payment of $213,000 and includes in the lease terms the following future payments:
   
   i. $100,000 currently being held by Beaumaris Sports Club as ‘start-up’ cash be paid to Council by no later than the fourth anniversary of the execution of the lease; and

   ii. In addition to any rental, insurances, or other payments required as part of the lease with Council, the Beaumaris Sports Club commences annual payments of $11,300 on the fifth anniversary of the lease, continuing until such time as the outstanding $113,000 is paid in full to Council; and

2. Advises Beaumaris Sports Club of this decision.

**Support Attachments**

1. Additional Beaumaris Sports Club Up-front costs ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The Beaumaris Sports Club will provide positive benefits for young people and adults through their participation and engagement in sport and recreation activities at Banksia Reserve.

Natural Environment
Council is committed to effective partnerships in order to achieve positive environmental outcomes through environmentally sustainable design principles, which have been incorporated within the design development process.

Built Environment
The BSC pavilion is fully accessible and includes a number of design elements befitting such a high profile facility.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Discussions and meetings are continuing with BSC representatives regarding fundraising, project costs, leasing and tenant sporting clubs usage arrangements.

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 signed a funding agreement with Sport and Recreation Victoria to deliver the Project. The BSC has agreements in place with AFL Victoria, Cricket Australia, Cricket Victoria and Tennis Victoria and equipment/product suppliers for funding and equipment contributions.

A draft lease has been prepared and subject to final financing arrangements will be finalised and signed by the Beaumaris Sports Club and Council.

Finance
The Beaumaris Sports Club was required to provide total funding of $1.43 million towards a total project cost of $5 million. During recent meetings BSC have advised Council that it is unable to meet this requirement with a current shortfall of $213,000. Deferring the payment of this amount will allow it to commence operations and it is expected that the club will generate an operating surplus once the facility is fully operational. It is not proposed that Council will require interest to be paid on the deferred amounts. The deferred payments will be required as follows:

- $100,000 currently being held by Beaumaris Sports Club as ‘start-up’ cash be paid to Council by no later than the fourth anniversary of the execution of the lease; and
• In addition to any rental, insurances, or other payments required as part of the lease with Council, the Beaumaris Sports Club commences annual payments of $11,300 on the fifth anniversary of the lease, continuing until such time as the outstanding $113,000 is paid in full to Council.

Council has accepted a request from the BSC to act as loan guarantor for an amount of $700,000. Successful operation of the facility by the BSC is required so that the Club can service the loan.

Links to Council policy and strategy


The Beaumaris Sports Club project contributes to the above plans and strategies by:

• Providing community based recreation facilities for children and adults;
• Using open space and parkland to meet the needs of the Bayside community; and
• Ensuring the use of open space and parkland is fit for purpose with appropriate infrastructure.
### BSC Fit Out Costs Summary Excluded from City of Bayside Construction Costs - Oct 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Inc GST</th>
<th>GST</th>
<th>Net Gst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chefs Hat</td>
<td>F&amp;B Operating Equipment</td>
<td>$19,415.77</td>
<td>$1,765.07</td>
<td>$17,650.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSI</td>
<td>AV</td>
<td>$31,610.00</td>
<td>$2,899.16</td>
<td>$28,710.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaju</td>
<td>Furniture / Other</td>
<td>$83,342.60</td>
<td>$7,576.60</td>
<td>$75,766.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Vectron</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telstra</td>
<td>Comms/Data Hardware</td>
<td>$9,140.90</td>
<td>$830.99</td>
<td>$8,309.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>Beer Equipment</td>
<td>$39,600.00</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asahi Beverages</td>
<td>Kiosk &amp; Bar Fridges</td>
<td>$27,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweppes</td>
<td>Post Mix System</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comacater</td>
<td>Kitchen Equipment</td>
<td>$115,500.00</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Café</td>
<td>Coffee Machines (2)</td>
<td>$16,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>GYM</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$403,109.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,671.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>$366,437.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not included in Above**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Inc GST</th>
<th>GST</th>
<th>Net Gst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Signage</td>
<td>LED Scoreboard</td>
<td>$45,031.80</td>
<td>$4,093.80</td>
<td>$40,938.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and background
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a progress report on proposed works to be undertaken on the HMVS Cerberus and the progress of a Heritage Victoria permit application.

The HMVS Cerberus is owned by Council having been purchased by Sandringham Council and scuttled in Half Moon Bay in 1927 to form a breakwater. It has national significance and is listed on the National Heritage Register. The wreck is deteriorating and work is required to conserve it and ensure the structure is stable and the site is safe. Any work at the site requires a permit from Heritage Victoria.

