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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 28 March 2017.

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

### 7.1 PETITION: 3RD OVAL AT ELSTERNWICK PARK NORTH

**Corporate Services - Governance**  
File No: PSF/17/68 – Doc No: DOC/17/77689

Petitions from individuals requesting Bayside City Council to investigate the urgent need of incorporating a 3rd Oval at Elsternwick Park North into the Masterplan to cater for increasing population growth and female participation. (486 signatories)

“Ovals throughout Bayside and Melbourne Metro are reaching peak capacity. This year alone we have an additional 250+ females registered to play AFL in Bayside alone. With limited opportunity to build new ovals in Melbourne metro, we the undersigned hereby petition Bayside City Council to investigate the urgent need of incorporating a 3rd Oval at Elsternwick Park North into the Masterplan to cater for increasing population growth and female participation.

We ask that the investigation:

- Acknowledge the future needs of AFL and Cricket;
- Liaise with key stakeholders such as AFL Vic, VAFA, SMFJL, Auskick, local AFL and cricket clubs, Cricket Victoria, SECA and schools;
- Review the possibility of a shared pavilion with a larger and relocated Oval #2 (currently located on New Street)

Ignoring this request will mean:

- Less access to ovals
- A less active community
- An immediate adverse impact on our overall health and well-being.”

**Petition Requirements**

The submitted petition contains 486 signatories which meets the required format of a petition in accordance with Council’s Governance Local Law No: 1, Clause 65

A further 58 signatories have been submitted but do you meet the requirements of the Local Law.

That the petition be received and be dealt with in conjunction with the development of a detailed masterplan for Elsternwick Park (North) at a future meeting of Council.

**Support Attachments**

Nil
8. Minutes of Advisory Committees

Nil

9. Reports by Special Committees

Nil
Executive summary

Purpose and background

To report on the implications of the recently released Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 and associated material including the revised residential zones and the Plan’s five year implementation plan.

Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 builds on Plan Melbourne 2014 and previous metropolitan planning strategies including Melbourne 2030 and Melbourne @5 Million.

The Plan identifies both long and short term goals to be achieved over the coming decades. Some of the key challenges that metropolitan Melbourne is expected to experience between now and 2050 include:

- population growth from 4.5 to 8 million;
- demand for an additional 1.6 million homes;
- capacity needed to accommodate an estimate 10 million more trips a day on the city’s transport network; and
- an additional 1.5 million jobs in the local economy.

The Plan seeks to place emphasis on protecting the character of the city whilst trying to address the challenges of housing affordability and availability, congestion, access to jobs and services, and climate change to achieve the Plan’s vision to continue to be a global city of opportunity and choice. The Plan provides principles, outcomes, directions and policies and focuses on the area comprising 31 metropolitan municipalities and part of the Mitchell Shire which is located within the urban growth boundary.

Whilst further details about implementation and expectations for councils are yet to be provided by State Government through some identified medium and short term implementation actions, the following sections of this report focuses on implications for Bayside.

A report informing Council of the release of Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 was presented to Council at the 28 March 2017 Ordinary Meeting of Council. This report deals specifically with implications for Bayside as a result of the revised plan.

Key issues

Managing development in residential areas to accommodate the future population growth is a focus of this report. A new set of residential zones that attempt to increase the density of new housing construction while seeking to address neighbourhood character and facilitating the retention of green space, was concurrently released.

The main implication for Bayside resulting from the principles, outcomes, directions and policies outlined in Plan Melbourne, will be the pressure to accommodate the predicted population growth. The key challenge is accommodate the expected growth whilst maintaining the distinctiveness, liveability and sustainability of our suburbs at the same time as ensuring
that services and facilities are provided to a high standard. Changes in Bayside’s demographic profile indicate that by 2031 the +65 demographic group will make up to 25% of its total population, which will result in added pressure to services and facilities used by this demographic group. An increase in one person households is also expected, which will require the provision of housing that respond to this trend.

Specifically for Bayside, based on Council’s population forecast for 2036, the population is expected to grow to 118,650 (13.39%). During that same period the total number of dwellings to accommodate the population in Bayside is expected grow by 16% which equates to a total of 49,564 dwellings.

A key change of the Plan include the realignment of new boundaries for the metropolitan region. The new regions seek to foster partnerships to achieve regional outcomes in areas where common interests and priorities have been previously identified. As a result of this change, Bayside along with Glen Eira, Boroondara and Stonnington are now part of the State Government newly identified Inner South East Planning Region.

A snapshot of the outcomes of the strategy that directly relate to Bayside and implications for our City is provided below:

1. **Melbourne is a productive city that attracts investment, supports innovation and creates jobs**
   
   Melbourne will need 1.5 million new jobs over the next 35 years. Currently, the city has around 2.1 million jobs. The projected employment growth for the Inner South East Region from 2015-31 of which Bayside is part of, is expected to grow to over 60,000 jobs at an average rate of 1.3% p.a.

   Council’s Retail Commercial and Employment Strategy 2016 (RCE) is aligned with these projections and identifies opportunities to facilitate growth and employment generation in all industries identified by Plan Melbourne. Whilst the Bayside Business District (BBD) is not recognised in the Plan as a key investment area, it provides an important role as a provider to the Employment and Innovation Clusters identified in Plan Melbourne and its protection from residential encroachment remains critical.

   The BBD and the Major Activity Centres will continue to provide employment closer to where people live. Diversification of uses in our activity centres is encouraged to provide local employment and support local economies that are aligned with the 20-minute neighbourhood concept outlined in the Plan.

2. **Melbourne provides housing choice in locations close to jobs and services.**

   Melbourne will need an additional 1.6 million new homes over the next 35 years.

   The Plan seeks to accommodate more diverse housing that responds to different household types, lifestyles and needs in close proximity to jobs, transport and services. An aspirational distribution based on achieving a 70/30 split of net dwelling additions (70% to be provided in established areas and 30% to be provided in infill areas) shows the inner south east region, which Bayside along with Glen Eira, Boroondara and Stonnington is part of, as being responsible to accommodate between 110,000 and 125,000 net new dwellings, between 2015-2050.

   Bayside’s Housing Strategy and Strategic Planning Framework define where housing growth is expected to occur. The majority of our Major Activity Centres have adopted structure plans to guide how increased development in this areas should occur. Planning policies provide direction in relation to land use and built from in this areas
and highlight infrastructure improvements and economic development actions to ensure that the centres remain economically viable whilst providing a high level of amenity to our current and future residents. Structure Plans for two of our large neighbourhood activity centres (Hampton East and Martin St) are currently in the final stages of the statutory implementation process and the Small Activity Centres Strategy that covers the remainder of the small activity centres is currently on exhibition. Structure planning processes for Southland and Highett are at the inception stages.

The revised residential zones released by the Minister for Planning at the same time as Plan Melbourne, make changes to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) and General Residential Zone (GRZ). This includes:

**Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ)**
- The mandatory building height limit of 8 metres has been increased to 9 metres with a maximum 2 storey height limit.
- The density restriction of 2 dwellings on a lot has been removed and replaced with a new minimum garden area requirement on lots 400m² or greater, that varies between 25% - 35% depending on the size of the lot.
- Neighbourhood, heritage, environment or landscape character objectives for the area must be contained within the schedule to the zone.

**General Residential Zone (GRZ)**
- The discretionary building height limit of 9 metres is being replaced with a mandatory building height of 11 metres and a maximum 3 storey height limit.

In Bayside some areas within the GRZ already have mandatory requirements by way of Design and Development Overlays of 11 metres (MAC residential areas). Areas in the GRZ with no specified height controls will now have the 11 metres and 3 storey maximum height limit requirement (ie- Southland/Pennydale).

- The new minimum garden area requirement of 25%-35% also applies to the GRZ. This requirement is consistent with the intent of DDO5, Preferred Medium Residential Areas (Highett), which seeks to provide for low scale apartment typology that is located within vegetated garden settings.

3. **Melbourne has an integrated transport system that connects people to jobs and services and goods to market.**

Melbourne’s transport system needs the capacity to cope with an additional 10.4 million trips a day by 2050; in addition to the current 12.5 million trips a day.

For Melbourne to continue to be a globally connected and competitive city with strong and healthy communities and higher social and economic participation, the share of trips by public transport, as well as active transport modes such as walking and cycling, must increase.

That means land use and transport needs to integrate to support and encourage convenient trip options so that more people can meet most of their needs locally and be less reliant on private vehicles.
Improvements to the public transport network affecting Bayside include the rail crossing removals proposed at Park Road and Charman Road in Cheltenham and the completion of the Southland Train Station.

For Bayside, improving local travel options to support the 20 – minute neighbourhoods is consistent with the recommendations of Council’s adopted Integrated Transport Strategy 2013 (ITS). Implementation outcomes of the ITS will ensure all residents regardless of age and ability, can access the local services they need in their community. The ITS is expected to undergo a review in 2017/18.

4. **Melbourne is a distinctive and liveable city with quality environments.**

Heritage will continue to be one of Melbourne’s competitive strengths, contributing to its distinctiveness and liveability and attracting visitors, new residents and investors. Melbourne’s heritage is an important component of Victoria’s tourism industry and benefits the economy.

The revised residential zones include a new requirement for relevant neighbourhood, heritage, environmental or landscape character objectives to be specified in the schedule to the zone.

This change will result in greater certainty in relation to future development that is aligned with the existing or identified future neighbourhood character of an area or precinct.

Specific details as to what will be required to inform this section in the various schedules has not been yet provided.

5. **Inclusive, vibrant and healthy neighbourhoods.**

The concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood has been applied in previous metropolitan strategies. It’s all about enabling people to ‘live locally’ - meeting most of residents everyday needs within a 20-minute walk, cycle or local public transport trip of their home. Those everyday needs include; schools, shops, meeting places, open spaces, cafes, doctors, childcare and access to public transport.

Bayside’s local planning policy framework identifies a network and hierarchy of activity centres that seek to provide everyday needs to our community within a short trip from their place of residence. The RCE Strategy complements this work by ensuring that the economic vision of the centres is maintained.

The 20 minute concept is aligned with council strategies as it seeks to:

- be safe, accessible and well connected for pedestrians and cyclists to optimise active transport
- offer high-quality public realm and open space
- provide services and destinations that support local living
- facilitate access to quality public transport that connects people to jobs and higher-order services
- deliver housing/population at densities that make local services and transport viable
- facilitate thriving local economies.

The Plan goes back to the use of the term Major Activity Centres which the previous Plan Melbourne had referred to as Activity Centres. Whilst the purpose/vision for this
areas remain unchanged revised practice notes and definitions have not been released, to assess any impacts on Bayside’s activity centres hierarchy and intent.

6. **Melbourne is a sustainable and resilient city**

The city’s growth, in combination with climate change, is testing the resilience of Melbourne’s natural and built environment, causing habitat loss and biodiversity decline, higher urban temperatures, reduced rainfall, more frequent and extreme weather events, increased consumption of resources and more waste and pollution.

By 2050, Melbourne will need to be a more sustainable and resilient city that manages its land, biodiversity, water, energy and waste resources in a much more integrated way. To respond to the challenge of climate change and ensure Melbourne becomes more sustainable as it grows, a green economy needs to emerge; built around renewable energy, environmentally sustainable development and resource recovery. Council’s adopted *Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025* sets consistent direction and guidance for environmental planning and decision-making within Bayside.

Planning policy changes to implement the reformed residential zones, the minimum garden area requirement and Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 have taken place through various state planning scheme amendments:

- **VC110 (27 March 2017)**
  Implemented the government’s response to the recommendations of the Managing Residential Development Advisory Committee by amending Clause 72 to introduce a new general term, “garden area” and amending the Neighbourhood Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, Residential Growth Zone, Mixed Use Zone and Township Zone.

- **VC 134 (31 March 2017)**
  The Amendment changes the Victoria Planning Provisions and all planning schemes in Victoria by introducing the new Metropolitan Planning Strategy (*Plan Melbourne 2017-2050*) and making corresponding updates to the State Planning Policy Framework. It also restructures Clause 11, includes policy-neutral updates and administrative changes and introduces new and updated incorporated and reference documents.

Whilst the planning provisions have been amended, there are further implementation actions required to provide certainty about process and expectations from Council. For instance, while the minimum garden area requirement is mandatory, no changes have made to the Building Act to enforce its implementation where developments do not require a planning permit. This may create an anomaly in that the work will comply with the *Building Act* but will be in breach of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

Planning permit applications lodged prior to 28 March 2017 will benefit from transitional provisions. The transitional provisions outline that they are exempt from the mandatory garden area and height requirements. However, it is not clear whether formally amending the existing application via section 50 or Section 57A of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, such as the formal amending of plans, will void these transitional provisions. Clarity needs to be provided in this respect to avoid uncertainty.

It can be concluded that whilst the aspirations from State Government in terms of density and growth may vary to those of Bayside, particularly the density provision in the Neighbourhood residential Zone 3 (NRZ3) the strategic basis for our planning policies are generally aligned with the vision and outcomes outlined in Plan Melbourne.
Recommendation

That Council notes the release of Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 and implications for Bayside as outlined in this report in consideration of future decision making processes relating to land use and development.

Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
While there are no social impacts as a result of this report the directions and outcomes presented in Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 are aimed to result in positive social impacts through more connected and accessible neighbourhoods and a diverse housing stock that is accessible, adaptable and caters for all the needs of our Bayside community.

Natural Environment
While there are no environmental impacts as a result of this report, some of the directions and outcomes presented in Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 will facilitate sustainable design outcomes that will result in reduced resources and energy consumption across Melbourne.

Built Environment
Plan Melbourne is a metropolitan planning strategy that defines the future shape of the city and state over the next 35 years.

Managing development in residential areas to accommodate an expected additional 1.6 million dwellings will continue to be a challenge. Ensuring the provision of social infrastructure and the retention of key neighbourhood character elements will be key in facilitating positive and sustainable outcomes that add to the liveability of Bayside’s suburbs.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The preparation of Plan Melbourne (2014) involved extensive community consultation. This Refresh builds on feedback provided as part of that process. Some of the options for discussion provided in the Melbourne Refresh Discussion Paper were in response to issues raised by local government and industry bodies and highlighted by the media in response to current planning issues. The revised Plan Melbourne was expected to be released at the start of 2016 as highlighted in the Discussion Paper, no communication, or information was released until 11 March 2017, when the final document Plan Melbourne 2017-2050 was announced by the Minister for Planning.

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 of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2016.

Legal
Planning Scheme Amendments VC110 and VC134 have implemented changes to the VPP’s and are now being implemented.

Finance
There are no financial implications to Council as a result of this report.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Policy or strategy implications associated with the information provided in this report will be assessed and presented to Council at the April Council briefing, following a detailed analysis of the implications of the directions and outcomes of the Melbourne Plan 2017-2050 on
Bayside’s Local Planning Policies and its strategic intent. As mentioned in the report, Council’s planning policy framework is generally consistent with the directions of Plan Melbourne.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
To present Council with the submissions received in response to Planning Scheme Amendment C153, which proposes to update the Special Building Overlay (SBO) and remove the Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) from the Bayside Planning Scheme. Amendment C153 was initiated at the request of Melbourne Water to update existing planning controls for land in Bayside that is susceptible to flooding to ensure they reflect more advanced and current flood modelling.

The amendment was publicly exhibited between 14 November 2016 and 16 January 2017. A summary of the exhibition process and consultation and engagement outcomes is provided in the Customer Service and Community Engagement section of this report. Over 10,000 owners and occupiers of affected properties were notified as part of the exhibition process. Throughout the exhibition period, 64 submissions (7 late submissions) were received. In summary:

- 26 submissions supported the amendment in full or part;
- 5 did not disclose a position (raising out of scope or other issues); and
- 33 submissions opposed the amendment in full or part.

Key issues
Summary of Amendment C153:

The current boundaries of the SBO contained in the Bayside Planning Scheme are out of date and were introduced in February 2002. As a result, development may not be incorporating the necessary flood mitigation measures to respond to flood risks or may be unnecessarily incorporating flood mitigation measures.

