Agenda

Ordinary Meeting of Council

Tuesday, 11 September 2018
6.30pm
Ordinary Meeting of Council
Tuesday, 11 September 2018 at 6.30pm
to be held at the Moonee Valley Civic Centre

TO :

Members:  Cr John Sipek                        Mayor
          Cr Samantha Byrne                   Deputy Mayor
          Cr Jim Cusack
          Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici
          Cr Richard Lawrence
          Cr Nicole Marshall
          Cr Cam Nation
          Cr Narelle Sharpe

Officers:  Mr Bryan Lancaster                   Chief Executive Officer
          Mr Steven Lambert                   Director City Services
          Ms Natalie Reiter                   Director Planning and Development
          Mr Petrus Barry                     Acting Director Organisational Performance
          Mr Gil Richardson                   Acting Director Asset Planning and Strategic Projects
          Ms Allison Watt                     Manager Governance and Communications
          Ms Vera Mitrovic-Misic              Acting Manager Statutory Planning
Business:

1. Opening

2. Reconciliation Statement

3. Apologies and Leave of Absence

4. Confirmation of Minutes
   Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday, 28 August 2018.

5. Declarations of Conflict of Interest

6. Presentations
   Nil.

7. Petitions and Joint Letters
   Nil.

8. Public Question Time

9. Reports from Special Committees
   Nil.

10. Reports
   10.2 Planning Policy Framework for the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.................................................................9
   10.3 2017/18 Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist.........................................................14
   10.4 2018-19 Capital Works Program Update .........................................................37
   10.5 Kindergarten in Moonee Ponds........................................................................41
   10.6 Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program for people seeking asylum........46
   10.7 Moonee Valley City Council Highball Stadium Development ....................65
   10.8 Moonee Valley Paid Parking Plan.................................................................70
   10.9 Update to Response to Notice of Motion 2017/21 - Electric Car Charging Infrastructure ........................................................................82
   10.10 Significant Tree Register - Summary of submissions post consultation........................................................................94
   10.11 Windy Hill and Essendon Football Club .......................................................105
   10.12 Community Sport Infrastructure Fund (CSIF) Update - Overland Reserve........................................................................110
11. Notices of Motion
   Nil.

12. Urgent Business

13. Delegates Reports

14. Confidential Reports
   14.1 38-42 Scotia Street, Moonee Ponds (All land in Strata Plan 20307) - Consideration of an in-principle agreement reached at a VCAT Compulsory Conference

   14.2 327-357 Mt Alexander Road, Ascot Vale (Lot 1 TP691989U, Lot 1 TP759343W, Lot 1 LP47069, Vol.8442 Fol.272, Lot 1 TP183001L, Lot 1 TP531956H, Lot 1 TP534732Q, and Lots 1 & 2 TP959305Q) - Demolish buildings and construct buildings and works comprising a multi-storey mixed-use development and four triple storey townhouses in a Commercial 1 Zone, Heritage Overlay (HO363) and Design and Development Overlay (DDO3), use of the land for dwellings, a reduction in car parking requirements and alteration of access to a road in a Road Zone, Category 1

15. Close of Meeting

BRYAN LANCASTER
Chief Executive Officer

File No:  Fol/18/32
Author:  Damian Hogan - Manager Finance
Directorate:  Organisational Performance

Purpose
To adopt in principle the 2017/18 Annual Financial report.

Executive Summary
This report presents Council’s 2017/18 Annual Financial Report, consisting of the Financial Statements and Notes to the Audit Committee, for review and recommendation to Council to adopt this report.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Notes the recommendation of the Audit Committee.
3. Nominates and authorises Councillor John Sipek and Councillor Samantha Byrne to certify, on behalf of Council, the Annual Financial Report, in the final form.

Background
The Victorian Auditor-General’s Office has completed the external audit of the 2017/18 Annual Financial Report.

The Annual Financial Report consisting of the Financial Statements and Notes (refer Appendix A – separately circulated), has been prepared in accordance with relevant legislation, applicable Australian Accounting Standards and other related accounting guidelines.

The Audit Committee at its meeting held Monday 27 August 2018, in accordance with Section 137 of the Local Government Act 1989, having reviewed the Annual Financial Report consisting of the Financial Statements and Notes, recommended that Council adopt the 2017/18 Annual Financial Report on an “in principle” basis and submit them to the Victorian Auditor-General for final audit.

In accordance to Section 131(8) of the Local Government Act 1989, the completed Annual Financial Report is to be signed by the Principal Accounting Officer and authorised by two Councillors having regard to the recommendations, if any, from the Victorian Auditor-General.

The Victorian Auditor-General’s certification is anticipated in September 2018.
Discussion

The Annual Financial Report is prepared strictly in accordance with the applicable Australian Accounting Standards which includes the Australian equivalent to International Financial Reporting Standards (AIFRS). These Standards require the preparation of five mandatory statements. These statements include:

- “Comprehensive Income Statement” (Operating – Accrual Statement). This comprises non-cash items such as Depreciation and cost of goods (assets) sold, and excludes Capital Expenditure and Transfers to and from Other Reserves.
- “Balance Sheet” which lists Council’s assets and liabilities. It indicates the overall financial position of Council.
- “Statement of Changes in Equity”. This indicates movements in Council’s Reserve Funds.
- “Statement of Cash Flows”. This indicates all cash expended and received for all activities during the financial year.
- “Statement of Capital Works” which details Council’s capital works expenditure for the financial year. It sets out the expenditure on creating or buying property, infrastructure, plant and equipment by each category of asset.

For the 2017/18 financial year, Council is also required to prepare two “Budget Comparison Notes” with variance explanations to the 2017/18 Annual Budget. These being Income Statement and Capital Works.

The following analysis of the 2017/18 Annual Financial Report is at a macro level, which reflects the nature of the Report’s disclosures. It is not designed nor intended to be used as a Management report that provides details of programs, or resultant variances. No analysis has been provided for the Statement of Changes in Equity.

1. Income Statement

The operating result represents the accrual accounting treatment, which includes the non-cash items of depreciation and cost of goods (assets) sold, but excludes expenditure on Capital items and transfers to and from other reserves.

As at 30 June 2018, Council reported a net operating surplus position of $13.01 million, compared to a budgeted operating result of $10.58 million. The surplus is due to an increase above budget in rates and charges of $1.96 million, monetary and non-monetary contributions of $3.38 million, statutory fees and fines $1.65 million and other income $1.11 million (predominately made up from interest received from invested funds). Capital grants were $3.50 million under budget due to the unsuccessful application for the shared facilities funding program.

2. Balance Sheet

The Balance Sheet indicates that Council’s overall financial position and its cash and liquidity position are sound and within acceptable financial parameters.

Council’s cash position as at 30 June 2018 was represented by cash on hand and investments of $68.42 million. This represents an increase in cash holdings
of $4.54 million during the 2017/18 financial year, mainly due to the favourable operating result.

The value of Council’s property, infrastructure, plant and equipment as at 30 June 2018 is $2.39 billion, an increase of $358.70 million from 30 June 2017. This was due to the revaluation of Council’s land under roads, land assets and building assets.

Trade payables brought to account were $17.49 million, an increase of $2.81 million on the June 2017 level. The increase is primarily due to the volume of outstanding invoices processed for payment as at 30 June 2018.

Council’s end-of-year working capital ratio of 2.31:1 exceeds the key sustainable target ratio of 1.20-2.00:1. This ratio is used to assess Council’s ability to meet current commitments and is derived by dividing current assets by current liabilities.

3. **Cash Flow Statement**

   Overall cash flow has decreased by $15.45 million predominately due to the increase in payments for property, infrastructure, plant and equipment of $11.40 million.

   Operating cash flow decreased by $4.29 million due to increases in employee costs - $7.24 million and materials and services - $4.77 million. The increased cash outflows were offset by increases in rates and charges - $4.03 million and user fees - $3.30 million.

4. **Statement of Capital Works**

   Capital expenditure for the year ended 30 June 2018 was $35.10 million. Projects totalling $9.12 million will be carried forward into 2018/19 financial year including Overland Reserve Pavilion ($2.97 million), Ormond Park Pavilion ($0.07 million), East Keilor Leisure Centre Development and Design ($0.85 million) and Windsor and Balmoral Avenue Drainage improvements ($0.83 million).

**Consultation**

The Annual Financial Report is prepared by Council’s Finance Department. Consultation regarding the process, or the resolution of any queries, during its preparation, occurs with the Victorian Auditor-General’s Office.

**Implications**

1. **Legislative**

   This report addresses the requirements of sections 131 and 132 of the *Local Government Act 1989* (Act) and Regulation 19 of the *Local Government Planning and Reporting Regulations 2014* (Regulations).

2. **Council Plan / Policy**

   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to foster a culture of accountability and transparency in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 5: Resilient organisation - A resilient organisation that is
sustainable, innovative, engaging and accountable - Good governance is everyone’s responsibility.

3. **Financial**
   
   This report has no direct financial implications.

4. **Environmental**
   
   There are no environmental issues associated with this report.

**Conclusion**

The Annual Financial Report indicates that Council’s overall financial position is sound for the financial year ended 30 June 2018.

**Appendices**

10.2 Planning Policy Framework for the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Corina de Araujo - Strategic Planner
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the rewrite of the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) to include the MV2040 Strategy into the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme, and to present the new Planning Policy Framework (PPF) to Council. The PPF is the result of recently announced State Government reforms to the form and content on planning schemes. At the meeting on 28 August 2018 Council resolved that this matter be deferred to the meeting on 11 September 2018.

Executive Summary
- A statutorily required review of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme was presented at the Ordinary Meeting on 26 June 2018. Its key recommendation was to update the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) to implement the MV2040 Strategy.
- At the same Ordinary Meeting, the new MSS was presented to Council. It was drafted to ensure the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme reflected local strategic direction within the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF). Importantly, it was also written in a way that would allow for an easier translation to anticipated structural change to the planning policy framework.
- On 11 July 2018 Council received correspondence from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) notifying that Council’s application for authorisation to prepare Amendment C193 required further review. This was due to DELWP’s proposed changes to the form and content of planning schemes as part of its ‘Smart Planning’ program, and its likely impact to Amendment C193.
- On 31 July 2018 the Minister for Planning (Minister) approved reforms to the Victoria Planning Provisions (VPP) via Amendment VC148. The reforms served to consolidate the structure of planning schemes and introduce a new integrated Planning Policy Framework (PPF). Amendment VC148 requires all councils to translate their local planning content into the PPF.
- The new PPF (Appendix A – separately circulated) relocates local planning policy content from the recently drafted MSS in line with State instruction (Planning Advisory Note 71 and 72), removing duplication of State and regional policy, along with content incompatible with the PPF model, and correcting grammatical and formatting inconsistencies.
Recommendation

That Council:

1. Notes the new Planning Policy Framework (PPF) structure of all Victorian Planning Schemes and the required translation of the Local Planning Policy Framework into the PPF as a result of Amendment VC148 on 31 July 2018.

2. Notes the Moonee Valley Planning Policy Framework local content and related changes (Appendix A – separately circulated) been prepared to translate the recently redrafted Municipal Strategic Statement into the newly required PPF format.

3. Lodges the Moonee Valley Planning Policy Framework local content and related changes with the Minister for Planning to allow progression of Amendment C193 (or a revised Amendment as advised by DELWP).

4. Allows Council officers to make minor editing and typographical changes as required.

Background

At the Ordinary Meeting on 26 June 2018, Council adopted the MV2040 Strategy as Moonee Valley’s long-term strategic plan, and the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme Review Report as the review pursuant to section 12B of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The key recommendation of the review was to comprehensively re-write the MSS to include the vision, key issues, opportunities and strategic directions of the city, as articulated in the MV2040 Strategy. At the same meeting, a revised MSS (Clause 21) and a new ESD Local Policy was presented to Council, and Council endorsed the preparation of Amendment C193 (previously C195) to update the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

On 27 June 2018, Council officers formally requested the Minister to authorise Amendment C193 pursuant to section 8A(3) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. The request was lodged on DELWP’s new online Amendment Tracking System (ATS) which automatically generates amendment numbers, and explains the difference between the number presented to Council and the now lodged amendment number.

On 11 July 2018, Council received correspondence from DELWP notifying that Amendment C193 required further review. This was due to DELWP’s impending changes (at the time) to the form and content of planning scheme and its likely impact to Amendment C193.

On 31 July 2018, the Minister approved reforms to the VPP via Amendment VC148 as part of its Smart Planning program. The reforms introduce a new integrated PPF that will see State, regional and local planning policies ‘nested’ into a policy framework that is more consistent, succinct, logical and easier to use. Amendment VC148 implements the first stage of the PPF by replacing the SPPF. The new PPF (Clauses 10 to 19) replaces the SPPF (former clauses 9 to 19) and provides the structure for three tiers of integrated planning policy – state, regional and local. Figure 1 diagrammatically displays the structure of the VPP prior to Amendment VC148, while Figure 2 shows the new structure.
Discussion

Further to DELWP’s letter of 11 July 2018 notifying further review of Amendment C193 pending a translation of the Local Planning Policy Framework (Clause 21 and 22) into the PPF format, it is now opportune for Council to reformat our draft policy. In completing this work, Moonee Valley will become one of the first councils to implement a full PPF. Moonee Valley’s PPF will either be implemented into the Planning Scheme through a revised Amendment C193, or as part of a new Amendment (advice from DELWP is pending).

The MSS re-write presented to Council at the Ordinary Meeting on 26 June 2018 was written in a way that would allow for an easier translation to the anticipated structural change to the planning policy framework. As such, the new PPF (Appendix A – separately circulated) relocates local content in line with State instruction (Planning Advisory Note 71 and 72), removing duplication of State and regional policy along with content incompatible with the PPF model, and correcting grammatical and formatting inconsistencies.
Consultation
The re-write of the MSS, and its subsequent translation to the PPF, were underpinned by community views expressed during the comprehensive MV2040 Engagement Program. This included three phases of direct community consultation from February 2017 to May 2018.

Pending the Minister’s authorisation, consultation relating directly to PPF will take place during a formal exhibition period.

Implications

1. Legislative
   The PPF translation is consistent with the Ministerial Direction – The Form and Content of Planning Schemes under section 7(5) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.
   The report has been prepared with due regard for the Human Rights Charter.

2. Council Plan / Policy
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to deliver timely, high-quality statutory planning services to manage growth and development in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 3: Sustainable living - Connected, well designed municipality, thriving neighbourhoods, accessible places and spaces - Growth and development is well managed.

3. Financial
   The cost of translating the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme to the PPF will be funded through the Strategic Planning operational budget.

4. Environmental
   Updating the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme will have a positive environmental impact. Among other objectives, the PPF translation seeks to manage:
   - Climate change impacts
   - Energy efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions
   - Waste and resource recovery
   - Biodiversity impacts.
   This contributes to MV2040 Strategy’s vision for a green Moonee Valley that is ecologically healthy and environmentally responsible.

Conclusion
Amendment VC148 implements the first stage of the PPF by replacing the SPPF and requires all councils to introduce their local planning policies. On this direction, Council officers have prepared a full PPF that integrates the LPPF with regional and state-wide planning policy. Resolutions consistent with the recommendations of this report will provide the necessary information to assist in securing the Minister’s authorisation for translation of MV2040 into the Planning Scheme.
The redrafting of the MSS into the PPF format will incorporate the MV2040 Strategy into the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme, ensuring the planning scheme is up to date. This is important in ensuring the appropriate framework is in place to guide decision-making and achieve a healthy, fair, thriving, connected and beautiful city by 2040.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Planning Policy Framework - 20 Aug 2018 (separately circulated)  ⇨ 📄
10.3 2017/18 Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist

File No:  Fol/18/32
Author: Marianne McArthur
Corporate Planning Officer
Directorate: Organisational Performance

Purpose
To present the 2017/18 Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist to Council for approval and certification.

Executive Summary
The 2017/18 Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist form part of the annual report. These documents must be approved and certified by Council before being included in the annual report. The performance statement must also be submitted to Council’s auditors for final audit clearance following certification.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Approves in principle the 2017/18 Performance Statement;
2. Authorises Councillor John Sipek and Councillor Samantha Byrne to certify the Performance Statement on behalf of Council;
3. Submits the certified Performance Statement to the Victorian Auditor-General’s Office (VAGO) for final audit approval; and
4. Approves the Governance and Management Checklist for certification by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer.

Background
In 2014-15 the Victorian Government introduced a mandatory performance reporting framework known as the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF). This framework requires that certain information be disclosed in the annual report, including an audited Performance Statement and a Governance and Management Checklist.

Council’s 2017/18 Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist are attached as Appendix A and Appendix B respectively. These documents must be certified prior to inclusion in the annual report, as per sections 131(3)(a)(ii) and 132(5)(b)) of the Local Government Act 1989 and regulations 12 and 18 of the Local Government Planning and Reporting Regulations 2014.
Discussion

Performance Statement

The Performance Statement is an accountability document setting out results achieved by Council against a prescribed set of sustainable capacity, service performance and financial indicators. The Performance Statement has undergone a detailed process of preparation, review and approval, including an independent review by VAGO and the Audit Committee. Once Council has approved the Performance Statement in principle, VAGO will issue a final report on the Performance Statement for inclusion in the annual report.

Council must provide explanatory commentary regarding any material variations (movements of ten per cent or more) in performance between the current and previous year. Some comments have, however, been added to certain service indicators in the absence of a material variation where it was considered prudent to provide the reader with greater context regarding the results.

Governance and Management Checklist

The annual report of operations must contain Council’s assessment of its results against a prescribed checklist concerning governance and management matters. Some questions in the checklist relate to compliance with legislation, while others relate to items regarded by Local Government Victoria (LGV) as “better practice”.

Council has complied with all legislative requirements in the checklist. The “better practice” items Council did not have in place were:

- 10-year asset management plans. Instead, Council has in place shorter term asset management plans that are progressively being reviewed; and
- Six-monthly reporting against Council Plan indicators, as the results for the vast majority of these indicators are available only on an annual basis.

In accordance with LGV’s recommended process, the Audit Committee has reviewed the checklist and approval is now sought from Council for the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer to certify the checklist.

Consultation

The nature of this report does not require any consultation.

Implications

1. Legislative

This report addresses the requirements of sections 131(3)(a)(ii) and 132(5)(b)) of the Local Government Act 1989 and regulations 12 and 18 of the Local Government Planning and Reporting Regulations 2014.

2. Council Plan / Policy

In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to foster a culture of accountability and transparency in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 5: Resilient organisation - A resilient organisation that is
sustainable, innovative, engaging and accountable - Good governance is everyone’s responsibility.

3. Financial
   This report has no direct financial implications.

4. Environmental
   This report has no direct environmental implications.

Conclusion
The Performance Statement and Governance and Management Checklist are accountability documents that have undergone a robust review process prior to being presented to Council for approval.

Appendices
Appendix A: Performance Statement 2017/18
Appendix B: Governance and Management Checklist 2017/18
Performance statement
For the year ended 30 June, 2018

Description of municipality

The City of Moonee Valley is north-west of Melbourne’s CBD and is in the inner metropolitan region of Melbourne. It includes the suburbs of Flemington, Travancore, Ascot Vale, Moonee Ponds, Aberfeldie, Niddrie, Essendon West, Essendon, Essendon North, Avondale Heights, Keilor East, Strathmore, Strathmore Heights, Airport West and the locality known as Essendon Fields. The municipality is ideally situated between the Melbourne CBD and Melbourne Airport.

Moonee Valley is a diverse, primarily established, residential municipality. Complementing its residential areas are an eclectic mix of retail strips and centres, combined with offices, some industrial areas and Essendon Airport. The main industries include manufacturing, rental, hiring and real estate services, construction, transport, postal and warehousing and the retail trade. Moonee Valley is an attractive destination to do business, with around 10,680 businesses, the majority of which are small — more than 85 per cent have fewer than five employees.

The Council covers 43 square kilometres and has a population of approximately 121,700 people which is expected to grow by 30,000 people to 149,000 by 2036 (an average of 1,500 people per annum).
**Sustainable capacity Indicators**

For the year ended 30 June, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator/measure</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Material variations and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per head of municipal population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Total expenses / Municipal population]</td>
<td>$1,094</td>
<td>$1,161</td>
<td>$1,174</td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure per head of municipal population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Value of infrastructure / Municipal population]</td>
<td>$4,226</td>
<td>$4,347</td>
<td>$4,316</td>
<td>$4,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population density per length of road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Municipal population / Kilometres of local roads]</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Own-source revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-source revenue per head of municipal population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Own-source revenue / Municipal population]</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>$1,069</td>
<td>$1,097</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recurrent grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent grants per head of municipal population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Recurrent grants / Municipal population]</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disadvantage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative socio-economic disadvantage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Index of Relative Socio-economic Disadvantage by decile]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

"adjusted underlying revenue" means total income other than:

(a) non-recurrent grants used to fund capital expenditure; and

(b) non-monetary asset contributions; and

(c) contributions to fund capital expenditure from sources other than those referred to above

“infrastructure” means non-current property, plant and equipment excluding land

"local road" means a sealed or unsealed road for which the council is the responsible road authority under the Road Management Act 2004

"own-source revenue" means adjusted underlying revenue other than revenue that is not under the control of council (including government grants)

"population" means the resident population estimated by council

"relative socio-economic disadvantage", in relation to a municipality, means the relative socio-economic disadvantage, expressed as a decile for the relevant financial year, of the area in which the municipality is located according to the Index of Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage (Catalogue Number 2033.0.55.001) of SEIFA

"SEIFA" means the Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas published from time to time by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on its Internet website

"unrestricted cash" means all cash and cash equivalents other than restricted cash.
## Service performance Indicators

For the year ended 30 June, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/indicator/measure</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Material variations and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of aquatic facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number of visits to aquatic facilities / Municipal population]</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal management prosecutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number of successful animal management prosecutions]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The number of annual prosecutions has fluctuated slightly over the past four years according to the number of dog attacks reported. Over the past four years, Council successfully prosecuted all matters brought to court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and major non-compliance notifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council has a strong record of conducting follow-up inspections on time. Over the past four years, a small number of follow-up inspections were not conducted within prescribed timelines because the businesses had ceased operating at the time of the scheduled follow-up visit. In 2017/18, one follow-up inspection could not be carried out within prescribed timelines, as the premises was a temporary premises at a soccer match. Council addressed the issue at the time of the event, and will conduct a routine food safety assessment of the premises during the 2018 soccer season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of critical non-compliance notifications and major non-compliance notifications about food premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Satisfaction with council decisions</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council changed its survey method in 2017/18 from a telephone survey to a postal survey, achieving a higher response rate. In 2017/18, over two-thirds of respondents rated Council’s performance as positive. Satisfaction levels have fluctuated over the past four years. Decreased satisfaction has largely been associated with community concerns regarding planning and development related issues. Council is focussing on guiding growth to occur in the areas best suited for it, areas with good access to public transport, community facilities and services. This will help ensure that inappropriate development is minimised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and community care</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Participation in HACC service</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Reporting ceased 1 July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting on HACC ceased on 1 July 2016 due to the introduction of the Commonwealth Government’s NDIS and CHSP programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Reporting ceased 1 July 2016</td>
<td>Reporting on HACC ceased on 1 July 2016 due to the introduction of the Commonwealth Government's NDIS and CHSP programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in HACC service by CALD people</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Reporting ceased 1 July 2016</td>
<td>Reporting on HACC ceased on 1 July 2016 due to the introduction of the Commonwealth Government's NDIS and CHSP programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
<td>18.25%</td>
<td>19.03%</td>
<td>17.63%</td>
<td>This data includes only physical and digital resources, and does not include online learning resources or music and video streaming, which have been enthusiastically embraced by our community. Over the past four years, utilisation of physical and digital resources has remained at stable levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and child health</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Data unavailable due to the transition to a new database</td>
<td>79.57%</td>
<td>80.92%</td>
<td>Council initiated a service improvement this year that resulted in a higher number of clients identifying as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and child health</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Data unavailable due to the transition to a new database</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>Council initiated a service improvement this year that resulted in a higher number of clients identifying as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Transition to a new database</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roads**

**Satisfaction**

Satisfaction with sealed local roads

[Community satisfaction rating out of 100 with how council has performed on the condition of sealed local roads]

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Aboriginal children who attend the MCH service at least once (in the year) / Number of Aboriginal children enrolled in the MCH service</td>
<td>x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council changed its survey method in 2017/18 from a telephone survey to a postal survey, achieving a higher response rate. Council maintains roads to a high standard and satisfaction levels have been fairly consistent over the past four years. In 2017/18, six in 10 respondents felt that Council’s performance in maintaining the condition of sealed roads in the local area was positive. Decreased satisfaction has largely been associated with community concerns regarding planning and development related issues. Council is focussing on guiding growth to occur in the areas best suited for it, areas with good access to public transport, community facilities and services. This will help ensure that inappropriate development is minimised, and that the issues surrounding parking availability and traffic management are lessened.