In 2009, the Friends of the Cerberus instigated a successful National Heritage Investment Initiative grant application of $500,000. The funds are held in trust by the National Trust (Victoria). While the Friends of the Cerberus were the grant applicant, the funding agreement is between the Federal Government and Bayside City Council as the owner of HMVS Cerberus. At 30 June 2017, the balance of the fund is approximately $585,000.

In considering the most recent report on the HMVS Cerberus at its 25 July 2017 meeting, Council resolved:

That Council:

1. Notes the preferred Heritage Victoria process for Council to apply for a Heritage Permit for conservation and stabilisation works on the HMVS Cerberus;

2. Expends approximately $20,000 to engage suitable consultants to prepare the Heritage Permit application for works on the HMVS Cerberus;

3. Seeks reimbursement of any unbudgeted expenditure on the HMVS Cerberus from available grant funding; and

4. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to make contact with the relevant senior officers of the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) to identify RAN’s potential future interest in matters relating to the HMVS Cerberus.

Key issues
Heritage Victoria Permit - Application

In line with Heritage Victoria’s preferred process, Council engaged a highly qualified and experienced maritime archaeologist to determine the most appropriate stabilisation method, obtain costings from a suitable contractor and complete the required documentation to make an application for a permit to Heritage Victoria.

Method of Stabilisation

Council’s appointed maritime archaeologist, in collaboration with a highly regarded professional diving and wreck management company has reviewed a number of stabilisation methods while considering the available funding. Investigations have concluded that
stabilisation of the wreck with concrete in-fill would be the most suitable long term method of conservation for the wreck in-situ.

Concrete in-fill will preserve the presence of the wreck into the future and mitigate against unauthorised entry into the wreck. This achieves appropriate conservation outcomes, stabilisation of the wreck and management of Council’s ongoing risk management issues.

This method would not provide sufficient structural support to enable the guns to be returned to the deck of the wreck.

Another, more expensive option to stabilise the wreck is to install rock beaching around the hull to support its weight. Other structural options, such as bracing were not considered viable as the appearance of the wreck would be altered and this is not supported from a heritage perspective.

Costs and funding
A preliminary costing indicates that stabilising the HMVS Cerberus with concrete in-fill would likely cost approximately $720,000. While this exceeds the current available funding ($585,000) it is recommended that Council use this method of stabilisation as the basis for a permit application to Heritage Victoria.

All other methods of conservation and stabilisation that were identified were assessed as more expensive than the concrete in-fill option.

If a permit is issued by Heritage Victoria, Council would receive a future report with detailed costings and possible means of funding the required conservation and stabilisation works.

Recommendation
That Council:

1. Endorses the use of concrete in-fill as the preferred method of conservation and stabilisation of the HMVS Cerberus and makes an application for a permit to Heritage Victoria to undertake the works;

2. Informs stakeholders including the Friends of the Cerberus and The Assistant Director Maritime and Commonwealth Heritage from the Department of the Environment and Energy, Historic Heritage Section of this decision; and

3. Receives a further report once Heritage Victoria has assessed the permit application for conservation and stabilisation of the HMVS Cerberus.

Support Attachments
Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

**Liveable community**

**Social**
The HMVS Cerberus site has significant social and cultural heritage values. As the owner of the wreck, Council is responsible for its maintenance and protection. A Friends of the Cerberus group has been formed by people interested in the wreck.

**Natural Environment**
An environmental impact statement and heritage analysis has been required as part of the permit application process with Heritage Victoria. A recent survey showed that the wreck acts as a significant marine feature and accommodates large amounts of algae and invertebrates.

A detailed ecological baseline survey and impacts monitoring program would need to be undertaken prior to and post any works undertaken on the wreck.

**Built Environment**
The HMVS Cerberus is a significant form within the Half Moon Bay landscape and is deteriorating. Concrete in-fill has been assessed as the most appropriate method of stabilising the wreck.

**Customer Service and Community Engagement**
Stakeholder consultation between Council, Heritage Victoria, the National Trust and the Friends of the Cerberus regarding an appropriate solution for HMVS Cerberus have been ongoing since 2011.

Council staff met with a representative of the Friends of the Cerberus to discuss the implications of this report on 18 October 2017. While acknowledging that the recommended approach achieves conservation and stabilisation of the wreck within reach of the funding available, the Friends representative remains disappointed that the proposed approach is irreversible.

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

**Legal**
Council owns the HMVS Cerberus and is legally responsible for management of the wreck. Public safety and heritage conservation are significant issues. This is complicated due to the vessel resting in water and a seabed over which Council has no jurisdiction.