For properties in the SBO, a planning permit is required to construct or carry out works and to subdivide land. An application must be referred to Melbourne Water under Section 55 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (‘the Act’).

The Planning Scheme SBO maps are used when assessing planning and building permit applications. However, Melbourne Water as the floodplain management authority and referral authority is using updated floodplain boundaries when assessing SBO applications referred to them. The use of varied data sets has created conflicting advice as well as applications not being referred to Melbourne Water when they should be and equally, applications being unnecessarily referred. The planning scheme amendment process is the only mechanism to update the boundaries of the SBO in accordance with the latest flood modelling data prepared by Melbourne Water. The update of the SBO boundaries will ensure that planning referrals are sought when needed and that appropriate conditions are included on planning permits.

The application of the SBO typically results in specific conditions addressing building floor levels to respond to flood risk to ensure flood waters are not obstructed or diverted by development. This has implications for development in areas with a mandatory height limit, as building floor levels may need to be higher.
The amendment also proposes to remove the LSIO from Elsternwick Park and replace it with a Special Building Overlay. The proposed change will provide consistency with the flood overlays across municipal boundaries.

Outcomes of Public Exhibition:

The submissions received in support of the amendment were generally on behalf of properties proposed to be removed from the SBO. The key issues and feedback raised in submissions related to:

- The accuracy of the flood modelling and the approach taken by Melbourne Water in applying the SBO;
- The inadequacy of existing drainage infrastructure and how this contributes to flooding (both Council and Melbourne Water infrastructure);
- Flooding issues are a direct result of or perceived to be a result of infill development in the catchment. As a result, developers should be required to contribute to the cost of new infrastructure;
- Problems with blocked or poorly designed drains relating to specific properties/areas; and
- Negative impacts the SBO has on property values, increased insurance premiums, the ability to develop land and requests for compensation.

A response to the submissions received with maps of affected properties is included at Attachment 1.

The flood model is consistent with the approach Melbourne Water has undertaken in other municipalities when updating the SBO. This is a technical hydrological assessment and the flood model and its assumptions and methodology will be explored further throughout the Planning Panel process.

Council has a comprehensive program of drainage infrastructure works, outlined in the Drainage Upgrade Strategy 2015 and the Bayside Drainage Development Contributions Plan which provide for the key areas Council is targeting for drainage upgrades. Most localised flooding reported through the submission process were as a result of more frequent rain events which are lesser events than the 1 in 100 year event which is the subject of the Amendment C153. Council adopted Amendment C139 in April 2016 to implement the Bayside Drainage Development Contributions Plan and is awaiting a decision from the Minister for Planning. Amendment C139 facilitates contributions from development over the next 20 years toward upgrading the municipal drainage network.

Site specific drainage issues are being assessed by Council's City Assets and Projects Department.

Planning Panels have consistently found that any potential impacts on property values, insurance premiums and requests for compensation should not have any bearing on the application of the SBO.

Pursuant to the Act, a planning authority must consider all submissions and must either:

- Change the amendment in the manner requested by submitters;
- Refer the submissions to an independent Planning Panel; or
- Abandon the amendment.

As many of the submissions raise questions or concerns with Melbourne Water’s technical mapping, no changes are proposed to be made to the amendment documents at this time. Melbourne Water has provided advice to Council that some minor modifications to the proposed SBO boundaries may be suitable. For the purpose of transparency it is recommended that Council requests the Minister for Planning to appoint an independent Planning Panel to consider submissions. Other options considered but not proposed are included at the end of this report.

Pursuant to Section 22(2) of the Act, the Planning Authority may consider a late submission at its discretion. Given that acceptance of a late submission is not automatic, Council must formally agree to accept the seven late submissions under the Act. The seven late submissions received should be accepted.

The Planning Panel will consider submissions, receive presentations from submitters and then provide recommendations to Council and the Minister for Planning on any changes to be made to the amendment. Changes recommended to the amendment documents to address submissions will be presented, discussed and tested through the Panel process.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Accepts the late submissions to Amendment C153 in accordance with Section 22(2) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987;

2. Requests the Minister for Planning appoint an independent Planning Panel to consider the submissions received for Amendment C153 in accordance with Section 23(1)(b) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 as per option 1 addressed on this report; and

3. Writes to all submitters and advises them accordingly.

**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Amendment C153 – Response to Submissions (separately enclosed)
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The amendment will minimise risk to life and property and potential property damage from flooding by requiring a permit for buildings and works in the areas identified as liable to inundation by overland flows due to the capacity constraints of the urban drainage system. The updated SBO control will assist in minimising the personal, social, community and financial losses that result from flooding. The amendment also provides greater awareness and transparency of flood risks and impacts.

Natural Environment
The amendment will minimise the potential detrimental effects of overland flooding by ensuring drainage impacts are assessed at an early stage of the planning approval process. This will reduce the impact of new buildings and works on the free flow and temporary storage of floodwaters.

Built Environment
The updated SBO control will support prevention of inappropriate development from occurring in the areas identified as liable to inundation by overland flows that could reduce the capacity of the floodplain to store and convey floodwater, or divert floodwater to other land not normally inundated by floodwater. The amendment minimises potential property damage by overland flooding by requiring a permit for buildings and works in the areas identified as subject to inundation.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Public exhibition of Amendment C153 was undertaken from 14 November 2016 to 16 January 2017. The exhibition included:

- Notice of the preparation of an Amendment published in the Bayside Leader and Government Gazette;

- Weekly advertisements in the Bayside Leader between 15 November and 13 December;

- Over 10,250 letters were sent directly addressed to all owners and occupiers affected by the SBO and LSIO, including those added to the overlay, removed from the overlay and those remaining within the overlay. A map was included with each letter which showed whether the extent of the SBO on the property was being increased, reduced or not changed;

- Three drop-in sessions were held in November 2016 to enable residents and interested parties to view and discuss the proposed changes, with Council and Melbourne Water staff available at each;

- An interactive map on Council’s website which enabled users to enter an address and see how the amendment affected that property;

- Letters to the prescribed Ministers required under the Planning and Environment Act 1987, referral authorities and adjoining municipalities.
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 exhibition process that has been undertaken complies with the provisions of Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 and the prescribed consultation process of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

Legal
Pursuant to the Planning and Environment Act 1987, Council must consider all submissions made during the exhibition period. In considering submissions which request a change to the amendment, Council must either change the amendment in the manner requested; refer the submissions to a Panel; or abandon the amendment. There are no legal implications from referring the submissions received to a Planning Panel.

Finance
Melbourne Water will bear all costs associated with the Planning Panel hearing. Melbourne Water has reimbursed Council for the costs associated with the consultation process including the development of the interactive map, printing of letters and brochures and associated postage. Council officer time will be required to administer the amendment and Panel Hearing which can be accommodated within Council’s 2016/17 Budget.

Links to Council policy and strategy
Undertaking an amendment to update the SBO boundaries in the Bayside Planning Scheme is consistent with the following Council Plan 2013-2017 strategy:

- Strategy 3.1.1: Develop planning strategies and policies within our community that enhance Bayside’s liveability along with its natural and built environment.

Updating the SBO boundaries will ensure that drainage issues are accurately identified at an early stage in the development process through the Bayside Planning Scheme.
**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 C153.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Will provide the opportunity for the proponent and submitters to have their issues and concerns considered by an independent body. Will enable 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 inquire into all aspects of the Amendment and submissions and will give expert advice to Council regarding the amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>None. Melbourne Water have agreed to cover the costs associated with the Planning Panel hearing.</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 submissions referred to a Panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Due to the range of issues raised in the submissions and the proponent of the amendment not likely to withdraw its application, a mutually acceptable outcome is unlikely to be achieved. It is highly likely that a Planning Panel will still be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Abandon Amendment C153.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>There are no obvious benefits to this option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>An outdated and inaccurate SBO (flood) control will remain in place. There will be a reduced awareness of flood risk, with over 700 new properties that are subject to flooding not being identified as such in the Planning Scheme. There will be an increase in flood impacts overtime as future development of these properties will not be designed to address flood risk. Council will not have fulfilled its obligation as planning authority to keep the Planning Scheme up to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3 STRENGTHENING DISCRETIONARY HEIGHT CONTROLS IN ACTIVITY CENTRES

City Planning & Community Services - City Planning & Community Services
File No: PSF/17/2951 – Doc No: DOC/17/70610

Executive summary

Purpose and background
To advise Council of the decision made by the Minister for Planning in relation to Planning Scheme Amendments C113, C114 and C115 proposing to introduce mandatory height controls in the commercial areas of activity centres and report on progress made in pursuing alternative means of strengthening discretionary height controls within activity centres.

Background
Council has advocated for many years to obtain mandatory height controls within the commercial precincts of its activity centres. Following many years of negotiation, and extended periods without controls, the Minister for Planning in 2013 approved permanent discretionary controls for the four Major Activity Centres (MACs) of Bay and Church Streets, Brighton, Hampton and Sandringham.

In 2012/13 Council commenced a process to obtain permanent mandatory height controls for the MAC commercial precincts, reflecting the same heights as discretionary controls. Council in 2014 proceeded with planning scheme amendment proposals for the Church Street (C115), Bay Street (C114) and Sandringham (C113) MACs. Hampton (C116) did not proceed as the Minister of the day refused authorisation because Council’s previous, but recent, request for 6 storey mandatory controls in the Hampton Willis Street precinct had already been denied by the Minister.

Amendments C113 – C115 were presented to a Planning Panel in 2015 which recommended against supporting the approval of these amendments, citing that there to be insufficient strategic basis to justify the application of mandatory height controls within the commercial areas of the activity centres. The Panel was of the view “that the Victoria Planning Provisions (VPPs) continue to be performance based and that there is a role for mandatory provisions in exceptional circumstances where justified and necessary,… preferred maximum heights are not to be exceeded unless the proposal provides an exemplary response to the site, its context, design objectives and other policy in the planning scheme.”

Council adopted the Amendments in October 2015 and submitted them to the Minister for Planning for approval in February 2016. The Minister wrote to the Mayor in March 2017 advising that he has decided not to approve the three amendments, supporting the recommendation of the Planning Panel. These amendments will now lapse. A copy of the Minister’s letter is attached to this report.

Despite the Panel suggesting discretionary heights should not be exceeded except for exemplary proposals, Council is increasingly presented with proposals in activity centres that seek to exceed discretionary controls of varying degrees. In addition, the response of the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) to such proposals and the role of discretionary controls can be variable. The recent proposal for the corner of Hampton and Holyrood Streets sought approval for a multi-storey building double the height of the...
discretionary height control (8 storeys within a 4 storey precinct, one hundred per cent greater).

Understandably, the community is dissatisfied by the growing disregard shown by some applicants towards discretionary height controls, of which the community and Council have invested significant time and resources through structure planning and planning scheme amendment processes to establish. This is a growing trend across Melbourne and puts community confidence in the Planning System at risk, lacking the certainty of built form outcomes in activity centres the community expects. Experience has shown, reinforced by the Minister’s recent decision, that it is extremely difficult to secure mandatory height controls in commercial areas from successive governments.

Key issues

- Council wrote to the Minister for Planning in February seeking an urgent meeting to address growing concerns with the manner in which discretionary height controls are being exploited. Cognisant that Council was awaiting a response for its requested mandatory height controls, an alternative approach was taken seeking a partnership approach in working with the Minister to identify and pilot improvements to how discretionary controls are implemented in the planning system.

- The Minister resolved not to support Council’s Amendments C113 – C115, advising however of a pilot project initiated at his direction between the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) and the City of Moonee Valley to review the role of height controls within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre. The Minister is seeking to apply the lessons learnt from this pilot to other activity centres across Melbourne and encouraged Bayside to engage in this project.

- In March this year, the Minister for Planning released Plan Melbourne 2017-2050, the Victorian Government’s new metropolitan strategy. The revised plan includes a specific policy (2.1.4) to ‘Provide certainty about the scale of growth in the suburbs’ which acknowledges that local government and communities require greater confidence that built form objectives will be adhered to and proposes, in areas of change such as activity centres, to strengthen requirements to ensure adherence to discretionary height controls.

- Council wrote to the Minister’s office in March, putting forward a package of interventions with the purpose of strengthening the role and function of discretionary height controls within the planning system, including a number of inter-related elements to strengthen discretionary height controls, such as:
  - A percentage maximum height limit, in which discretionary controls can only be exceeded by a set percentage and height beyond that is prohibited;
  - Strengthening of criteria/test that must be addressed by applications seeking to exceed a preferred (discretionary) height control;
  - Clarification of State Policy as it relates to ‘Strategic Redevelopment Sites’;
  - Improvements to Application Requirements and Decision Guidelines within the Planning Scheme; and
  - A value capture mechanism for additional height above the preferred height control, with a requirement for applicants to make financial contributions towards additional open space, streetscape improvements, public art or setting aside floor space for community uses, social housing or office space, with similar provisions in place at the City of Melbourne.

Pilot Program
Senior Council officers met with the Minister’s advisor and senior DELWP officials in March to advocate for greater strengthening of discretionary controls, to present the package of interventions and seek support for a pilot program.

DELWP has offered Bayside the opportunity to nominate to be part of a further pilot program, similar to that being conducted with the City of Moonee Valley for Moonee Ponds. Possibly between 2 to 4 additional councils may participate in a pilot program.

A pilot program would involve, in partnership with DELWP, a review of existing strategic planning work and its integrity, development feasibility and capacity, infrastructure requirements and current height and built form controls; leading to the development of planning provisions to better manage proposals that seek to exceed discretionary heights.

Conclusion

Considering the Minister has again reinforced that he is not prepared to apply mandatory height controls in the commercial areas of the activity centres, an alternative approach is warranted. Participation in the DELWP pilot program provides Council with a feasible opportunity to strengthen discretionary height controls within activity centres. As a limited number of candidate councils will be selected for participation, it is appropriate that Council put forward a nomination to DELWP seeking selection.

With the Hampton Activity Centre being Bayside’s largest, in addition to it experiencing greater development activity with a number of proposals seeking to exceed the discretionary controls, it is recommended that Council put forward Hampton as the candidate activity centre for the pilot.

To elevate Council’s nomination with the Department, and to address current capacity constraints, it is recommended that Council fund a temporary project manager to facilitate its participation in the pilot program, if selected.

Without confirmation of participation in the pilot program, or knowing the potential duration of such a pilot, Council should submit an application to the Minister for Planning seeking interim mandatory height controls for the commercial areas of the Hampton Activity Centre. This is an appropriate request when coupled with the pilot, considering the nature of multi-storey building proposals Council is currently receiving. Council can request the Minister, pursuant to Section 20(4) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, to exchange the current preferred (discretionary) height controls with mandatory controls for a period of up to 9 months.

Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the Minister’s decision not to approve Amendments C113, C114 and C115, which will now lapse;

2. Nominates the Hampton Activity Centre with the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to form part of an activity centre height control pilot program; and

3. Writes to the Minister for Planning pursuant to Section 20(4) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 seeking the Minister prepare and approve an amendment to the Bayside Planning Scheme to introduce interim mandatory height controls to all commercial zoned land within a discretionary height control precinct within the Hampton Activity Centre for a minimum period of nine (9) months.
Support Attachments

1. Letter from the Minister for Planning, Hon Richard Wynne MP to the Mayor - Bayside Planning Scheme Amendments C113, C114, C115 - Sandringham Village, Bay Street And Church Street Activity Centres ↓
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Council and the community have together invested significant time and resources through structure planning and planning scheme amendment processes to establish height controls for activity centres. If mandatory height controls are not a long term option for activity centres, strengthening preferred (discretionary) height controls will contribute to restoring community confidence in the planning system.

Natural Environment
Not applicable to this report.

Built Environment
Council and the community have together invested significant time and resources to establish built form objectives and controls activity centres, designed to enable sufficient development capacity while achieving an appropriate urban design response in consideration of the local activity centre context.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Council is receiving an increasing volume of contacts and correspondence from the community voicing concerns about the exploitation of discretionary height controls in activity centres. While many community members have suggested Council again pursue mandatory height controls, experience has demonstrated limited success in achieving their application from the Minister for Planning.