**Statutory planning**

**Decision making**

Council planning decisions upheld at VCAT

[Number of VCAT decisions that did not set aside Council’s decision in relation to a planning application / Number of VCAT decisions in relation to planning]

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of VCAT decisions that did not set aside Council’s decision in relation to a planning application / Number of VCAT decisions in relation to planning</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>52.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of VCAT decisions upheld in Council’s favour has fluctuated over the past four years. The decrease this year was primarily due to a considerable increase in applications made to VCAT and a decrease in decisions in favour of Council. The losses mainly relate to differing opinions between Council and VCAT on the application of relevant local planning policy and the acceptability of building design in various neighbourhood contexts. In 2018/19 Council will commence a review of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme and will include the adopted MV2040 Strategy as the Council’s long-term strategic plan.
**Waste collection**

**Waste diversion**

*Kerbside collection waste diverted from landfill*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>44%</th>
<th>43.46%</th>
<th>43.89%</th>
<th>41.67%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside collection waste diverted from landfill [Weight of recyclables and green organics collected from kerbside bins / Weight of garbage, recyclables and green organics collected from kerbside bins] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

"Aboriginal child" means a child who is an Aboriginal person

"Aboriginal person" has the same meaning as in the Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006

"active library member" means a member of a library who has borrowed a book from the library

"annual report" means an annual report prepared by a council under sections 131, 132 and 133 of the Act

"CALD" means culturally and linguistically diverse and refers to persons born outside Australia in a country whose national language is not English

"class 1 food premises" means food premises, within the meaning of the Food Act 1984, that have been declared as class 1 food premises under section 19C of that Act

"class 2 food premises" means food premises, within the meaning of the Food Act 1984, that have been declared as class 2 food premises under section 19C of that Act

"Community Care Common Standards" means the Community Care Common Standards for the delivery of HACC services, published from time to time by the Commonwealth

"critical non-compliance outcome notification" means a notification received by council under section 19N(3) or (4) of the Food Act 1984, or advice given to council by an authorized officer under that Act, of a deficiency that poses an immediate serious threat to public health

"food premises" has the same meaning as in the Food Act 1984

"HACC service" means home help, personal care or community respite provided under the HACC program

"local road" means a sealed or unsealed road for which the council is the responsible road authority under the Road Management Act 2004

"major non-compliance outcome notification" means a notification received by a council under section 19N(3) or (4) of the Food Act 1984, or advice given to council by an authorized officer under that Act, of a deficiency that does not pose an immediate serious threat to public health but may do so if no remedial action is taken

"MCH" means the Maternal and Child Health Service provided by a council to support the health and development of children within the municipality from birth until school age

"population" means the resident population estimated by council

"target population" has the same meaning as in the Agreement entered into for the purposes of the Home and Community Care Act 1985 of the Commonwealth

"WorkSafe reportable aquatic facility safety incident" means an incident relating to a council aquatic facility that is required to be notified to the Victorian WorkCover Authority under Part 5 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act 2004.
**Financial performance Indicators**
For the year ended 30 June 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/indicator/measure</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Forecasts</th>
<th>Material variations and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average residential rate per residential property assessment</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
<td>$1,484</td>
<td>$1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Residential rate revenue / Number of residential property assessments]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses per property assessment</td>
<td>$2,385</td>
<td>$2,535</td>
<td>$2,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Total expenses / Number of property assessments]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignations and terminations compared to average staff</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number of permanent staff resignations and terminations / Average number of permanent staff for the financial year] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical turnover was lower than would normally be expected. Council has been more active in setting expectations regarding working towards a high performing culture and accountability. Council has also made some changes to workforce structure over the past two years in response to changing community needs and expectations. Current turnover rate is within an acceptable range when compared to industry benchmarks. While Council will continue to monitor turnover rates, Council does consider the present level of turnover as being ‘healthy’ in terms of a balance between service continuity and bringing in new skill sets and ideas to further enhance Council’s offering to its community as a result of staff turnover.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/Indicator/Measure</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Forecasts</th>
<th>Material variations and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquidity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets compared to current liabilities</td>
<td>[Current assets / Current liabilities] x100</td>
<td>200.20% 219.15% 251.05% 230.98% 210.30% 187.58% 145.94% 115.41</td>
<td>The projected forecast decrease is due to Council using cash and other financial assets to fund three major capital work programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted cash</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted cash compared to current liabilities</td>
<td>[Unrestricted cash / Current liabilities] x100</td>
<td>104.24% 83.80% 25.52% 37.64% 29.86% 27.85% 15.07% 5.64</td>
<td>The increase in 2017/18 is due to having more term deposits for less than 90 days whereas those deposits greater than 90 days are classified as other financial assets and excluded from the calculation. The projected forecast decrease is due to Council using cash reserves in addition to borrowings to fund three major capital work programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Obligations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset renewal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset renewal compared to depreciation</td>
<td>[Asset renewal expenses / Asset depreciation] x100</td>
<td>50.23% 55.19% 51.02% 51.70% 56.51% 64.44% 61.47% 61.56</td>
<td>The actual percentage is expected to be higher considering most of the major upgrade/new/expansion works have some renewal component e.g. pavilion works. For 2018/19 Council has taken steps to more accurately cost project expenditures based on the nature of works undertaken within a project and thus investment profile is expected to be more reflective of actual renewal investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loans and borrowings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings compared to rates</td>
<td>[Interest bearing loans and borrowings / Rate revenue] x100</td>
<td>4.01% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 23.03% 30.15% 39.57</td>
<td>The projected forecast increase is due to Council undertaking borrowings to fund three major capital projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results vs Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loans and borrowings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans and borrowings repayments compared to rates</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>The projected forecast increase is due to Council undertaking borrowings to fund three major capital projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Interest and principal repayments on interest bearing loans and borrowings / Rate revenue] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indebtedness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-current liabilities compared to own source revenue</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>24.16%</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
<td>The projected forecast increase is due to Council undertaking borrowings to fund three major capital projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Non-current liabilities / Own source revenue] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted underlying result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted underlying surplus (or deficit)</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>9.53%</td>
<td>9.81%</td>
<td>The reduction in 2017/18 was due to an increase in employee costs that resulted in an operating surplus less than 2016/17. The projected forecast increase is due to revenue received from contributions cash through developer contribution payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Adjusted underlying surplus (deficit)/ Adjusted underlying revenue] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to adjusted underlying revenue</td>
<td>67.71%</td>
<td>68.99%</td>
<td>66.22%</td>
<td>66.24%</td>
<td>67.98%</td>
<td>67.39%</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>67.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rate revenue / Adjusted underlying revenue] x100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dimension/indicator/measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rates effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates compared to property values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rate revenue / Capital improved value of rateable properties in the municipality] x100</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material variations and comments**

In 2018 there was an increase of 22 per cent in property valuations, but the increase in revenue will not be reflected until the following year when the 2018/19 rate notices are generated using the higher valuation amounts. It is worth noting though the significant property valuation increase does not lead to a significant increase in revenue as the rate cap requires that the average rate amount cannot increase by more than the cap of 2.25%. The introduction of rate capping is the main cause for the gradual percentage decrease over the previous three years.
Definitions

"adjusted underlying revenue" means total income other than:
(a) non-recurrent grants used to fund capital expenditure; and
(b) non-monetary asset contributions; and
(c) contributions to fund capital expenditure from sources other than those referred to above

"adjusted underlying surplus (or deficit)" means adjusted underlying revenue less total expenditure

"asset renewal expenditure" means expenditure on an existing asset or on replacing an existing asset that returns the service capability of the asset to its original capability

"current assets" has the same meaning as in the AAS

"current liabilities" has the same meaning as in the AAS

"non-current assets" means all assets other than current assets

"non-current liabilities" means all liabilities other than current liabilities

"non-recurrent grant" means a grant obtained on the condition that it be expended in a specified manner and is not expected to be received again during the period covered by a council's Strategic Resource Plan

"own-source revenue" means adjusted underlying revenue other than revenue that is not under the control of council (including government grants

"population" means the resident population estimated by council

"rate revenue" means revenue from general rates, municipal charges, service rates and service charges

"recurrent grant" means a grant other than a non-recurrent grant

"residential rates" means revenue from general rates, municipal charges, service rates and service charges levied on residential properties

"restricted cash" means cash and cash equivalents, within the meaning of the AAS, that are not available for use other than for a purpose for which it is restricted, and includes cash to be used to fund capital works expenditure from the previous financial year

"unrestricted cash" means all cash and cash equivalents other than restricted cash
Other information

For the year ended 30 June, 2018

Basis of preparation

Council is required to prepare and include a performance statement within its annual report. The performance statement includes the results of the prescribed sustainable capacity, service performance and financial performance indicators and measures together with a description of the municipal district and an explanation of material variations in the results. This statement has been prepared to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act 1989 and Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014.

Where applicable the results in the performance statement have been prepared on accounting bases consistent with those reported in the financial statements. The other results are based on information drawn from council information systems or from third parties — such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

The performance statement presents the actual results for the current year and for the prescribed financial performance indicators and measures, the results forecast by the council’s Strategic Resource Plan. The Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014 requires explanation of any material variations in the results contained in the Performance statement. Council has adopted materiality thresholds relevant to each indicator.

The forecast figures included in the performance statement are those adopted by Council in its Strategic Resource Plan on 26 June 2018, which forms part of the Council Plan. The Strategic Resource Plan includes estimates based on key assumptions about the future that were relevant at the time of adoption and aimed at achieving sustainability over the long term. Detailed information on the actual financial results is contained in the General purpose financial statements. The Strategic Resource Plan is available on Council’s website.
Certification of the performance statement

In my opinion, the accompanying performance statement has been prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 and the Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014.

_____________________________
Damian Hogan  B.Bus (Acc) CPA
Principal Accounting Officer
Dated:

In our opinion, the accompanying performance statement of Moonee Valley City Council for the year ended 30 June 2018 presents fairly the results of Council’s performance in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 and the Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014.

The performance statement contains the relevant performance indicators, measures and results in relation to service performance, financial performance and sustainable capacity.

At the date of signing, we are not aware of any circumstances that would render any particulars in the performance statement to be misleading or inaccurate.

We have been authorised by Council and by the Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014 to certify this performance statement in its final form.

__________________
Councillor
Dated:

__________________
Councillor
Dated:

__________________
Bryan Lancaster
Chief Executive Officer
Dated:
GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT CHECKLIST

The Governance and Management Checklist shows the frameworks Council has for policies, community engagement, planning, monitoring, reporting and decision-making. This checklist is produced in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1989* (Act) and the *Local Government (Planning and Reporting) Regulations 2014*.

Some items in the checklist concern compliance with legislation, while others relate to matters regarded as good practice. Council has complied with all legislative requirements in the checklist. The results of our assessment against the checklist are set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance and management items</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community engagement policy (policy outlining Council’s commitment to engaging with the community on matters of public interest)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of operation of current policy: 21/10/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy will be updated in 2018/19 in line with proposed changes to the <em>Local Government Act</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community engagement guidelines (guidelines to assist staff to determine when and how to engage with the community)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of operation of current guidelines: 15/06/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The guidelines will be updated in 2018/19 in line with proposed changes to the <em>Local Government Act</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Strategic resource plan (plan under section 126 of the Act outlining the financial and non-financial resources required for at least the next four financial years)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of adoption: 26/06/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Annual budget (plan under section 130 of the Act setting out the services to be provided and initiatives to be undertaken over the next 12 months, and the funding and other resources required)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of adoption: 26/06/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Asset management plans (plans that set out the asset maintenance and renewal needs for key infrastructure asset classes for at least the next 10 years)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council has four asset management plans (AMPs): the Facilities AMP 2012-16, Roads AMP 2014-17, Open Space AMP 2012-17 and Drainage AMP 2006-10. These are being reviewed progressively, commencing with the Drainage AMP, in line with the <em>Local Government Act</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rating strategy (strategy setting out</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and management items</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rating structure of Council to levy rates and charges</td>
<td>Date of operation of current strategy: 26/06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 <strong>Risk policy</strong> (policy outlining Council's commitment and approach to minimising the risks to Council's operations)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of operation of current policy: 16/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 <strong>Fraud policy</strong> (policy outlining Council’s commitment and approach to minimising the risk of fraud)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of operation of current policy: 30/09/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 <strong>Municipal emergency management plan</strong> (plan under section 20 of the Emergency Management Act 1986 for emergency prevention, response and recovery)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of preparation: 21/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 <strong>Procurement policy</strong> (policy under section 186A of the Local Government Act 1989 outlining the matters, practices and procedures that will apply to all purchases of goods, services and works)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of approval: 22/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 <strong>Business continuity plan</strong> (plan setting out the actions that will be undertaken to ensure that key services continue to operate in the event of a disaster)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of operation of current plan: 16/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 <strong>Disaster recovery plan</strong> (plan setting out the actions that will be undertaken to recover and restore business capability in the event of a disaster)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of operation of current plan: 26/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 <strong>Risk management framework</strong> (framework outlining Council’s approach to managing risks to Council’s operations)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of operation of current framework: 22/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 <strong>Audit Committee</strong> (advisory committee of Council under section 139 of the Act whose role is to oversee the integrity of Council’s financial reporting, processes to manage risks to the Council’s operations and for compliance with applicable legal, ethical, and regulatory requirements)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of establishment: 23/06/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 <strong>Internal audit</strong> (independent accounting professionals engaged by)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of engagement of current provider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and management items</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council to provide analyses and recommendations aimed at improving Council’s governance, risk and management controls)</td>
<td>15/01/2018 The internal audit function was brought in-house with an internal auditor appointed on 15/01/2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Performance reporting framework (a set of indicators measuring financial and non-financial performance, including the performance indicators referred to in section 131 of the Act)</td>
<td>Yes Date of operation of current framework: 01/07/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Council Plan reporting (report reviewing the performance of the Council against the Council Plan, including the results in relation to the strategic indicators, for the first six months of the financial year)</td>
<td>No Strategic indicator results are reported once a year, as the results for most indicators are only available annually. However, reports are presented to Council regarding progress in implementing Council Plan actions on a quarterly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Financial reporting (quarterly statements to Council under section 138 of the Act comparing budgeted revenue and expenditure with actual revenue and expenditure)</td>
<td>Yes Dates statements presented: 12/09/2017, 14/11/2017, 27/02/2018, 08/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Risk reporting (six-monthly reports of strategic risks to Council’s operations, their likelihood and consequences of occurring and risk minimisation strategies)</td>
<td>Yes Date of reports: 18/09/2017, 11/12/2017, 28/02/2018, 16/04/2018, 18/06/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Performance reporting (six-monthly reports of indicators measuring results against financial and non-financial performance, including the performance indicators referred to in section 131 of the Act)</td>
<td>Yes 23/10/2017, 16/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Annual Report (annual report under sections 131, 132 and 133 of the Act to the community containing a report of operations and audited financial and performance statements)</td>
<td>Yes Date of consideration: 24/10/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Councillor Code of Conduct (code under section 76C of the Act setting out the conduct principles and the dispute resolution processes to be followed by councillors)</td>
<td>Yes Date reviewed: 21/2/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Delegations (a document setting out the specific powers and duties of councillors)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and management items | Assessment
--- | ---
the powers, duties and functions of Council and the Chief Executive Officer that have been delegated to members of staff) | Council to staff: 24/10/2017  Council to CEO: 22/08/2017  Council to Land Acquisition Special Committee: 13/03/2018  Council to Grants Assessment Special Committee: 27/03/2018

Meeting procedures (a local law governing the conduct of meetings of Council and special committees) | Yes  
Date local law made: 15/09/2009  
Date the meeting procedure protocol (which is incorporated by reference) was amended: 24/10/2017

I certify that this information presents fairly the status of Council's governance and management arrangements.

__________________
Bryan Lancaster  
Chief Executive Officer  
Dated:

__________________
Cr John Sipek  
Mayor  
Dated:
10.4 2018-19 Capital Works Program Update

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Nikhil Aggarwal - Capital Works Program Planner
Directorate: Asset Planning and Strategic Projects

Purpose
To seek endorsement for known 2018/19 Capital Works Program (CWP) variations considered necessary to deliver the program and/or improved outcomes for the wider community.

Executive Summary
- Council adopted the 2018/19 CWP of $54.82 million (including part 2017/18 CWP carryovers), which was revised to $58.74 million to include all 2017/18 CWP carryovers and 2018/19 CWP variations approved through various reports and/or delegations.
- Subsequently, Council officers have identified necessary variations to the current authorised 2018/19 CWP to deliver the program and/or improved outcomes for the wider community.
- Council will be apprised of 2018/19 CWP variations requiring its approval as required and of program progress quarterly.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Authorises requested 2018/19 Capital Works Project variations as per Section A.1 of Appendix A.
2. Notes year-to-date program savings on completed projects, as per Section A.2 of Appendix A, that partially offset variations to date.

Background
Council adopted 2018/19 CWP of $54.82 million (including part 2017/18 CWP carryovers), which was revised to $58.74 million to include all 2017/18 CWP carryovers and 2018/19 CWP variations approved through various reports and/or delegations. This report apprises Council of and seeks its endorsement for necessary variations to current authorised 2018/19 CWP to deliver the program and/or improved outcomes for the wider community.

Discussion
2018/19 CWP has commenced and officers have identified necessary variations to the program that require Council authorisation to deliver the program and/or improved outcomes for the wider community. Details of these variations are as per Section A of Appendix A. Section B of Appendix A lists variations previously
authorised through Tender reports, Capital Works Program Updates, Other Reports and CEO delegation (approvals above and up to +5 per cent of authorised project budget).

Consultation
This report has been prepared in consultation with capital works project officers as part of detailed monthly program reviews and has been endorsed by Council’s Capital Works Review Committee and Executive Team.

Implications

1. Legislative
   There are no Legislative implications of this report except to the extent it relates to Council’s overall budget set in accordance with Section 127 of the Local Government Act 1989.

2. Council Plan / Policy
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to foster a culture of accountability and transparency in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 5: Resilient organisation - A resilient organisation that is sustainable, innovative, engaging and accountable - Good governance is everyone’s responsibility.

3. Financial
   This report details changes to Council’s funding commitments to the 2018/19 CWP.

4. Environmental
   There are no environmental issues associated with this report.

Conclusion
Appendix A details new 2018/19 CWP variations that require Council authorisation to proceed as well as lists variations previously approved through various reports and delegations.

Appendices
Appendix A: 2018-19 Capital Works Program- Variations Register
## 2018-19 Capital Works Program - Variations Register

**Appendix A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ledger #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Variation Type</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Comments on the Variation</th>
<th>Budgeted Project Financial Years</th>
<th>Authorised Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Revised Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Change in Total Project Cost</th>
<th>External Grants</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Budget Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5666</td>
<td>Crown St Stables Flooring Renewal</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Works completed early August 2018</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$114,033</td>
<td>$-34,033</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-34,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53053992855</td>
<td>Facilities Related Energy and Efficiencies - 1a projects of 15</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Works completed late 2017/18 post draft budget process</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-18,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5689</td>
<td>Cross Keys Reserve - Fencing</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Works completed late 2017/18 post draft budget process</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$115,600</td>
<td>$99,585</td>
<td>$-17,015</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-17,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54403</td>
<td>Drainage Upgrade 125 The Beechwood Acre-episode</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>Works completed late 2017/18 post draft budget process</td>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2018-19 Capital Works Program - Variations Register

**Appendix A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ledger #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Variation Type</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Comments on the Variation</th>
<th>Budgeted Project Financial Years</th>
<th>Authorised Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Revised Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Change in Total Project Cost</th>
<th>External Grants</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Variations Previously Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **B.1** Tender Reports
  - None currently
  - $0

- **B.2** CEO delegation
  (i.e. variations greater than and equal to 10% of authorised project budget)
  - None currently
  - $0

- **B.3** CWP Updates
  - Unbudgeted Work 12278
    - Albertsia Primary School - Netball Ground Resurfacing
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $0
  - Unbudgeted Work 12280
    - Bridge Street Car Park Upgrade - additional hard landscaping
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $0
  - Unbudgeted Work 12286
    - Contractor Reporting Project
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $0
  - Open Space Land Acquisition - $85,425 MR Alexander Road
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $3,000,000
  - Boxing Reserve - New Pavilion works
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $3,479,000
  - Door St under pass - shared path works
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $100,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ledger #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Variation Type</th>
<th>Approved By</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Comments on the Variation</th>
<th>Budgeted Project Financial Years</th>
<th>Authorised Total Project Budget</th>
<th>Revised Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Change in Total Project Cost</th>
<th>External Grants</th>
<th>Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>Other Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Unbudgeted Work 30702 P002
    - Essendon Gen and Lepidoptera Club (EGLC)
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 28-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $0
  - Unbudgeted Work 30656
    - Book A Court System
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $0
  - 12246
    - Moonee Ponds Multi Level Car Park (Investigation Works)
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 14-Aug-18
      - 2018/19: $5,000
  - Unbudgeted Work 12279
    - VoIP System Replacement
      - Scope: Budget
      - Council: 24-Jul-19
      - 2018/19: $0

### Project Costs

- $9,644,000
- $13,200,217
- $3,563,617
- $1,045,000
- $1,618,617

### Increased costs funded through

- $9,386,000
- $12,984,184
- $3,678,184
- $1,900,000
- $1,778,184
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10.5 Kindergarten in Moonee Ponds

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Jason Crockett - Coordinator, Kindergarten Services
Directorate: City Services

Purpose
To provide an update on the provision of kindergarten services in Moonee Ponds, as resolved at the Council meeting held on 23 August 2016.