Heritage Victoria is the permitting authority for any works to the vessel, decisions regarding permit applications are made under the Heritage Act 1975.

**Finance**
Grant funds of approximately $585,000 (as at 30 June 2017) are held in trust by The National Trust (Victoria) for the purpose of stabilisation and interpretation of HMVS Cerberus. Use of
the funds is limited to the historic site, being the wreck itself and a 25 metre zone surrounding the wreck.

The proposed concrete in-fill method of conservation and stabilisation is likely to cost $720,000.

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The 2017-2021 Council Plan Goal 1 is Infrastructure and states that Council will work together with the Bayside community to plan and deliver community infrastructure that responds to the changing needs of the Bayside community. The HMVS Cerberus is a significant piece of Council’s history and valued by many in the community. This report relates to the conservation and stabilisation of the wreck of the HMVS Cerberus.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report provides a summary and analysis of Council's financial performance for two (2) months to 31 August 2017.

The report is designed to analyse actual results against the 2017/18 Adopted Budget to ensure consistency and compliance with the Budget, and to measure Council’s overall financial performance.

Please refer to the Detailed Financial Report attached for full analysis.

Key issues
The Adjusted Budget for 2017/18 of $22.015M has increased by $185k from the Adopted Budget of $21.830M and includes the following timing adjustments for projects to be delivered in 2017/18:

- $500k Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation
- $ 10k Dendy Park Soccer/Cricket Pavilion Redevelopment
- ($325k) Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment

2017/18 Year to date operating result
The August 2017 result is a surplus of $5.8M which is $1.8M favourable to budget.

2016/17 Forecast operating result
The current forecast for the year represents a surplus of $20.9M which is ($1.2M) unfavourable to Budget.

The underlying forecast result is favourable to budget by $380k and excludes the following one off or timing items:

- ($269k) Operating Grant funding received in prior year for 2017/18 programs:
- ($822k)Timing of capital grants and contributions received in advance or deferred to align with the expected completion of capital projects (Blackspot, Brighton Library Interior Upgrade, Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct and Dendy Street Beach).
- ($439k) expenditure for Aged & Disability Regional projects for which funding was received in 2016/17.

It should be noted that Council budgets for a surplus in its operating budget each year so as to fund capital works and debt reduction. 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.
Cash and Investments

The cash position as at August 2017 is $93.1M
The YTD favourable variance to budget of $19.0M as at August 2017 is mainly due to:

- $19.2M greater opening cash balance than budgeted:
  - $11.6M capital works underspend including Rollover of 2016/17 capital projects of $11.1M to be spent in 2017/18.
  - $7.6M favourable cash operating result for 2016/17 including $3.1M transferred to the infrastructure reserve.

There will be a significant drawdown on these cash reserves over the next 4 years to pay off debt and to fund a rapid 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

The forecast for capital expenditure to 30 June 2018 is favourable $244k and indicates that 99% of the capital expenditure budget will be spent by June 2018.

Recommendation

That Council notes the operating and capital financial report for two months to 31 August 2017.

Support Attachments

1. Bayside City Council August 2017
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 $20.9M which is ($1.2M) unfavourable to budget. Taking into account one off and timing issues the underlying operating result is $380k favourable to budget.

The capital expenditure forecast including the anticipated rollover of projects to 2018/19 is favourable to budget $244k.

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 31 August 2017

Operating Result

The Adjusted Budget for 2017/18 of $22.015M has increased by $185k from the Adopted Budget of $21.830M and includes the following adjustments for projects to be delivered in 2017/18:

- $500k Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation
- $10k Dendy Park Soccer/Cricket Pavilion Redevelopment
- ($325k) Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment

2017/18 Year to date operating result

The August 2017 result is a surplus of $5.8M which is $1.8M favourable to budget.

2017/18 Forecast operating result

The current forecast for the year represents a surplus of $20.9M which is ($1.2M) unfavourable to Budget. The underlying forecast result is favourable to budget by $380k and excludes the following one off or timing items:

- ($269k) Operating Grant funding received in prior year for 2017/18 programs:
- ($822k) Timing of capital grants and contributions received in advance or deferred to align with the expected completion of capital projects (Blackspot, Brighton Library Interior Upgrade, Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct and Dendy Street Beach)
- ($439k) expenditure for Aged & Disability Regional projects for which funding was received in 2016/17.
### Operating Services & New Initiatives Budget

#### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates and Charges</td>
<td>14,779</td>
<td>15,007</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>88,707</td>
<td>88,772</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>8,957</td>
<td>(173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>(220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/(Loss) on Disposal of assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,421</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,137</strong></td>
<td>(284)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Costs</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>6,627</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>43,047</td>
<td>43,079</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>7,544</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>44,466</td>
<td>45,076</td>
<td>(610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>17,362</td>
<td>(184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,231</strong></td>
<td><strong>537</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,406</strong></td>
<td><strong>106,271</strong></td>
<td><strong>(865)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Result - Surplus**

4,007  5,841  1,834  22,015  20,866  (1,150)

**Operating Result by Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division (In '000s)</th>
<th>2016/17 YTD Budget</th>
<th>2016/17 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>Budget variance</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>2016/17 Current Forecast</th>
<th>Variance to Current Forecast</th>
<th>Varience to Current Percentage Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>9,103</td>
<td>9,113</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>(227)</td>
<td>8,570</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Rec. &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>5,138</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>33,144</td>
<td>33,201</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>9,425</td>
<td>(658)</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Finance</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>(458)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>(2,235)</td>
<td>(2,313)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying Operating</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,349</strong></td>
<td><strong>56,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>(726)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>(14,799)</td>
<td>(15,043)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>(88,882)</td>
<td>(88,947)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Income</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>(754)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>(7,660)</td>
<td>(7,358)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>17,362</td>
<td>(184)</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4,007)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,841)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>(22,015)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,886)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,150)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive forecast unfavourable ($10k)
- $69k favourable in salaries:
  - $60k savings due to timing of appointment for unfilled Innovation position.
  - $37k reduction to EFT due to part time arrangement until January in Capability & Culture and lower banding for secondment role in Liveability & Policy.
  - $17k savings due to staff vacancies in Arts & Culture.
  - ($28k) additional resource for the Community Engagement projects, this is fully offset by savings in research and survey expenditure across divisions.
- $26k additional Library State grant funding received.
- ($60k) consultancy fee for strategy work to be undertaken funded from savings in Innovation salaries.
- ($40k) consultancy fee for the Digital Strategy to be completed in September 2017.

Corporate Services forecast unfavourable ($81k)
- ($40k) consulting and legal fees required for Enterprise Agreement negotiations.
- ($39k) specialist ICT support required to close the VAGO ICT audit recommendations from the year end audit.

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure forecast unfavourable ($57k)
- ($67k) net increase in employee costs in Sustainability & Transport for backfilling and acting appointments to cover vacant roles and extended leave.
- ($43k) increase in actual CPI up to 2.5% from a budget of 1.75% for Contract & Maintenance costs.
- ($20k) additional expenditure for the HMVS Cerberus Heritage Victoria Works permit, council resolution July 2017.
- $57k reduction to waste education program which will be relaunched following the completion of a Recycling and Waste Management Strategy.
- $20k State Government now funding SES costs.

City Planning & Community Services forecast unfavourable ($658k)
- ($439k) expenditure for Regional Projects for which funding was received in advance in 2016/17.
- ($209k) School Crossing grant funding received in advance in 2016/17.
- ($49k) unfavourable in Family Services for additional staffing and purchasing of vaccines to rollout new immunisation program, grant funding received in 2016/17.
- ($32k) for the review of Council’s Emergency Management Recovery Plan and the development of the Early Years Plan following Council resolution in April.
- $50k increase in parking fines issued around school crossing areas.
- $34k salary savings in Planning due to vacant positions currently being recruited.

Corporate Finance forecast favourable $78k.
- $69k savings in 2017/18 workcover premium due to an improving claims history.
Cash and investments

The cash position of $93.1M has increased by $3.7M from the 2016/17 ending balance of $89.4M and is comprised of $13.6M net operating cash inflows and ($9.9M) net capital outflows.

The YTD favourable variance to budget of $19.0M as at August 2017 is mainly due to:

- $19.2M greater opening cash balance than budgeted:
  - $11.6M Favourable capital works underspend including Rollover of 2016/17 capital projects of $11.1M (to be spent in 2017/18).
  - $7.6M Favourable cash underspend for operating activities including $3.1M transferred to the Infrastructure Reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</th>
<th>30 Jun.17</th>
<th>31 Aug.17</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual $'000</td>
<td>Actual $'000</td>
<td>Budget $'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated &amp; unrestricted</td>
<td>30,431</td>
<td>35,035</td>
<td>34,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>58,974</td>
<td>58,059</td>
<td>39,465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total cash and cash equivalents                   | 89,411     | 93,104     | 74,053     | 19,051       | 62,574     | 73,753         | 11,179      |

Cash & cash equivalents (including investments) consists of:

- Retail banks: 77,026
- Community banks: 3,000
- Cash on hand and at bank: 9,385

| Total cash and cash equivalents                   | 89,411     | 93,104     |

Statutory Reserves

- Recreational Land Reserve: 15,009
- Car Parking Reserve: 398

| Total Statutory Reserves                          | 15,407     | 15,091     |

Funds Subject to Intended Allocation

- Infrastructure Reserve: 8,220
- Dendy Street Beach Improvement Reserve: 1,561
- Community Facilities Enhancement Reserve: 947
- Early Childhood Facilities Reserve: 5,522
- Defined Superannuation Shortfall: 3,588
- Unspent Conditional Grants Reserve: 5,992
- Capital Works Carried Forward Reserve: 14,764
- Street and Park Tree Management Carried Fd: 87

| Total Funds Subject to Intended Allocation        | 39,993     | 39,085     |

Total Other Reserves

| Total Other Reserves                               | 54,500     | 54,176     |

Committed Funds

- Trust Funds and Deposits: 4,474
- Street and Park Tree Management Carried Fd: 87

| Total Committed Funds                              | 4,474      | 3,893      |

Total Restricted, Committed and Allocated funds

| Total Restricted, Committed and Allocated funds    | 58,974     | 58,069     |

Restricted funds include trust funds and reserves.


**Victorian Auditor – General’s Office (VAGO) Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>VAGO Target (to maintain low risk)</th>
<th>Forecast Performance</th>
<th>Forecast Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquidity</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 150%</td>
<td>499.68%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Current assets / Current liabilities)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-financing</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 20.0%</td>
<td>27.62%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Net operating cash flow / Underlying revenue)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Replacement</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 150%</td>
<td>277.42%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Total Capital spend : Depreciation)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indebtedness</strong></td>
<td>&lt; 40.0%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Non-current liabilities/Own source revenue)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying result</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 0%</td>
<td>15.44%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Net surplus/Revenue)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal gap</strong></td>
<td>&gt; 100%</td>
<td>224.70%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Renewal capital spend:Depreciation)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**

- **Liquidity** - the ability to pay liabilities within the next 12 months.
- **Self Financing** - the ability to replace assets using cash generated from day to day operations.
- **Capital Replacement** - to ensure sufficient spending on capital renewal and new capital works.
- **Indebtedness** - the ability to repay debt from own source revenue being revenue not tied to specific projects.
- **Underlying result** - sufficient operating income to cover operating expenses.
- **Renewal gap** – to ensure sufficient spending on existing capital assets.

**Local Government Performance Reporting Framework Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Achievable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average residential rate per residential property assessment</td>
<td>$700 to $2,000</td>
<td>$1,977</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per property assessment</td>
<td>$2,000 to $5,000</td>
<td>$2,362</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash compared to current liabilities</td>
<td>10% to 300%</td>
<td>242.8%</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>2.5%</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted underlying surplus (or deficit)</td>
<td>-20% to 20%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to adjusted underlying revenue</td>
<td>30% to 80%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to property values</td>
<td>0.15% to 0.75%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2017/18 Adjusted Budget for capital expenditure of $48,409M reported above has increased by $2.7M from the Adopted Budget of $45,677M. The adjusted budget includes the confirmed rollover of projects worth $11.1M from 2016/17.

### Capital Programs Status

![Graph showing capital programs status from July to June 2017/18](image)

#### Capital Forecast Revenue - unfavourable ($303k)
- $509k Annual Road Reseal & Resheet program additional funding to be received in 2017/18.
- $328k Blackspot grant funding unbudgeted for Roundabout New, Wellington & Carpenter St Brighton.
- ($375k) Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct funding from the State Government and AFL received in prior year for 2017/18.
- ($315k) Brighton Library Interior Upgrade funding received prior year for 17/18.
- ($460k) Dendy Street Masterplan Implementation construction unlikely to commence in 17/18, grant funding to be received in 18/19 and 19/20.

#### Capital Forecast Expenditure – favourable $244k.
- $790k Sandringham Village Activity Centre Streetscaping delayed due to possible redesign.
- $696k Dendy Park Soccer/Cricket Pavilion Redevelopment to be completed under budget in 17/18.
- $194k North Road Drain Brighton to be completed under budget in 17/18.
- ($790k) Stormwater Harvesting Brighton Golf Course & Dendy Park funding from possible delays in the Sandringham Village Activity Centre Streetscaping.
- ($509k) Annual Road Reseal & Resheet program offset by additional funding to be received in 2017/18.
Detailed Schedules