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

Legal
The Planning and Environment Act 1987 (the Act) is state legislation which provides the legal framework for Victoria’s Planning System. The Bayside Planning Scheme is a statutory document, subordinate to the Act, which regulates the use and development of land through planning provisions across Bayside. The process to change the Planning Scheme is prescribed by the Act.

It is important to note that the Minister for Planning is the final decision maker for a change to a Planning Scheme. While Council and the community may wish to introduce mandatory height controls, any proposal to do so requires the approval of the Minister pursuant to the Act.

Finance
Funds have not been allocated in the current financial year 2016/17 budget, or as part of the 2017/18 draft budget to participate in a pilot program, of which Council has only become recently aware. If Bayside was selected to participate, the resource required is for a temporary project manager to facilitate the pilot with the DELWP, as existing resources are
allocated to Council’s other strategic planning priorities. If Council is selected, a senior part
time resource would be required, for up to a 6 month period, estimated at a cost of $50,000.
Further, resources have also not been allocated to request interim mandatory height controls
for the commercial areas of the Hampton Activity Centre, however capacity can be made to
prepare a request.

Links to Council policy and strategy


This report seeks to implement the following Strategic Objectives and Strategies of the
Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 3.1: Protecting and enhancing amenity, liveability and neighbourhood
class.)

Strategy 3.1.1: Developing planning strategies and policies with our community that enhance
Bayside’s liveability along with its natural and built environment.

Strategy 3.1.2: Engaging with our community to ensure we develop appropriate planning
controls for Bayside.

Strategy 3.1.3: Advocating Council’s planning and urban design objectives.

Council and the community have invested significant time and resources in establishing built
form controls for its activity centres, to ensure growth and development is responsive to
Council’s urban design objectives. While securing mandatory controls may not be an option,
participation within a pilot program, investigating alternate means of strengthening
discretionary controls directly contributes to the achievement of the Council Plan strategies.

Bayside Housing Strategy 2012

The Bayside Housing Strategy 2012 sets out Council’s plans for how growth and residential
development will be accommodated and managed across Bayside. The Housing Strategy
recommends that Structure Plans are developed for designated growth areas across
Bayside, which generally include the commercial areas of activity centres, so that the height
and scale of new development can be effectively managed.
### Options considered

#### Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Seek to participate in a pilot program with the State Government with the aim of strengthening discretionary height controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>A feasible and constructive opportunity to strengthen height controls are applied in activity centres, with potential to apply outcome to other centres. There is Ministerial support for the pilot program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Council may not be selected to participate. Current resource capacity means there will be a cost to participate. Amount of time taken to arrive at an outcome (can request interim controls).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Request permanent mandatory height controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Would demonstrate immediate action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>The Minister has recently advised Council that he is not prepared to support its pervious Amendment requests (C113 – C115) to apply mandatory height controls in the commercial areas of activity centres. It is highly unlikely the Minister’s position will change. An independent planning panel has already considered Amendments C113 – C115 and is of the view there is insufficient strategic justification to support a request for mandatory height controls. Despite the likes of the 427 Hampton Street being lodged, little has changed to further justify mandatory controls. Pursuing this option again, which has a low likelihood of success, would be a poor use of resources for Council, which have not been allocated to undertake such work. It would also consume the time and energy of the community and property owners participating in a process that is likely to lead to a disappointing outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hon Richard Wynne MP
Minister for Planning

Cr Alex del Porto
Mayor
Bayside City Council
76 Royal Avenue
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191

Dear Mayor

BAYSIDE PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENTS C113, C114, C115 - SANDRINGHAM VILLAGE, BAY STREET AND CHURCH STREET ACTIVITY CENTRES

I refer to Amendments C113, C114 and C115 to the Bayside Planning Scheme, which were submitted for approval under section 31 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 affecting land within the Sandringham Village, Bay Street and Church Street Activity Centres and propose to change existing preferred height controls to mandatory height controls. Amendment C113 also seeks to remove the E2 precinct from the Sandringham Village precinct.

I have decided not to approve the amendments. In forming this decision I had regard to the report of Planning Panels Victoria, which found that the amendments lack strategic justification.

Please note that I have recently directed the Department of Environment, Water and Planning (DELWP) to start work on a pilot project with the City of Moonee Valley to review the role of mandatory and discretionary height controls in the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre. Following this process, I will consider how the lessons learnt from the pilot project can be applied to other activity centres across metropolitan Melbourne. I encourage Bayside City Council to engage with DELWP officers on this project in the coming months.

Amendments C113, C114 and C115 will lapse when notice of my refusal to approve the amendments is published in the Victoria Government Gazette.

If you have any further queries in relation to this matter please contact Alison Glynn, Director State Planning Services of DELWP, on (03) 8392 5511.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

HON RICHARD WYNNE MP
Minister for Planning

10/3/17
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this paper is to present the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 and outcomes of community consultation.

The Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 (BCMP) identifies eleven foreshore precincts. Since adoption of the BCMP Council has adopted two foreshore masterplans, has two in draft for Council consideration and has commenced a fifth masterplan. The Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 (Attachment 1) covers the foreshore from Brighton Beach (south of Green Point) to Hampton Beach (Linacre Road) and includes Ferdinando Gardens.

This precinct is classified in the Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 (BOSS) as Regional Open Space. This area is highly valued by the community as it is serviced directly by the Bay Trail and is popular for swimming because of the wide sandy Brighton and Hampton Beaches. Hampton Life Saving Club and Ferdinando Gardens are located at the southern end of this precinct. The distinctive sculpture ‘The Swimmer’ by Jeffrey Wilkinson is also located within this precinct. Council is Committee of Management for this area of Crown Land. This precinct is highly utilised for a range of active and passive recreational pursuits by local residents and visitors.

The Masterplan will inform Council’s future capital works program, funding applications and priorities for infrastructure renewal, replacement and redevelopment over the next decade. The Masterplan will also be a key tool to assist Council and other stakeholders in obtaining required Coastal Management Act Consent from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) for implementation of projects within the precinct.

Key issues

The Masterplan has a focus on ensuring the community can continue to enjoy this area of foreshore as it comes under increased pressure through population growth. Access, safety, convenience, recreation and environmental issues are addressed in the Masterplan.

Access

As a regional foreshore area, this precinct is highly utilised for a range of active and passive recreational pursuits by local residents and visitors.

The existing sea wall and associated foreshore promenade that extends for over 1.2 kilometres from Green Point to Ferdinando Gardens terminates at the southern end in a short set of bluestone stairs. At high tide, there is restricted beach access through to the Linacre Road stairs and Sandringham Harbour. Recent construction of timber stairs has improved access to Linacre Road, however the informal track along the toe of the steep bank is unstable, subject to ongoing erosion and is not a sustainable outcome in the longer term.
The Department of Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP) in conjunction with Council have been undertaking a consultation process with the community, regarding renourishment of the section of beach adjacent to HLSC. The Masterplan proposes ongoing liaison with DELWP during these works to formalise high tide path access from the end of the existing sea wall promenade through to the Linacre Road stairs and Sandringham Harbour. Further detail of this proposal can be found on page 14 of the Masterplan (Detail Plan D).

**Recreational Amenity**

The Masterplan initially proposed an extensive upgrade for the area on the promenade immediately below Ferdinando Gardens, known as the ‘Octopus Garden’. Established in 1998 as part of the beach renourishment works, it is now a limited facility that does not adequately reflect the needs of current users.

The Masterplan originally included a salt water play area, upgrade of rubber soft fall, picnic facilities and planting. There was concern from the community during consultation regarding both the cost and the availability of parking to cater for the use of this proposed facility. Following community feedback, the salt water play area was reassessed and has now been scaled back to a smaller play/picnic area with new seating and low level indigenous planting. Further detail of this proposal can be found on page 13 of the Masterplan (Detail Plan C).

The foreshore between Green Point and Ferdinando Gardens has little natural shade and provides limited relief to beach goers during summer. The Masterplan proposes installation of two new shade structures, one adjacent to HLSC and one towards the end of South Road. These were generally supported by the community during consultation.

The provision of way finding signage, particularly adjacent to Brighton Beach railway station is also recommended in the Masterplan, especially given the proximity of the Dendy Street Beach bathing boxes (a popular tourist attraction). This was raised as an issue by many local residents during consultation, who acknowledged the difficulty visitors to this area have in locating their bearings if arriving to the beach by train.

Council plans to undertake a precinct study of Brighton Beach Railway station and shopping centre precinct in 2017/18. The study will recommend improvements to its function, attractiveness, economic viability and connection with the foreshore. An important component of this will be to provide an attractive and legible wayfinding system to enable tourists to find the foreshore and the Brighton Bathing Boxes.

**Bay Trail**

The Bayside Bay Trail Safety Audit 2010 identified, recorded and prioritised existing and potential safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. A range of hazards that presented a public safety, legal, financial and reputational risk to Council were identified as part of this process. These related to sight distance, path alignment, adjacent path clearance and path width.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 28 February 2017 Council resolved (in part):

1. notes that the remaining high risk safety hazards along the Bay Trail present a public safety, legal, financial and reputational risk to Council if left unresolved;

2. undertakes community engagement activities associated with addressing each of the ‘high risk’ safety hazards identified in the Bay Trail Safety Audit, as outlined in the report.

The report presented to Council prioritised each of the remaining high risk safety hazards on the Bay Trail.
Although the Bay Trail adjacent to the Beach Road/South Road intersection was not identified in the top ten risk sites of this audit, an assessment of the Bay Trail during development of the Masterplan, and feedback from the community, did identify this site as a potential risk area due to the high volume of bicycle traffic and pedestrians and local topography. The Masterplan notes that there is significant congestion between pedestrians accessing the beach and cyclists using the Bay Trail, exacerbated by the fact that the Bay Trail in this area traverses up and down a slope, meaning cyclists are at speed at the point where pedestrians are entering the Bay Trail from the beach.

In response, the Masterplan proposes realigning a section of the Bay Trail closer to the edge of Beach Road and restricting through access for cyclists to the ramp. It is recommended that this proposal (see Detail Plan A on page 11 of the Masterplan) be further canvassed with the community during the upcoming Have Your Say process for the Bay Trail, noting that other areas are a higher priority for Council action.

Another safety issue identified as part of this process was the location of the existing gardeners shed at Ferdinando Gardens. In particular its door which opens directly onto the Bay Trail. The shed is no longer used by Council and can be permanently closed to reduce the risk to cyclists. The reduction of vegetation height and some clearance of vegetation to either side of the shed is also recommended to maintain clear sightlines as per the BJ Ferdinando Gardens Heritage Conservation Plan 2013.

**Proposed Public Toilet Facility opposite New Street**

Public toilet facilities are located at the end of South Road and on the ground and upper floor of the Hampton Life Saving Club. The toilets are approximately one kilometre apart, fully accessible and are in good condition.

Assessment completed as part of the Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012 recommended the establishment of an additional public toilet facility on the foreshore in the vicinity of New Street. Further assessment and consultation with the community during the development of the Masterplan concluded that there is limited parking in the vicinity of New Street. There was no support for a new facility with the majority of feedback comfortable with the provision of current public toilet facilities. As a result, it is recommended that this action in the Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012 is updated and removed.

**Hampton Life Saving Club**

Hampton Life Saving Club (HLSC) was established in 1909 and currently has over 900 members. The clubhouse was rebuilt in 1998 as part of a $3 million beach renourishment project funded by the Victorian State Government. Discussions with HLSC during consultation indicated that membership is increasing and it would like to upgrade or extend its facility.

The Masterplan identifies an area of hard stand (currently an existing asphalt driveway) immediately behind HLSC that could be used to accommodate additional storage and facilities. The Masterplan identifies a possible option to increase building capacity by expanding the ground floor storage and replacing the existing roof without increasing hard surfaces or impacting views from Beach Road or Hampton Beach. This proposal will require investigation and funding by HLSC and Life Saving Victoria. Continuation of the coastal path would be maintained via an unsealed walking path between HLSC and the Shared Trail.

The Masterplan also identifies an opportunity to expand equipment storage on beach days (Nippers events and patrolled beach days) on the beach side of the seawall. This would reduce congestion and improve safety immediately in front of the HLSC building. Durable fibre reinforced mesh is recommended for installation on the sand area with the inclusion of...
two new on-beach showers. The existing beach shower is proposed to be changed to an accessible drinking fountain and access to the existing public toilets retained.

A detailed plan of these proposals for HLSC can be found on page 12 of the Masterplan (Detail Plan B).

Stormwater Harvesting

The Masterplan identifies various opportunities for stormwater harvesting throughout the precinct. The previously established ephemeral wetlands opposite Orlando Street is proposed to be revitalised by the reconfiguration of stormwater flows into these soaks to improve water quality treatment prior to discharge into the Bay.

There is also an opportunity to liaise with Melbourne Water to investigate options to mitigate flooding and to establish a Gross Pollutant Trap (GPT) and stormwater harvesting system for the New Street drain outfall. Works could include installation of a large underground storage tank in the open grassed area between New Street and Mair Street to improve sustainability of irrigation at Brighton Beach Oval.

Foreshore Vehicle Access and Parking

Beach Road is managed by VicRoads and is the primary parking area for visitors to Hampton Beach as is the case at Black Rock Life Saving Club. There is no off street parking at Hampton Life Saving Club (HLSC) or Ferdinando Gardens, although the HLSC has a key to a gate on the foreshore for access to the clubrooms. Parking on the lawns in Ferdinando Gardens by club members is an ongoing issue as it damages the grass in the area. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Beach Road outside Clearway and No Stopping periods.

As part of the Masterplan development, the opportunity for indented parking along Beach Road was assessed as recommended in the Beach Road Corridor Strategy – Metropolitan Route 33 Elwood to Mordialloc 2011.

This strategy identified that parking on Beach Road restricts traffic flow during peak periods creating pinch points and reduces safety for cyclists using Beach Road at these times. Four options were assessed during development of the Masterplan and canvassed with the community during consultation:

Option 1. Maintain status quo.
Option 2. Indented parking on the residential side between New Street and Small Street.
Option 3. Indented parking on the foreshore side without relocation of the Bay Trail.
Option 4. Indented parking on the foreshore side increasing capacity by relocating the Bay Trail where possible but without removal of trees or native vegetation.

This issue received the most feedback during consultation. There was overwhelming support for ‘Option 1. Maintain status quo’ and this has been reflected in the Masterplan. Although some residents advocated to increase the Clearway area, the majority of residents supported maintaining existing arrangements. Further details of the options investigated are on page 22 of the Masterplan (Beach Road Indented Parking Options).

The Masterplan also recommends installing bollards along the coast walking path and perimeter of the lawn area adjacent to the lifesaving club to prevent cars parking on the lawn. A removable bollard is proposed on the path for maintenance access and the gate retained with keys for club use.

A detailed plan of these proposals can be found on page 12 of the Masterplan (Detail Plan B).
To improve parking for those with limited mobility the provision of two designated accessible parking bays in the B5 South Road Foreshore car park is recommended (see Detail Plan A on page 11 of the Masterplan).

**Recommendation**

That Council;

1. notes the outcomes of the community consultation regarding the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan;

2. adopts the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan; and

3. Notes that this item in the Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012 has been assessed and is no longer required.

**Support Attachments**

1. Attachment 1 - Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan (separately enclosed)

2. Attachment 2 - Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan Consultation Report (separately enclosed)

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**

This precinct is within walking distance from Brighton Beach and Hampton train stations, and easily accessed by visitors. The Masterplan makes recommendations to improve recreational facilities with an upgrade to the Octopus Garden precinct and also via provision of two shade structures along the promenade. Provision of accessible parking, improvements to wayfinding signage and beach access to Sandringham Harbour will also enable pedestrians to move through this precinct more easily.