Executive Summary
- In Moonee Ponds there are approximately 151 children of four year old kindergarten age who attend kindergarten within the municipality.
- Currently 72 (48%) children eligible for four year old kindergarten who live in Moonee Ponds attend a non-Council integrated kindergarten program in Moonee Ponds.
- In the first round of allocations for 2018 kindergarten, 88 children who live in Moonee Ponds registered through Council’s Central Registration Service (CRS).
- There are currently four long day care childcare centres within Moonee Ponds offering integrated kindergarten programs (Goodstart Moonee Ponds, Moonee Ponds Early Learning Centre (All for Kids), Community Children and Kinder Haven). In these integrated childcare services, 90 children attend kindergarten. Of these children 72 (80%) live in Moonee Ponds. To date there are no sessional kindergarten options available in Moonee Ponds.
- The current demand for sessional four year old kindergarten in 2018 continues to be met, with 42 surplus places across the municipality.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Agrees to cease receiving a report on the provision of kindergarten services in Moonee Ponds every 12 months.
2. Notes that Council officers will update Councillors as required, should any circumstances change or opportunities arise in relation to kindergarten service provision in Moonee Ponds.
**Background**

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 22 September 2015, Council carried Notice of Motion 2015/21 – Kindergarten in Moonee Ponds:

That Council:

1. Receives a report in relation to the provision of a kindergarten located in Moonee Ponds, such report to address all relevant considerations, including, without limitation:
   a) Details of where Moonee Ponds’ families are enrolling their children in kindergarten given the lack of kindergarten located in Moonee Ponds;
   b) Current and projected demand for kindergarten places from Moonee Ponds families, in light of the significant growth projected for Moonee Ponds;
   c) Potential locations of a kindergarten and timeframes as to when a kindergarten is likely to be provided in Moonee Ponds; and
   d) Funding and partnering options available in relation to the provision of a kindergarten in Moonee Ponds.

2. Write to State and Federal members of parliament to seek information about potential funding opportunities.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 23 February 2016, a report responding to the above Notice of Motion was received, with the following resolution carried:

That Council:

1. Receives and note the response regarding the provision of a Kindergarten in Moonee Ponds.

2. Receives a further report when the draft recommendations for Council’s long term community facility plan are finalised.

3. Without limiting point 2, continue to receive further reports no less frequently than every 6 months updating Council on this issue, until such time as an appropriate kindergarten site within Moonee Ponds is identified.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 23 August 2016, a further report was presented to Council, with the following resolution carried:

That Council:

1. Receive and note the report, Kindergartens in Moonee Ponds Update.

2. Receive further reports no less frequently than every 12 months, updating Council on the issue.

3. A further report on this matter was received and noted by Council in August 2017.
Discussion

Kindergarten options

Kindergarten is traditionally delivered via two models, sessional and integrated. The two models of delivery respond to individual family needs, such as providing flexible or extended hours for working families or more structured kindergarten times.

To date there are no sessional kindergartens in Moonee Ponds.

Sessional kindergarten

Sessional kindergarten provides a set number of hours per week (15) with all children attending for the same amount of time each session. In 2018, 88 children living in Moonee Ponds registered for a place in a four year old sessional kindergarten program. The majority (39%) of these children’s applications nominated Montgomery Park Kindergarten in Essendon as their preferred service.

The table below identifies the four year old sessional kindergarten program where Moonee Ponds families were initially placed for 2018 and identifies the number of children attending as of 21 August 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Moonee Ponds children placed as of September 2017</th>
<th>Moonee Ponds children attending as of 21 August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascot Kindergarten</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascot progress Kindergarten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Street Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation Kindergarten</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopetoun Early Years Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Park Kindergarten</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Essendon Kindergarten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aidans Kindergarten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews Kindergarten</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore Community Kindergarten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore Heights Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Council’s Central Registration Service, August 2018.

Integrated kindergarten

In an integrated model of delivery the age range of the children in the room is usually wider (three to five years) and the children accessing the kindergarten program (four year olds) may not all attend on the same days, as the program is run across five days rather than specific session times.

Integrated kindergarten is offered through a number of long day care centres across the municipality, managed by Council, not for profit or private providers. Four of these
services (non-Council) are located within Moonee Ponds (Goodstart Moonee Ponds, Moonee Ponds Early Learning Centre (All for Kids), Community Children and Kinder Haven). In 2018, Ninety children attend integrated four year old kindergarten at these long day care centres. Of these children, 72 (80%) live in Moonee Ponds. The below table indicates the number of four year olds attending each integrated service and the number who are Moonee Ponds residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Centre</th>
<th>Number of Four Year olds</th>
<th>Number residing in Moonee Ponds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodstart</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All for Kids</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder Haven</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational program**

While the two models offer flexibility for families, the educational program is consistent across both models with the program delivered by a qualified kindergarten teacher. Both models of delivery operate under the *Education and Care Services National Regulations 2011* and are required to deliver an educational program that aligns with approved curriculum documents, the *Early Years Learning Framework* and the *Victorian Early Years Learning and Development Framework*.

Delivering educational programs using these documents provides consistency across different delivery models as well as providing consistency for all kindergarten programs across the state. This consistent approach assists in delivering high quality learning outcomes so that all children arrive at school developmentally on track.

**Central Registration Service**

Council manages a Central Registration Service (CRS) for 18 four year old sessional kindergartens in Moonee Valley, including 13 Council and five community managed services. This provides a sound platform for data collection and analysis of kindergarten placements across Moonee Valley.

The Central Registration Service uses priority of access criteria when allocating places, to ensure that offers respond to family and children's needs and to ensure equity. Using these priority of access criteria ensures that children are treated fairly and equitably, regardless of their residential address or proximity to an individual kindergarten. Children living in Moonee Ponds seeking the sessional delivery option are not disadvantaged because there is no sessional kindergarten located in Moonee Ponds. As such, they are given consistent weighting based on the nearest kindergarten to their home, i.e. Montgomery Park Kindergarten.

Four year old kindergarten (both sessional and integrated) is available across Moonee Valley. Based on Council's Central Registration Service as at August 2018, the current demand for four year old kindergarten in 2018 continues to be met, with 42 surplus places across the municipality. This includes the 88 Moonee Ponds families initially registered for four year old kindergarten for 2018. Enrolment data for 2019 is currently being entered in to Council's Central Registration Service.
Consultation

Future planning of kindergarten services will determine the best model and locations for kindergarten to meet community need and demand, with Moonee Ponds considered as part of this planning process.

Implications

1. Legislative
   
   Children’s services are governed by the Education and Care Services National Regulations 2011 and must comply with service and building requirements. Research supports the policy directions at a Federal, State and Local Government level to plan towards integrated service settings or hubs.

   The provision of children’s services is strongly aligned with the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 supporting to freedom, respect, equality and dignity.

2. Council Plan/Policy
   
   In presenting this report, Council is achieving its strategic directions in accordance with Council Plan, Integrating The Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2017-21 Theme 1: Friendly and safe – An equitable, inclusive and healthy community.

3. Financial
   
   There are no immediate financial implications from this report

   Environmental

   This report is consistent with Council’s Sustainability Policy.

Conclusion

There are currently approximately 151 four year old children who live in Moonee Ponds attending kindergarten within the municipality. Of these children, 79 (52%) attend sessional kindergarten across the municipality (refer to table above). A further 72 children (48%) attend integrated kindergarten at a child care centre located in Moonee Ponds. The current demand for sessional kindergarten across Moonee Valley is being met, with a number of vacancies across the municipality. The use of priority of access criteria ensures that sessional kindergarten places offered are done so in a fair and equitable manner for all children.

Future planning for the delivery of kindergarten services will consider all parts of the municipality including Moonee Ponds.

Appendices

Nil.
10.6 Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program for people seeking asylum

File No:  Fol/18/32  
Author:  Kate McCaughey - Manager Community Planning  
Directorate:  Planning and Development  

Purpose
To seek Council endorsement to support a Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Services program for people seeking asylum.

Executive Summary
- On behalf of the Mayor, Cr John Sipek, officers attended a Mayoral Roundtable (Roundtable) called by the City of Greater Dandenong for local government leaders regarding Asylum Seekers on Tuesday 31 July 2018. The meeting was attended by both Councillors and officers from a number of Councils across Victoria to consider advocacy and support for people seeking asylum living in Victorian communities.

- The Roundtable was instigated following concerns regarding the Australian Department of Home Affairs’ changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program’s eligibility provisions. These changes will significantly reduce access to the program by people seeking asylum in Australia, from approximately 13,300 to 5,000. As at 28 February 2018, there were approximately 4,059 children on the SRSS program.

- The Refugee Council of Australia anticipates as a result of these changes, many vulnerable cohorts such as pregnant women, families with young children, and survivors of torture who do not meet the Department’s heightened vulnerability criteria will be left without any form of income to pay for rent, prescriptions, or adequate daily food requirements.

- There is also concern local communities and charities will bear the consequences of these changes and will see an increase in people seeking emergency relief for food, clothing, blankets, support to pay rent, and other services such as health and housing. There is also concern within the local government sector that additional burden will be placed on Councils to coordinate material aid responses.

- The Roundtable considered a Joint Statement (Statement) for participating Councils to consider, endorse and then advocate, and is enclosed as Appendix A. The Statement calls on the Australian Government to reverse the recent assessment changes to the SRSS program and provide adequate income and case management support for people seeking asylum while they seek sustainable employment. To date, thirteen Councils are signatories to the Joint Statement.
• Greater Dandenong are also establishing a SRSS Mayoral Taskforce and are calling for Councils to be part of this either on the Executive or as a member. To support efforts, it is recommended $1,000 in cash and $4,000 in-kind support be provided to the City of Greater Dandenong. The in-kind contribution would be in the form of advocacy support.

• It is estimated 142 asylum seekers live in Moonee Valley on bridging visas. Recent data indicates an increase of 70 asylum seekers in Moonee Valley since 2014; the second largest increase for all Victorian local government areas. Avondale Heights is the neighbourhood with the highest number of asylum seekers in Moonee Valley (and the 21st highest for suburbs in Victoria).

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Endorses the ‘Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Service’ for people seeking asylum as outlined in Appendix A.
2. Notes that Moonee Valley City Council will participate on the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) Mayoral Taskforce as a non-executive member, including representation by Councillor Jim Cusack, Councillor Cam Nation and relevant Moonee Valley officers.
3. Notes that Moonee Valley City Council will provide material aid to people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley as outlined in Table Three.
4. Notes that Moonee Valley City Council will explore joining the Welcoming Cities Network and provide a further update to Council in 2019.
5. Agree Moonee City Council will provide $1,000 cash and $4,000 in-kind contribution to Dandenong City Council to support the ‘Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Service’.

Background
Mayoral Roundtable - 31 July 2018
The City of Greater Dandenong (Greater Dandenong) resolved at their meeting on 23 April 2018 to advocate to the Australian Government on this issue and to look for Councils to jointly advocate.

To this end, Greater Dandenong held a Mayoral Roundtable (Roundtable) for local government leaders regarding Asylum Seekers on Tuesday 31 July 2018. Moonee Valley Council officers attended on behalf of the Mayor, Cr John Sipek. The meeting was attended by both Councillors and officers from a number of Councils across Victoria to:

• Discuss concerns regarding the Australian Department of Home Affairs’ changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program’s eligibility provisions.
• Consider advocacy and support for people seeking asylum living in Victorian communities as a result of these program changes, including a ‘Joint Council
Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Service’ as outlined in Appendix A.

The proposed Joint Council Statement builds on a 2015 joint Statement called ‘Joint Statement in support of Asylum Seekers Living in the Community’ to which Moonee Valley was a signatory, along with the cities of Greater Dandenong, Greater Geelong, Ballarat, Bendigo, Banyule, Brimbank, Darebin, Hobsons Bay, Latrobe, Melton, Mildura Rural, Monash, Moreland, Swan Hill Rural, Wyndham and Yarra; as well as the shires of Bass Coast, Colac Otway, East Gippsland, and Surf Coast.

The Refugee Council of Australia notes:

“...People seeking asylum (whether by boat or plane) often need support to survive in Australia while their claims for protection are being processed. Having often faced traumatic circumstances, they can have difficulty finding work because of their lack of permanent status and are not entitled to the social security payments available to others.

The Australian Government did not permit people to work for several years, but once work rights were granted, many people seeking asylum have worked to support themselves. Unfortunately, many of the jobs were short-term, and this temporary work has meant that people need basic financial assistance while they look for another job.


Discussion

Global context

A United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) report (Global Trends, Forced Displacement in 2015) identified the number of people displaced by conflict at the end of 2015 was the highest ever — even greater than the refugee crisis that followed the Second World War. These record high levels of displacement have seen an unprecedented 68.5 million people around the world being forced from home. Among these are nearly 25.4 million refugees, over half of whom are under the age of 18. There are also an estimated 10 million stateless people who have been denied a nationality and access to basic rights such as education, healthcare, employment and freedom of movement. In addition, the UNHCR estimate nearly one person is forcibly displaced every two seconds as a result of conflict or persecution. Key UNHCR statistics are outlined in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: UNHCR – Global Refugee Figures at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internally Displaced People</th>
<th>Refugees</th>
<th>Asylum-seekers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 million</td>
<td>25.4 million</td>
<td>3.1 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.9 million under UNHCR mandate
5.4 million Palestinian refugees registered by UNHCR.
Resettlement of refugees in Australia

An Australian Department of Parliamentary Services report identified the number of offshore refugee category visas granted since 1975 has varied greatly over the past few decades. The highest number being in the early 1980s under the Fraser Government, when Australia granted 20,795 visas (mostly to Indochinese), and the lowest being 1,238 ten years later under the Hawke Government. From 2000 onwards, the Government has slightly increased the annual quota of refugee visas to its current level of around 6,000 visas—where it has remained for the last ten years (with one notable exception). The most dramatic increase was under the former Labor Government in 2012, when the number of offshore refugee visas granted doubled to over 12,000 in one year in response to the recommendation of the 2012 Expert Panel on Asylum Seekers. (Source: Refugee resettlement to Australia: what are the facts? Department of Parliamentary Services 2016)

Today in Australia:

- there are still 13,218 people waiting for a decision by the Department of Home Affairs
- most of them are waiting in Victoria (6,236) and NSW (5,154), with significant numbers also in South Australia (743) and Queensland (630)
- most of those still waiting are from Iran (35%), Sri Lanka (17%), stateless (14%), Afghanistan (9%)
- almost all of them (13,092) are living in the community on a Bridging Visa E, but there are still 110 of them in held detention


Attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration

Since 2007, the Scanlon Foundation and Monash University researchers have been tracking Australian attitudes on issues including immigration, multiculturalism, discrimination and political trust. The annual survey has a sample of 42,000 respondents, and is the largest survey of its kind in Australia. It is worth noting in the context of this report that despite significant demographic change over the decade
(including population rise and increased diversity), Australian attitudes have remained stably positive.

In late 2017, Scanlon Foundation survey responses identified 63 per cent of respondents agree or strongly agree that ‘accepting immigrants from many different countries makes Australia stronger’. A minority of Australians (37 per cent) believe Australia’s immigration intake is ‘too high’. Agreement that ‘multiculturalism has been good for Australia’ remains in the high range of 83 – 86 per cent, where it has been since the Scanlon Foundation surveys began asking the question in 2013. These figures correlate with Moonee Valley’s 2017 Community Survey which found 63 per cent of respondents agreed with the statement “I value living in Moonee Valley because of its multiculturalism”.

**Welcoming Cities movement**

Whilst the issue of immigration has been divisive and highly political in Australia over the past decade; communities and Councils at the grassroots have found practical ways to approach this issue from a humanitarian perspective. To this end, the ‘Welcoming Cities’ movement has grown in recent years to support local councils and their communities become more welcoming and inclusive. “Welcoming” is about inclusion at all levels; and is a process by which local councils, businesses and communities can embrace and integrate migrant communities for greater social cohesion and economic success. Underlying principles of the movement note that:

- When people feel welcome they are more likely to participate in civic life; and
- People’s sense of belonging and connectedness is improved through greater insight and understanding of different cultures living in a place.

Approximately 135 municipalities around the world have become members of the Welcoming Cities Network which supports local governments to foster communities “…where everyone can belong and participate in social, cultural, economic and civic life.” ([https://welcomingcities.org.au](https://welcomingcities.org.au)) Membership allows Councils to access a knowledge sharing platform, webinars and advice, eligibility for awards and inclusion in leadership groups and events. It also provides promotional and communications support to help members tell their success stories and showcase their commitment to the wider community.

This approach is in line with the Moonee Valley 2040 Strategy’s ‘Fair’ objectives as well as the recently adopted ‘Standing Together and Supporting Diversity’ Statement. Officers will explore membership and report back to Council in 2019.

**People Seeking Asylum in Moonee Valley**

The most recent figures (March 2018) are summarised in Figure 3 below and identify:

- there are 142 people seeking asylum living in Moonee Valley on bridging visas (or approximately 0.004 per cent of the world’s asylum seekers)
- an increase of 70 people seeking asylum living in the municipality since 2014 - the second largest for all Victorian LGAs (there have also been decreases in the other LGAs).
- 73 asylum seekers live in Avondale Heights (still the 21st highest per suburb in Victoria)
- nearly 60 per cent were aged under 24 years.
**Figure 3:** People Seeking Asylum in Moonee Valley

**Refugees and Asylum Seekers**

**Asylum Seekers**
- 142 asylum seekers live in Moonee Valley on bridging visas (at March 2018).
- This is the 10th most for Victorian LGAs.

**Refugees**
- 123 refugees on humanitarian visas settled in Moonee Valley in 2016.
- In the first quarter of 2017, another 38 refugees settled in Moonee Valley.

20% of these were 12-24 years of age. 56% were aged under 24 years of age.

Syria, Iraq and Ethiopia were the most common countries of birth for refugees settling in Moonee Valley in 2016.

Sources:
- Department of Social Services, *Settlement Data Reports*, 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016, Australian Government, Canberra.
- Department of Social Services, *Settlement Reporting Faculty, Customised Data for Humanitarian Visas in Moonee Valley*, 2016, Australian Government, Canberra.
A key priority within our Council Plan is to:

“Strengthen Council’s commitment as a Refugee Welcome Zone through promotion, active engagement with, and support for, refugees and asylum seekers by creating partnerships with key refugee advocacy organisations such as the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre.” (4.1.1.1.4)

Council provides support to people seeking asylum through service provision (Community Development and Health and Family Wellbeing team in particular), as well as through on-going funding and support of key partners such as the Farnham Street Neighbourhood Learning Centre and the Wingate Avenue Community Centre; as well as the Brotherhood St Laurence JVEN employment service.

A summary of material support provided by the Health and Family Wellbeing team for children and families seeking asylum in Moonee Valley is outlined in Table One below.

Table One: Health and Family Wellbeing - material support summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Government Department of Social Services – Financial Wellbeing and Capability Grant (reviewed annually)</td>
<td>In 2018/19 MVCC have received $56,350.00 (Financial Wellbeing and Capability Grant) to provide Emergency Relief to our community. This emergency relief is divided between Essendon Citizen’s Advice Bureau, Aged Care/Disability Services and Family Services (with provisions also made for Enhanced Maternal Child Health). Families engaged with our services are provided with emergency relief cards through this program as assessed as necessary (via our Early Intervention Services) and in accordance with their immediate needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services Early Intervention Services:</td>
<td>Our Early Intervention Service offers a Duty/Intake &amp; Referral Service (9am-5pm) at the Civic Centre. Information is provided to families about which organisations within the municipality offer material aid support on an as needs basis. Families who are active clients or engaged with MVCC for the purpose of Brief Intervention (up to 10 hours of service) or case work (ongoing) can access Food Vouchers and material aid directly from Family Services or they are referred to the Essendon Citizen’s Advice Bureau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services – Integrated Family Services</td>
<td>All families currently engaged with Integrated Family Services can access up to $1200.00 (Flexible Support Package) for material aid support to assist them to achieve the goals of their Child and Family Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health Universal and Enhanced</td>
<td>All families can access a fully funded cot, mattress,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs) – Nursery Equipment Program</td>
<td>mattress protector and car restraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health (Enhanced) and Family Services - Partnerships with Material Aid services/support</td>
<td>We regularly partner with the following organisations to provide material aid support to all families requiring assistance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Helping Hands Mission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We support families to access material aid, recycled goods and the Community Supermarket for fresh fruit, vegetables and grocery items. The service is located on Fullarton Rd, Airport West. Families can also attend the Community Café once a week to obtain a meal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Caroline Chisholm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We support expecting mothers and new parents to access baby bundles and nursery equipment through the Caroline Chisholm society and provide a supported referral process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St Kilda Mums</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We assist families to access children’s clothes and other associated items e.g., high chairs and care equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St Vincent De Paul/Brotherhood of St Lawrence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families can access recycled goods including furniture items with free delivery. Families can also access food vouchers and material aid. This service visit the families at home to assess their needs and we provide a supported referral process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New Hope Foundation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We refer clients to the New Hope Foundation to access a range of settlement services for caring for the everyday needs of the child/ren and their family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS)

The SRSS program provides:

- short term needs-based support to non-citizens who are unable to support themselves while resolving their immigration status
- provides a basic living allowance (food, rent and medical treatment), casework support and access to torture and trauma counselling
- 89 per cent of Newstart allowance (typically), or approximately $35 per day.

As at 28 February 2018, there were approximately 13,300 people on the SRSS program, of whom some 4,059 were children.

In June 2018, the Australian Department of Home Affairs (the Department) announced changes to the SRSS program’s eligibility provisions. These changes will
significantly reduce access to the program by people seeking asylum in Australia, from approximately 13,300 to 5,000.