1. Income Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>$'000s</th>
<th>2017/18 YTD Budget</th>
<th>2017/18 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>2017/18 YTD Variances</th>
<th>2017/18 Budget Forecast</th>
<th>2017/18 Forecast Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rates and Charges</td>
<td>14,779</td>
<td>15,007</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>88,707</td>
<td>88,772</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7,829</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>8,957</td>
<td>(173)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>(460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/(Loss) on Disposal of Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>21,775</td>
<td>23,072</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>127,421</td>
<td>127,137</td>
<td>(284)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Costs</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>6,627</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>43,047</td>
<td>43,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>7,544</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>44,466</td>
<td>45,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>17,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>17,768</td>
<td>17,231</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>105,406</td>
<td>106,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Result - Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,007</td>
<td>5,841</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>22,015</td>
<td>20,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Statement of Capital Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL in $'000's</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Current Forecast</th>
<th>2017/18 Budget less Forecast variance</th>
<th>2017/18 Carry Forward Balance to 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Expenditure</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11,975</td>
<td>11,292</td>
<td>683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Improvements</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>201*</td>
<td>(180)</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant &amp; Equipment Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixtures, Fittings and Furniture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems, Network, Servers and Communication</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assets</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreshore and Conservation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>483*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15,896</td>
<td>15,128</td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Car Parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,266*</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>(604)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Infrastructure</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1,270*</td>
<td>(688)</td>
<td>8,153</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>6,326*</td>
<td>6,756</td>
<td>(432)</td>
<td>48,409</td>
<td>48,166</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,280)</td>
<td>(2,427)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>(411)</td>
<td>(5,380)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10)*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>(744)*</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>(5,380)</td>
<td>(4,920)</td>
<td>(460)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>(754)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>(7,660)</td>
<td>(7,358)</td>
<td>(303)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,991</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>40,749</td>
<td>40,808</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cashflow Statement - period ended 31 August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 Jun 17</th>
<th>Actual $'000</th>
<th>Budget $'000</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
<th>31 Aug 17</th>
<th>Actual $'000</th>
<th>Budget $'000</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
<th>Actual $'000</th>
<th>Budget $'000</th>
<th>Variance $'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from operating activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td>85,358</td>
<td>17,638</td>
<td>16,429</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>88,613</td>
<td>88,296</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>(317)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory fees and fines</td>
<td>6,396</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>(944)</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>3,902</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental income</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - monetary</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>5,039</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>12,192</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9,221</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>(273)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>2,842</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>(226)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>(169)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>(530)</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net GST refund</td>
<td>5,756</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>6,764</td>
<td>7,505</td>
<td>741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee costs</td>
<td>(38,970)</td>
<td>(7,818)</td>
<td>(7,975)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>(42,364)</td>
<td>(42,386)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to suppliers</td>
<td>(46,845)</td>
<td>(9,299)</td>
<td>(13,798)</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>(52,784)</td>
<td>(59,286)</td>
<td>(6,502)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities</strong></td>
<td>47,370</td>
<td>13,596</td>
<td>6,277</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>40,332</td>
<td>34,714</td>
<td>(5,618)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from investing activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>(27,514)</td>
<td>(9,902)</td>
<td>(2,358)</td>
<td>(7,544)</td>
<td>(45,677)</td>
<td>(48,166)</td>
<td>(2,489)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from term deposit investments</td>
<td>(10,026)</td>
<td>(3,500)</td>
<td>(6,000)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in investing activities</strong></td>
<td>(37,540)</td>
<td>(13,402)</td>
<td>(8,358)</td>
<td>(5,044)</td>
<td>(40,677)</td>
<td>(39,166)</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from financing activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>(437)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(162)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from borrowings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of borrowings</td>
<td>(5,193)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,131)</td>
<td>(2,131)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in financing activities</strong></td>
<td>(5,630)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(2,293)</td>
<td>(2,296)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase(decrease) in cash and cash equivalents</strong></td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>(2,638)</td>
<td>(6,658)</td>
<td>(4,020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the beginning of the period</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</td>
<td>9,395</td>
<td>9,578</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposits</td>
<td>80,026</td>
<td>83,526</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>12,526</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>71,026</td>
<td>11,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</td>
<td>89,411</td>
<td>93,104</td>
<td>74,053</td>
<td>19,051</td>
<td>62,574</td>
<td>73,753</td>
<td>11,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated and unrestricted</td>
<td>30,437</td>
<td>35,035</td>
<td>34,588</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>28,938</td>
<td>29,712</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>58,974</td>
<td>58,069</td>
<td>39,465</td>
<td>18,604</td>
<td>33,636</td>
<td>44,041</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89,411</td>
<td>93,104</td>
<td>74,053</td>
<td>19,051</td>
<td>62,574</td>
<td>73,753</td>
<td>11,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance Sheet as at 31 August 2017</th>
<th>Full Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Jun. 17</td>
<td>Actual $'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>9,385</td>
<td>9,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>8,969</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial assets</td>
<td>80,026</td>
<td>83,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non current assets classified as held for sale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>99,842</td>
<td>95,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, infrastructure, plant and equipment</td>
<td>3,372,475</td>
<td>3,376,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-current assets</td>
<td>3,372,927</td>
<td>3,376,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other payables</td>
<td>12,688</td>
<td>7,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>3,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>8,272</td>
<td>8,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income in Advance</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current liabilities</td>
<td>27,990</td>
<td>21,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-current liabilities</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>28,970</td>
<td>22,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated surplus</td>
<td>844,778</td>
<td>850,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset revaluation reserve</td>
<td>2,544,521</td>
<td>2,544,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reserves</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td>54,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total equity</td>
<td>3,443,799</td>
<td>3,449,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report presents to Council a schedule of actions pending for the period to 24 October 2017.