**Natural Environment**

Following successful renourishment of Hampton Beach in 1988, extensive landscaping (including the establishment of ephemeral wetlands) was undertaken on the coastal slopes and foreshore above the promenade. The Masterplan makes recommendations to improve indigenous vegetation throughout the precinct. Recommendations to improve stormwater quality from the surrounding catchment prior to it entering the Bay include improvements to the existing wetlands and a proposed new GPT and stormwater harvesting system. Implementation of a GPT and storm water harvesting will require liaison with Melbourne Water as the asset owner of this drainage infrastructure.
Built Environment

Opportunities to improve safety on the Bay Trail will offer pedestrians and cyclists safer access through this precinct. The formalisation of a high tide access path to be developed in conjunction with DELWP as part of planned beach renourishment works will also create improved access for pedestrians from the Linacre Road stairs to Sandringham Harbour.

The identified space for possible extension of Hampton Life Saving Club enables increased capacity for the club without encroaching into vegetated areas or impacting on views from either Beach Road or Hampton Beach.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

Community consultation throughout the development of the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 included meeting with the following key stakeholders as well as local residents and the wider community:

- Hampton Life Saving Club committee
- Life Saving Victoria
- Friends of Native Wildlife

Three drop in sessions were held at various locations; Sandringham Football Club function centre, Hampton Life Saving Club and a consultation booth at Sandringham Village. Council staff and consultants were available to speak to interested people at each session.

The Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan was available on Council’s ‘Have your Say’ online portal from 18 August to 11 September 2016. A large banner was also installed along the Bay Trail adjacent to Beach Road and smaller signs were installed at key entry points to the foreshore throughout this precinct. Hard copies of the Masterplan (coloured A3) were available for interested people to view at all Council libraries and at the Bayside City Council Corporate Centre.

Throughout the consultation period, other onsite meetings, telephone conversations and email clarifications were undertaken by Council officers to address specific issues or opportunities raised during this time.

A full copy of the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan Community Consultation Report is at Attachment 2.

The consultation activities were successful in extracting the views of the community so that the Masterplan reflects the desired community outcomes.

Human Rights

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

Legal

There are no legal implications associated with the recommendations in this report.

Finance

The proposed opportunities identified in the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 will renew, upgrade or improve existing facilities and assets to improve their usability and performance for the community.
Of this total, $810,000 is identified to be funded by others (DELWP, VicRoads, Melbourne Water, Hampton LSC and Lifesaving Victoria) and a total of $2,608,920 is proposed to be funded by Council over a number of years.

An Implementation Schedule Summary of proposed works and priorities for the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 over a ten year period is shown below. A detailed Implementation Schedule can be found on page 16 of the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017.

The estimated costs associated with the Masterplan proposals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY AREA</th>
<th>PRIORITIES</th>
<th>TOTAL BCC</th>
<th>TOTAL OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Beach</td>
<td>$261,500</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Beach</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$187,500</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Life Saving Club</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinando Gardens</td>
<td>$70,400</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linacre Road to Ferdinando Gardens</td>
<td>$286,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Works</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL WORKS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$761,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$987,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,028,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCIES (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BRIGHTON BEACH - FERDINANDO GARDENS MASTER PLAN - CAPITAL IMPLEMENTATION WORKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Links to Council policy and strategy**

The Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 addresses the following areas of the Council Plan:

Goal 1 – an engaged community and Council, Strategic Objective 1.1. Ensuring decisions are informed by community input and clearly communicate what we decided and why.

The Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 classifies this precinct to be of municipal and regional importance in Bayside. It caters for Bayside residents, tourists and others from outside the City. Municipal and regional spaces in Bayside are intended to cater for a diverse range of interests and often have a wide catchment because of the unique features they offer. As such, community engagement has been vital in planning the Masterplan for this precinct.

The Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 included extensive consultation with the Bayside community and has informed the development of the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017. The BCMP 2014 provides the strategic direction for actions and works contained within the Masterplan.

Other relevant Council policy includes the Beach Road Corridor Strategy – Metropolitan Route 33 Elwood to Mordialloc 2011, the Bayside Recreation ‘Active by the Bay’ 2013-2022, and the Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012.
Options considered
This report provides the outcomes of consultation on the Brighton Beach to Ferdinando Gardens Masterplan 2017 and presents the final Masterplan for adoption. No options are presented for consideration.
10.5 SANDRINGHAM BEACH AND GARDENS FORESHORE MASTERPLAN

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure - Open Space, Recreation & Wellbeing
File No: PSF/17/65 – Doc No: DOC/17/67820

Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this paper is to present the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 and outcomes of community consultation to Council.

The Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 (BCMP) identifies eleven foreshore precincts. Since adoption of the BCMP, Council has adopted two foreshore masterplans, has two in draft for Council consideration and has commenced a fifth masterplan. The Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 (Attachment 1) covers the foreshore from Abbott Street to Eliza Street in Sandringham and includes Sandringham Gardens. Council is Committee of Management for this area of Crown Land.

This precinct is classified as Regional Open Space in the Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 (BOSS). This area is highly valued by the community as Sandringham beach is a wide stable beach that is popular for swimming with Sandringham Life Saving Club located at the northern end of Sandringham Gardens. The precinct is popular for dog walking and picnicking and is highly utilised for a range of active and passive recreational pursuits.

The Masterplan will inform Council’s future capital works program, funding applications and priorities for infrastructure renewal, replacement and redevelopment over the next decade. The Masterplan will also be a key tool to assist Council and other stakeholders in obtaining required Coastal Management Act Consent from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) for implementation of projects within the precinct.

Key issues

The Masterplan has a focus on ensuring the community can continue to enjoy this area of foreshore as it comes under increased pressure through population growth. Access, safety, convenience, recreation and environmental issues are addressed in the Masterplan.

Access

Due to the steep topography of this section of coastline, the area is serviced by a range of access ramps and stairs. The potential for upgrade and/or replacement of these existing structures is constrained by the steep topography, unstable and highly erodible soils and the need to minimise impact on environmental and cultural valuable spaces. The majority of these access points, while safe, do not meet contemporary standards for access and mobility. The Masterplan proposes to install signage at each beach access point indicating ramp grade/condition with directions to preferred access points as staged upgrades are completed. New handrails and rest points on existing ramps are proposed to mitigate some of these issues at various access points.

The Masterplan recommends relocating the Bay Road timber stairs that lead from the gardens to the foreshore promenade. The use of treated pine in this visually prominent location clashes with the predominant stone and concrete masonry character of the gardens. The aging timber stairs will require complete replacement within five years. Subject to further geotechnical investigation, the new staircase is proposed to be set back into the bank to minimise visual impact and be designed to match the existing character of the gardens.
The former stair site will be revegetated with low growing indigenous coastal vegetation. A detailed drawing of this proposal can be found on page 16 of the Masterplan (Bay Road Stairs Replacement Detail Plan).

**Sandringham Gardens Playground Upgrade**

The Sandringham Gardens Playground is classified as a district playground, catering for both visitors and locals. It is a medium size play space supported by picnic, shelter, shade and toilet facilities. This popular foreshore playground area will be upgraded as part of the Bayside Playground Improvement Plan and these works are scheduled for 2020/21.

**Bay Trail and proposed removal of electrical substation from Sandringham Gardens**

The Bayside Bay Trail Safety Audit 2010 identified, recorded and prioritised existing and potential safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. A range of safety hazards that presented a public safety, legal, financial and reputational risk to Council were identified as part of this process. These related to sight distance, path alignment, adjacent path clearance and path width.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 28 February 2017 Council resolved (in part):

1. notes that the remaining high risk safety hazards along the Bay Trail present a public safety, legal, financial and reputational risk to Council if left unresolved;

2. undertakes community engagement activities associated with addressing each of the ‘high risk’ safety hazards identified in the Bay Trail Safety Audit, as outlined in the report.

The report presented to Council prioritised each of the remaining high risk safety hazards on the Bay Trail. The Bay Trail adjacent to the end of Bay Road, Sandringham was prioritised as the third highest priority with recommended works to take place in 2018/19.

An electrical substation is located immediately abutting the Bay Trail adjacent to the Bay Road/Beach Road intersection. This area becomes heavily congested during peak summer periods with pedestrians crossing the road to access the gardens and beach. The Masterplan also identified this particular section of the Bay Trail as a significant risk to cyclists and pedestrians and also to staff accessing the substation. The Masterplan proposes to investigate relocation of this substation away from the foreshore. This was also an identified recommendation in the Sandringham Gardens South Landscape Masterplan 2006 and the Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014.

The following three options were discussed as potential relocation sites with the electricity provider:

- Option 1 - Relocation of the sub-station off the foreshore as part of a new private development site.
- Option 2 - Relocation of the substation off the foreshore to Council owned land at 122 Beach Road.
- Option 3 - Replacement of the substation with a new smaller electrical kiosk on the foreshore with increased set back from the Bay Trail.

Option 1 is the preferred open space outcome to pursue in further discussions with the electricity provider as this option achieves relocation of the sub-station at no cost to Council. However, as it may take some time for a suitable development site to be identified, and for works to be designed and completed and the substation removed, it is also recommended...
that the feasibility and cost of Options 2 and 3 is further considered in conjunction with these discussions. Further details are set out in Attachment 2.

Public Toilets

There are three public toilet facilities located within the Sandringham Beach and Gardens precinct; an automated facility in good condition integrated into the Sandringham Life Saving Club, an automated facility in good condition adjacent to the playground in Sandringham Gardens and an older brick public toilet on the foreshore opposite Southey Street. The Southey Street toilet does not meet current accessibility standards and has been ranked within the top ten toilet facilities for major upgrade/replacement in the Bayside Public Toilet Strategy 2012. The Masterplan identifies that the existing red brick structure should be replaced with a new facility that will meet a higher standard of compliance for public toilets, accessibility and building code. One tree is proposed to be removed as part of this rebuild to improve sight lines from the Bay Trail. The upgrade of this public toilet was generally supported by the community. It is proposed to conduct further conversations with the residents immediately adjacent to the proposed site during development of detailed design following adoption of the Masterplan.

Stormwater

There are significant opportunities to improve the quality of stormwater entering the Bay throughout this precinct. Two sites have been identified for installation of stormwater harvesting systems.

A proposed wetland treatment for Sandringham Gardens includes a bio retention system with low planting of indigenous sedges and rushes to remove sediment and nutrients from stormwater diverted from existing pipes and pits in Bay Road. The treated stormwater would then be used to irrigate the formal lawns at Sandringham Gardens. An underground storage tank would be installed beneath the lawns as part of this project. This proposal was well received by the community during consultation and will also dramatically improve the quality of the grass areas, which have not been irrigated since the commencement of the Millennium drought over fifteen years ago (see page 17 of the Masterplan Sandringham Gardens Wetland Treatment Section D).

A smaller bio retention system to treat stormwater is proposed in the grassy area opposite Southey Street. Similarly, this would involve stormwater being diverted from existing pits and pipes in Beach Road to a water quality treatment area planted with low growing indigenous sedges and rushes. The vegetation would remove pollutants including nutrients and sediment from the water, while maintaining existing views. The treated water would then be returned to the existing pipe network and discharged at the beach outfall near Royal Avenue. This wetland system would be integrated with the existing coastal walking path and a new seating and lookout area with views to Red Bluff. Further detail is on page 18 of the Masterplan (Southey Street Detail Plan).

The existing stormwater drain and outfall at Sandringham Beach is owned by Melbourne Water. This outfall and associated discharge on the beach after rain events was raised by both the community and Sandringham Life Saving Club as a significant issue. The steep topography and developed nature of the catchment limit opportunities for water quality treatment. The Masterplan recommends to continue liaison with Melbourne Water to undertake detailed design investigation of measures to improve stormwater quality at this site. Possible works may include installation of a gross litter pollution (GPT) trap at Crescent Gardens and/or installation of a new stormwater surcharge pit and beach level to release pressure during high flows. These proposals are detailed further on page 15 of the Masterplan (Sandringham Beach Outfall Section C).
**Recommendation**
That Council:

1. notes the outcome of community consultation regarding the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan; and
2. adopts the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan.

**Support Attachments**
1. Attachment 1 - Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan (separately enclosed)
2. Attachment 2 - Options for relocation of substation in Sandringham Gardens (separately enclosed)
3. Attachment 3 - Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan Consultation Report (separately enclosed)

**Considerations and implications of recommendation**

**Liveable community**

**Social**
This precinct has a strong relationship with Sandringham Village and is easily accessed from Sandringham station, making it a popular destination for both locals and visitors.

The opportunities proposed for Sandringham Gardens and the adjacent beaches in the Masterplan will further enhance access to and through this highly utilised site. The reuse of stormwater for irrigating the formal lawns within Sandringham Gardens will also enhance the amenity of the grass, improving both its aesthetics and durability for picnics and other gatherings.

The proposed upgrade of the popular playground in Sandringham Gardens will further improve this site, creating a better recreational experience for residents and visitors.

**Natural Environment**
Although Sandringham Gardens is a predominantly formal landscape planted with introduced species such as conifers and palms, there is also relatively intact indigenous coastal vegetation along the coastal cliff top path. The Masterplan proposes to further enhance indigenous planting and also aims to increase areas of vegetation by closing and revegetating duplicated pathways.

The provision of two stormwater bio retention systems (opposite Southey Street and within Sandringham Gardens) will allow stormwater from the surrounding catchments to be treated in small wetlands planted with low growing indigenous sedges and grasses to remove nutrients and sediments from the water prior to it being released into the Bay.

Additionally in Sandringham Gardens, this will allow reuse of stormwater to irrigate the formal lawns. These gardens have not been irrigated since 2000 and the visual amenity could be improved with irrigation.
Built Environment
The opportunity to remove/relocate the electrical substation located within Sandringham Gardens adjacent to the Beach Road/Bay Road intersection is a positive step to relocating non-coastal dependent infrastructure away from the coast.

Replacement and upgrade of the public toilet opposite Southey Street is also another positive opportunity to improve facilities within this precinct as is the replacement and relocation of the aging timber staircase from the gardens to the beach promenade. The new staircase is intended to be less visually intrusive and require less maintenance than the existing timber staircase.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
Community consultation throughout the development of the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 included meeting with the following key stakeholders as well as local residents and the wider community:

- Sandringham Life Saving Club committee
- Life Saving Victoria
- Black Rock and Sandringham Conservation Association (BRASCA)
- Sandringham Foreshore Association (SFA)
- Friends of Native Wildlife
- ZNX and United Energy

Three drop in sessions were held at various locations; Sandringham Football Club function centre, Hampton Life Saving Club and a consultation booth at Sandringham Village. Council staff and consultants were available to speak to interested people at each session.

The Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan was available on Council’s ‘Have your Say’ online portal from 18 August to 11 September 2017. A large banner was also installed along the Bay Trail adjacent to Beach Road and smaller signs were installed at key entry points to the foreshore throughout this precinct. Hard copies of the Masterplan (coloured A3) were available for interested people to view at all Council libraries and at the front counter of the Bayside City Council Corporate Centre.

Throughout the consultation period, other onsite meetings, telephone conversations and email clarifications were undertaken by Council officers to address specific issues or opportunities raised during this time.

A full copy of the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan Community Consultation Report is at Attachment 3.

The consultation activities were successful in extracting the views of the community so that the Masterplan reflects the desired community outcomes.

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

Legal
There are no legal implications associated with the recommendations in this report.
Finance

The proposed opportunities identified in the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 will renew, upgrade or improve existing facilities and assets to improve their usability and performance for the community.

Of this total, $1,021,200 is identified to be funded by others (DELWP, Melbourne Water) and a total of $3,678,000 is proposed to be funded by Council over a number of years.

An Implementation Schedule Summary of proposed works and priorities for the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 over a ten year period is shown below. A detailed Implementation Schedule can be found on page 20 of the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017.

The estimated costs associated with the Masterplan proposals are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY AREA (BCC)</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>UNBUDGETED</th>
<th>TOTAL BCC</th>
<th>TOTAL OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandringham Gardens</td>
<td>$1,122,000</td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,102,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Access</td>
<td>$135,500</td>
<td>$513,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Trail</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Walking Path</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Toilets</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lookout Points and Viewing Areas</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sandringham Beach and Gardens Works</td>
<td>$1,105,000</td>
<td>$1,477,500</td>
<td>$1,291,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$3,065,000</td>
<td>$851,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (20%)</td>
<td>$21,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sandringham Masterplan - Capital Implementation Works</td>
<td>$3,678,000</td>
<td>$1,021,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,678,000</td>
<td>$1,021,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to Council policy and strategy

The Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 addresses the following areas of the Council Plan:

Goal 1 – an engaged community and Council, Strategic Objective 1.1. Ensuring decisions are informed by community input and clearly communicate what we decided and why.