Whilst it is difficult to obtain specific information on the timing and detail of the proposed program changes, there is concern SRSS recipients will not be given adequate time to prepare before their support will be cut off. The Refugee Council of Australia have advised that SRSS providers and the Department will assess a person’s vulnerability prior to potential exit from the program, including:

- physical and mental health barriers
- single parents with pre-school aged children; pregnant women with complications; primary carer for someone with a significant vulnerability; people aged 70+ years
- a major crisis (family violence, house fire, flood).

**Figure 3** has been prepared by the Refugee Council of Australia and summarises some key information regarding the SRSS program and its relative cost effectiveness compared to other programs.

**Figure 3:** Refugee Council of Australia – Cuts to support for people seeking asylum
Cuts to support for people seeking asylum

Who are they?

13,299 people are at risk of losing support. 4,059 of these are children (this was the number of people on the Status Resolution Support Services program as at 27 February 2018, and the total of those under 18).

Between 72-88% of those who came by boat have been found to be refugees so far. 72% is the percentage of people granted protection as part of the Legacy Caseload as of 30 April 2018, and 78% and 80% is the number of those still on PNG and Nauru who have been found to be refugees as of 26 February 2018.

How much do they get?

A single person gets less than $35 a day to live on (for a person without children, calculated according to 69% of Newstart rates).

The poverty line in 2016 is $63 a day (50% of the median income in June quarter 2019).

Where else we can save money?

A person seeking asylum living in the community costs the government on average $10,221, a person in community detention $103,243 and a person in held detention $346,660 (averages given for 2017-2018 year to date by the Department of Home Affairs on 21 May 2018).

What we spend on offshore processing would support almost 145,000 people in the community (based on $1.48 billion estimated expenditure in 2017-18, divided by average cost of those in the community).

The money we spent resettling 7 people in Cambodia would have support 661 people in the community (based on $6.76 million spent on resettlement excluding $40 million in development assistance, divided by average cost of those in the community).

Who is helping?

Over 10,000 people seeking asylum were helped in 2016 and 2017 in NSW and Victoria alone.

These agencies have helped people with housing, financial help, English classes, education and employment, and social activities.

They have done so with the help of well over 2,000 ordinary people who have volunteered their time.

All rely on tens of thousands of generous donors.

Impact of the changes

The Refugee Council of Australia notes:

“…Support for people seeking asylum has been provided in recent years through the SRSS program… cuts to the program will make it almost impossible for people to apply for the program: very few people will fit the restrictive criteria. This will see a reduction of the current program by over 60%.”  

The Roundtable meeting noted that refugee service organisations were given little or no notice of the roll out dates, and are concerned the changes will mean:

- people seeking asylum (including pregnant women, families with young children, and survivors of torture), who do not meet the heightened vulnerability criteria set by the Department will be left without any form of income to pay for pay for rent, prescriptions or adequate daily food requirements.

- thousands of people seeking asylum will be turning to alternative services such as Councils, local charities, service organisations and community groups as they face homelessness, food insecurity and removed access to health services and trauma / torture counselling.

- local communities, service agencies and charities are likely to bear the consequences of these changes in terms of demand for their services. There is also concern within the local government sector that additional burden will placed on Councils to coordinate material aid responses. Greater Dandenong have prepared a background document which outlines the local level coordination likely to be required by local government (Appendix B, page 2).

Following the July Roundtable, Moonee Valley's Community Development team are in the process of liaising with key partners and local service providers to address likely service needs and map out required material support for people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley as a result of changes to the SSRS program. Council is also working with other Councils to reduce duplication and share approaches.

**Proposed Joint Statement and associated advocacy**

Greater Dandenong's July Roundtable for local government leaders called for advocacy regarding SRSS program changes, including a ‘Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Service’ (Appendix A). The Statement was initially drafted by Greater Dandenong and revised during the Roundtable workshop. The Statement calls on the Australian Government for five key commitments as outlined in Table Two.

**Table Two: Joint Council Statement - Key Commitments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Calls on the Australian Government to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment One</td>
<td>Reverse the recent assessment changes to the SRSS program and provide adequate income and support for people seeking asylum while they seek sustainable employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Two</td>
<td>Provide funding to enable accurate initial job readiness assessment by trained employment consultants who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commitment | Calls on the Australian Government to:
--- | ---
understand the barriers faced by people seeking asylum.
Commitment Three | Provide additional funding to enable asylum seekers to be registered as Stream B and C job seekers within the jobactive network of agencies to facilitate ongoing job readiness and skilled employment consultant support.
Commitment Four | Improve local area coordination in cooperation with LGA’s. We call on the Australian Government to work with local municipalities in exploring the feasibility of local coordination points to better respond to local area need.
Commitment Five | Provide greater resourcing to reinforce the capacity of community service and voluntary organisations to assist people seeking asylum to live safely in local communities and receive emergency relief and material aid support until such time as they receive a substantive visa or are deported.

To date, thirteen Councils are signatories to the Joint Statement including: Brimbank City Council; Cardinia Shire Council; Darebin City Council; Gannawarra Shire Council; Greater Bendigo City Council; Greater Dandenong City Council; Greater Geelong City Council; Maroondah City Council; Moreland City Council; Port Phillip City Council; Whittlesea City Council; Wyndham City Council and Yarra City Council.

Greater Dandenong is also establishing a Local Government Mayoral Taskforce supporting People Seeking Asylum (Taskforce). Its Executive represent Brimbank, Darebin, Greater Dandenong, Moreland and Yarra Councils. The general membership also includes the municipalities of Cardinia, Port Phillip, Wyndham and Whittlesea and is expected to grow in coming weeks and months.

Moonee Valley officers have indicated an interest in being a member (rather than on the Executive) of the Taskforce, and propose that Council continues to provide support with a focus on providing material aid and service coordination across other local government areas. Councillors Jim Cusack and Cam Nation have been proposed as Moonee Valley City Council representatives in their capacity as the chairs of the Community Wellbeing and Access, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (IDEA) Portfolio Advisory Committees. It is anticipated advocacy measures will be devised and coordinated through Executive Taskforce membership and that these will include:

- writing to the Australian Government, and other levels of government to advise the Statement and requested policy change
- media campaigns to highlight the issue and impact on people seeking asylum
- Mayoral delegations to other levels of government (to be confirmed).

Non-executive Taskforce members will be invited to join in these activities and will be named in campaign material as Councils supporting this position.

**Material support for People Seeking Asylum in Moonee Valley**

In addition to advocacy, the other key role for local Councils is coordination of material aid responses to people seeking asylum as local communities and charities
increasingly bear the consequences of these changes through an increase in people seeking emergency relief for food, clothing, blankets, rental and housing support, health and other services. Moonee Valley will provide material support as outlined in Table Three below.

Community Development will work across the Council and with neighbouring Councils and agencies to develop a coordinated response for asylum seekers who have settled in Moonee Valley. This response will include the establishment of a local agency network to address the coordination and access to material aid and support services for asylum seekers. The network will develop an eligibility process. This will be similar to the City of Darebin’s passport model, where asylum seekers are provided with a passport or card which identifies them as an asylum seeker and eligibility for material aid and free access to recreation, education and employment programs as well as critical support services.

**Table Three: Material aid initiatives for people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Convene a working group of local service providers and agencies to assess need and coordinate material aid for people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with other Councils in the region to reduce duplication of effort and share approaches and resources as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct provision</td>
<td>Work with partners such as the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre (ASRC) to prepare a list of material aid and services available people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley and adjacent local government areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue delivery of Health and Family Wellbeing programs as outlined in Table Three of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide free access to the following Moonee Valley services for people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moonee Valley Leisure Centres, including casual entry ($5.30 per visit) to aquatic facilities or to support motivation and connection to local communities offering a Health Club multi pass (10 visits to dry gym and aquatic facilities, Concession price is $173 per person). This is similar to other Councils such as Darebin and Whittlesea who have provided free access to their Leisure Centres as part of a suite of support measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library events and programs (where there is a participation cost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• arts and cultural events (where there is a participation cost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Development programs (such as school holiday programs etc., where there is a participation cost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Development programs (where there is a participation cost).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following will apply to ‘free access’ to the Moonee Valley services listed above:

- Will be managed with due diligence to support people seeking asylum and ensure that the benefit is not misused by others seeking to take advantage of the initiative.
- May be expanded to include other Council services. Councillors will be advised through subsequent Councillor Updates.
- Will be reviewed at the end of 2019 to determine whether still required.

Consultation

On behalf of the Mayor, Cr John Sipek, Moonee Valley Council officers attended a Mayoral Roundtable for local government leaders regarding Asylum Seekers on Tuesday 31 July 2018. The meeting was attended by both Councillors and officers from a number of Councils across Victoria.

Subsequent to this, Moonee Valley Council officers have worked with other Councils to reduce duplication of effort and share approaches and resources as required regarding provision of material aid. These Councils include: Darebin, Banyule, Whittlesea, Yarra and Moreland Councils.

Community Development teams are also in the process of contacting local service providers and partners with a view to coordinating local material aid responses as outlined in Table Three.

Implications

1. Legislative

   There are no statutory considerations as a result of this report.

   The Victorian Human Rights Charter outlines the right to:

   - recognition and equality before the law (section 8): Everyone is entitled to equal and effective protection against discrimination, and to enjoy their human rights without discrimination.

   - protection of families and children (section 17): Families are entitled to protection. Children have the same rights as adults with added protection according to their best interests.

2. Council Plan / Policy

   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to work with partners to address health and wellbeing priorities including health inequities, mental health, alcohol and other drugs, gambling, homelessness, non-communicative diseases and sexual and reproductive health in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 1: Friendly and safe - An equitable, inclusive and healthy community - Our community is socially inclusive and healthy.
In addition, a key priority within our Council Plan is to:

“Strengthen Council’s commitment as a Refugee Welcome Zone through promotion, active engagement with, and support for, refugees and asylum seekers by creating partnerships with key refugee advocacy organisations such as the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre.” (4.1.1.1.4)

This issue is referenced within the Moonee Valley 2040 Strategy as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster respect and diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide support and advocate on behalf of people seeking asylum and our newly arrived communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Financial

Budgetary or funding considerations as a result of this report include the cost of providing services free to people seeking asylum in Moonee Valley as outlined in Table Three. The estimated value of this initiative is a maximum of approximately $30,000 per annum. This is calculated on the assumption each of Moonee Valley’s 142 people seeking asylum take up one offer of a leisure centre’s $173 Health Club Multi visit card (approximate value $24,566); plus accesses other listed services (approximate value $5,400). The cost of providing free services as listed in Table Three will be reviewed at the end of 2019.

To support efforts, it is recommended $1,000 in cash and $4,000 in-kind support be provided to the City of Greater Dandenong. The in-kind contribution would be in the form of advocacy support; cash would be provided within the existing operational budget.

4. Environmental

There are no related environmental issues.

Conclusion

The Roundtable considered a Joint Statement (Statement) for participating Councils to consider, endorse and then advocate, and is enclosed as Appendix A. The Statement calls on the Australian Government to reverse the recent assessment changes to the SRSS program and provide adequate income and case management support for people seeking asylum while they seek sustainable employment. To date, thirteen Councils have signed on to be signatories to the Joint Statement.

There is also concern within the local government sector that additional burden will be placed on Councils and local community organisations to coordinate material aid responses. Moonee Valley’s efforts to support material aid to people seeking asylum is outlined in Table Three and in the ‘Financial’ section of this report.

Appendices

Appendix A: Joint Council Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Service, August 2018

Appendix B: Background document Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) for People, City of Greater Dandenong, August 2018
Joint Statement against changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) for People Seeking Asylum

We the undersigned representatives of local governments in Victoria issue the following statement:

We want the Australian Government to provide adequate resources to meet the needs of people seeking asylum who live in the community.

Over 4,000 children nationally could be affected by the changes and we call upon the Australia Government to adhere to its national and international obligations in accordance with the Charter of Human Rights.

We strongly believe more effective collaboration and coordination is essential between Commonwealth, State and Local Governments and we seek the following commitments from the Australian Government:

Commitment One: We want the Australian Government to reverse the recent assessment changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program and provide adequate income and case management support for people seeking asylum while they seek sustainable employment.

Commitment Two: We strongly call on the Australian Government to provide funding to enable accurate initial job readiness assessment by trained employment consultants who understand the unique and significant barriers that people seeking asylum face.

Commitment Three: We want the Australian Government to provide additional funding to enable asylum seekers to be registered as Stream B and C job seekers within the jobactive network of agencies to facilitate ongoing job readiness assessment and skilled employment consultant support.

Commitment Four: The Australian Government needs to improve local area coordination in cooperation with LGA’s. We call on the Australian Government to work with local municipalities in exploring the feasibility of local coordination points to better respond to local area need.

Commitment Five: We strongly call on the Australian Government to provide greater resourcing to reinforce the capacity of community service and voluntary organisations to assist people seeking asylum to live safely in local communities and receive emergency relief and material aid support until such time as they receive a substantive visa or are deported.

Accountability

Additional resourcing will bring with it an obligation to ensure that Local Government allocates resources appropriately and resource areas of identified need.

We commit to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.

We commit to evaluate the application of resources in people seeking asylum support programs by measuring service delivery against agreed objectives and targets. The evaluation process will include annual program reports and Inter-Governmental consultations to review program effectiveness and refine objectives and activities.
BACKGROUND STATEMENT DOCUMENT

Changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) for People Seeking Asylum

Preamble

Local Government is an essential tier of government working in partnership with the State and Commonwealth Governments to improve the overall quality of life and achieve the best outcomes for people in local communities. Local government’s strength is in activities and services that are place based and responsive to the community.

Local Governments support a wide range of services that help both people seeking asylum and refugees, through direct service provision and through collaborative partnerships with community groups.

From the recognition of various local government areas as Refugee Welcome Zones, the establishment of Interfaith Networks, free access to maternal and child health services, local government seeks to create a community that is welcoming and inclusive.

This Statement represents the agreed views of local government bodies across Victoria that carry the greatest burden of real, every-day support for asylum seekers.

Joint Statement

We the undersigned representatives of local governments in Victoria note that providing adequate resources for support for people seeking asylum based in the community is a duty of the Australian nation and primarily a responsibility of the Commonwealth Government of Australia.

We want the Australian Government to support local government with adequate resources to meet the needs of people seeking asylum who live in the community.

Over 4,000 children nationally could be affected by the changes and we call upon the Australia Government to adhere to its national and international obligations in accordance with the Charter of Human Rights.

We strongly believe more effective collaboration and coordination is essential between Commonwealth, State and Local Governments and we seek the following commitments from the Australian Government:

Reversal of the job readiness changes for SRSS eligibility

Changes to the Federal Government’s SRSS program will cut income and case management support of many people seeking asylum and dramatically increase the demand for material aid resources at the local municipality level. This action will leave many people destitute and requests for places to live, money for clothes, food and medicine, will only escalate.

People seeking asylum are already seeking emergency assistance in increasing numbers from agencies and other charities throughout Australia. Many of these organisations receive no money from the government. There is a genuine risk that people seeking asylum will increasingly fall to integrate as healthy and productive community members and the changes to the SRSS program will erode the social cohesion that Australia has invested so much in achieving.
Commitment One: We want the Australian Government to reverse the recent assessment changes to the Status Resolution Support Services (SRSS) program and provide adequate income and case management support for people seeking asylum while they seek sustainable employment.

Additional funding to enable accurate assessment and support for job readiness

Accurate job readiness assessment for sustainable employment is difficult to assess and providers of SRSS case management are not trained employment consultants. There is a strong concern in the sector that the majority of people seeking asylum affected by the SRSS changes will be even more disadvantaged than other job seekers in the marketplace.

Federal government funded jobactive providers only provide extremely limited Stream A level job seeking support for people seeking asylum who register voluntarily with their service. People seeking asylum face significant challenges in finding employment, accentuated by the uncertainty of their status in Australia, language and cultural barriers, and a lack of work place understanding. People seeking asylum come from unbelievably traumatic situations, often suffering from physical and mental abuse, homelessness and periods of starvation. The effects of these deprivations are often ongoing and a far higher level of support will be required to prepare for job readiness. Current funding levels for Stream A employment outcomes do not incentivise jobactive providers to provide any job assessment or employment consultant support for people seeking asylum.

Commitment Two: We strongly call on the Australian Government to provide funding to enable accurate initial job readiness assessment by trained employment consultants who understand the unique and significant barriers that people seeking asylum face.

Commitment Three: We want the Australian Government to provide additional funding to enable asylum seekers to be registered as Stream B and C job seekers within the jobactive network of agencies to facilitate ongoing job readiness assessment and skilled employment consultant support.

Local level coordination

Local Government takes account of the needs of all groups in the community when allocating its limited resources. Informed local area planning is essential for Local Government to provide adequate and timely support for asylum seekers and support groups in the community, while ensuring that support is well targeted and equitably distributed.

Community organisations are often among the first responders in providing support to vulnerable community members and provide a service that is distinct to that of funded service providers. Operating in isolation and with limited funds, these organisations do not currently have the resources available to enable a coordinated response which at times results in the unnecessary duplication of effort and a less efficient use of already scant resources.

Commitment Four: We strongly call on the Australian Government to provide greater resourcing to reinforce the capacity of community service and voluntary organisations to assist people seeking asylum to live safely in local communities and receive emergency relief and material aid support until such time as they receive a substantive visa or are deported.
Emergency relief and material aid resources

The Australian Government must recognise that local government and the community work together as key partners when addressing the complex needs of people seeking asylum in Australia. A wide range of community service and voluntary organisations offer essential assistance to people seeker asylum and many rely on philanthropic, voluntary or charitable contributions to enable them to deliver these services. Voluntary agencies do not have the capacity to service this growing need and stretched volunteer agencies cannot be expected to provide the level of service required for the growing demand that changes to the SRSS policy will bring.

Commitment Five: We strongly call on the Australian Government to provide greater resourcing to reinforce the capacity of community service and voluntary organisations to assist people seeking asylum to live safely in local communities and receive emergency relief and material aid support until such time as they receive a substantive visa or are deported.

Accountability

Additional resourcing will bring with it an obligation to ensure that Local Government allocates resources appropriately and resource areas of identified need.

We commit to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.

We commit to evaluate the application of resources in people seeking asylum support programs by measuring service delivery against agreed objectives and targets. The evaluation process will include annual program reports and Inter-Governmental consultations to review program effectiveness and refine objectives and activities.
10.7 Moonee Valley City Council Highball Stadium Development

File No: FOL/18/32
Author: Ben McManus
Major Community Infrastructure Program Manager
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
This report seeks Council's endorsement to bring forward Council funding for the Highball Stadium design and construction on the proviso Council successfully receives external funding for other major projects including a low interest loan from the Victorian Government under the Community Sports Infrastructure Loan Scheme.

Executive Summary
- This report seeks Council endorsement to bring forward the Council funding, adopted as part of the long term capital works plan, for the Highball Stadium design and construction on the proviso Council successfully receives external funding for Flemington Community Hub and also funding through Community Sports Infrastructure Loan Scheme.
- A saving of $2.2 million is expected to be made by bringing forward this project due to savings in escalation costs.
- Officers have continued investigations on the delivery of a highball facility in the municipality and initial community testing did not elicit a negative response in relation to opportunities for indoor netball, basketball and gymnastics at Quinn Grove Reserve. Further opportunities to engage the local community will occur this year.

Recommendation
That Council:
1. Brings forward the highball stadium design and construction allocation to commence 2019/2020, currently commencing 2022/2023, subject to receipt of a low interest loan of $10 million for a sports project from the Victorian Government and $10 million in funding for other Major Projects.
2. Seeks funding of $5 million for the development of the Highball Stadium from other levels of Government.

Background
The 2017-2021 Council Plan has a priority strategy to "prepare options for the development of a highball facility within the municipality." The development of a highball stadium was identified as a high priority within the Sports Development Plan 2014-2024 due to Moonee Valley not currently providing facilities for sports such as netball and basketball.
Council completed a highball stadium needs assessment in August 2016. The needs assessment confirmed there is considerable current demand for such facilities, and to meet this demand, council would require the development of 12 indoor courts. This number of courts is expected to increase to 15 by 2030.

On the 22 May 2018, council was presented with the requested highball stadium feasibility work from the 20 December 2016 Ordinary Meeting and on 22 May 2018, resolved “that Council notes the findings from the draft highball feasibility study; commences community testing and consultation on the development of a highball stadium at Quinn Grove Reserve…. (and) continues the site investigations, concept design planning and broader precinct planning on the viability of accommodating a highball stadium at Quinn Grove Reserve.”

The Victorian Government released the Community Sports Infrastructure Loan Scheme (CSILS) in July 2018, with $100 million available through the program. Organisations have access to low-interest loans through this program of between $500,000 and $10 million per project. This is a pilot program from the Victorian Government so the future success of this program will be influenced by the level of interest in this round.

The Quinn Grove Precinct Plan work will continue over the next year, looking at providing sports opportunities in high demand.

**Discussion**

Council has applied for a loan for the East Keilor Leisure Centre redevelopment and the development of a highball stadium. Should Councillors not support bringing forward the highball stadium project, Council would withdraw the highball stadium application.

Proposed construction of the East Keilor Leisure Centre remains unchanged, however CSILS provides a potential saving to Council with a low-interest loan. If successful, this loan will be in addition to the $3 million grant from the Victorian Government for this project through their Better Pools Program.

The access to low-interest finance has created the opportunity to bring forward current delivery timeframes to commence construction of a highball stadium in late 2020, therefore Council consideration is required. The highball stadium development is currently sitting in the long term capital works plan (LTCWP) from 2023 to 2025. The current budget for this project in the LTCWP is $31.4 million including escalation costs. Bringing forward this project saves on escalation costs. Based on current highball cost plans (Appendix A) and escalation rates, council could save $2.2 million by adjusting this delivery program by three years. The planning phase of this project remains relative, with the detailed design phase proposed to commence 2019/2020.

The below table outlines the capital costs depending on timing of project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highball Stadium Development Program</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design in 2022/2023 and Construction in 2023 to 2025</td>
<td>$31.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Design in 2019/2020 and Construction in 2020 to 2022</td>
<td>$29.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Cost Saving</td>
<td>$2.2 million*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Financing costs would be incurred on borrowing but $10 million would be at the low-interest rate offered by the State.
The ability of Council to finance this movement in the capital program is subject to the following:

1. Confirmation of external funding for the Flemington Community Hub to $10 million
2. Success in receiving a CSILS low-interest loan from the Victorian Government.

Bringing forward the delivery of the highball stadium to 2020-2022 is expected to deliver further savings, since the construction will commence/immediately follow the delivery of the East Keilor Leisure Centre, and hence the site set-up for the EKLC may be able to be retained to service construction of the highball stadium.