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. Council Action Awaiting report ↓
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Comments/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.08.14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Planning Scheme Amendment C116: Mandatory height controls in Hampton Street Activity Centre &amp; Willis Street Urban Design Framework</td>
<td>DCPCS</td>
<td>Officers are currently in the process of seeking authorisation for Amendment C130. It is Council's confirmed intention to run amendment C116 and C130 for Hampton in parallel. Amendment C116 has been put on hold pending outcome of Amendments C113-C115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11.14</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Home and Community Care (HACC) Service Review</td>
<td>DCPCS</td>
<td>Report to proceed to the June 2018 Council Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.08.15</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Hampton Willis Street Precinct – Traffic Management and Scout Hall Site</td>
<td>DCorp</td>
<td>A report was presented outlining the options for 6A Willis Street. Consideration was deferred to a future time pending the outcome of traffic management in the precinct. A report will be provided to the new Council on the future of the site including use as carpark, open space or sale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.09.15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Strategic Service Review – Family &amp; Childrens Services</td>
<td>DCPCS</td>
<td>Interim Report was presented to 23 August 2016 Council meeting. Resolution stated that ten year improvement plan is to be presented to April 2017 Council meeting. To be undertaken when Early Years Action Plan is developed as part of the Wellbeing for all Ages Abilities Plan in 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.10.15</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Request to purchase land 3 Hansen Street</td>
<td>DCorp</td>
<td>Owner has been advised survey plans need to be finalised to allow Council to provide a sworn valuation. Further work is pending upon the acceptance...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>That Council indicates its intention to sell a portion of the land adjacent to number 3 Hansen Street to the owner of the abutting land and refers the matter to the Director of Corporate Services to negotiate a suitable sale price and conditions and Council to further consider the matter at a future meeting.</td>
<td>of these costs as per the Discontinuance and Sale of Land procedures. The owner has yet to accept the costs so surveying and valuation is yet to occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24/05/16       | **Sandringham Village Streetscape Masterplan**  
3. in the event that the bus route change to Bay Rd, 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. | DCPCS | In the event that the bus route changes in Bay Road, Beach Road, Melrose Street and Station Street and does not proceed and the Village Square feature not be achievable, a revised Master Plan without the Village Square concept will be presented at a future Council meeting for adoption. | |
| 24/05/16       | **Children’s Sensory Garden Investigation**  
That Council:  
1. notes the typical elements of a suburban sensory garden;  
2. proposes the CSIRO site is the preferred location for the establishment of a sensory garden in Bayside;  
3. seeks community feedback regarding the concept of establishing a sensory garden in Bayside to inform future decisions on this matter; and  
4. receives a further report detailing the financial implications associated with the establishment of a sensory garden. | DERI | A further report will be provided to a future Council meeting. | |
| 21/06/16       | **Bayside Public Transport Advocacy Statement**  
That Council:  
2. receives further updates of the Bayside Public Transport Advocacy Statement as part of the annual Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) update report required as part of Council’s resolution for adopting the ITS to seek the endorsement of any new advocacy issues and positions that are evolved. | DERI | Further updates on the Bayside Public Transport Advocacy Statement will be provided to Council for adoption for any new advocacy issues when they arise. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13/09/16        | **Acquisitive Art Prize**  
That Council resolves to review the Acquisitive Art Prize governance, process and criteria for 2018 and beyond in November 2017. | DCPCS    | A report will be presented to Council in November 2017.                         |
| 28/02/17        | **Potential Land Purchase**  
1. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to seek to negotiate the purchase of approximately 0.35 hectare of land at the CSIRO site in Highett for the potential future development of a library and community facilities; and  
2. receives a further report on the outcomes of these negotiations | DCorp    | A further report will be submitted to Council following the negotiations.        |
| 28/02/17        | **Bay Trail Shared Path Public Safety Risks and Outstanding Audit Actions**  
That Council receives a further report following the completion of the community consultation and the phased approach for the implementation of the program. | DERI     | A report will be submitted to Council following the community consultation.      |
| 27/04/17        | **10 Year Kindergarten Improvement Plan – Expanded Scope**  
That Council received a ten year Early Year’s Infrastructure Plan at the 21 November Council Meeting. | DCPCS    | Report to be presented to the November Council Meeting.                         |