The Bayside Open Space Strategy 2012 classifies this precinct to be of municipal and regional importance in Bayside. It caters for Bayside residents, tourists and others from outside the City. Municipal and regional spaces in Bayside are intended to cater for a diverse range of interests and often have a wide catchment because of the unique features they offer. As such, community engagement has been vital in planning the Masterplan for this precinct.

The Bayside Coastal Management Plan 2014 also included extensive consultation with the Bayside community and has informed the development of the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017. The BCMP 2014 provides the strategic direction for actions and works contained within the Masterplan.
Other relevant Council policy includes the Bayside Recreation ‘Active by the Bay’ 2013-2022, the Bayside Toilet Strategy 2012 and the Sandringham Gardens South Landscape Masterplan 2006.

**Options considered**

This report provides the outcomes of consultation on the Sandringham Beach and Gardens Masterplan 2017 and presents that final Masterplan for adoption. No options are presented for consideration.
Executive summary

Purpose and background

The purpose of this report is to provide the findings of the feasibility study undertaken to inform the development of a 10 year Kindergartens Improvement Plan and to recommend that the scope of the work to an Early Years Infrastructure Improvement Plan be expanded to include maternal and child health and other early years' services.

At the 24 June 2014 Ordinary Meeting of Council regarding 461 – 463 Bluff Road Hampton, Council resolved:

To transfer the net proceeds of the sale to the Infrastructure Reserve to be used towards specific projects involving early years facilities;

At the 28 April 2015 Ordinary Meeting of Council regarding 5 – 11 Sandringham Road Sandringham, Council resolved:

That the net proceeds be used for the upgrade of kindergarten facilities subject to the execution of a Section 173 Agreement;

At the 23 August 2016 Ordinary Meeting of Council, Council resolved:

That Council:

1. confirms its commitment to ensuring the long term viability of its community based kindergartens within walking/cycling distance of all Bayside residents
2. develops a 10 year Kindergartens Improvement Plan in collaboration with community based kindergartens that considers:
   a) the best available data and knowledge to understand trends, user demand and innovative and sustainable models of early years kindergarten provision;
   b) indoor and outdoor space requirements and equipment
   c) financial resourcing, equitable access across the Bayside geographic area and potential efficiencies as a result of an independent cluster management approach;
   d) contemporary early years education programs that cover a range of social and cognitive experiences and learning patterns;
   e) marketing and promotional opportunities across a range of mediums;
   f) Council’s policy approach to the provision of equitable building, equipment and financial resourcing to Council owned kindergartens
3. undertakes short term renewal works that meet the immediate needs of Council owned kindergartens;
4. approves up to $500,000 for the short-term renewal works to be financed from the Early Years Reserves Fund;
5. receives a 10 year Kindergartens Improvement Plan at the April 2017 Council Meeting reinforcing Council’s commitment to community based kindergartens; and
6. uses the money available through the Early Years Reserves Fund to fund the 10 year Kindergarten Improvement Plan.

**Background Information**

Local governments in Victoria are long-standing providers of kindergarten (also known as preschool) services and facilities. Some local governments provide land and buildings to community managed services and some employ the kindergarten teachers and operate the services directly. Bayside is in the former category being a provider and owner of 14 kindergarten buildings across Bayside.

In 2014 Council engaged an architect to undertake a comprehensive assessment of Bayside’s Kindergarten infrastructure. The report did not consider models of service type or delivery.

In February 2016, Council expanded on the architect’s report and commenced development of a 10 year Kindergartens Improvement Plan. This work was undertaken in consultation with kindergarten representatives, including educators and parent committee members. The viability of sessional community delivered kindergarten in Council owned facilities was considered within the broader kindergarten landscape across Bayside which includes sessional kindergarten delivered in church owned buildings, long day care centres and early learning centres located in schools. Each kindergarten operating in a Council owned facility completed a self-assessment of their building that focused on issues impacting on their capacity to provide a quality education program in an evolving and competitive market.

Council engaged Wayfarer Consulting in November 2016 to undertake a feasibility study that considered contemporary and innovative service models and subsequent infrastructure requirements to support the viability of sessional kindergarten operating from council owned buildings. Consultation during the feasibility study included workshops with key stakeholders, individual site visits, observations and interviews with educators, followed by a further workshop to test criteria for prioritising works and emerging themes. Community based kindergartens operating from church owned facilities were involved in workshops and individual discussions.

Building works totalling $120,000 have been completed in recent months at twelve of fourteen council owned facilities, to address immediate infrastructure works prioritised to meet compliance and regulatory standards. All Council owned kindergarten facilities are now compliant with regulatory standards. Identified works that improve functionality continue to be scheduled.

Mapping of early year’s services across Bayside and a summary of key trends and issues are provided in Attachment 1, Kindergartens Improvement Plan Background Information.

**What we know about current supply and demand**

Universal access to 15 hours per week of kindergarten is available to four year old children in the year prior to commencing school. The State and Federal Governments fund approximately 10 and five hours respectively however the continuation of the Federal Government’s five hours ‘top-up’ commitment is uncertain beyond 2017. The Victorian kindergarten participation rate of four year olds in 2015 was 98.1 percent.

The 15 hours of four year old kindergarten can be provided as a sessional model at community-based kindergartens usually in council or church owned facilities, as part of the longer hours of care within long day care (child care) centres and as part of the school hours program within early learning centres (in a school setting). All service types delivering a kindergarten program by a qualified kindergarten teacher can access the 15 hours of state and federal funding. During the period of 2012 to 2015, Victoria experienced a 10 percent market share shift from community-based kindergartens to long day care centres. Accordingly, contemporary data reflects an increase in long day care service providers. Table 2, Attachment 1.
Furthermore, between 1981 and 2011, there was a 26 percent national increase in the employment of mothers with children less than five years of age. This has contributed to an increased demand for longer hours of care (Baxter, J. A; *Child care and early childhood education in Australia* 2015).

Despite state and national trends recording a 10 percent reduction in demand for community based kindergarten and the continuing expansion of long day care providers in Bayside, current four year old enrolments indicates 68 percent of Bayside children are attending a community-based kindergarten, 20 percent above the state average (ABS March 2017). A number of these children attend community kindergarten for their funded kindergarten hours and access long day care for additional hours of childcare.

There are 14 community based kindergartens operating in Council owned buildings and seven operating in church owned buildings. Forty-six percent of Bayside children are attending a community kindergarten in a council owned facility and 22 percent in a church owned building. All church kindergarten programs are operating at full capacity. Five of the seven community based kindergartens operating from church buildings are in the northern part of the municipality. There are no four year old kindergartens operating from church owned buildings in the southern part of the municipality.

Bayside City Council, like neighbouring local government areas does not invest in the maintenance or upgrade of church owned infrastructure but rather supports the church kindergartens through invitations to apply for grants, sector network meetings, professional development opportunities and by providing a central registration service.

In recent years 11 of Bayside’s 14 community kindergartens have demonstrated stable utilisation and are currently operating at or above 94 percent capacity. Table 6, Attachment 1. While community delivered kindergarten is highly valued in Bayside, the infrastructure may limit the service’s ability to meet future needs of families, such as changing maternal employment trends and the need for longer hours of care. The single room design of many Council-owned buildings lacks the timetabling capacity required to offer extended hours of care and the age of the buildings limits their capacity to deliver an innovative and contemporary curriculum.

**Future supply and demand in Bayside**

A current oversupply exists in the sector, with 246 unfilled four year old places. Community kindergarten is oversupplied by 50 of these places. With modest population growth forecast, the sector oversupply is predicted to reduce to 164 places by 2027, assuming there is no further expansion of long day care centres or closures of existing services.

If current utilisation of community kindergarten is maintained, combined with anticipated growth of 0 – four year olds, 97 percent of currently available community kindergarten places would be utilised in 2027. However, if the increasing demand by families to access longer hours of care continues, the sessional kindergarten market will need to consider innovative changes to the existing service model to remain appealing and relevant.

It became apparent through the feasibility study that planning for community based sessional kindergarten infrastructure, would be best planned within the context of a broader early year’s infrastructure strategy. This would consider the full spectrum of early years’ education, care, health and wellbeing needs so that future investment capitalises on the evidence-based benefits that can be achieved through specialised precincts that provide for example, collocated or adjacent services, flexible, multi-purpose indoor spaces and early years open spaces. Service infrastructure which responds to current and future needs as well as community aspirations will better support the community kindergarten model to remain a viable and attractive choice for families into the future.
An immediate opportunity to explore the demand for an Early Year’s Precinct exists in the Black Rock Area. The Janet Mundy Kindergarten is approaching the end of its useful life and will require demolition regardless of the outcome of the Improvement Plan. With only eight four year old enrolments and no three year old program in 2017, the kindergarten’s management body has indicated that the service will not be viable beyond this year. The former guide’s hall in close proximity to Janet Mundy also creates an opportunity as the building is significantly under-utilised. The Black Rock Kindergarten has strong utilisation and is located approximately one kilometre from Janet Mundy, so would need to be incorporated into long term considerations.

Furthermore, in the context of a broader Early Year’s Infrastructure Plan, Maternal and Child Health facilities should be considered in future early year’s services and infrastructure considerations.

Council has a legislated responsibility to develop a Municipal Health and Wellbeing Plan within 12 months of a new Council being elected. To meet this legislative requirement Council is currently developing its Municipal Health and Wellbeing Plan, titled the Wellbeing for All Ages and Abilities (WAAA) Strategy. This strategy is inclusive of a Healthy Ageing Action Plan, a Youth Action Plan and an Early Years Action Plan.

The development of a 10 Year Kindergartens Improvement Plan needs to be considered within the context of the WAAA and an Early Years Action Plan, to maximise available monies in the Early Years Reserve Fund. This would result in an Early Years Infrastructure Plan that is fully informed by commonwealth and state policy direction and future community need.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. undertakes a broader scope of enquiry and develops 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. commences consultation to understand the need for an early years precinct in the Black Rock area and includes this information in a 10-year Early Years Infrastructure Plan;

3. continues 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. receives a ten-year Early Year’s Infrastructure Plan at the 21 November 2017 Council Meeting.

**Support Attachments**

1. Kindergartens Improvement Plan Background Information
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 undertaken in the short term have meant 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
The feasibility study was undertaken in consultation with kindergarten representatives. To this end, kindergarten representatives have been provided with information, been involved in workshops and have undertaken an assessment of the performance of their facilities from their perspective.

Families and committee members currently accessing kindergartens were consulted regarding future service needs. A family’s affiliation with a kindergarten community averages five years. 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, $120,000 has been expended.

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 2013 - 2017
1. **Introduction**

This paper presents information relevant to the provision of kindergarten services in Bayside.

2. **State and National Trends**

   **National and Victorian Trends**

   The following data indicates that at both a national and state level, during the period 2012-2016 there has been a clear shift towards children being enrolled in four year old kindergarten programs provided within a long day care setting (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012, 2014, 2015, 2016).

   **Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school sessional</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care centre</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in both service types</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>No data available</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total enrolments</td>
<td>273,297</td>
<td>309,185</td>
<td>325,273</td>
<td>344,676</td>
<td>77,007</td>
<td>94,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Numbers of service providers over the same period show a similar trend, as can be seen from the table below (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2012, 2014, 2015, 2016).

   **Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school sessional</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care centre</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of providers</td>
<td>7,594</td>
<td>8,989</td>
<td>10,636</td>
<td>11,070</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Maternal Employment**

   Many industrialised countries have experienced significant growth in maternal employment over recent decades, even among mothers of very young children. In Australia in 1981, 30% of mothers with children aged under 5 years were employed, compared to 56% in 2011. (Australian Institute of Family Studies, *Child Care Participation and Maternal Employment Trends*.)
3. Bayside Trends

Population of kindergarten aged children in Bayside

As indicated in the table below, during the period 2011 to 2027 most of the expected growth in numbers of children aged 0-4 will occur in the central and southern areas, with a 7.3 to 15.4 percent increase respectively. Based on these population changes it is anticipated that 1,327 kindergarten places will be required in 2027 – an additional 82 places (id consulting, Oct 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>% Change 2011-2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton, Brighton East</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton, Hampton East, Sandringham, Hightt (West)</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock, Beaumains, Cheltenham (West)</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bayside 4 year old required kindergarten places)</td>
<td>(1245)</td>
<td>(1327)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Provision of kindergarten places and service providers in Bayside

The table below shows the market share of four-year old kindergarten places currently available in Bayside across the different service types. Figures are approximate where services are licensed for 0-5 year olds as the number of available places fluctuates depending on demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type / Places available 2017</th>
<th>3 Year Old</th>
<th>4 Year Old</th>
<th>% Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessional – Council Facility</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional – Church Facility</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Learning Centres (located in schools)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Child Care Centres</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current provision in Bayside indicates a supply of 1,491 four year old kindergarten places, an oversupply of 246. Forecast population growth would suggest the oversupply would reduce to 164 places if current provision was maintained. However, this over-supply is likely to increase over time as new private facilities currently in the planning or construction stages are opened. Since 2015, four planning permits have been granted for long day care centres in Bayside. See Table 4a below for service provider market share in Bayside.
Table 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Providers</th>
<th>No of Services</th>
<th>% Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Kindergartens</td>
<td>21 Services</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 in Council buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 in Church buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Kindergartens</td>
<td>2 Services</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergartens in Early Learning Centres</td>
<td>3 Services</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergartens in Long Day Care Centres</td>
<td>32 Services</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Day Care (no kindergarten)</td>
<td>1 Service</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilisation

Of the 1,245 four year olds in Bayside in 2017, 846 children are enrolled in 907 of the available places in community kindergartens, an oversupply of 61 places. If the forecast population growth and current market share utilisation rate of 68 percent is maintained the community kindergarten sector will only be oversupplied by 5 places in 2027 (Assuming no other changing variables).

Kindergarten – an increasingly complex environment

*Universal Access*

Since 2013, funded kindergarten programs have been required to provide at least 15 hours of kindergarten (previously 12 hours) delivered by a Bachelor trained Early Childhood Teacher. Single room services had to accommodate the extra hours into an already tight timetable, often at the expense of one four year old group or a reduction in hours available for three year old programs.

*Educator to child ratios*

Prior to 2016, Council buildings were operating at a 1:15 educator to child ratio. As most services are licensed for at least 30 children (based on the square meterage per child), services were offering 30 places per group with two educators. In 2016 the educator to child ratio increased to 1:11 with operators in council owned buildings choosing to reduce the number of places offered to 22 children rather than employing a third educator. See Table 5 overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>4yo actual utilisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 (%) 1:15 ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brighton Kindergarten – North Brighton</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurlingharn Preschool – Brighton East</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Kindergarten – Highett</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Road Kindergarten – Sandringham</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Community Kindergarten – Hampton</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Paul Kindergarten – Hampton</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagle Preschool – Sandringham</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumaris 3yo Kindergarten - Beaumaris</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock Preschool – Black Rock</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Beaumaris Kindergarten – East Beaumaris</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Street Preschool – Beaumaris</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and Jill Kindergarten - Beaumaris</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Mundy Kindergarten – Black Rock</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Phillips Kindergarten - Beaumaris</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Avenue Kindergarten - Cheltenham</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 1: Bayside Council and Church owned Community kindergartens
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Created by GIS Team, Information Services 6 March, 2017
Map 2:
Proximity of Community Kindergartens, MCH Centres, Occasional Care Centres and Playhouses
Map 3: Current Council and Private Early Learning Facilities in Bayside
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Map 4: Fern Street Facilities, Black Rock
Executive summary

Purpose and Background

The purpose of this report is to respond to the Council Resolutions of the Ordinary Meetings of 16 August 2019 and 29 November 2016 to provide an update on the current level of service in Statutory Planning between 1 July 2016 and 30 March 2017 (Quarters 1, 2 and 3, 2016/17).