It should also be noted that council has separately applied for funding of $30,000 from the Victorian Government through the Community Sports Infrastructure Program to support planning of the Quinn Grove Precinct over the next year. This planning will look at future sports provision opportunities, particularly for netball and basketball. The result of this application will be known prior to the Victorian Government election caretaker period which commences 30 October 2018.

Applications for the CSILS was submitted by the deadline of 31 August 2018, however, as outlined above, Council can choose to withdraw this application should it choose not to pursue this opportunity. Council will receive notification of this application prior to 30 October 2018.

Consultation

Consultation on Highball in Keilor East will continue over the next year. A letter drop was made to residents nearby to Quinn Grove Reserve alerting them to the Quinn Grove Precinct Plan. Council did not receive any feedback about the aim to investigate opportunities for indoor netball, basketball and gymnastics at the site.

Implications

1. Legislative

   The concept for the future development of a highball stadium adheres broadly to the Human Rights Charter Section 12 Freedom of Movement and Section 18 Taking Part in Public Life by meeting current building code requirements guided by the Disability Discrimination Act 1992. As the project proceeds full designs will be prepared that will comply with all relevant legislation including DDA Universal Design Principles and the Charter of Human Rights.

2. Council Plan / Policy

   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to prepare options for the development of a highball facility within the municipality in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 4: Vibrant and diverse - Celebrating diversity, promoting participation, and creating a strong economy - High levels of participation in accessible leisure and learning opportunities.

3. Financial

   Council’s long term capital works plan has budgeted of $31.4 million to construct a Highball Stadium from 2023 to 2025.
A potential capital saving of $2.2 million could be made by bringing this program forward three years. Bringing the program forward is subject to council receiving external funding for the Flemington Community Hub and success of one of our CSILS applications.

Low interest loans will be subject to market fluctuations but are proposed as low as 3.1 per cent (current market rate is approximately 3.96%) with further reductions possible through Sport and Recreation Victoria loan subsidies. The details and final loan rate will be agreed once all projects are assessed and announcements made. Council will review the loan agreement before executing.

4. Environmental

If this project proceeds, the highball stadium will be designed to minimise environmental impact. To achieve this objective, it is anticipated a dedicated Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) consultant will be engaged in the detailed design stage.

Council’s environmental policies, including the Sustainable Building Guidelines, will be used during this process.

Conclusion

Research to date demonstrated substantial demand for a highball stadium in Moonee Valley. This project is a high priority in the current council plan. Council endorsement is required to bring forward the construction of a Highball Stadium in Moonee Valley subject to other project funding and a low interest loan from the Victorian Government. Further savings will be made should this program be brought forward due to a reduction in escalation costs.

Appendices

Appendix A: Highball Stadium Cost Plan  

.
### East Keilor Leisure Centre - Stadium

**Preliminary Cost Plan**

**ITEM 10.7 - APPENDIX A**

#### Building Works - Stadium Feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Rate ($)</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access ramp (incl. handrail)</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor seating</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabling</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing room</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,536,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General works</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,840,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Works - Level 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Rate ($)</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access ramp (incl. handrail)</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor seating</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabling</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing room</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,536,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General works</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,840,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Building Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Area (sqm)</th>
<th>Rate ($)</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Works</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>9,120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Project Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Works</td>
<td>9,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation &amp; slopes</td>
<td>740,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site services</td>
<td>450,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>10,477,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE:**

- Costs are preliminary estimates and are subject to change based on further detailed design and construction.
- Costs include all materials, labor, and site works.
- Costs are exclusive of GST.

---

**Turner & Townsend**

---

**NOTE:**

- Costs are preliminary estimates and are subject to change based on further detailed design and construction.
- Costs include all materials, labor, and site works.
- Costs are exclusive of GST.
10.8 Moonee Valley Paid Parking Plan

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Damir Agic - Strategic Transport Planner - Technical Services
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to present the Moonee Valley Paid Parking Plan, and seek endorsement to implement paid parking at specific locations within the municipality through small scale projects at the centre of the overloading.

Executive Summary
- Paid parking was first introduced to Moonee Valley in 2004 by implementing a paid parking scheme to the parking spaces in Alexandra Avenue, Moonee Ponds.
- In order to manage the anticipated parking demands associated with the population growth in Moonee Valley and the wider area, it was decided to investigate potential implications, benefits and issues associated with the introduction of paid parking in Moonee Valley.
- The proposed introduction of paid parking aligns with Council’s Municipal Parking Strategy, which recognises appropriate car parking management is critical to achieving high levels of amenity, good accessibility and long term sustainability.
- The proposed introduction of paid parking is in line with strategies in MV2040 in relation to transport mode choice, and more efficient management of land use and publicly available infrastructure. MV2040 Theme 3: Sustainable living - Connected, well designed municipality, thriving neighbourhoods, accessible places and spaces - Getting around is easy, safe and sustainable.
- Council appointed Phillip Boyle & Associates (PBA) to assist with the review of paid parking in the municipality, to develop a list of options for the introduction of paid parking, and presented this to Council, highlighting the information gathered and next steps.
- Council officers have undertaken further investigation to identify suitable locations within the municipality where implementing paid parking would be appropriate to cater for future parking demands by managing existing parking supply more efficiently.
- It is proposed to introduce paid parking to the sites nominated with a flat fee of $1.00 per hour. Behavioural based pricing may see this fee modified to in the future to achieve the appropriate occupancy balance.
- It is proposed to implement the paid parking and other parking management changes on a small scale in identified locations central to the overloading.
The next stage in the process is to prepare the implementation plan for the identified locations, including the number of parking spaces, use of paid parking technology, etc. and commence implementation.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Implements paid parking in the newly-created kerbside parking areas in:
   a) Eddy Street, Moonee Ponds, on the east side, between Taylor Street to the north and Homer Street to the south.
   b) Penny Lane, Moonee Ponds, on the west side, between Young Street to the north and Gladstone Street to the south.

2. Implements paid parking in the existing kerbside parking areas in:
   a) Moore Street, Moonee Ponds, on the west side along the railway line, between Gladstone Street to the north and Browning Street to the south.
   b) Mt Alexander Road, Moonee Ponds, on the east side along Queens Park, between The Strand to the north and Kellaway Avenue to the south.
   c) The Boulevard, Moonee Ponds, on the north and south sides near the Boathouse, west of Orford Street.
   d) Matthews Avenue, Niddrie, on the east side, north of Keilor Road.
   e) Treadwell Road, Niddrie, on the west side, north of Keilor Road.
   f) Woodland Street, Essendon, on the south side along the Cross Keys Reserve frontage, east of the railway line.

3. Reviews the existing fee regime in paid parking areas within Alexandra Avenue, Moonee Ponds and implements the reviewed rate.

4. Authorises the Chief Executive Officer to fix, rescind, vary fees for any vehicles in the parking areas, outlined in Recommendations 1, 2 and 3, and the manner of payment of those fees.

5. Receives a further report detailing the implementation of the paid parking 6-months post installation.

**Background**

As Melbourne’s population continues to increase, in line with the State Government’s population projections, Moonee Valley will transition to change and expand to accommodate a growing number of residents, both living and visiting the city. This means increased housing density, and associated traffic pressures, across the municipality, in particular in and around activity centres such as the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre. In some parts of Moonee Valley, the demand for parking is already greater than the amount of publicly available parking.

In 2011, there were around 60,000 vehicles registered to Moonee Valley residents, and with the anticipated increase in population, this is expected to increase to 77,000
by 2026, based on the current rate of ownership being maintained. There is also significant congestion caused by drivers travelling into the municipality for a variety of reasons, in particular to park near public transport options.

In order for Council to deal with increasing demands and appropriately plan for the future, more effective management of publicly available parking is required. Time based and resident exempt restrictions have been previously used to protect residential parking availability in residential areas. It is now considered appropriate to implement paid parking in order to manage parking demands in specific areas, and also influence mode choice in line with the objectives of MV2040.

In light of the above, Council officers appointed an independent consultant (PBA) to prepare a Discussion Paper identifying the benefits, challenges and implications associated with expanding the use of paid parking in Moonee Valley. The Discussion Paper was presented to Council at the Strategic Briefing on 6 February 2018.

**Discussion**

Introducing parking fees encourages parkers to think about their time, and consider the most efficient use of the available parking supply, resulting in parking turnover and increased availability of parking opportunities. Generally, the presence of an economic hurdle, through paid parking, is considered an effective tool to manage high levels of car based transport.

Behavioural parking fees are where the fee setter seeks to apply a fee level that is commensurate with the benefit received from the location; the fee must be high enough to mean people who won’t receive great benefit from parking in that particular location won’t park there, while being low enough not to present a significant financial burden to parking users or lead to high vacancy rates. The aim of behavioural pricing is to allow for as many people as possible to access centres; fees are adjusted to keep bays open near the desired destination, increasing the number of potential users. Parkers looking for long-stay parking will generally park further away as a result of parking restrictions and higher fees, as do parkers who, in order to avoid the behavioural fee, are willing to spend time hunting for a parking space and walking. Parking fees are designed to influence behaviour, not raise revenue.

**Proposal sites**

It is now proposed to introduce paid parking at core pressure points, through a range of small scale projects at the centre of the overloading. This approach allows the introduced measures to be tested and adjusted as required, without impacting the remaining parking supply.

The parking information gathered as part of Council’s ongoing Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) program has been used to identify destinations where parking is clogged. Data gathered through the LATMs has assisted in identifying the appropriate locations to implement paid parking, noting that LATM reports have not focussed on where behavioural fees would be relevant.

A number of the investigation locations proposed to have parking changes are around train stations (all listed below). One of the benefits of introducing paid parking at these locations would be passengers who live close to and drive to the station, may choose to walk or cycle to the station in the future, thereby reducing congestion in the surrounding road networks. Passengers who continue to drive to the stations
will need to pay for parking, thereby assisting with reinvesting into the local area. Also, drivers will experience a more reliable parking availability due to the reduced congestion.

Importantly, the overall parking conditions for residents around stations would improve. Vehicles displaying valid residential parking permits will be exempt from fees in paid parking areas, regardless whether the paid parking is to be implemented into a currently unrestricted parking area, or an area with existing time controls. Existing parking permits will remain valid in applicable permit zones, while residents eligible to get parking as per the current Municipal Parking Strategy will be able to obtain new permits. Further, the said reduced congestion will result in increased parking availability for residents and their visitors to park.

The following potential paid parking locations are now proposed to be implemented:

- **Moonee Ponds Activity Centre – Eddy Street and Penny Lane**

  Moonee Ponds Activity Centre is the busiest activity centre in Moonee Valley and managing the parking supply to ensure demands are met can be challenging. The significant construction activities of late have resulted in additional pressure to the overall parking availability, for both short-term (1P and 2P) as well as all day parking.

  Council officers identified kerbside areas in Eddy Street and Penny Lane that can support the provision of new parking spaces. An initial review indicates an approximate total of 11-15 new parking spaces can be created, with 6-9 new spaces on the east side of Eddy Street, and 5-6 new spaces on the west side of Penny Lane.

  This proposal involves introducing paid parking in areas where parking is currently not permitted. It is considered appropriate to test paid parking in these areas, given the existing parking supply will not be impacted in any way. Appropriately designed behavioural fees are to be implemented in each location to ensure adequacy and appropriateness based on the distance to the various desired destinations. It is considered this will have a number of benefits, while minimising impact to the local area.

  The location of the identified areas in Eddy Street and Penny Lane can be seen in Appendix A – proposals 1a and 1b.

- **Moonee Ponds Railway Station – Moore Street**

  The Moonee Ponds railway station is accessed by approximately 3,000 passengers each day, with this number expected to rise significantly in the future. More than 500 of those visitors arrive by car, generally parking in publicly available parking areas nearby. Some passengers use the VicTrack parking areas, however as this number is very limited, the majority of the passengers park in other uncontrolled parking areas within the road network.

  It is considered the majority of passengers who drive to the Moonee Ponds railway station park in nearby local streets, which provide uncontrolled parking, thereby impacting the parking availability for residents and visitors. Given the proximity to the station, and the existing parking arrangements including uncontrolled parking on the west side of the street along the railway line, it is
considered Moore Street experiences significant pressure due to parking demands associated with the railway station.

In light of the above, it is proposed to introduce resident exempt all-day paid parking on the west side of Moore Street, Moonee Ponds, between Gladstone Street to the north and Browning Street to the south, along the railway line. Appropriately designed behavioural fees are to be implemented to ensure adequacy and appropriateness based on the distance to desired destinations. It is considered this will have a number of benefits, while minimising impact to the local area.

The location of the identified area in Moore Street can be seen in Appendix A – proposal 2a.

- **Queens Park – Mt Alexander Road**

Queens Park is bound by Mt Alexander Road to the west, The Strand to the north, Pascoe Vale Road to the east and Kellaway Avenue to the south. Kerbside parking is available along all Queens Park frontages, generally consisting of restricted and unrestricted parking opportunities.

Mt Alexander Road, along the Queens Park frontage between Kellaway Avenue to the south and The Strand to the north, offers a mixture of unrestricted parking, 3 Hour parking, as well as restrictions servicing buses and local deliveries. The available parking supply along the Queens Park frontages is generally well utilised, with visitors utilising the restricted parking opportunities, and employees and commuters utilising the available unrestricted parking.

The kerbside parking along the Mt Alexander Road frontage is conveniently located, providing easy access to the park and services within, as well as the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre. It is considered appropriate to introduce paid parking at this location, offering short-term paid parking opportunities for visitors to the area, as well as all-day paid parking for employees in the area and commuters accessing the nearby public transport opportunities.

Appropriately designed behavioural fees are to be implemented to ensure adequacy and appropriateness based on the distance to various desired destinations. It is considered this will have a number of benefits, while minimising impact to the local area.

The location of the identified area in Mt Alexander Road can be seen in Appendix A – proposal 2b.

- **Boathouse – The Boulevard**

The Boulevard runs along the Maribyrnong River, through the Maribyrnong Park and Aberfeldie Park, providing access to numerous off-street and on-street parking opportunities. The existing parking supply along The Boulevard is generally unrestricted.

The Boulevard is generally subject to significant demands, noting the demand levels generally vary in different sections of the road. There is a history of parking availability concerns along The Boulevard, in particular during peak operating times such as sporting events.

The angled parking opportunities at the eastern end of The Boulevard near Orford Street are conveniently located providing easy access to the
Maribyrnong Park and the Maribyrnong River, including the Boathouse. It is considered appropriate to introduce paid parking at this location, offering short-term and long-term all day paid parking opportunities for visitors to the area. Appropriately designed behavioural fees are to be implemented to ensure adequacy and appropriateness based on the distance to desired destinations. It is considered this will have a number of benefits, while minimising impact to the local area.

The location of the identified area in The Boulevard can be seen in Appendix A – proposal 2c.

- **Keilor Road Activity Centre – Matthews Avenue and Treadwell Road**

Keilor Road Activity Centre is a busy area, regularly experiencing significant parking demands. The existing parking pressures have in part been addressed to date through time controls in most public on-street and off-street parking areas in the vicinity.

It is considered appropriate to introduce behavioural fees for short-term parking in the Keilor Road Activity Centre with the aim to encourage turnover of parking opportunities, improve parking availability, and assist with accessing the shops. Given the location and the objective to be achieved, it is considered appropriate to implement a tiered pricing arrangement, giving parkers a number of options ranging between free parking for short term occupations, and paid parking for medium and long term stays.

In light of the above, it is proposed to convert the existing kerbside parking area on the east of Matthews Avenue, and on the west side of Treadwell Road, north of Keilor Road, to paid parking. These locations are considered suitable to assess the impact of behavioural fees, given the parking areas are proximate to the shops, providing a value to visitors who urgently need a parking space, while not located on Keilor Road directly in front of the shops. Matthews Avenue and Treadwell Road are both side streets and as such experiences less activity than Keilor Road.

The locations of the identified areas in Matthews Avenue and Treadwell Road can be seen in Appendix A – proposals 2d and 2e.

- **Strathmore Railway Station – Woodland Street**

The number of people accessing the Strathmore Railway Station is expected to rise significantly in the future. A significant proportion of passengers arrive at the station by car, generally parking in publicly available parking areas nearby. Some passengers use the VicTrack parking areas, however as this number is very limited, the majority of the passenger park in other uncontrolled parking areas within the road network.

It is considered the majority of passengers who drive to the Strathmore Railway Station park in nearby local streets, which provide uncontrolled parking, thereby impacting the parking availability for residents and visitors. Given the proximity to the station, and the existing parking arrangements including uncontrolled parking in the area, it is considered Amelia Crescent and Woodland Street experience a significant amount of pressure due to parking demands associated with the railway station.
In light of the above, it is proposed to introduce resident exempt all-day paid parking on the south side of Woodland Street, in the kerbside parking area along the Cross Keys Reserve frontage.

It should be noted that paid parking in the angled kerbside parking area on the east side of Amelia Crescent along the railway line was also considered. However, the area abuts Victrack owned land, and the exact location of the property boundary is currently unclear. Due to the lack of clarity regarding land ownership, a proposal to introduce paid parking in Amelia Avenue has been omitted at this stage. This matter may be revisited in the future, following confirmation of land ownership and consultation with Victrack.

 Appropriately designed behavioural fees are to be implemented in each location to ensure adequacy and appropriateness based on the distance to desired destinations. It is considered this will have a number of benefits, while minimising impact to the local area.

In light of the need to encourage recreation at Woodland’s Reserve, it is proposed to offer the first hour of parking free, followed by the fee of $1.00 per hour.

The location of the identified area in Woodland Street can be seen in Appendix A – proposal 2f.

- **Alexandra Avenue, Moonee Ponds – Review of existing Paid Parking**

  Council introduced paid parking in Alexandra Avenue, Moonee Ponds back in 2004. To date, this is the only paid parking area in Moonee Valley managed by Council. The current parking rate in Alexandra Avenue, as per Council’s adopted Fees and Charges – 2018/19 Budget Statutory Fees is $4.10 per hour or $18 per day.

  The regular monitoring of the parking occupancies in Alexandra Avenue indicates a significant under-utilisation of the parking areas, with more than half of the available parking bays regularly empty during the day. This is reinforced by a relatively low parking revenue generated throughout the year for prime parking spots in an activity centre such as Moonee Ponds.

  The parking occupancies in remaining, free parking areas within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre are generally significantly higher, which indicates that parkers choose not to use parking in Alexandra Avenue, most likely due to the high cost. The low parking occupancies in Alexandra Avenue suggests the price exceeds the ‘value’ delivered by the location of the parking bays, and it is considered the utilisation levels and associated overall revenue would increase if the existing parking fees were lowered.

  As such, it is considered appropriate to review the existing fees in Alexandra Avenue, with the aim to adopt a fee regime relevant to the location of parking bays with respect to nearby desired destinations. This can be achieved by splitting the bays in Alexandra Avenue between two different purposes, being short-term and long-term parking. The proposed split can be made at Walker Street on the north side and the laneway separating the Foxtel building from the onsite car park on the south side of the street.
The bays west of the proposed split, near the Moonee Ponds Junction are closer to the centre, and can be allocated to short-term parkers visiting the centre. Due to the proximity to the centre and the ease of access, these bays are considered prime bays, and a short-term fee of $1.00 per hour is considered appropriate. The stay duration in these bays will be capped to a maximum of two hours to encourage a regular turnover, thereby improving the availability of these prime parking spaces.

The bays east of the proposed split, near McPherson Street are further away from the centre, and may be more appropriate for the use of long-term parkers such employees who work in the centre.

Cost and Timing

In all cases, it is proposed paid parking is implemented with a fee of $1.00 per hour which will apply to parking between 6am and 10pm. The maximum payment will be capped at a total of $10.00, covering the parking period between 6am and 10pm.

These fees are competitive with the existing, privately operated paid parking available in the municipality. Council officers will monitor the use of the paid parking areas to assess the impact and effectiveness of the fees, and determine if changes to the fee regime are required.

Consultation

The purpose of this report is to seek approval to implement paid parking at specific locations within the municipality through small scale projects at the centre of the overloading.

Signage will be placed at the locations to notify people of the intention to introduce paid parking including the cost and time limits. We welcome general feedback from the public, and request any responses to the specific proposals be sent to Council in writing by post or email.

Should significant negative responses (20+) be received in response to any of the specific proposals, a report will be brought back to Council to seek further guidance on the continuation of paid parking at the specific location.

Implications

1. **Legislative**

   The authority to apply paid parking is at *Local Government Act (1989)* Schedule 11.

   The content of this report complies with the Human Rights Charter 2006.

2. **Council Plan / Policy**

   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objectives in line with the Council Plan 2017-2021 and MV2040, and contributes to Theme 3: Sustainable living - Connected, well designed municipality, thriving neighbourhoods, accessible places and spaces - Getting around is easy, safe and sustainable.

   The proposed introduction of paid parking aligns with Council’s Municipal Parking Strategy, which recognises appropriate car parking management is
critical to achieving high levels of amenity, good accessibility and long term sustainability

3. **Financial**

A capital investment of $150,000 will be required to implement the infrastructure required to implement parking at the eight (8) proposed locations. This includes paid parking technology, and physical works such as line marking etc.

Given it is expected the locations will yield a total of 174 spaces, at an estimated revenue of $5 average per space per day, the payback period is expected within 6 months.

Revenue in excess of costs will contribute towards pedestrian and cycling infrastructure to encourage more walking and cycling.

4. **Environmental**

Introducing paid parking is a step towards more effective management of parking issues and traffic congestion in Moonee Valley. Parking fees are also a way to encourage behavioural change, at least for motorists with access to alternate transport mode options, thereby potentially further reducing carbon emissions.

**Conclusion**

It is recommended Council resolve to implement paid parking at the specific locations within the municipality nominated in this report.

Once completed, a report will be made 6-months post-implementation detailing the effects of the project.

**Appendices**

Appendix A: Moonee Valley Paid Parking Plan – Proposed Locations [i] [ii].
1a) Eddy Street, Moonee Ponds 6 x new kerbside parking spaces on the east side, north of Homer Street

1b) Peiny Lane, Moonee Ponds 5 x new parking spaces on the west side, south of Young Street

2a) Moore Street, Moonee Ponds 29 x kerbside parking spaces on the west side, south of Gladstone Street

2b) Kit Alexander Road, Moonee Ponds 31 x kerbside parking spaces on the west side, south of Gladstone Street
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2c) The Boulevard, Moonee Ponds. 55 x parking spaces on the north and south sides near the Boat House, west of Orford Street.

2d) Mathews Avenue, Niddrie. 7 x parking spaces east side, north of Kellor Road.