| 27/04/17        | **Statutory Planning Service Update – April 2017**  
That Council receives a further report at the November 2017 Council Meeting providing: | DCPCS    | Report to be presented to the November Council Meeting.                         |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27/04/17        | 10.13 **Additional Planning and Amenity Committee Meetings**
|                 | That Council receives a report at the November 2017 meeting cycle to consider options for clarifying and improving the Council Delegations which govern which statutory planning applications must be heard by the Planning and Amenity Committee. | DCS | Report to be presented to the November Council Meeting. |
| 25/7/17         | 10.4 **Sandringham Golf Course Increased Investment and Upgrade Proposal**
|                 | That Council receives a report on the outcomes of the consultation to determine if the proposal should proceed. | DCS | Report to be submitted Council following the consultation. |
| 25/7/17         | 10.6 **Response to petition - Reclaim the historic name ‘Pennydale’ for the neighbourhood bounded by Bay Road, Frankston railway line, Park Road and the residential zone on both sides of Jack Road**
<p>|                 | That Council considers a further report on the matter following the completion of the community consultation process, and to | DCS | A further report will be submitted Council following completion of the community consultation process. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/7/17</td>
<td>further address the strong link with the locality and sense of place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/7/17</td>
<td><strong>Bayside Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025 Annual Progress Report</strong></td>
<td>DERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to the August 2018 Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/8/17</td>
<td><strong>Future Provision of Netball Facilities - Site Assessment Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>DERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted before or at the April 2018 Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/8/17</td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/8/17</td>
<td>4. Receive a report before or at the April 2018 Council meeting on the establishment of a netball centre on the site of the Sandringham Golf Driving Range;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/8/17</td>
<td><strong>Brighton Secondary College Synthetic Hockey facility - Management Committee Financials Update</strong></td>
<td>DERI</td>
<td>A report will be submitted to the July 2018 Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/8/17</td>
<td>That Council receives a further report no later than July 2018 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>22/8/17</td>
<td><strong>Integrated Transport Strategy 2013 - Implementation Progress During 2016/17</strong></td>
<td>DERI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF MEETING</td>
<td>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</td>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>COMMENTS/STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/9/17</td>
<td>10.2 Amendment C151 – Implementation of the Hampton East (Moorabbin) Structure Plan 2016</td>
<td>DCPCS</td>
<td>• A report was presented to the Council Briefing Meeting on 11 October 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A report addressing resolution 2 &amp; 3 will be presented at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 24 October 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Receives a report at the October Ordinary Meeting of Council on the costs, funding options and timing of an additional study on the remainder of the Amendment; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Subject to the above report, undertakes an additional study for Precincts 3, 5 &amp; 6 to address the Panel Recommendations declining Council’s preferred mandatory height in Precinct 5 &amp; 6 and to provide additional rationale for reducing the recommended discretionary height of 6 storeys for Precinct 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/9/17</td>
<td>10.5 Amendment C126 – Small Activity Centres Strategy 2014</td>
<td>DCPCS</td>
<td>• Work is progressing to finalise the material for the Council Briefing report to be presented on 5 December 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Notification of decision was mailed out and emailed to submitters on 2 October 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Considers the submissions to Amendment C126 at a future Council meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A meeting with the Pennydale Action Group is to be organised following the Council Briefing on 5 December 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Receives a briefing on the outcome of the review at its 5 December 2017 Councillor briefing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Writes to submitters and advises of its decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Engages with the Pennydale Action Group to further discuss the implications of Amendment C126 prior to the December meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. **Reports by Delegates**

1. **Association of Bayside Municipalities** – Cr Evans
2. **MAV Environment Committee** – Director Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure
3. **Metropolitan Transport Forum** – Cr Martin
4. **Municipal Association of Victoria** – The Mayor Cr del Porto
5. **Inner South Metropolitan Mayors’ Forum** – The Mayor Cr del Porto
6. **Metropolitan Local Government Waste Forum** – Cr Heffernen

12. **Urgent Business**

13. **Notices of Motion**

   Nil