This report also provides an update on the progress to date on the initiatives to improve the performance of the Statutory Planning Department from the reinvestment of additional revenue from planning applications back into the service following the 29 November 2016 resolution of Council.

Key Issues

Current service performance

As outlined in the previous reports to Council on this matter, the large 30% increase in permit applications between 2013/14 and 2016/17 has resulted in an increasing backlog of undetermined applications within the service. This historic inability to match the rate of incoming application with the rate of decision output has led to a reduced service being provided to the community in this key service area.

At present, Council’s Timeliness and Service Standard is comparable to the standards of the other Inner Metropolitan Councils (IMCs) such as Port Phillip and Stonington for the financial year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know Your Council (LGPRF) Measure</th>
<th>SERVICE PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>2015 Bayside LGPRF Result</th>
<th>2016 Bayside LGPRF Result</th>
<th>2017 Bayside Current Result *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SP1 TIMELINESS                   | The average (median) number of calendar days between receipt of and a decision on the application. | 115 | 88 | Bayside = 110 days  
Metro average = 110 days |
| SP2 SERVICE STANDARD             | Number of Non-VicSmart planning application decisions made within 60 days. | 44% | 58% | Bayside 46%  
Metro average = 52% |
| SP4 DECISION MAKING              | Number of VCAT decisions that agreed with Council / Delegates Decision. | 41% | 44% | 56 VCAT determinations  
21% Affirmed  
23% Varied |

*subject to further audit.
Bayside is currently processing 46% of all applications within 60 statutory days, but all other Metropolitan Melbourne Councils are experiencing similar volume and capacity challenges. The Inner Metropolitan average service standard is currently only 52%.

Bayside’s Timeliness standard is 110 days, with the IMU Council average being identical at 110 days.

In 2016/17, significant improvement has also been made in the department’s responsiveness to customers and requests for service on the telephone and in-person at the Corporate Service Centre. Over 14,000 calls were taken and over 8,000 in-person enquiries were answered.

**Reinvesting in Development Services**

At its meeting of 29 November 2017, Council committed to allocation of all additional revenue from both the increase in application numbers and the fee income increases from the State Government back into the Development Services Department.

This revenue is being used to implement a comprehensive transformation plan that focuses on our customers, our people, our technology and efficiency as well as our decision quality and clarity to improve service, timeliness, decision quality and customer experiences within the area.

This plan will take a four year approach to provide a customer responsive, reliable, efficient and trusted Development Service for our community. The resourcing boost has allowed a number of initial quick-wins, and longer term, sustainable improvements are also planned.

Therefore, whilst the current data shows a reduced service performance within Bayside and across the Metropolitan area, Q4 and the next financial year 2017/18 should see a noticeable improvement.

The revenue commitment commenced on 1 April 2017 and the following quick-win actions have already been taken by Council:

**Investing in our people**

1. In April 2017, new positions in both the technical and administrative areas of the service were created. Many new staff are joining in the coming months which will reduced the staff to application ratio down significantly from 1:75-80 historically down to 1:45-50 from 1 July 2017 onwards. This will have the flow on effect of allowing more time for staff to provide better customer experiences and better liveability outcomes for Bayside. 7 new officers started in April 2017.

2. Reliance on short-term contract staff has reduced by over 50% to invest in permanent, long-term Bayside officers.

3. Investments in existing staff have also been made with training, mentoring and support continuing to be key focus of our delegate leadership team.

**Significant planning to determine the backlogged applications**

4. The backlog of undetermined applications is being processed to resolve matters for customers expediently, seeking to offer a better experience to both new and existing customers equally. In July 2016, the total number of undetermined applications with Council for a decision was over 650 applications and at April 2017, the number had reduced to 550.

5. In April 2017, two Planning & Amenity Meetings were required to consider the c.25 applications recommended to the Committee for a decision. Normally, 7-10 applications are considered by one committee each month. The additional applications being reported is a direct result of a focus on decisions and the on boarding of additional staff.
**Improving our technology and processes to be more efficient**

6. Council has purchased an electronic assessment tool to be able to process applications and endorse plans without paper. This electronic tool will significantly improve decision times, decision quality, allow for online visibility of all future decisions and reduce records management and paper file purchasing costs.

**Improving the experience for all of our customers**

7. The Department will shortly be taking all direct incoming development calls from the community straight to Development Services officers. This will allow customer enquiries for general information and application specific matters to be directed quickly to the right person, and for telephone messages, complaints and incoming mail to be recorded and responded to within Councils’ Customer Service Charter timelines.

8. Staff have provided a qualified information service in-person for over 8,000 residents between July 2016 and March 2017 at the Corporate Centre in Sandringham. More face-to-face meetings are being offered for objectors and applicants, including an improved general information service in-person. All complaints are being addressed in person before being responded to in writing.

9. Call answering and call return rates have improved significantly in 2017. The level of incoming calls that were answered by staff at the first call attempt, and the number of phone messages were returned within 24 hours have improved in 2017 compared to previous years. The average time to resolve a phone enquiry has also improved significantly from over 15 minutes in 2016 to 3 seconds in 2017.

10. New online and hard-copy information for stakeholders and Bayside residents is being prepared.

**Future performance improvements**

This four year plan seeks to improve the overall performance of the service in the key result areas of timeliness, service standard and decision quality to the following levels, as set out in the Draft Council Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know Your Council (LGPRF) Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP1 TIMELINESS</td>
<td>75 days</td>
<td>70 days</td>
<td>65 days</td>
<td>60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all types of application</td>
<td>all types of application</td>
<td>all types of application</td>
<td>all types of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2 SERVICE STANDARD</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all types of Non-VicSmart application</td>
<td>all types of Non-VicSmart application</td>
<td>all types of Non-VicSmart application</td>
<td>all types of Non-VicSmart application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Council will receive a report in November 2017 that will provide details of the 2017 LGPRF results for Bayside and a comparison to the other Inner Metropolitan Councils, progress towards achieving the above Year 1 Statutory Planning Future Improvement Targets as well as advising of improvement indicators and activities across the service including more details on:

- The number of complaints and our effectiveness of addressing those complaints, with care, efficiency and empathy in a consistent and reliable manner;
- The responsiveness and quality of calls and correspondence;
- Customer satisfaction with our service; and
- More detailed analysis of Council’s areas of improvement when advocating for the community at the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT).
Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the report; and

2. Receives a further report at the November 2017 Council Meeting providing:
   a) a review of the Final Bayside 2017 LGPRF result with comparable Inner Metro Melbourne Councils;
   b) details of the service improvements between April 2017 and September 2017 towards the Year 1 target; and
   c) a summary of continuous improvement activities that are planned for the remainder of the 2017/18 financial year.

Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social

No adverse implications.

Natural Environment

No adverse implications. Positive benefits for the Natural Environment are being realised through better Statutory Planning decisions, which are being achieved and improved upon by the Service Improvement Plan.

Built Environment

No adverse implications. Significant positive benefits for the Built Environment are being realised through better Statutory Planning decisions and the delivery of the Bayside Planning Scheme, which are being achieved and improved upon by the Service Improvement Plan.

Customer Service and Community Engagement

Significant improvements in the service we provide our customers have been brought about by the continuous improvement initiatives and the Staff and Resourcing Plan will maintain the current target service levels of 60% of in Planning Applications being determined within the statutory timeframe.

Human Rights

The implications of this Amendment 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

No implications.

Finance

This recommendation proposes to have no adverse impact on the long term financial plan, as the service changes proposed can be accommodated through the additional revenue gained in statutory planning regulatory fees.

Links to Council policy and strategy

The statutory planning service review assists Council in achieving the following goals and strategies of the Council Plan 2013-2017 (2014 review):

- Goal 3: A liveable city, particularly strategic objective 3.1: ‘protecting and enhancing amenity, liveability and neighbourhood character’.
- Goal 7: Financial responsibility and good governance particularly strategy 7.1.4: ‘ensuring that Council is delivering the most effective mix of services in the most efficient way possible.’
10.8 FEBRUARY 2017 FINANCIAL REPORT

Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report provides a summary and analysis of Council’s financial performance for eight months to 28 February 2017.

The report is designed to analyse actual results against the 2016/17 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 surplus for 2016/17 of $22.279M reported below has decreased by $13k from the Adopted Budget of $22.292M and includes the following adjustments

- $50k increase in the rollover of funding for the Beaumaris Sports Club pavilion to $2.055 M
- ($63k) 2015/16 Urban Strategy projects to be delivered in 2016/17
  - Hampton East (Moorabbin) structure plan implementation
  - Martin St structure plan implementation
  - Car parking precinct plans

2016/17 Year-to-date operating result
The February 2017 result is a surplus of $18.2M which is $6.6M favourable to budget.

2016/17 Forecast operating result
The current forecast for the year projects an operating surplus of $23.5M which is $1.2M favourable to Budget.

The underlying forecast result is favourable to budget by $2.7M and excludes the following one off or timing related items:

- ($120k) Timing of income and expenditure for Aged and Disability Regional projects
- ($1.394M) Timing of capital grants and contributions received in advance or deferred to align with the expected completion of capital projects.

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 February 2017 is $101.4M and is forecast to be $68.9M at June 2017.
The YTD favourable variance to budget of $27.7M as at January 2017 is mainly due to:

- **$17.9M greater opening cash balance than budgeted:**
  - $6.8M Favourable capital works underspend including Rollover of 2015/16 capital projects of $5.1M (to be spent in 2016/17)
  - $11.1M Favourable operating result at June 2016 compared to budget forecast which includes $4M of additional developer contributions transferred to reserves, increased parking fines, interest income and grants in advance.
- **$6.5M YTD favourable operating cash flow results and $3.3M YTD favourable capital cash flow results.**

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 2017 is favourable $7.3M and indicates that 84% of the capital expenditure budget will be spent by June 2017.

The forecast indicates that $8.4M of capital expenditure will be required to be carried forward to 2017/18 due to the following projects

- $3.3M construction for Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct to be completed in 17/18.
- $3M construction for Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation, construction works likely to commence in 17/18.
- $2M Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment to be completed in 17/18.

Including the impact of projects carried forward to 2017/18 the capital program forecast is unfavourable $361k which includes additional playground renewal $200k and kindergarten upgrades $150k funded from reserves.

**Recommendation**

That Council notes the operating and capital financial report for the eight months to 28 February 2017.

**Support Attachments**

1. Bayside City Council February 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 $23.5M which is $1.2M favourable to budget. Taking into account one off and timing issues the underlying operating result is $2.7M favourable to budget.

The capital result forecast including the anticipated rollover of projects to 2017/18 is $361k unfavourable to budget which includes additional playground renewal $200k and kindergarten upgrades $150k funded from reserves.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The monthly financial report is identified within Goal 8 Governance in the Council Plan 2017-2020. We want an organisation that is financially stable and with decision making that is open, transparent, and informed by the community.
Operating Result

The Adjusted Budget surplus for 2016/17 of $22.279M reported below has decreased by $13k from the Adopted Budget of $22.292M and includes the following adjustments:

- $50k increase in the rollover of funding for the Beaumaris Sports Club pavilion to $2.055M
- ($63k) 2015/16 Urban Strategy projects to be delivered in 2016/17
  - Hampton East (Moorabbin) structure plan implementation
  - Martin St structure plan implementation
  - Car parking precinct plans

2016/17 Year-to-date operating result

The February 2017 result is a surplus of $18.2M which is $6.6M favourable to budget.

2016/17 Forecast operating result

The current forecast for the year represents a surplus of $23.5M which is $1.2M favourable to Budget. The underlying forecast result is favourable to budget by $2.7M and excludes the following off or timing related items:

- ($120k) Timing of income and expenditure for Aged and Disability Regional projects
- ($1.376M) Timing of capital grants and contributions received in advance or deferred to align with the expected completion of capital projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Services &amp; New Initiatives Budget Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and Charges</td>
<td>56,927</td>
<td>57,297</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>85,286</td>
<td>85,576</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>5,051</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>5,307</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>8,288</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>3,381</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>7,791</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10,209</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(566)</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>(1,365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>(331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/(Loss) on Disposal of assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>80,180</td>
<td>82,402</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>123,470</td>
<td>124,111</td>
<td>632</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>27,689</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>40,192</td>
<td>40,424</td>
<td>(232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>29,399</td>
<td>26,383</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>43,499</td>
<td>42,739</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>10,976</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>68,611</td>
<td>64,195</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>101,200</td>
<td>100,646</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Result - Surplus | 11,569 | 18,207 | 6,637 | 22,279 | 23,466 | 1,188 |
Operating Result by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division (in ‘000s)</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>2016/17 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>2016/17 YTD variance</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Current Forecast 2016/17</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget less Forecast Variance</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Percentage Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>5,415</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>7,910</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Rec. &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>21,260</td>
<td>20,419</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>31,624</td>
<td>31,541</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planning &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>8,887</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Finance</td>
<td>(1,886)</td>
<td>(2,911)</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>(2,975)</td>
<td>(3,263)</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Operating</td>
<td>36,229</td>
<td>30,769</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>54,485</td>
<td>52,260</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>(56,706)</td>
<td>(57,235)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>(85,196)</td>
<td>(85,534)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Income</td>
<td>(1,978)</td>
<td>(2,136)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(8,039)</td>
<td>(9,663)</td>
<td>(1,376)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>10,975</td>
<td>10,396</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>(11,570)</td>
<td>(18,207)</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>(22,279)</td>
<td>(23,466)</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive forecast favourable $279k
- $143k savings in salaries due to the timing of the appointment to positions in Strategy & Performance, Arts & Culture and Library Services.
- $50k forecast saving for My Bayside App project being discontinued due to the new website functionality being adaptable to different media devices.
- $30k additional grant funding for Library

Corporate Services forecast favourable $432k
- $256k forecast savings in insurance premiums based on favourable tender results.
- $120k merchant service fees charged from 1 July to recover merchant fees for credit card payments.
- $87k savings in salaries due to the timing of appointments to positions in Commercial Services, Governance and Human Resources.
- $52k forecast savings in Provision of Electoral Services.
- ($62k) insurance audit to provide a comprehensive insurance register
- ($53k) reduction in lease cost recovery from tenants due to the reduced insurance premiums.

Environment, Recreation & Infrastructure forecast favourable $83k
- $147k favourable variance relating to a number of Open Space services contracts with CPI being lower at 1.7% compared to the budgeted 2.5%.
  - $15k Bushland and foreshore
  - $26k Garden beds
  - $23k Infrastructure & Playground
  - $35k Turf
  - $35k Tree Management
  - $9k Tree planting and establishment
- $84k reduction ($7k per month) in lighting and maintenance charges due to the energy efficient public lighting program.
- $60k reduction in expected costs for the development of the Waste Strategy to reflect progress by June 2017.
- $50k increase in income for tree amenity improvements due to increased development activities.
- $41k favourable variance for Boat Ramp Maintenance as no further works are required in 16/17.
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- $38k Traffic Signals maintenance not required, confirmed by Vic Roads.
- ($103k) approved fixed term position extension for the Wellbeing for All Ages Community Grants Officer and the Abilities (WAAA) Project Officer funded from savings.
- (270k) Polytrade contract re-negotiation for sales of recyclable materials.