2e) Treadwell Road, Niddrie. 12 x parking spaces on the west side, north of Kellor Road.
2f) Woodland Street, Essendon, 29 parking spaces on the south side along the Cross Keys Reserve frontage, east of the railway line
10.9 Update to Response to Notice of Motion 2017/21 - Electric Car Charging Infrastructure

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Natalie Reiter - Director Planning and Development
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
The purpose of the report is to respond to the resolution of Council in May 2018, requesting a report that incorporates additional advice of the Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Inquiry into Electric Vehicles.

Executive Summary
- Public charge stations are available within the Melbourne metropolitan area. Significant gaps in public charging infrastructure provision is evident in regional and rural areas.

- Fear of being stranded with a flat battery is a barrier to the uptake of electric vehicles. However, rapid advancement in battery technology has significantly increased the number of kilometres that can be travelled before a vehicle requires charging. This makes it possible for metropolitan drivers to recharge at home or at their workplace, provided they have access to off-street parking.

- Despite the recent Inquiry, the Victorian Government has not provided guidance to local councils regarding the application of planning provisions for installation of charging infrastructure. State government expectations regarding local councils’ role in providing electric vehicle charging infrastructure remains unclear.

- Advances in technology, the high cost to install charge stations, and the absence of clear state-level guidance, means that it would be premature for Council to invest resources in modifying planning provisions, or installing charging infrastructure at this time.
Recommendation

That Council notes the following:

1. The update provided in this report.
2. The Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Inquiry into Electric Vehicles Report does not make any recommendations to government. The Committee Chair states that “a lot more work needs to be done before we can fully understand or support electric vehicles in Victoria”.
3. Officers will continue to monitor changes in state government policy regarding support for electric vehicles and the evolution of the electric vehicle industry.
4. Officers will continue to monitor community need for electric car charging in the city.
5. Officers will continue to consider the need to include electric car charging conditions in planning permits.

Background

At the Ordinary meeting of Council on 25 July 2017, Notice of Motion 2017/21 – Electric Car Charging was unanimously supported calling for a report to:

1. Address options for the provision of recharge points, the costs of which may be offset by identifying opportunities to partner with car companies (e.g. BMW and others);
2. Identify implications for planning and the need for incorporation into future major developments (retail, commercial and residential); and
3. Identify a transition plan for Council’s car fleet to incorporate electric vehicles.

A report was presented at the Ordinary meeting of Council on 22 May 2018. At the time, the Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Report on the Inquiry into Electric Vehicles had been delayed and was not due for release until the end of May 2018. The report recommended that Council:

1. Note the update provided.
2. Note the relatively low penetration of electric vehicle sales in Australia and the current lack of guidance at a State Level regarding the provision of electric charging stations.
3. Continue to monitor the need for electric car charging in public areas of the city.
4. Continue to consider the need to include the provision of electric car charging conditions in planning permits.
5. Note the progress underway to transition the Moonee Valley City Council fleet to electric.

At this Ordinary meeting, Cr Cusack moved that a report be developed for consideration by Council in December 2018 that incorporates additional advice of the Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Inquiry into Electric Vehicles. The motion was carried unanimously.
Discussion

Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Inquiry into Electric Vehicles Report (May 2018)

The terms of reference for the inquiry limited the Committee to consideration of:

- the potential benefits that could result from higher uptake of electric vehicles in Victoria;
- the regulatory, infrastructure, economic, employment and incentive options for supporting the uptake of privately owned electric vehicles;
- the applicability of electric vehicles in public transport bus fleets and public sector fleets;
- options for supporting the manufacture and assembly of electric vehicles in Victoria, including transition of workers and suppliers affected by the closure of vehicle manufacturing in Victoria; and
- the applicability of electric vehicles to the car share providers market.

The Committee received more than 200 submissions and held three days of public hearings to gather information from relevant stakeholders.

The Committee Chair Bernie Finn stated that the report "does not make any recommendations to government [...] a lot more work needs to be done before we can fully understand or support electric vehicles in Victoria"

27 findings are noted in the Report. The following findings are considered relevant for Council’s consideration:

- Finding 1: Currently the high upfront cost of electric vehicles compared to other vehicles in the same class, makes them prohibitively expensive for many Victorians.
- Finding 9: Any electric vehicle charging infrastructure deployed in Victoria must be accessible, comprehensive, up-to-date and relevant for the future.
- Finding 11: In the deployment of electric vehicles charging infrastructure, the Victorian Government and or industry representatives would work with relevant counterparts in other states and territories to ensure that electric vehicles can be driven across Australia.
- Finding 12: Should electric vehicles become more prevalent in Victoria it will be necessary for the State and Local Governments to update the relevant Victorian building and planning provisions and guidelines to ensure all new residential and commercial developments are prepared for electrical vehicle charging needs.
- Finding 13: The South Australian Government have partnered with manufacturers and businesses to establish an electric vehicle charging hub in the City of Adelaide and electric vehicle charging infrastructure across the state.
- Finding 15: Some local councils such as Moreland have introduced electric vehicles into their fleets. Others such as those in the Goulburn Broken Greenhouse Alliance are investigating ways to support electric vehicles in their
communities with support from the Victorian Government, such as through the New Energy Jobs Fund.

- Finding 16: The Victorian Department of Treasury and Finance does not have targets for inclusion of fully battery operated electric vehicles in the Victorian Government fleet, nor do they have comprehensive charging infrastructure to support them. However, the Department has indicated that it will include fully battery operated electric vehicles in the Victorian Government fleet in future and is investigating the charging infrastructure required to support electric vehicles.

- Finding 17: The Department of Parliamentary Services does not supply charging infrastructure to Parliamentarians or executive-level Parliamentary staff driving electric vehicles.

The discussion below is drawn from the inquiry report, supplemented by information contained in recent industry articles and reports.

**Electric Vehicle (EV) Policy in Australia**

International experience has demonstrated that government policy can be critical in encouraging the uptake of electric vehicles. Electric vehicle policy in Australia is in its infancy. The table below summarises the current status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>FED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uptake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV purchases 2011-2016</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV sales per 10,000 vehicles (2016)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle CO₂ emissions standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial incentives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duty, registration and tax discounts</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct vehicle subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging infrastructure support</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-financial incentives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle lane and parking privileges</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric vehicle public transport trials</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government fleet initiatives</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and education programs</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table notes: Policies that are in place are marked √, policies that are planned but not implemented are marked √* policies under consideration are marked o. This table was compiled through a survey of Australia’s state, territory and federal governments on their electric vehicle policies. The Commonwealth Government, the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, the Northern Territory, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria provided input. For Western Australia we undertook a desktop research study. Vehicle purchase numbers do not include Teslas.

**Overview of federal, state and territory government policy**


There is no overarching electric vehicle policy framework in Australia. This limits the capacity for a coordinated national approach. The Commonwealth Government
provides a discount on the luxury car tax, and several states and territories (including Victoria) provide varying discounts on stamp duty and registration for electric vehicles. Only the ACT, Queensland and South Australia are currently providing charging infrastructure support.

The Victorian Government is behind other states in terms of development of regulations, incentives and initiatives for electric vehicles. The Committee received evidence from both the Northern and the Eastern Alliance for Greenhouse Action, that there is insufficient guidance in Victorian planning provisions relating to electric vehicles and environmental sustainability. Clarification of this area could facilitate better provision of support infrastructure for electric vehicles, including car-share vehicles. The Eastern Alliance for Greenhouse Action suggested that improving state-level guidance to local councils regarding both the application of planning provisions for installation of charging infrastructure, and expectations regarding local councils’ role in providing electric vehicle charging infrastructure, would also support the uptake of electric vehicles for car-share providers.

In a submission, the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV), the statutory peak body for Local Government stated that: "[…] to assist with a smooth and efficient transition to EVs it is critical that the Commonwealth and state governments work together to ensure a coordinated approach is taken and that the appropriate policies and incentives are in place."

Mr Washington, founder of local electric vehicle infrastructure company JET Charge, told the Committee that government support for infrastructure is vital to wider consumer uptake of electric vehicles, including by car-sharing businesses. Government support or investment in this infrastructure can give the wider industry confidence to invest in vehicles and further charging infrastructure. Submissions from Uber and Tourism and Transport Forum Australia suggested that examples, from jurisdictions overseas, have shown that incentives such as rebates, introduced to promote electric vehicle uptake, have been ineffective without appropriate charging infrastructure in place to support it.

**EV Charging Stations - Types**

There is no universal charging station for all electric vehicle makes and models driven in Victoria. The Committee heard that competition between major car manufacturers and technology advances has led to different standards and battery charging capacities. The table below shows the types of charging stations. Each type is suitable for different applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Charging</td>
<td>3-22kW</td>
<td>4-16 hour charge sessions: This is ideal for home and also workplace charging, where cars tend to sit for a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Destination</td>
<td>20-25kW</td>
<td>1-3 hour charge sessions: This is suitable for visitor parking where a person is only around for a couple hours. The AC charging is not suitable for these scenarios as the return on charging in that time provides no real benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Fast</td>
<td>50kW</td>
<td>20-90min: This application fits your retail, grocery, shopping centres, high turnover parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC High Power</td>
<td>150-350kW+</td>
<td>10-20min: This charging is for your highway corridor travel or Metro charge and go. The benefits of this is that when people travel long distances it creates the opportunity for drivers to rest. For the next five years 150kW will be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charging service application

Although not considered in the inquiry, it is noted that wireless car charging technology is emerging. It is currently expensive but static wireless technology enables recharge while parking, whilst dynamic wireless enables recharging while driving, eliminating the need to plug-in. (Source: Australian Electric Vehicle Market Study, ENERGEIA for ARENA and CEFC, May 2018 [https://arena.gov.au/assets/2018/06/australian-ev-market-study-report.pdf]). Although there is no current timeline for release in Australia, BMW now offer static wireless charging in Germany, using an inductive charging station GroundPad that can be used to charge the BMW 530e iPerformance in around three and a half hours. ([https://www.gizmodo.com.au/2018/05/bmw-launches-worlds-first-wireless-charging-for-electric-cars-groundpad-530e-iperformance/](https://www.gizmodo.com.au/2018/05/bmw-launches-worlds-first-wireless-charging-for-electric-cars-groundpad-530e-iperformance/)).

Distribution of EV Charging Stations in Victoria

Victoria has a total of 134 charging stations across the State. There are seven public DC charging stations and 127 AC charging stations. The map below shows the three locations of the fast chargers in Metropolitan Melbourne. The fast chargers are shown in orange and the other public charging stations are shown in green.

![Charger Map including fast chargers – location Melbourne](image)

The Committee heard that electric vehicle drivers commonly purchase adaptors that allow their vehicles to recharge at stations that have a different charging standard. In addition, while Victoria has the largest number of public charging stations compared to other Australian states and territories, not all stations are operating reliably and there are few charging stations outside of the city.

Around the world, different methods are used for payment when using public charging points. Sometimes charging is offered free, for example, as an incentive to use a particular shopping centre. Payment for charging is generally done by registering with charging station operators such as PlugShare.
Charging station installation costs

The Committee heard that the costs of installing public charging stations are high and a barrier for many businesses. During the Victorian Government EV Trial, 140 charging outlets were deployed for households, fleets and public sites. Overall, costs of charging infrastructure ranged from $1,750 for a household charging circuit and up to $2,500 for a dedicated household charging outlet. The establishment of a fast charging public station could cost up to $100,000. These costs were drawn from the Department of Transport Planning and Local Infrastructure (Vic), Creating a Market: Victorian Electric Vehicle Trial Mid-Term Report, Victorian Government, Melbourne, 2013.

The cost of charging circuitry, rather than the outlet, was the most expensive aspect of charging infrastructure across all categories and particularly for public charging stations. Ms Fiona Calvert, Director, Transport Analysis and Assessment at the State Government's Transport for Victoria agency stated: “Probably the most important factor that was found through the trial was that actually the installation costs of charging infrastructure — not the charge points themselves but the cost of cabling and so on — were a much bigger factor than anything else. The logistics of that were complex, and the costs of it could be quite significant, particularly where you are retrofitting into circumstances that no one ever expected — having to lay cables to reach an underground car park or a place that is distant or inaccessible from electrical supply.”

The Committee heard that given the small number of electric vehicles and high upfront costs, businesses are reluctant to install public charging stations. ABB Australia Ltd (a subsidiary of the ABB Group, which has deployed charging stations worldwide) explained in a submission: “The challenges faced is that the installation of electric vehicle infrastructure provides a small return creating a loss on investment to businesses to justify the purchase and installation. A 50 kW unit on its own can cost between $30,000 – $35,000 and installation costs can vary depending on the sites supply capabilities. For high power chargers that would be used for inter-city travel or “charge and go” can cost over $100k. It also doesn’t help that there is a low population density when looking at large networks which makes the return difficult.”

Although not considered in the inquiry, it is worth noting that innovative solutions, to reduce charging infrastructure installation costs, are being developed around the world. For example, a German company Ubitricity, is turning existing street lights into charging stations. This technology enables people that don’t have access to off-street parking, to charge their vehicles on the street. Houslow, a borough in west London, has rolled out some of these stations, which are slow charging, but have the benefit of not requiring significant infrastructure works for installation. (Source: https://www.curbed.com/2017/6/22/15855130/ubitricity-electric-car-charging-lamp-posts and https://www.ubitricity.com/en/charging-solutiona/b2b-smart-cities/). The City of Hobsons Bay, is considering the feasibility of a trial of similar smart pole technology. (Source: Electric vehicles and charging infrastructure, Discussion Paper. April 2018, Hobsons Bay City Council http://www.hobsonsbay.vic.gov.au/files/80c05e14-d6de-4ce3-a72b-b201c18bcee3/Appendix-08-Electric-Vehicle-Charging-Stations.pdf?streamFile=true).

Charging Station Providers

In addition to the public stations installed by the Victorian Government as part of the EV Trial, Tesla, Westfield (in partnership with BMW), and the RACV have been responsible for the installation of most public charging infrastructure in Victoria.

Car manufacturers are also likely to continue to deploy charging infrastructure to support the roll-out of their own vehicles. In the US, Porsche has announced plans to launch its fully electric vehicle, the Taycan, in 2019. The vehicle is intended to compete with Tesla. To support the uptake of the Taycan, Porsche plans to install at least 500 fast chargers across the US, “to rival Tesla’s Supercharger network, which consists of over 10,000 chargers worldwide.”


An Eastern Alliance for Greenhouse Action submission indicated that incentives could be developed to encourage private infrastructure installations to be placed in publicly accessible locations such as car parks to encourage wider distribution and coverage of services. The potential role for local government in delivering incentives was not described in the inquiry report.

**Risks of investment in rapidly evolving technology**

The Committee heard that electric vehicles are in a relatively early developmental phase and are rapidly evolving. Stakeholders pointed out that today’s solutions may soon become outdated. For example, the Australian Electric Vehicle Association submission noted that new generation electric vehicles have extended range capacities (of up to 600 km on a single charge in the new model Tesla Roadster). Although these developments do not remove the need for public charging infrastructure, it highlights the need for careful planning to develop a cost-efficient public charging infrastructure to promote electric vehicles in the future.

Consideration should also be given to advances in competing technologies. Although development of Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles (FCEV) has been focused on heavy vehicles, FCEVs are an alternative technology to plug-in battery EVs (BEVs). Refuelling can be undertaken in a shorter time than for BEVs, and requires hydrogen refuelling stations, rather than electric charging infrastructure. Although worldwide uptake of FCEVs is currently well below that of BEVs, and the cost is much higher, it must be noted that car manufacturers are investing research dollars into both technologies. As recently as June 2018 Hyundai and Audi (responsible for FCEV development for the Volkswagen Group) announced that they have entered into an agreement that will allow them to cross-patent fuel cell technology for electric vehicles. (Source: https://reneweconomy.com.au/hyundai-and-audi-join-forces-to-further-fuel-cell-vehicles-56137/). CSIRO’s membrane technology, that enables hydrogen to be extracted from ammonia, was developed in collaboration with BOC. This new technology, announced in August 2018, is perceived to be a game changer that might make FCEV more competitive, particularly with support from Toyota and
Given the pace of technology change, any investment in electric vehicles, supporting infrastructure, and/or policy development needs to account for technology trajectories to gain long-term relevance, value and effectiveness. It is difficult to tell, at this stage which low emissions car technology will become most popular in Victoria in coming years and therefore which type of charging infrastructure will be in the highest demand.

**EV Driver Charging Practices**

Average distances travelled by metropolitan drivers each day are within the current range of modern electric vehicles. Drivers therefore typically recharge their cars at home by connecting to a wall socket, or by installing a charging outlet at home for a faster charge. Charging at home enables drivers to conveniently draw on cheaper domestic or overnight power; or use stored solar power.

Stakeholders told the Committee that although electric vehicle drivers will predominately charge at home or at workplaces – public charging stations are needed to mitigate range anxiety on the part of prospective purchasers. Mr Bryce Gatton, Executive Committee member of the Victorian branch of the Australian Electric Vehicle Association (AEVA) stated that: “I drive to work and back every day, have done for five years, in an electric car from Noble Park, Dandenong North, into the city and back again. If I want to, I go over and visit relatives who live near the airport – the airport and back with my car, which is a generation 1 car with a range of just over 120 kilometres. There is no problem. The problem is taking country trips.”

Other regional and rural stakeholders, such as the Goulburn Broken Greenhouse Alliance, also highlighted the importance of building a network of charging stations in the regions where travelling distances are much longer.

**Future Demand for Public Charging Stations**

Future demand for public charging infrastructure in Australia is unknown, however it is likely to be a function of the number and type of EVs on the road, EV driving and parking behaviour, and the availability, convenience and cost of both public and home charging infrastructure. The two main types of inconvenience to drivers are: the extra driving required to locate a free charger; and the extra time spent waiting for a recharge. Demand for Shared Autonomous Electric Vehicles (SAEVs) could also impact future demand for public charging infrastructure by requiring automated refuelling technology and by reducing the number of cars on the road. (Source: Australian Electric Vehicle Market Study, ENERGEIA for ARENA and CEFC, May 2018 [https://arena.gov.au/assets/2018/06/australian-ev-market-study-report.pdf](https://arena.gov.au/assets/2018/06/australian-ev-market-study-report.pdf)).

**EV Policy Options for Victoria**

In assessing the regulatory and infrastructure options and financial and other incentives that could suit Victoria, the Committee looked at evidence received from stakeholders across the board. Of those suggested, the Committee found that the following incentives may be suitable for implementation in Victoria:

• Establishment of a State electric vehicle target and corresponding strategy that complements the Victorian Renewable Energy Targets and sets a target figure for the number of electric vehicles on the roads by certain dates;
• Support for Commonwealth government-initiated vehicle emission regulations that outline a preference for low emitting vehicles including electric vehicles;
• Upfront purchase incentives that include reducing or removing the current Luxury Car Tax ‘penalty’ for electric vehicles;
• Reducing the Stamp Duty for electric vehicles;
• Driver benefits such as the introduction of time limited traffic and parking privileges for electric vehicle drivers; and
• Partnering with key stakeholders including Local Government and industry in the planning, design and roll out of charging infrastructure.

The Committee did not provide any detail regarding the role of local government in such partnerships.

Support for Car-share Service Providers

Support for car-sharing has the benefit of reducing congestion by reducing the total number of cars on the road. Priority parking provisions and other incentives that increase uptake of car share services has potential to enable people to use electric cars without incurring the costs of owning one.

Numerous stakeholder submissions suggested electric vehicle infrastructure initiatives that could be considered specifically to support car-sharing services include:

• Capital funding for 10 private charging hubs (estimated $3.0-$6.0 million)
• Subsidised occupancy expenses at private charging hubs (estimated $600-$900,000 per annum)
• Tax offset credits for electric vehicle car-sharing service providers purchasing and installing associated charging equipment
• Discounted sales tax on electric vehicle charging equipment
• Subsidised or free-to-use public charging for car-share vehicles
• Identifying strategic locations for charging stations across the state, including regional centres and transport corridors, as priority areas for subsidised or government provided charging services
• Coordinate infrastructure efforts across levels of government, including considering potential incentive approaches
• Consider options for supporting local businesses to provide charging infrastructure
• Expedited permitting and installation of charging units.

The Committee heard different estimates on how much public infrastructure would need to be provided to support electric vehicle car-sharing.
Multiple stakeholder submissions suggested that charging infrastructure to support car-sharing services needs to be fast to prevent users experiencing delays getting to their destinations and abandoning the service as inconvenient. Further, charging infrastructure to support car-sharing services needs to be near or on-street in practical locations that are high-traffic, easy to get to, and facilitate drivers pulling aside to use them. Provision of this public, central infrastructure is not associated with any particular business and would therefore likely need to be initiated by government.

Depending on the agreements reached with car share service providers, it is possible that charging stations, managed by the car-share providers may be able to be made available to the public. The potential role for local government in enabling this type of arrangement requires further investigation.

Consultation
The nature of this report does not require any consultation.

Implications
1. **Legislative**
   The Human Rights Charter is not impacted by the contents of this report.

2. **Council Plan / Policy**
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to conduct evidence-based infrastructure planning and investment that meets the needs of our community in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 2: Green, clean and beautiful - A healthy environment and enhanced amenity - Our infrastructure meets the needs of today and can respond to future demand.

3. **Financial**
   This report does not raise budgetary or funding considerations.

4. **Environmental**
   Electric Vehicle use has the potential to improve environmental outcomes. The Victorian Parliament Economy and Infrastructure Committee Inquiry found that “while increasing the number of electric vehicles in Victoria is unlikely to lead to significant reductions in Carbon Dioxide (CO2) without a shift to renewable energy sources, more electric vehicles on the road will lead to an improvement in air quality in Metropolitan Melbourne.”

   Electric cars also reduce traffic noise. Oil and coolant changes are not required, to the same extent as internal combustion vehicles, reducing the environmental impact of waste disposal. Batteries that fuel these cars however, require significant amounts of rare earth elements which requires mining, refining and recycling activities.

   Once direction has been provided regarding Council’s role for facilitating electric vehicle use, further work is expected to be undertaken.
Conclusion

There is much work to be done, at the Commonwealth and State level before adequate information is available to enable Council to make decisions regarding:

- investment (or partnerships) for the provision of charging stations at activity centres; or
- the imposition of planning permit conditions that would require developers to provide charging infrastructure.

It is recommended that Moonee Valley City Council continue to adopt a watch and see approach. Officers will continue to monitor changes in state-government policy regarding support for electric vehicles and the evolution of the electric vehicle industry. Officers will also monitor the need for electric car charging in public areas of the city, and continue to consider the need to include the provision of electric car charging conditions in planning permits.

Appendices

Nil.
10.10 Significant Tree Register - Summary of submissions post consultation

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: David Kilroe - Senior Strategic Planner
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to summarise all submissions received following formal exhibition of the draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and associated Planning Scheme Amendment C179 which implements its findings.

The report presents Council officers position on submissions received to Amendment C179 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme and also seeks a Council resolution to proceed to a Planning Panel to consider unresolved submissions.

Executive Summary

- The Significant Tree Register aims to identify and protect significant trees within the City of Moonee Valley by incorporating them into the Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme. The ESO can require a planning permit for works that might impact on significant trees.

- Council resolved to exhibit Amendment C179 at its Ordinary Meeting on 12 September 2017. The Amendment proposes to update and complete the Significant Tree Register following a 2017 municipal-wide review.

- A request was sent to the Minister for Planning on 19 September 2017 for authorisation to proceed to exhibition. Interim controls were also requested under Amendment C187, to protect identified trees until such time as permanent controls under Amendment C179 could be considered.

- It should be noted some trees were identified within the Flemington Housing Estate and this resulted in an 8 month delay in a decision on both Amendments while the Housing Renewal Program for this site was under review. Interim controls and authorisation to proceed to exhibition with Amendment C179 were eventually granted on 6 May 2018.

- The draft Significant Tree Register 2017 (Appendix A – separately circulated) and Amendment C179 documentation underwent formal exhibition over a 5 week period between 28 June and 2 August 2018. The process involved a letter mail-out to all affected parties and three drop-in sessions at Council Offices and Flemington Library.

- Over the exhibition period Council received 44 submissions from owners and occupiers of properties within or in proximity to an identified Significant Tree. Appendix B (separately circulated) and Appendix C contain a summary and response to submissions.
Following consideration of submissions to Amendment C179, recommended changes to the draft Significant Tree Register 2017 can be summarised as follows:

- Remove 12* records from the register as they are no longer present on the land.
- Remove 13 trees from the register in response to submissions received.
- Minor edits to various Individual Tree Assessments in response to feedback received.
- Acceptance of a nomination of trees within Ascot Vale Public Housing Estate for potential inclusion in a future review of the Register.

* In the case of 12 records (28 trees) in the draft Significant Tree Register, the trees have since been removed, and thus should be deleted from the register. These individual trees or tree groups have either been removed following due consideration and an approved planning permit process, or without a planning permit (with enforcement action being undertaken).

- Having considered all feedback received during the exhibition process, it is considered appropriate Council proceed to an independent Planning Panel Hearing for submissions to be considered.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Acknowledges submissions received during exhibition of Amendment C179 to the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme, including changes proposed to the final draft register and submissions of support from the community.

2. Refers unresolved submissions to Amendment C179, to an independent Planning Panel in accordance with Section 23(1)(b) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

3. Notes officers will present positions on submissions as outlined in this report and its attachments to the independent Planning Panel Hearing.

4. Allows Council officers to make minor editing and typographical changes as required.

**Background**

Council has now completed a second review of its Significant Tree Register since its incorporation into the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme in December 2013. The Significant Tree Register included a recommendation it be reviewed annually to ensure it remained up to date and include any nominations received. The first of these reviews commenced in 2014 under Amendment C149 and was approved in March 2016 resulting in the addition of only 19 trees to the register.

Noting a resource heavy and timely process for listing trees and the need to protect trees under immediate threat, Council commissioned external arborists Homewood Pty Ltd to undertake a full municipal-wide survey, together with nominations to identify all trees of potential significance within Moonee Valley and complete the register.
At its Ordinary Meeting on 12 September 2017, Council resolved to undertake community consultation on the draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and Amendment C179 which implements its findings by proposing an ESO tree control on 1,509 identified trees.

Some of the identified trees in the draft register are located within the Flemington Housing Estate which is subject to the state initiative Housing Renewal Program. This resulted in an 8 month delay in a decision on both Amendment C179 and an interim control request to protect trees whilst permanent controls could be considered.

Interim controls and authorisation to proceed to exhibition with Amendment C179 were granted on 6 May 2018.

Discussion

Draft Significant Tree Register 2017

The Significant Tree Register includes Individual Tree Reports which outline the details for each tree or group of trees considered significant. Details include the age, height and condition of a tree or group of trees as well as the reason for their significance.

Following a detailed assessment of some 635 trees or groups of trees, 459 tree records (211 from 2014 and 248 from 2017) were included in a draft Significant Tree Register 2017 for public consultation. 5 trees from the 2014 register were noted as having been removed.

The completed register comprised 79 groups and 380 individual specimens amounting to a total of 1,509 trees. 188 records are on Council land; 248 are on private land; and 23 relate to trees on school grounds.

The content of the 2017 review has informed the preparation of Moonee Valley Planning Scheme Amendment C179.

Planning Scheme Amendment C179

Amendment C179 continues to implement the previous Moonee Valley Significant Tree Register 2014 by:

1. Updating the register to include additional trees and delete trees which have been removed.

2. Amend Schedule 2 to the Environmental Significance Overlay of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme to be consistent with the above changes to the Register.

3. Applying the Environmental Significance Overlay to all trees included in the Moonee Valley Significant Tree Register 2017, including each tree’s respective tree protection zone.

4. Delete the Environmental Significance Overlay from areas where significant trees were previously located but have since been removed.

It is considered the ESO should be applied to the additional trees identified in this 2017 report, and deleted from significant trees which have been removed.

The ESO is the most appropriate tool for protecting the municipality’s significant trees, as it can require a planning permit for the removal of any tree identified within
the register, or any buildings and works proposed within each tree’s Tree Protection Zone (TPZ).

A TPZ is an area surrounding a tree in which development should be managed to prevent damage to the tree and its root structure.

![Figure 1: Example TPZ's for existing and proposed significant trees](image)

**Public Exhibition**

The draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and Amendment C179 underwent consultation for a period of 5 weeks between 28 June and 2 August 2018. Key aspects of the community consultation program include:

- Letters to all landowners and occupiers proposed to be affected by the application or deletion of the Environmental Significance Overlay (ESO)
- Correspondence to those who nominated trees to be reviewed, advising of the outcome of the review
- 3x community drop in sessions with an offer of one-on-one meetings with Council staff and a Homewood Arborist
- Notices and promotional material in the local newspapers (Moonee Valley Weekly and Moonee Valley Leader)
- Information displayed at the Civic Centre and local libraries
- Comprehensive information on Council’s website.
Submissions
A total of 44 submissions were received. Submissions were primarily from owners and occupiers of private residential properties affected by the ESO tree control.

Of the submissions received, 8 were in support of the draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and Amendment C179, recognising the values established tree canopies can offer the wider community as well as the urban cooling effect they bring.

A number of submissions requested amendments to the content of the draft Significant Tree Register and details of Individual Tree Assessments.

The remaining submissions (36) objected to the inclusion of identified trees in the register. The key concerns expressed in these submissions can be summarised as follows:

- Maintenance issues and safety
- Property damage and nuisance caused by an identified tree
- Questions around accuracy and justification in the draft Register
- Impact on future development opportunities
- Financial impost due to ongoing maintenance and potential planning fees
- Nominated tree is a non-native, weed or allergenic
- Impact on property values
- Issues with the consultation process; and
- Appropriateness of the ESO as a tree control.

Issues raised

Maintenance issues and safety hazards from dropping limbs
It is the owner’s responsibility to ensure trees on private land are not safety hazards or cause nuisance, regardless of any planning controls that may apply to the land. Owners can remove or lop parts of vegetation without a permit if there is an immediate risk of personal injury or damage to property. It is therefore considered that this Amendment will not put in place controls which will endanger the safety of those affected.

Flexibility has been built into the proposed ESO which states a permit is not required to ‘prune trees for maintenance purposes provided that the branch size is no greater than 10 centimetres in diameter and the total amount removed is not more than 10 percent of the canopy in accordance with Australian Standard AS4373-2007’. This exemption has been carefully considered to allow for adequate maintenance and pruning of trees in an urban context, particularly with respect to branches overhanging into neighbouring properties.

Property damage and nuisance caused by identified trees
Significant damage to properties and service infrastructure, primarily by an identified tree root system, has been brought to light in a number of submissions received during formal exhibition. Council’s Arborist has deemed a number of these trees to have outgrown their locations. In these cases the recommendation is not to pursue ESO controls.
An ESO control on root systems causing visible damage to assets of surrounding residents and associated service infrastructure is not considered fair and orderly planning. Pursuant to Section 4(c) of the Planning and Environmental Act 1987, it is an objective of the amendment to:

(c) protect public utilities and other assets and enable the orderly provision and coordination of public utilities and other facilities for the benefit of the community;

Where considerable damage by root systems is evidenced in submissions, it is recommended tree controls are not further pursued.

Questions about the accuracy and justification in the draft Register

The methodology used by Homewood was thorough, consisting of a combination of: community member nominations; stakeholder input from local community groups and a Wurundjeri Tribe representative; desk-top search; drive-by and on-site inspections; and assessment of trees on the current register. Further information has been brought to light through the exhibition process which has informed the recommendations in this report.

Impact of Amendment on future development opportunities

The viability of any potential future development on a site is not considered a relevant consideration when determining the significance of trees. This amendment seeks to preserve vegetation with identified environmental values, as defined through the National Trust Criteria for Significant Trees. Future development proposals on affected sites would be balanced with the consideration of significant trees through the planning permit process.

The ESO covering the TPZ effectively introduces a permit requirement for any buildings or works that may impact on the health of the tree. This will ensure the tree is better protected. It doesn’t mean works cannot be undertaken, but ensures Council has an opportunity to review any works and may impose conditions to protect the tree whilst works are undertaken.

Financial impost due to maintenance and planning fees

As previously mentioned it is the owner’s responsibility to ensure trees on private land are maintained, regardless of any planning controls applying to the land.

Permit application fees are not part of the amendment but it is noted they are a consequence of the ESO. Council officers will further investigate requests to consider waiving fees for planning permits directly related to significant trees within private properties.

Nominated tree is a non-native, weed or allergenic

Trees have been identified as significant by meeting various National Trust Significant Tree Criteria such as ‘location of landscape context, outstanding size, particularly old specimen’. Given the urban context of the trees identified, it would be very difficult for the trees to become a weed problem. Therefore, it is considered there is no reason to remove trees based on this argument alone.

Impact to property values

It is not considered potential impact on property values is a relevant consideration when determining the significance of trees. This Amendment seeks to preserve
vegetation with identified environmental values, as defined through the *National Trust Significant Tree Criteria*.

The value of any property is determined by the complex interplay of many different factors such as location, streetscape and amenity. It is difficult to assign what effect, if any, the identification of a significant tree may have on the value of a property.

**Issues with the consultation process**

The draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and Amendment C179 underwent a thorough consultation process between 28 June and 2 August 2018. Key aspects of the community consultation are discussed earlier in this report.

All legal obligations of Council were met with respect to exhibition. A full and transparent exhibition process has been carried out.

**Appropriateness of the ESO as a tree control**

Firstly, and most importantly, the ESO requires a permit to carry out buildings and works within the TPZ, in order to regulate the impact of nearby development on the future health and development of a tree.

Secondly, the ESO can apply to trees with multiple identified significance values, for example: environmental or horticultural values; location or context; rarity; localised distribution; age; outstanding size or example of species; aesthetic value; growth form and cultural or historic significance.

Thirdly, the overlay can be applied to both individual and groups of trees as proposed in this Amendment.

**Next steps - recommended changes to be presented to Panel**

It is recommended Council resolve to proceed to an independent Planning Panel with the draft Significant Tree Register 2017 and Amendment C179 documentation as exhibited noting recommended changes as a result of submissions received.

In the case of 12 records (28 trees) in the draft Significant Tree Register, the trees have since been removed, and thus should be deleted from the register. These individual trees or tree groups have either been removed following due consideration and an approved planning permit process, or without a planning permit (with enforcement action being undertaken). Trees were confirmed as being removed following site inspections. **Table 1** below lists all trees no longer present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record number</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Lemon-scented Gum</td>
<td>37 Carrington Road, Niddrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Weeping Willow</td>
<td>Moonee Valley Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T57</td>
<td>Mexican Fan Palm</td>
<td>128 Tennyson Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T65</td>
<td>Southern Mahogany</td>
<td>34 Combermere Street, Aberfeldie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T104</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
<td>23 Brown Avenue, Ascot Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T201</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
<td>Queens Park north side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T205</td>
<td>Moreton Bay Fig</td>
<td>144 Pascoe Vale, Moonee Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T209</td>
<td>Row of Sugar Gums (17)</td>
<td>Buckley Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T276</td>
<td>Maritime Pine</td>
<td>30 Brown Street, Avondale Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T342</td>
<td>Spotted Gum</td>
<td>23 Munro Street, Ascot Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T443</td>
<td>Moreton Bay Fig</td>
<td>Moonee Valley Racecourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T446</td>
<td>Red Ironbark</td>
<td>27 The Strand, Moonee Ponds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Trees removed from the landscape**
In the case of 13 individual tree records, structural issues with respect to some of the identified trees, or their impact on nearby buildings and infrastructure, has been brought to light during exhibition. Cultural sensitivity issues have also been raised as well as questions with respect to the prominence of some identified trees on the landscape.

All of these issues prompted a second inspection of these trees by Councils Planning Officer and Consultant Arborist. In the case of 13 tree records listed in Table 2 below, it is recommended not to pursue ESO tree controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record number</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T299</td>
<td>Peppercorn Tree</td>
<td>57 Waltham Street, Flemington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T268</td>
<td>Peppercorn Tree</td>
<td>5 Milverton Street, Moonee Ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T295</td>
<td>Liquidamber</td>
<td>242 Buckley Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T298</td>
<td>Camphor Laurel</td>
<td>13 Tweedside Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T313</td>
<td>Monterey Cypress</td>
<td>3 Myross Avenue, Ascot Vale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T337</td>
<td>Lemon-scented Gum</td>
<td>47 Daisy Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T344</td>
<td>River Red-scented Gum</td>
<td>42 Bradshaw Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T350</td>
<td>Liquidamber</td>
<td>189 Cashmere Street, Travancore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T365</td>
<td>English Oak</td>
<td>46 Combermere Street, Aberfeldie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T380</td>
<td>Pin Oak</td>
<td>218 Napier Street, Strathmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T382</td>
<td>Peppercorn Tree</td>
<td>27 Kalimna Street, Essendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T419</td>
<td>Monterey Pine</td>
<td>28 Riverview Street, Avondale Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T439</td>
<td>Norfolk Island Pine</td>
<td>40 Robinson Street, Moonee Ponds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Tree controls no longer being pursued

Remaining changes to the draft Significant Tree Register include various updates to Individual Tree Reports, as a result of further information and clarification from submitters during exhibition.

Implications

1. Legislative
   The proposed amendment is in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and State Planning Policy, including Plan Melbourne.

   There are no Human Rights Charter implications as a result of this Planning Scheme Amendment.

2. Council Plan / Policy
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to reduce the impact of development on the natural environment in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 2: Green, clean and beautiful - A healthy environment and enhanced amenity - Our natural environment is protected and enhanced.

   The amendment is also closely aligned with the Fair, Beautiful, Connected, Green and Thriving themes of MV2040 and the overarching vision to achieve a healthy municipality. Strategic directions achieved through this amendment include;
- Strategic Direction 13: A city that is low carbon
- Strategic Direction 14: A city that is green and water-sensitive
- Strategic Direction 16: A city that is cool and climate-adapted
- Strategic Direction 20: A city in a beautiful landscape setting

3. Financial
Council will use existing resources within the strategic planning operational budget to cover the costs involved with this amendment.

4. Environmental
The amendment will provide environmental benefits as it will aim to protect Council’s natural resources. The prevalence of significant trees within the City of Moonee Valley is considered a valuable asset and is enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.

This amendment will assist Council in maintaining the biodiversity of this region, including the valuable habitats for native fauna which are provided by established trees.

Conclusion
The Moonee Valley Significant Tree Register 2017 and associated Planning Scheme Amendment C179 will assist Council in preserving the municipality’s significant trees, which provide numerous benefits for the community.

The draft Register and Amendment C179 underwent extensive community consultation between 28 June and 2 August 2018. During the exhibition period Council received feedback from 44 owners and occupiers. Having considered all feedback received, it is recommended Council request an independent Planning Panel Hearing to consider all unresolved submissions and the proposed changes to the amendment as outlined in this report and its attachments.

Appendices
Appendix A: Draft Significant Tree Register 2017 as exhibited (separately circulated)
Appendix B: Summary of Submissions and Officer Recommendations (separately circulated)
Appendix C: Summary of Submissions Matrix.
## Significant Tree Amendment – Summary of Submissions received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Number</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Property damage and nuisance caused by an identified tree</th>
<th>Impact of Amendment on future development opportunities</th>
<th>Maintenance issues and safety</th>
<th>Impact to property values</th>
<th>Financial impost due to ongoing maintenance and potential planning fees</th>
<th>Questions accuracy and/or justification in the draft Register</th>
<th>Issues with the consultation process</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the ESO as a tree control</th>
<th>Nominated tree is a non-native, weed or allergenic</th>
<th>Cultural sensitivity &amp; Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Number</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Property damage and nuisance caused by an identified tree</th>
<th>Impact of Amendment on future development opportunities</th>
<th>Maintenance issues and safety</th>
<th>Impact to property values</th>
<th>Financial impact due to ongoing maintenance and potential planning fees</th>
<th>Questions accuracy and/or justification in the draft Register</th>
<th>Issues with the consultation process</th>
<th>Appropriateness of the ESO as a tree control</th>
<th>Nominated tree is non-native, weed or allergic</th>
<th>Cultural sensitivity &amp; Other issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.11 Windy Hill and Essendon Football Club

File No: Fol/18/32
Author: Ben McManus - Major Community Infrastructure Program Manager
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
To gain endorsement of commencement of the long term planning for the Windy Hill precinct.

Executive Summary
- MV2040 identifies Windy Hill as an anchor for the Essendon neighbourhood.
- The Essendon Football Club have a lease on Windy Hill until 2031.
- Significant Funding has been included in the Long Term Capital Works (LTCW) Plan for the development of a community hub at Essendon in between 2028 and 2031. The specific location is yet to be agreed, but could be Windy Hill.
- A Crown Grant exists on the land at Windy Hill which restricts use to the public recreation of the people.
- A new vision for Windy Hill needs to be developed with the community and key stakeholders on the site.

Recommendation
That Council undertakes extensive consultation with the Essendon community, key stakeholders, and the broader community as part of work to commence long-term planning for the Windy Hill precinct. Consultation to include but not be limited to the following:
- Essendon community generally
- Residents and users of the Essendon neighbourhood
- Essendon Football Club
- Essendon Football Club Members (incl. Volunteers/Cheer squad)
- Essendon Cricket Club
- Essendon Bowls Club
- Essendon Croquet Club
- Essendon District Football League
- Windy Hill Fitness Centre community
- Broader Moonee Valley community
- Community groups who use the facility.
Background

MV2040 has identified Essendon Junction and Windy Hill as the anchors for the Essendon neighbourhood. The anchors will be a key focus for Council’s neighbourhood planning approach. The implementation initiatives for Essendon include delivering an Essendon community hub with Windy Hill a feasible option.

Moonee Valley City Council is the appointed Committee of Management for Windy Hill under section 14 of the Crown Land Reserves Act 1978 (CLRA) and has the authority to enter into any lease of the land for sporting and recreation purposes, subject to approval from the Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change. Council entered a Crown land lease with the Essendon Football Club for occupancy and use of Windy Hill for a term of 21 years which commenced on 23 March 2010 and terminates on 22 March 2031. The current annual rental is $61,000 (GST inclusive).

There is an adopted master plan for Windy Hill (2012). The adopted master plan has not been tested with the community and is considered to be well out of date as it does not reflect contemporary practice of shared facilities.

At the meeting of 25 July 2017, a Confidential Report regarding the future for Windy Hill was considered by Council. Following this report, discussions have continued with the Essendon Football Club however little progress has been achieved.

Part of Essendon Football Club’s permitted use under the existing lease allows provision for a range of sport and recreation opportunities, but also for gaming. The Essendon Football Club, at Windy Hill, currently play VFL Men’s and Women’s competition. Aside from the Windy Hill Venue, the site also is also home to the Windy Hill Fitness Centre, managed by Belgravia Leisure, and another privately run fitness business.

Currently the fencing and large scale buildings located on the perimeter of Windy Hill give the perception on restricted access to Windy Hill.

Other users at this site include: the Essendon Cricket Club, with 79 senior playing members and 60 junior playing members; Essendon Bowls Club with 174 members and 4 juniors; Essendon Croquet Club; and the EDFL for administration, umpire training and finals games.

A condition assessment and detailed costings report was undertaken by Buildspect Building Consultants in 2016 on the Windy Hill facilities. While the full extent of this work would bring the current facilities to a functional level, it would not achieve the longer term vision of opening up Windy Hill to the broader community.

Discussion

To align Windy Hill with the Council adopted position of multi-use spaces, a new draft vision is proposed to be discussed with the key stakeholders and the broader community. Any extension to the use of Windy Hill would need approval by the Victorian Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change as per the process with the existing Crown Grant on the Windy Hill land. The ideas for the future include a community hub that includes sporting change facilities, meeting space and working to improve the amenity of the reserve by opening it up with walking tracks and general park improvements.

Essendon Football Club may be more supportive of achieving this new vision rather than spending funds on improvements that do not align with a contemporary vision. The club has significantly reduced their debt in the last two years and it’s been
reported that their debt will be cleared by the end of 2018; it is understood the club plans to further develop their home base at Tullamarine.

While this piece of visioning work is proposed to commence shortly, the project will run over the long term since Essendon Football Club’s current lease agreement is until 2031. The early phases of the Windy Hill Precinct plan are as follows:

1. Initial key stakeholder and community engagement for vision development (now)
   a. Undertake stakeholder and community consultation to understand the needs of the broader Essendon community using Windy Hill and seek their feedback to the concept of opening the ground up to broader community use.
   b. Establish a draft vision for the Windy Hill Precinct.
   c. Identify the infrastructure required and broadly scope individual projects, including the identification of issues and options.

2. Development of an issues and options paper to inform a draft Plan.

3. Prepare a draft long term Windy Hill Precinct Plan and present to Council for endorsement for the purposes of broader consultation.

4. Consideration of feedback and final plan adoption.

Should a new draft vision for the Windy Hill precinct be signed off by the key stakeholders and presented to Council for adoption, there will be short, medium and long term priorities determined on the basis of the existing land use conditions as well as cost and funding opportunities.

Initial discussion with stakeholders could include the following:

- Review of current building infrastructure
- Possible creation of more green spaces
- Possible new walking tracks, streetscapes and way finding/directional signage to Windy Hill
- Improved interfaces with the community through the school and with the Essendon Traders along Napier Street through to the Essendon Junction
- Removal of the Windy Hill fences.