City Planning & Community Services forecast favourable $963k
- $600k forecast increase in parking infringement revenue based on YTD results due to increase in patrol area hotspots. The number of infringements issued YTD was 21,752 (22,312 YTD 2015/16) representing a 2.61% decrease for the same period last year.
- $176k favourable for Aged & Disability related to savings as a result of:
  - $35k reduction in training costs
  - $73k additional grant funding
  - $63k reduced travel costs related to the implementation of GPS
- $80k increase in Local Laws and Investigation permits and prosecutions.
- $80k Environmental Health forecast increase due to a successful prosecution and savings related to timing of appointment to a position.
- $70k increase in parking user fees due to increased patronage over summer.
- $68k net savings in Youth Services due to staff member on extended unpaid sick leave and vacant roles during the year which have now been filled.
- ($54k) forecast unfavourable budget result for Development Services
  - $515k forecast increase in revenue which reflects a 30% year on year increase in planning applications lodged and also includes a $250k forecast increase to reflect the impact of the increase in fees from 13 October 2016.
  - $238k forecast increase in revenue for general and other statutory planning fees reflecting trends based on current rate of applications and requests for service.
  - ($158k) forecast increase in legal fees for VCAT major cases expected as a result of Council decisions on permit applications with an increase in refusal of complex activity centres and apartment applications. In addition $45k for heritage advice.
  - ($88k) software license fee for viewing planning applications.
  - ($538k) forecast increase in staffing and other direct costs required to meet service targets.
    This is funded from increased revenue.
- ($88k) unfavourable due to timing of Aged & Disability Regional projects. Forecast net expenditure of ($120k) for 2016/17. Aged and Disability Regional projects are to be delivered between July 2017 and June 2019. Ongoing funding has been received since 2015/16. This project is fully funded by Commonwealth and State Government, with no net cost to Council.

Corporate Finance forecast favourable $468k
- $305k forecast increase in interest from term deposits due mainly to a favourable opening cash position for the year.
Cash and Investments

The cash position as at February 2017 is $101.4M.

The YTD favourable variance to budget of $27.7M as at February 2017 is mainly due to:

- $17.9M greater opening cash balance than budgeted:
  - $6.8M Favourable capital works underspend including Rollover of 2015/16 capital projects of $5.1M (to be spent in 2016/17)
  - $11.1M Favourable operating result at June 2016 compared to budget forecast which includes $4M of additional developer contributions transferred to reserves, increased parking fines, interest income and grants in advance.
- $6.5M YTD favourable operating cash flow results and $3.3M YTD favourable capital cash flow results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</th>
<th>30 Jun 16</th>
<th>28 Feb 17</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated &amp; unrestricted</td>
<td>35,002</td>
<td>63,506</td>
<td>28,504</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>28,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>40,123</td>
<td>37,874</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>29,862</td>
<td>30,123</td>
<td>9,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75,125</td>
<td>101,380</td>
<td>26,255</td>
<td>55,862</td>
<td>56,123</td>
<td>26,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash & cash equivalents (including investments) consists of:

- Retail banks: 70,000
- Community banks: -
- Cash on hand and at bank: 5,185

Total cash and cash equivalents: 75,185

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Reserves</th>
<th>30 Jun 16</th>
<th>28 Feb 17</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Land Reserve</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td>14,523</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>11,781</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking Reserve</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statutory Reserves</td>
<td>13,683</td>
<td>14,911</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>12,182</td>
<td>12,201</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds Subject to Intended Allocation:

- Infrastructure Reserve: 3,522
- Dendy Street Beach Improvement Reserve: 1,544
- Community Facilities Enhancement Reserve: 954
- Early Childhood Facilities Reserve: 5,759
- Defined Superannuation Shortfall: 2,038
- Unspent Conditional Grants Reserve: 934
- Capital Works Carried Forward Reserve: 3,310

Total Funds Subject to Intended Allocation: 22,115

Total Other Reserves:

- Trust Funds and Deposits: 4,321
- Total Committed Funds: 4,321
- Total Restricted, Committed and Allocated funds: 40,123

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>Liquidity (Current assets / Current liabilities)</td>
<td>&gt; 150.0%</td>
<td>326.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-financing (Net operating cash flow / Underlying revenue)</td>
<td>&gt; 20.0%</td>
<td>30.93%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Replacement (Total Capital spend : Depreciation)</td>
<td>&gt; 1.5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness (Non-current liabilities/Own source revenue)</td>
<td>&lt; 40.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying result (Net surplus/Revenue)</td>
<td>&gt; 0%</td>
<td>18.91%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal gap (Renewal capital spend:Depreciation)</td>
<td>&gt; 100.0%</td>
<td>135.2%</td>
<td>Yes</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>LGPRF Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Expected Range</th>
<th>2016/17 Forecast</th>
<th>Within Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average residential rate per residential property assessment</td>
<td>$700 to $2,000</td>
<td>$1,888</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per property assessment</td>
<td>$2,000 to $5,000</td>
<td>$2,299</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash compared to current liabilities</td>
<td>10% to 300%</td>
<td>189.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings compared to rates</td>
<td>0% to 70%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings repayments compared to rates</td>
<td>0% to 20%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted underlying surplus (or deficit)</td>
<td>-20% to 20%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to adjusted underlying revenue</td>
<td>30% to 80%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to property values</td>
<td>0.15% to 0.75%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16/17 YTD Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>16/17 YTD Actuals</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2018/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Current Forecast</th>
<th>Forecast Variance</th>
<th>Variance including rollover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Income</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8,039</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>(1,376)</td>
<td>2,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>15,832</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>46,426</td>
<td>39,086</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>8,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>13,854</td>
<td>11,552</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>38,387</td>
<td>32,423</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>6,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forecast for capital expenditure to 30 June 2017 is favourable $7.3M and indicates that 84% of the capital expenditure budget will be spent by June 2017.

The forecast indicates that $8.4M of capital expenditure will be required to be carried forward to 2017/18 due to the following projects:

- $3.3M construction for Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct to be completed in 17/18.
- $3M construction for Dendy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation, construction works likely to commence in 17/18.
- $2M Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment to be completed in 17/18.

Including the impact of projects carried forward to 2017/18 the capital program forecast is unfavourable $381k which includes additional playground renewal $200k and kindergarten upgrades $150k funded from reserves.
Capital Forecast Revenue unfavourable ($1.376M)
- $550k Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct funding from the State Government to be received in advance in 2016/17 rather than 2017/18.
- $250k Sandringham Golf Club Car Park unbudgeted income from lease agreement, offset by expenditure.
- $214k Synthetic Green & Lighting-Brighton Beach Bowls Club unbudgeted income for works in 16/17.
- ($250k) Annual Road Reseal and Resheet Program decrease in funding for R2R Program in 16/17.
- ($100k) Cheltenham Recreation Reserve Pavilion CSIF funding unsuccessful.
- ($2,055M) Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment capital grants and club contribution to be received on completion of the project in 17/18

Capital Forecast Expenditure favourable $7.340M
- $3.3M construction for Elsternwick Park No 1 Oval Precinct to be completed in 17/18.
- $3M construction for Dandy Street Beach Masterplan Implementation, construction works likely to commence in 17/18.
- $2M Banksia Reserve Beaumaris Pavilion Redevelopment to be completed in 17/18.
- $1M construction for the Sandringham Village Activity Centre Streetscaping now to be completed in 17/18 as works will commence later than originally planned.
- ($1M) overspend for Brighton Golf Stormwater project 16/17 to bring works forward and funded by the delay in commencement of the Sandringham Village Activity Centre Streetscaping.
- $210k works postponed for Brighton Beach Oval Precinct Redevelopment to future years as per Council’s resolution.
- ($300k) Sandringham Golf Club Car Park works to be funded from income received.
- ($275k) additional works required for Hurlingham Park Masterplan Implementation after Council decision to modify the oval perimeter drain and other associated changes.
- ($320k) Synthetic Green & Lighting-Brighton Beach Bowls Club unbudgeted works in 16/17 as per Council’s resolution funded partially from unbudgeted income.
- ($200k) Playground Renewal projects not completed in 15/16 to be funded from Reserves as per council resolution.
- ($200k) completion of works in 16/17 for Hurlingham Park Pavilion Redevelopment that was funded in 15/16.
- ($150k) Kindergarten Upgrades Council resolution to undertake improvement works. Immediate actions to be undertaken in 2016/17 to be funded from Reserves.
**Detailed Schedules**

1. **Income Statement**

<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>56,927</td>
<td>57,297</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>85,286</td>
<td>85,576</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Fees and Fines</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>5,071</td>
<td>5,307</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>8,288</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>4,054</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>7,675</td>
<td>7,791</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10,209</td>
<td>10,321</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(566)</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Operating</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash - Capital</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>(1,365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>(210)</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>(331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/(Loss) on Disposal of assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,180</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,402</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,222</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,479</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>632</strong></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>27,689</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>40,192</td>
<td>40,424</td>
<td>(232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>29,399</td>
<td>26,383</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>43,499</td>
<td>42,739</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and Doubtful Debts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and Amortisation</td>
<td>10,976</td>
<td>10,396</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,611</strong></td>
<td><strong>64,195</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>101,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>555</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Result - Surplus** | 11,569 | 18,207 | 6,637 | 22,279 | 23,466 | 1,188 |
2. **Statement of Capital Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL in $’000’s</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Budget Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2016/17 Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Current Forecast</th>
<th>2016/17 Carry Forward Balance to 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,911</td>
<td>13,094</td>
<td>4,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Improvements</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>(158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Buildings</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</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>193</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>(98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems, Network, Servers and Communication</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assets</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>420</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>263</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>894</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,220</td>
<td>8,337</td>
<td>3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Car Parks</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>431</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>(300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Infrastructure</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>(992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Infrastructure</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>(260)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>7,568</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>15,831</td>
<td>13,688</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,426</td>
<td>39,086</td>
<td>7,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>(645)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(566)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,659)</td>
<td>(3,649)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - Cash- Capital</td>
<td>(1,333)</td>
<td>(2,057)</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>(4,380)</td>
<td>(3,015)</td>
<td>(1,365)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>(1,978)</td>
<td>(2,136)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8,039)</td>
<td>(6,663)</td>
<td>(1,376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,854</td>
<td>11,553</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,387</td>
<td>32,423</td>
<td>5,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Statement of Cash Flows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 Jun 16</th>
<th>28 Feb 17</th>
<th>Full Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
<td>$'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from operating activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates and charges</td>
<td>82,602</td>
<td>68,530</td>
<td>65,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory fees and fines</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>3,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>7,166</td>
<td>7,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental income</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>3,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions - monetary</td>
<td>5,332</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Operating</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>7,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Capital</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
<td>2,702</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net GST refund</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>3,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee costs</strong></td>
<td>(38,356)</td>
<td>(26,839)</td>
<td>(28,680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to suppliers</td>
<td>(45,820)</td>
<td>(29,189)</td>
<td>(35,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities</strong></td>
<td>43,276</td>
<td>40,235</td>
<td>33,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from investing activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>(23,343)</td>
<td>(13,662)</td>
<td>(16,952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale property, infrastructure, plant &amp; equipment</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from term deposit investments</td>
<td>(17,000)</td>
<td>(25,500)</td>
<td>(17,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in investing activities</strong></td>
<td>(36,918)</td>
<td>(39,182)</td>
<td>(33,952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flows from financing activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>(735)</td>
<td>(263)</td>
<td>(289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from borrowings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of borrowings</td>
<td>(4,164)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in financing activities</strong></td>
<td>(4,919)</td>
<td>(358)</td>
<td>(369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net increase(decrease) in cash and cash equivalents</strong></td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>(580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the beginning of the period</td>
<td>3,746</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term Deposits</strong></td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</strong></td>
<td>75,185</td>
<td>101,380</td>
<td>73,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated and unrestricted</td>
<td>35,052</td>
<td>63,506</td>
<td>43,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, committed and allocated funds</td>
<td>40,123</td>
<td>37,874</td>
<td>29,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cash and cash equivalents at the end of the period</strong></td>
<td>75,185</td>
<td>101,380</td>
<td>73,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Balance Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance Sheet as at 28 February 2017</th>
<th>Full Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-Jun-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>5,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>6,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial assets</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non current assets classified as held for sale</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>82,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other receivables</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, infrastructure, plant and equipment</td>
<td>2,890,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-current assets</strong></td>
<td>2,890,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>2,972,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and other payables</td>
<td>9,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds and deposits</td>
<td>4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td>5,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income in Advance</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>27,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest bearing loans and borrowings</td>
<td>2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>3,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>30,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets</strong></td>
<td>2,942,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated surplus</td>
<td>828,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset revaluation reserve</td>
<td>2,078,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reserves</td>
<td>35,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total equity</strong></td>
<td>2,942,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Purpose and Background
For Council to consider a proposal to extend the current Banking and Payment Services contract for an additional year until 30 June 2018.

The current banking contract with The National Australia Bank (NAB) commenced 1 July 2014 for a three year period with two by one year extensions. The contract is due to expire on 30 June 2017.

The services provided under the contract include:

- **Transaction Banking** – Council’s Operating Accounts, Clearing Accounts, set-off accounts, payroll processing, account reconciliation and suppliers transaction payments.

- **Account Collections** – Including BPAY facilities, credit and debit card, merchant facilities, direct bank debit, EFTPOS payments and electronic/internet facilities.

- **Deposits and Investments** – Money market call and 11am, term deposits, commercial bills, fixed interest securities.

Key issues
In order to assess whether Council should take up the option of a contract extension Whitmore Consulting was engaged to conduct a market test (benchmarking exercise) in respect of the transaction banking and bill payment transaction solutions that are currently utilised by Council. The scope included comparing the current contract product pricing to current market quoted pricing. Based on the recent tender evaluations conducted by the consultant on behalf of Councils, the consultant provided market rates that could be reasonably expected in the current environment based on transaction volumes experienced by Bayside City Council.

The benchmarking results confirm that the fees and charges in the contract for the delivery of paper based services, electronic services, merchant service fees, and BPAY are very competitive and within market expectation. The benchmarking analysis based on the transaction volumes confirmed that there may be savings of up to $14,546 on fees and charges. The benefit however would be reduced to $5,875 as the savings associated with the merchant service fee $8,672 would be offset by the equivalent reduction in fees recovered from Bayside customers. The At Call Deposit interest rate provided by the NAB was also assessed against benchmark market rates and identified a 50 basis points premium above the benchmark. Based on an average daily bank balance of $2.5 million this results in additional interest income of $12,500 per annum based on the current NAB rate compared to the benchmark.

Based on the results of the market test an approach was made to the NAB requesting a review of existing rates. The NAB responded with a review of the rates which has resulted in 0.01% reduction in the Merchant Facility Margin included in the merchant service fee which has resulted in further savings of $2,890.
The market assessment has concluded that any potential savings in fees and charges would be more than offset by a reduction in interest income by as much as $6,624.00.

Based on the results of the benchmarking analysis including the at-call deposit rate, savings are unlikely to result from tendering the Council’s banking services at this time.

The extension of the contract will also allow the NAB and Bayside to continue to work on a number of innovative projects designed to create efficiency and improve the customer experience including

- Contactless card payment at parking meters
- Direct link automated file transfer
- Continuing to transition customers to more efficient and less costly payment channels including Direct debit and BPAY

**Recommendation**

That Council approve the extension of Contract no. 13/58 with the National Australia Bank for the provision of Banking and Bill Payment Services for an additional twelve months until 30 June 2018, and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to execute the contract documentation.

**Support Attachments**

1. NAB banking contract market analysis (separately enclosed) ⇦
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
Council requires from the supplier an understanding of Local Government, corporate social responsibility and a customer focus.

Natural Environment
Not applicable to this report.

Built Environment
Not applicable to this report.

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The banking services and payment transaction solutions contract will improve the service to the community by continuing to provide a range of payment facilities at a reduced fee to 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.

Legal
Council requires from the supplier an understanding of Local Government, corporate social responsibility and a customer focus.

Finance
Council’s 2017/18 Budget includes an amount of $237,800 for Banking and Bill Payment Services. This includes merchant service costs for credit card transactions of $130,000 which Council recovers from the customer via a merchant service fee.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The Banking and Bill Payment Services Contract is consistent with the 2013-17 Council Plan as identified in Commitment Goal 7 relating to Council’s intention to continue to be financially responsible with good governance.
**Executive summary**

**Purpose and background**

To approve the proposed naming of a private roadway adjacent to 154 New Street Brighton.

Residents of a small development known as 154 New Street, have requested Council to recommend to the Office of Geographical Names that the private roadway which abuts the property of 154 New Street be named Robyn Court.

For many years the property of 154 New Street which consists of eight units running off a private roadway has had no real sense of address. The long private roadway which connects all properties and to new street has never be named.

The owners of properties Unit 1 to Unit 8 154 New Street Brighton have unanimously agreed that the private road be named and recognised as "Robyn Court" which is connected to the original subdivision of the land.

**Key issues**

The naming of this private would provide an individual sense of address and give recognition to the private road for emergency services. Already postal services access the roadway to deliver mail to individual properties.

However, garbage collection services would still remain fronting 154 New Street.

It should be noted that there are many private roadways within close proximity that have been named to provide a sense of an individual address such as Gatehouse Place and Sayers Lane. (refer to the attached plan)

It should also be noted that given the roadway is a private road, Council is not responsible for the roadway, maintenance or street signage, however the style of the street sign must be erected in the same style as all street signs across the municipality.

Given the unanimous support of all residents of the Body Corporate at 154 New Street to name the private roadway Robyn Court, it is recommended that Council support the proposed naming of the roadway and lodge the request with the Office of Geographical Names.

Recognition of this roadway as Robyn Court would enable the affected properties to be logically renamed and numbered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/154 New Street</th>
<th>154 New Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/154 New Street</td>
<td>2 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/154 New Street</td>
<td>3 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/154 New Street</td>
<td>4 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/154 New Street</td>
<td>5 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/154 New Street</td>
<td>6 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/154 New Street</td>
<td>7 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/154 New Street</td>
<td>8 Robyn Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation

That Council:

1. endorses the proposal to name the private roadway abutting 154 New Street Brighton as Robyn Court;
2. advises the Registrar of the Office of Geographical Names of Council’s resolution in this matter;
3. advises adjoining property owners of 154 New Street Brighton accordingly once advice has been received from the Office of Geographical Names and the roadway has been formally gazetted; and
4. appropriate street signage be erected once advice has been received from the Office of Geographical Names that the road name has been formally gazetted

Support Attachments

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The naming of the private roadway will provide each resident with the private sense of address and enable emergency to more readily find properties within the roadway once it is officially declared a named roadway.

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

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

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The residents of 154 New Street through the Body Corporate have generated this request to name the roadway and the name Robyn Court has unanimous support by all 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
Schedule 10 (5) of the Local Government Act 1989 provides that Council may approve, assign or change the name of a road and in exercising that power must act in accordance with the Guidelines in force for the time being under the Geographical Place Names Act 1998 and must advise the Registrar under the Act of the action taken.

Finance
There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Links to Council policy and strategy
This proposal is consistent with Council’s naming of roadway policy and with the Office of Geographical Names.
Executive summary

Purpose and background
To seek Council seeks to amend the suburb boundary alignment of a property known as 2 Carew Street Sandringham.

Key issues
Many years ago the suburb boundary abutting property 2 Carew Street, Sandringham, was clearly defined by the Registrar of Geographic Names as in the suburb of Hampton. However Bayside City Council’s property database had indicated that this property was located in the suburb of Sandringham. Council was advised by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning through Land Victoria that our database was incorrect and we were required to correct this anomaly.

Accordingly, Council changed the property database to reflect the true designated suburb boundary of Hampton as registered by the Registrar of Geographic Names.

The resident of the subject property has expressed their dissatisfaction with the correction of suburb boundary name, and have requested this be amended to reflect their suburb name of Sandringham that they have enjoyed for many years.

The definition of the suburb boundary of this property appears to have no good reasoning, given that all other properties in Carew Street are within the suburb boundary of Sandringham.

It is therefore recommended that Council request the Registrar of Geographic Names to amend the suburb boundary to enable 2 Carew Street to be officially known as Sandringham. Refer to the attached plan.
Recommendation
That Council requests the Registrar of Geographic Names to amend the boundary of 2 Carew Street from the suburb Hampton to Sandringham.

Support Attachments
Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The subject property affected by the suburb change has enjoyed the suburb of Sandringham for more than 20 years and the impact upon the three property owners on this recent change has caused distress and have expressed concern about the their safety when call for emergency services.

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

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

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The residents have expressed their strong desire to be known as Sandringham as they have done so for more than 20 years.

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
There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Links to Council policy and strategy
It is important that our residents have a strong connection with its community and local neighbourhood and this is highlighted in the Council Plan. The realignment of the boundary back to the suburb of Sandringham will continue the connection for property owners at 2 Carew Street and their adjoining neighbours.
10.12 RE-ALIGNMENT OF SANDRINGHAM / HAMPTON BOUNDARY ON SUSAN STREET

Executive summary

Purpose and background
To seek Council approval to amend the suburb boundary alignment of a property known as 2a and 2B Susan Street Sandringham.

Key issues
Many years ago the suburb boundary abutting property 2A and 2B Susan Street, Sandringham, was clearly defined by the Registrar of Geographic Names as in the suburb of Hampton. However Bayside City Council’s property database had indicated that this property was located in the suburb of Sandringham. Council was advised by the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning through Land Victoria that our database was incorrect and we were required to correct this anomaly.

Accordingly, Council changed the property database to reflect the true designated suburb boundary of Hampton as registered by the Registrar of Geographic Names.

The residents of the subject properties has expressed their dissatisfaction with the correction of suburb boundary name, and have requested this be amended to reflect their suburb name of Sandringham that they have enjoyed for many years.

The definition of the suburb boundary of this property appears to have no good reasoning, given that all other properties in Susan Street are within the suburb boundary of Sandringham.

It is therefore recommended that Council request the Registrar of Geographic Names to amend the suburb boundary to enable 2A and 2B Susan Street to be officially known as Sandringham. Refer to the attached plan.
Recommendation
That Council requests the Registrar of Geographic Names to amend the boundary of 2A and 2B Susan Street from the suburb Hampton to Sandringham.

Support Attachments
Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
The subject property affected by the suburb change has enjoyed the suburb of Sandringham for more than 30 years and the impact upon the three property owners on this recent change has caused distress and have expressed concern about the their safety when call for emergency services.

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

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

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The residents have expressed their strong desire to be known as Sandringham as they have done so for more than 20 years.

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
There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Links to Council policy and strategy
It is important that our residents have a strong connection with its community and local neighbourhood and this is highlighted in the Council Plan. The realignment of the boundary back to the suburb of Sandringham will continue the connection for property owners at 2A and 2B Carew Street and their adjoining neighbours.
10.13 ADDITIONAL PLANNING AND AMENITY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/17/68 – Doc No: DOC/17/78570

Executive summary

Purpose and background
For Council to adopt additional Planning and Amenity Committee Meetings proposed for the period from May 2017 to November 2017.

As a result of increased planning applications and an increase in planning officers to assess planning applications a significant increase in items for the Committee’s consideration has occurred.

During the month of April, 22 items were considered by the Planning and Amenity Committee which was dealt with over two separate meetings. It is anticipated that the number of applications for consideration by the Planning and Amenity Committee will remain around 20 items per month for at least 5 – 6 months.

To accommodate this workload it is proposed to schedule additional Planning and Amenity Committee meetings for a short period of time. It is expected that on most occasions the Committee receives between 15 – 25 speakers requesting to be heard at each meeting, therefore it is appropriate that up to 10 items be included on each agenda in order to consider each item thoroughly, listen to speakers, deliberate and debate the item and conclude the meeting at 11.30pm in accordance with the Governance Local Law.

Key issues
Whilst scheduling additional meetings to cater for the increase workload of planning applications in the short term, the other alternative is to review the planning delegations which is proposed to be undertaken as part of a further review of Planning in November 2017.

The Planning & Amenity Committee considers all applications where planning delegates recommend that a planning permit be granted but there are two or more community planning objections to the application. Planning delegates are senior planning officers who currently have delegation to refuse to grant a planning permit, grant a planning permit where there are zero or one objection, or issue fast-track VicSmart permits. Due to the increase in the number of permit applications in Bayside, and the number of objections which are being received to those applications, the number of applications which must be determined by the Planning & Amenity Committee is increasing.

Given Council will have an opportunity to review the Planning delegations in November 2017, in the interim it is proposed that Council adopt the following additional Planning and Amenity Committee Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently scheduled</td>
<td>Tuesday 9 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Thursday 18 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently scheduled</td>
<td>Tuesday 13 June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, should the additional Planning and Amenity Committee not be required, that the Chief Executive Officer be authorised to cancel the Committee Meeting subject to adequate public notice being given on Council’s website.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Adopts the additional Planning and Amenity Committee Meetings as part of its Council and Committee meeting cycle for 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 18 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 22 June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 6 July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 3 August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 28 September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 2 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting</td>
<td>Thursday 30 November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to cancel a Planning and Amenity Committee meeting should the additional meeting not be required subject to adequate public notice being given on Council’s website.

3. 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.

**Support Attachments**

Nil
Considerations and implications of recommendation

Liveable community

Social
There are no social implications associated with this report.

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

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

Customer Service and Community Engagement
The additional Planning and Amenity Committee meetings will be publicises on Council’s website and any cancelation of meetings will be advised via Council’s website.

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
Should Council adopt the additional meetings, public notices will be given on Council’s website of the additional meetings in additional to a statutory public notice in the Age Newspaper.

Finance
The additional seven meetings will impact upon the budget particularly during 2017/18 financial year. It is anticipated the additional cost of the seven meetings will be approximately $2,500 per meeting.

Links to Council policy and strategy
The additional meetings will provide a more efficient decision making process for Council.
10.14 COUNCIL ACTION AWAITING REPORT
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Executive summary

Purpose and background
This report presents to Council a schedule of actions pending for the period to 28 March 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 - April Meeting ↓
## Council Action Awaiting Report Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF MEETING</th>
<th>COUNCIL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>COMMENTS/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19.08.14        | Planning Scheme Amendment C116: Mandatory height controls in Hampton Street Activity Centre & Willis Street Urban Design Framework  
3. receives a further report at the conclusion of the exhibition process for both Amendments to consider submissions and legal representation requirements. | DCP&CS   | 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. |
| 25.11.14        | Home and Community Care (HACC) Service Review  
8. receives further reports as information becomes available on the arrangements to be put in place in subsequent years, in order to consider Council’s future role and contribution to meeting the needs of its community for home support services; | DCP&CS   | Report to proceed to the June 2018 Council Meeting.                                                                                                                |
| 28.07.15        | HMVS Cerberus Update  
That Council receives a report at the completion of the feasibility study outlining the findings and proposed actions. | DER&I    | A briefing report will be provided at the 2 May 2017 Councillor briefing.                                                                                     |
| 25.08.15        | Hampton Willis Street Precinct – Traffic Management and Scout Hall Site  
That Council:  
4. receives a further separate report no earlier than the November Ordinary Meeting of Council regarding the future use or sale of 6A Willis Street Hampton: | DCorp    | 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.09.15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td><strong>Strategic Service Review – Family &amp; Childrens Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council&lt;br&gt;8. develops a ten year improvement plan for kindergartens;&lt;br&gt;12. considers the statement of purpose principles identified in the Family and Children’s Services review as part of the development of the next Early Years Action Plan due in 2017</td>
<td>DCP&amp;CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.10.15</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td><strong>Request to purchase land 3 Hansen Street</strong>&lt;br&gt;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>DCorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td><strong>Sandringham Village Streetscape Masterplan</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability Framework 2016-2025</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt; 1. receives a report annually on the progress and updates to the Environmental Sustainability Framework Action Plan.</td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/16</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td><strong>Development Services Sustainable Staff and Resourcing</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council receives a report to the Ordinary Meeting of Council in April 2017 on progress towards these timelines and service standard levels.</td>
<td>DCP&amp;CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td><strong>Childrens' Sensory Garden Investigation</strong>&lt;br&gt;That Council:&lt;br&gt; 1. notes the typical elements of a suburban sensory garden;&lt;br&gt; 2. proposes the CSIRO site is the preferred location for the establishment of a sensory garden in Bayside;&lt;br&gt; 3. seeks community feedback regarding the concept of establishing a sensory garden in Bayside to inform future decisions on this matter; and&lt;br&gt; 4. receives a further report detailing the financial implications associated with the establishment of a sensory garden.</td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Council Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td><strong>Bayside Public Transport Advocacy Statement</strong></td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council: 2. receives further updates of the Bayside Public Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy Statement as part of the annual Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>update report required as part of Council’s resolution for adopting the ITS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to seek the endorsement of any new advocacy issues and positions that are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evolved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/16</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td><strong>Brighton Secondary College Synthetic Hockey Facility Management Committee</strong></td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Financial Update</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council receives a further report no later than July 2017 from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Committee summarising activities, including the financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>position of the Brighton Secondary College Synthetic Hockey Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/08/16</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td><strong>Indian Mynah Control – Trial Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council, subject to the Bayside Indian Myna Action Group (BIMAG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuing to operate the Indian Myna control program: 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reviews future funding for this program as part of Council’s annual budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considerations; 3. Requests a report from BIMAG to be provided to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in May 2017 detailing the operations of the group for the period April 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to April 2017;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further updates on the Bayside Public Transport Advocacy Statement will be provided to Council for adoption for any new advocacy issues when they arise.

A report will be presented to the July 2017 Council meeting.

A report will be presented to the May 2017 Council meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/08/16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td><strong>Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy Implementation Progress 2015/16</strong></td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
<td>A report will be presented to the August 2017 Council meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. receives a further report on the implementation of the Bayside Integrated Transport Strategy and the supporting suite of transport strategies and plans at the conclusion of the 2016/17 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/08/16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td><strong>Statutory Planning – FY 2015/16 Service Review Update</strong></td>
<td>DCP&amp;CS</td>
<td>Report included in the April Ordinary Meeting Agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. receives a report in February 2017 on the improvement plan including achievement of performance and customer satisfaction measures for the period 1 July 2016 to 31 December 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/09/16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td><strong>Acquisitive Art Prize</strong></td>
<td>DCP&amp;CS</td>
<td>A report will be presented to Council in November 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Council resolves to review the Acquisitive Art Prize governance, process and criteria for 2018 and beyond in November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/09/16</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td><strong>NOM – 259 – Pedestrian Crossing along Hampton Street Hampton</strong></td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
<td>A report will be presented to the 2 May 2017 Councillor briefing meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That a Council report be prepared to review the need for additional pedestrian crossings along Hampton Street, whether signal controlled or otherwise, given there are only three existing crossings between Crisp Street and South Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Report Title</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/11/16</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Development Services Sustainable Staff and Resourcing Plan</td>
<td>DCP&amp;CS</td>
<td>Report included in the April Ordinary Meeting agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Future Provision of Netball and Athletics Facilities in Bayside</td>
<td>DER&amp;I</td>
<td>A report will be presented to Council at the August 2017 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A report will be presented to Council at the September 2017 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Potential Land Purchase</td>
<td>DCorp</td>
<td>A further report will be submitted to Council following the negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to seek to negotiate the purchase of approximately 0.35 hectare of land at the CSIRO site in Highton for the potential future development of a library and community facilities; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. receives a further report on the outcomes of these negotiations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Christmas in Bayside 2016 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Bay Trail Shared Path Public Safety Risks and Outstanding Audit Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Revised Residential Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/02/17</td>
<td>28/03/2017</td>
<td>Plan Melbourne 2017-2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A report will be submitted to Council at the May 2017 meeting.
- A report will be submitted to Council following the community consultation.
- A report is included in the April Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda.
- A report is included in the April Ordinary Meeting of Council agenda.

Plan Melbourne 2017-2050

That Council receives a report at the April 2017 Ordinary Meeting of Council that outlines the implications for Bayside as a result of the revised residential zones and any further work required as part of the implementation of theimpending changes.
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

13.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - 262 - REMOVAL OF CONFIDENTIALITY - BRIGHTON GOLF COURSE WATER HARVESTING

Corporate Services - Governance
File No: PSF/17/68 – Doc No: DOC/17/75296

I Cr Robert Grinter hereby give notice that I intend to move at the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held on 27 April 2017 at 7.00pm at the Council Chambers, Civic Centre, Boxshall Street, Brighton the following Notice of Motion:

Motion


Cr Robert Grinter

Support Attachments

Nil