**Consultation**

The Essendon neighbourhood and Moonee Valley Community generally will be consulted in the coming months. In addition, the following key stakeholders who will be crucial to the success of the visioning will be:

- Essendon Football Club (including members/volunteers)
- Essendon Cricket Club
- Essendon Croquet Club
- Essendon Bowls Club
- Essendon District Football League
- Essendon Primary School.
The consultation with these stakeholders will test the initial ideas relating to the new vision of opening up the reserve. A stakeholder engagement plan can be found in Appendix A.

Implications

1. Legislative
   The Human Rights Charter has been reviewed in line with this work and it is considered that this does not impact human rights.

2. Council Plan / Policy
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to upgrade infrastructure to support multiple benefits and value outcomes in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 2: Green, clean and beautiful - A healthy environment and enhanced amenity - Our infrastructure meets the needs of today and can respond to future demand.
   MV2040 has implementation initiatives for the Essendon area to deliver an Essendon community hub and advocate for the public activation of the Windy Hill precinct.

3. Financial
   This stage of the work will be funded through the existing operating budget for Community Facilities.

4. Environmental
   There are no environmental factors to be identified at this stage of the process.

Conclusion

Windy Hill is in need of maintenance and capital works upgrades to make it functional and to meet current standards. It is proposed to engage the community and key stakeholders at Windy Hill to develop an aligned vision to work towards making Windy Hill a community anchor for the Essendon neighbourhood with open parks, integrated facilities and the establishment of a community hub in Essendon.

This approach is required as little positive change has been able to be achieved through many years of discussions and that there is acknowledgement that this site is not operating at its full potential. The project will develop a strategy to ascertain the best and highest use of the site and resolve challenges both site and non-site specific.

Appendices

Appendix A: Stakeholder Engagement Plan – Windy Hill Precinct
## Stakeholder Engagement Plan – Windy Hill Precinct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder name/group</th>
<th>How are they associated with the project?</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moonee Valley Community</td>
<td>The Essendon neighbourhood has two anchors being Essendon Junction and Windy Hill, we need an understanding of aspirations of the Essendon community for Windy Hill in the short and long term.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon Football Club</td>
<td>Lease holder of Windy Hill until 2031, need input into the project.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon Cricket Club</td>
<td>Community group users of Windy Hill and we need input into the project. Share with football.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon Bowls Club</td>
<td>Community tenant who lease space, need input into project.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon Croquet Club</td>
<td>Community tenant who lease space, need input into project.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essendon District Football League</td>
<td>Tenant who leases office space, need input into project.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windy Hill Fitness Centre Users</td>
<td>Community members using WHFC.</td>
<td>Consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stakeholder categories are: Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate and Empower

## Stakeholder Consultation Plan

**Windy Hill Precinct Plan (2018/19)**

- 2018 September to June
  - Project web page and other social media – broader awareness of the project.
  - Community consultation on the long term plan for Windy Hill
  - Stakeholder group meetings – feedback from users on concepts to inform Council decisions.
  - Frequently asked questions – visioning paper to be tied in to consolidate feedback to community and key users.
  - Possible EOI for Community Reference Group
  - Community Reference Group meetings
  - Drop-in discussions
  - Information display
  - Resident/neighbourhood newsletter
10.12 Community Sport Infrastructure Fund (CSIF) Update - Overland Reserve

File No: F01/18/32
Author: Natalie Reiter - Director Planning and Development
Directorate: Planning and Development

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide information on the Overland Reserve Multipurpose Pavilion (ORMP) within the context of the broader pavilion program. This report provides Council on the status of the project, detailing the three concept options and associated indicative costs.

Executive Summary
- Over the past decade, Council has embarked on a pavilion program which has seen eight pavilions either upgraded or constructed, with costs ranging from just under $1 million to almost $5 million.
- The Overland Reserve master plan was endorsed by Council on 26 September 2017 which identifies a new multipurpose pavilion.
- The ORMP is a knock down and rebuild on the existing footprint.
- After working collaboratively with the sports clubs a draft pavilion concept design was presented to the clubs in June 2017. At the request of the club stakeholders, Council then explored two more pavilion concepts sketch designs and provided indicative costings to reflect the designs. These sketches have not been signed off by the clubs.
- A Councillor briefing was held 1 May 2018 to highlight the original concept design, potential extension option and associated financial implications.
- External funding from AFL Victoria has been received, and the outcome of the Sport and Recreation Victoria grant application is currently being reviewed.
- The ORMP project is currently on hold with the appointed architects until Council recommends a preferred design option. Officers halted the project pending confirmation of the available funding so as to avoid wasting design fees. It is considered the clubs would need to sign off on the preferred option before the project progresses to detailed design, unless Councillors direct Club agreement is not required.
- To advance this project, direction is required on which of the three scope and cost options are to be pursued. The main difference between each of the options is the size of the social space as per the following:
  1. Proceed with option one (multipurpose space 184m2) at a cost of some $3.6 million (within current budget).
  2. Proceed with option two (multipurpose space 300m2 including 116m2 of open deck) at the cost of some $3.8 million (within current budget only if in
receipt of $250,000 SRV grant; if unsuccessful with SRV Grant, additional budget of some $163,000 would be required).

3. Proceed with option three (multipurpose space 277m2 enclosed) at the cost of some $4.3 million (if in receipt of $250,000 SRV grant, would still require some $386,000 additional funds).

- While specific numbers regarding the costs of options proposed for Overland Pavilion are presented in this report, they are estimates based on concepts rather than costs provided by a Quantity Surveyor (QS) based on detailed design. Given the costs to achieve detailed design, it is considered appropriate to ask Councillors to provide direction based on the concepts. Once a concept has progressed to detailed design, a formal QS cost will be sought; if this QS exceeds the values detailed in this report, the project will come back to Council for a decision before works are tendered.

- It is noted that this Pavilion would not be constructed if not to fulfil a need for football and cricket provision. As such, it is considered that unless the clubs sign off on the concept design, the project should not proceed. Further, in line with Council’s commitment to shared-use, multipurpose facilities, the project should not proceed unless the club relinquish their lease and agree to shared use arrangements.

**Recommendation**

That Council:

1. Proceeds with option one at a cost of some $3.6 million (within current budget) from 30 October 2018 subject to:
   - the receipt of $250,000 SRV grant which would allow proceeding with option two at the cost of some $3.8 million within current budget
   - East Keilor Football Club and East Keilor Cricket Club agreeing to the proposed design
   - East Keilor Football Club and East Keilor Cricket Club relinquishing the lease on the current pavilion and moving to seasonal allocation.

2. Future proofs the pavilion by designing the structure such that the deck area can be enclosed in the future.

3. Abandons the project should the East Keilor Football Club and East Keilor Cricket Club not:
   - agree to the proposed design AND
   - relinquish their lease on the current pavilion and move to a seasonal allocation

before December 30, 2018.
Background

Pavilion Program

In recent years, Council has been working extremely hard to deliver against the adopted Pavilion Program. In this time, the following pavilions have been delivered to cater for club needs (expenditure by year and ordered by value).

**Table 1: Expenditure by pavilion in past decade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>2011-14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>2018/19*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Park Pavilion (2007-2009)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>976,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Reserve Pavilion extension</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,273,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberfeldie West (Ladies Cricket) Pavilion</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1,874,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,942,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver Reserve Pavilion Upgrade</td>
<td>771,000</td>
<td>1,488,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,259,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Park Pavilion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>1,327,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td>3,096,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys Reserve Pavilion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,977,000</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing Reserve Baseball Club Pavilion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>2,780,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>3,918,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbairn Park (Middle) Pavilion</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>2,968,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,948,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>791,000</td>
<td>1,542,000</td>
<td>2,414,000</td>
<td>2,936,000</td>
<td>10,052,000</td>
<td>3,173,000</td>
<td>21,913,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Finance Records – Actual Expenditure – *numbers rounded*

* Budget including carry forward

The following table compares the past projects costs, social room size, clubs and club participant base at the site. Membership data is based on information from clubs from the most recent seasonal allocations.
### Table 2: Pavilion Sports Club Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total project cost ($) rounded</th>
<th>Social space size (m²)</th>
<th>Clubs (name)</th>
<th>Club player membership (at site summer/ winter)</th>
<th>Number of grounds pavilion supports (summer / winter)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Park Pavilion (2007-2009)</td>
<td>976,000</td>
<td>81m²</td>
<td>Doutta Stars Cricket Club^ Doutta Stars Football Club Doutta Park Cricket Club^</td>
<td>575 (575)</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Reserve Pavilion Improvements^</td>
<td>1,273,000</td>
<td>188m²</td>
<td>Strathmore Cricket Club^ Strathmore Football Club^</td>
<td>1,140 (517)</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Cricket Pavilion/ Facilities Refurbishment</td>
<td>1,942,000</td>
<td>82m²</td>
<td>Essendon Maribyrnong Park Ladies Cricket Club^ Aberfeldie Sports Club (AFLW)</td>
<td>658 (136)</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver Reserve Pavilion Upgrade</td>
<td>2,259,000</td>
<td>80m²</td>
<td>FC Strathmore (Soccer Club)^ Strathmore Cricket Club</td>
<td>540 (360)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Pavilion - New Pavilion</td>
<td>3,096,000</td>
<td>167m²</td>
<td>Moonee Valley Football Club (AFL)^ Moonee Valley Cricket Club^</td>
<td>520 (520)</td>
<td>2 / 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys Reserve Pavilion</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>173m²</td>
<td>Essendon Royals Soccer Club^ Essendon Cricket Club^ Strathmore Cricket Club^</td>
<td>1,030 (520)</td>
<td>2 / 3.5 (based on new realignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing Reserve Baseball Club New Pavilion</td>
<td>3,918,000</td>
<td>150m²</td>
<td>Essendon Baseball Club^</td>
<td>180 (180)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbairn Park (Middle) Pavilion</td>
<td>4,948,000</td>
<td>131m² (can be split into 65.5m² spaces)</td>
<td>Ascot Vale Cricket Club^ Aberfeldie St Johns Cricket Club^ Avondale Football Club (Soccer) Moonee Valley Knights FC (Soccer)^ Essendon Royals Soccer Club</td>
<td>1,330 (530)</td>
<td>8 / 6 (based on new realignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,913,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1052m²</strong></td>
<td><strong>20 clubs</strong></td>
<td><strong>5973 (3338)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average per site</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,739,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>131.5m²</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5 clubs per site</strong></td>
<td><strong>747 (417)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Improvement works were only for the back changing rooms

^ Club home grounds

Key findings from the comparison table are:

- The average pavilion project has cost $2.74 million, with the average costs increasing dramatically over time
The average social space for the new pavilions is 131.5m², with Council’s agreed position (Sports Development Plan 2014-23) being 130m² for sports with a maximum of 15 players per team and 170m² for sports with over 15 players per team.

The average combined club active membership at each site is 417 players.

**Construction cost escalation**

There has been significant cost escalation over the decade-long pavilion construction program. In Australia, The Performance of Construction Index (PCI) is a composite indicator designed to provide an overall view of activity in the construction sector. The PCI is a composite index based on the diffusion indexes for the following five indicators: sales, new orders, employment, deliveries and prices. A reading above 50 indicates an expansion of the manufacturing sector compared to the previous month; below 50 represents a contraction; while 50 indicates no change.

The Australian Industry Group Performance of Construction Index rose to 52.0 in July of 2018 from 50.6 in June, rebounding from three straight drops and the slowest expansion in the construction sector since January of 2017. Construction PMI in Australia averaged 46.37 Index Points from 2005 until 2018, reaching an all-time high of 60.50 Index Points in July of 2017 and a record low of 29.24 Index Points in December of 2008.

**Figure 1: Construction Index 2014-2018**

Source: [https://tradingeconomics.com/australia/construction-pmi](https://tradingeconomics.com/australia/construction-pmi)

**Overland Reserve**

Overland Reserve is located in the suburb of Keilor East, in the north-west corner of the Millieara neighbourhood, approximately 300m north of JH Allen Reserve. Overland Reserve caters to football and cricket, while JH Allen Reserve caters to soccer.

The current Overland Reserve pavilion is leased to the East Keilor Sports Club which comprises the East Keilor Football Club and East Keilor Cricket Club. The East Keilor Sports Club has a total of 350 membership participants, and club activities are primarily confined to Overland Reserve.
The current pavilion at Overland is the multipurpose space is 198m², and the club considers it important that any new pavilion should include more multipurpose space as their current needs are not being met by the existing pavilion.

The Overland Reserve Master Plan was endorsed by Council on 26 September 2017 which included a new multipurpose pavilion. The adopted budget for the ORMP is $3,500,000 which includes 2018/19 budget deliberations of $500,000. $100,000 has been secured via AFL Victoria’s ‘2018 AFL Key Community Facilities Fund’ and $46,000 contribution from the East Keilor Sports Club committed to the project.

Additionally, $14,892 has been committed for solar panels for East Keilor Football Club via a Solar Panel Installation Grant.

Council has submitted a grant application under Sport and Recreation Victoria’s ‘Community Sports Infrastructure Fund’ (CSIF) asking for $250,000 towards the pavilion redevelopment. It is understood applications were reviewed and presented to the Department’s ‘Moderation Panel’ between Monday 20 August 2018 and Friday 7 September 2018.

As it stands, there is $3.6 million of secured funding available, and if $250,000 funding from the CSIF grant application is received, there will be a total of $3.88 million (per below) available.

Table 3: Funding Sources - Overland Pavilion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Funds Expended to date</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Council budget available</td>
<td>$3,471,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club commitment – pavilion (from club’s funds)</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club commitment – solar (through external grant)</td>
<td>$14,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL Victoria</td>
<td>$100,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Confirmed funds Available</td>
<td>$3,631,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconfirmed – SRV grant</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (if grant is successful)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,881,892</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Officers have received advice that this funding is contingent upon the project commencing construction prior to July 2019.

The ORMP has had a concept design (option one, see Appendix A) presented and reviewed by the sports clubs. This concept design has not been signed off by the sporting clubs due to them not agreeing on the size dimensions allocated for the multipurpose area.

Council has developed two further sketch concepts (option two and three, see Appendix B and Appendix C respectively) which provide larger multipurpose area, addressing a key concern of the sports clubs and have improved design functionality. There has been four Project Control Group (PCG) meetings with the sporting clubs without agreement to a preferred design. The project requires a preferred option to progress to detailed design. The ORMP project is currently on hold with the appointed architects until Council recommends a preferred design option. Officers
halted the project pending confirmation of the available funding so as to avoid wasting design fees. It is considered the clubs would need to sign off on the preferred option before the project progresses to detailed design, unless Councillors direct their agreement is not required.

Discussion

There are three proposed options for the ORMP with different sized multipurpose areas and indicative costs. Each option has its associated risks. The table below details each option.

Table 4: Options for Development of Overland Pavilion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Indicative cost *</th>
<th>Council’s financial position</th>
<th>Multipurpose area**</th>
<th>Total Gross Floor Area (Ext and Int)</th>
<th>Risk to Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>$3.6m</td>
<td>Within budget, not dependent on SRV grant.</td>
<td>184m2</td>
<td>900m2</td>
<td>While the estimated cost is within the adopted budget and is in line with Councils SDP, the sports clubs are not in agreement with the size of the multipurpose space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>$3.8m</td>
<td>Out of budget by some $163,000; if successful with SRV grant within budget.</td>
<td>300m2 (incl 116m2 outdoor deck)</td>
<td>1,016m2</td>
<td>This option is within budget if the CSIF grant application is successful. There is 116m2 additional multipurpose space, however the additional space is an open deck. The clubs have not agreed on this sketch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>$4.3m</td>
<td>Out of budget by some $386,000, even if successful with SRV grant.</td>
<td>277m2</td>
<td>1,004m2</td>
<td>This option is out of budget regardless of whether the CSIF grant application is successful. Council would need to secure additional funding. The clubs have not agreed on this sketch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All options include project escalation costs of 3%, an additional solar panel component (club funded) and are internal cost estimates.

** All options exceed the Sports Development Plan 2014-23 guidelines which outlines functional component size for multipurpose rooms in pavilions of up to 170m2.

For all three concept options, both the project price and social room space is above the average of the past pavilion projects, while the club membership numbers using
the pavilion is below the average of past pavilion projects (see Table 5 for comparison detail).

**Table 5: Pavilion Sports Club Users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total project cost ($) rounded</th>
<th>Social space size (m²)</th>
<th>Clubs (name)</th>
<th>Club player membership (at site)</th>
<th>Number of grounds pavilion supports (summer / winter)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Park Pavilion (2007-2009)</td>
<td>976,000</td>
<td>81m²</td>
<td>Doutta Stars Cricket C^ Doutta Stars Football C^ Buckley Park Cricket C^</td>
<td>575 (575)</td>
<td>2 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Reserve Pavilion Improvements*^</td>
<td>1,273,000</td>
<td>188m²</td>
<td>Strathmore Cricket Club^ Strathmore Football Club^</td>
<td>1,140 (517)</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies Cricket Pavilion/Facilities Refurbishment</td>
<td>1,942,000</td>
<td>82m²</td>
<td>Essendon Maribyrnong Park Ladies Cricket Club^ Aberfeldie Sports Club (AFLW)</td>
<td>658 (136)</td>
<td>1 / 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathnaver Reserve Pavilion Upgrade</td>
<td>2,259,000</td>
<td>80m²</td>
<td>FC Strathmore (Soccer Club)^ Strathmore Cricket Club</td>
<td>540 (360)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Pavilion - New Pavilion</td>
<td>3,096,000</td>
<td>167m²</td>
<td>Moonee Valley Football Club (AFL)^ Moonee Valley Cricket Club^</td>
<td>520 (520)</td>
<td>2 / 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Keys Reserve Pavilion</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>173m²</td>
<td>Essendon Royals Soccer Club^ Essendon Cricket Club^ Strathmore Cricket Club</td>
<td>1,030 (520)</td>
<td>2 / 3.5 (based on new realignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeing Reserve Baseball Club New Pavilion</td>
<td>3,918,000</td>
<td>150m²</td>
<td>Essendon Baseball Club^</td>
<td>180 (180)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbairn Park (Middle) Pavilion</td>
<td>4,948,000 (can be split into 65.5m² spaces)</td>
<td>131m²</td>
<td>Ascot Vale Cricket Club^ Aberfeldie St Johns Cricket Club^ Avondale Football Club (Soccer) Moonee Valley Knights FC (Soccer)^ Essendon Royals Soccer Club</td>
<td>1,330 (530)</td>
<td>8 / 6 (based on new realignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,913,000</td>
<td>1052m²</td>
<td>20 clubs</td>
<td>5973 (3338)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per site</td>
<td>2,739,100</td>
<td>131.5m²</td>
<td>2.5 clubs per site</td>
<td>747 (417)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Pavilion Opt. 1</td>
<td>3.6m</td>
<td>184m²</td>
<td>East Keilor Football Club and East Keilor Cricket Club</td>
<td>350 (350)</td>
<td>3 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Pavilion Opt. 2</td>
<td>3.8m</td>
<td>300m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Pavilion Opt. 3</td>
<td>4.3m</td>
<td>277m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation

The Overland Reserve Master Plan was endorsed by Council on 26 September 2017 which includes the new multi-purpose pavilion.

Comprehensive stakeholder consultation with Overland Reserve stakeholders was undertaken during the master plan process and pavilion concept design phase. The PCG was formed in 2017 comprising representatives from East Keilor Cricket Club, East Keilor Football Club, East Keilor Sports Club, Councillor, a community member and council officers. The purpose of the PCG is to assist in progressing the project to completion. To date there has been four PCG meetings.

As the project progresses the Overland Reserve stakeholders will continue to be engaged and consulted with at the PCG meetings.

It is noted that this Pavilion would not be constructed if not to fulfil a need for football and cricket provision. As such, it is considered that unless the clubs sign off on the concept design, the project should not proceed. Further, in line with Council’s commitment to shared-use, multipurpose facilities, the project should not proceed unless the club relinquish their lease and agree to shared use arrangements.

Implications

1. **Legislative**
   
   The contents of this report are not governed by legislative requirements.

2. **Council Plan / Policy Council Plan / Policy**
   
   In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective to actively seek financial support from a range of potential funding sources for the development of community infrastructure in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme 5: Resilient organisation - A resilient organisation that is sustainable, innovative, engaging and accountable - We are financially sustainable.

3. **Financial**
   
   The adopted budget for the ORMP is $3,500,000 which includes 2018/19 budget deliberations of $500,000. An additional $100,000 has been secured via AFL Victoria’s ‘2018 AFL Key Community Facilities Fund’, $14,892 via East Keilor Football Club Solar Panel Installation Grant and $46,000 contribution from the East Keilor Sports Club.

   As it stands, there is $3,631,892 of secured funding available, and if $250,000 funding from the CSIF grant application is received, there will be a total of $3,881,892 available.

   Option 1 is within budget and is not dependent on the SRV funding.

   Option 2 is currently outside of budget however, will fall within budget if the SRV funding is successful.

   Option 3 is out of budget regardless of the SRV funding. Council will need to source additional funding for this option.
4. Environmental

Materials specified in the development of the ORMP incorporate Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) principles. The installation of solar panels as part of this project is beneficial to the environment as it will reduce pollution and greenhouse gases.

Conclusion

There are three options for the Overland Reserve Multipurpose Pavilion Project that have been cost estimated by officers. Based on these three options detailed in the report, Council is required to determine what option to proceed with so that the appointed architect can be reengaged to finish the design of the Overland Reserve Multipurpose Pavilion.

Appendices

Appendix A: Overland Reserve Option 1
Appendix B: Overland Reserve Option 2 (open deck)
Appendix C: Overland Reserve Option 3 (sketch design of first floor)
CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

Closure of meeting to public

Recommendation

That Council resolves to close the meeting to the public pursuant to Section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989 to discuss the following matters:

14.1 38-42 Scotia Street, Moonee Ponds (All land in Strata Plan 20307) - Consideration of an in-principle agreement reached at a VCAT Compulsory Conference

Item 14.1 is Confidential under the terms section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989 as it contains information relating to: (h) other matter.

14.2 327-357 Mt Alexander Road, Ascot Vale (Lot 1 TP691989U, Lot 1 TP759343W, Lot 1 LP47069, Vol.8442 Fol.272, Lot 1 TP183001L, Lot 1 TP531956H, Lot 1 TP534732Q, and Lots 1 & 2 TP959305Q) - Demolish buildings and construct buildings and works comprising a multi-storey mixed-use development and four triple storey townhouses in a Commercial 1 Zone, Heritage Overlay (HO363) and Design and Development Overlay (DDO3), use of the land for dwellings, a reduction in car parking requirements and alteration of access to a road in a Road Zone, Category 1

Item 14.2 is Confidential under the terms section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989 as it contains information relating to: (h) other matter.