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Business:

1. Opening

2. Reconciliation Statement

3. Apologies and Leave of Absence
   Crs Jim Cusack and Cam Nation have approved leave of absence for this meeting.

4. Confirmation of Minutes
   Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday, 09 April 2019.

5. Declarations of Conflict of Interest

6. Presentations
   Nil.

7. Petitions and Joint Letters
   7.1 Traffic management during events held at Flemington Racecourse or the Showgrounds

8. Public Question Time

9. Reports from Special Committees
   Nil.

10. Reports
   10.1 14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds (Lot 1 on TP242796P) - Construction of six dwellings
   10.2 Airport West Station
   10.3 Timor-Leste Partnership Agreements
   10.4 Water Sensitive Urban Design Developer Voluntary Contribution Scheme
   10.5 Assemblies of Councillors

11. Notices of Motion
   11.1 Notice Of Motion Report No. 2019/12 - Lincoln Park

12. Urgent Business

13. Delegates Reports

14. Confidential Reports
   14.1 Drainage Improvement Works Hamilton Street and Ryder Street, Niddrie - Stage 4
15. Close of Meeting

BRYAN LANCASTER
Chief Executive Officer
PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS

7.1 Traffic management during events held at Flemington Racecourse or the Showgrounds

Author: Tracey Classon - Governance Officer
Directorate: Organisational Performance

Summary
Council has received a petition with 14 signatures, from residents of Duncan Street Flemington, requesting Council consider traffic management and street closures for all events held at the Flemington Racecourse or the Showgrounds, when scheduled to end in the evening (at or after 6:00pm).

Recommendation
That Council resolves to:
1. Receive and note the petition.
2. Refer this matter to the Director Planning and Development for investigation and reporting back to Council.
3. Advise the petition organiser accordingly.

Attachments
Nil
REPORTS

10.1 14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds (Lot 1 on TP242796P) - Construction of six dwellings

**Author:** Grant Michell - Principal Statutory Planner  
**Directorate:** Planning and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning File No.</th>
<th>MV/611/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Construction of six dwellings of two, three and four bedrooms (4 x triple storey and 2 x four storey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>DSP Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Mr Ilyas Elahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme Controls</td>
<td>Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Permit Requirement</td>
<td>Clause 37.08-5 – to construct a building or construct or carry out works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Car Parking Requirements (Clause 52.06) | Required: 10 car spaces  
Proposed: 10 car spaces |
| Bicycle Requirements | None |
| Restrictive Covenants | Restrictive Covenant 0823423 (varied on 9 August 2018) is not breached by this application. |
| Easements | None |
| Site Area | 616m² |
| Number Of Objections | 4 objections from 3 properties |

**Executive Summary**
- The application seeks approval for the construction of four triple-storey dwellings and two four-storey dwellings.
- The subject site is located within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre, has an area of approximately 616m², and is located on the southeast corner of Walker Street and Coats Street, Moonee Ponds.
AGENDA – ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

- The application was advertised and 4 objections from 3 properties received. Concerns were raised in relation to over-development, neighbourhood character, scale, number of dwellings, impacts on traffic and parking and amenity impacts.
- In accordance with Council’s Statutory Planning Protocols, a Consultation Meeting was not held as less than 10 objections were received.
- The application was referred to various internal departments who have not objected to the application, subject to conditions on any issued planning permit.
- The proposal demonstrates an appropriate level of compliance with the relevant policies and provisions of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme. It proposes intensification in a well-established residential area located within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre, proximate to public transport and commercial, community and public facilities. The architectural response is considered appropriate within the site context and presents an acceptable level of articulation.
- The proposal achieves an acceptable level of compliance with the requirements of the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1, with the exception of the proposed front setbacks. Additionally, the proposal achieves an appropriate level of compliance with the Standards of Clause 55, noting these requirements do not apply to this development, with three technical areas of non-compliance. The variations are associated with the street setbacks, rear setbacks of the third and fourth levels and overshadowing to the south, all considered appropriate. The proposed development represents an appropriate built form that provides a high level of internal amenity, protects the amenity of the adjoining properties and responds to its site context.
- This report recommends Council issues a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit, subject to conditions.
Recommendation

That Council issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit in relation to Planning Permit Application No. MV/611/2018 for the construction of six dwellings at 14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds (Lot 1 on TP242796P), subject to the following conditions:

Endorsement Conditions

1. Before the development starts, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The amended plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and be in an electronic format. The amended plans must be generally in accordance with the plans submitted and assessed with the application but modified to show:

   a) All habitable room windows on the southern and eastern elevations to be screened in accordance with Standard B22 of Clause 55.04-6 (Overlooking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme;

   b) All tree protection requirements in accordance with the Arborist Report submitted with the application prepared by, Glenn Waters Arboriculture, dated 5 April 2017;

   c) The relocation of the two bicycle spaces within the Walker Street frontage to a location easily accessible by residents and visitors of the site;

   d) A notation that all vehicle crossovers are to be constructed in accordance with Council’s Vehicle Crossing Design Standards and Vehicle Crossing Policy;

   e) Trench grates with a width of 300mm in front of each garage;

   f) The western façade of Dwelling 1 to Walker Street to include large window forms at all levels to address the streetscape;

   g) A greater variation of materials and finishes within the Northern Elevation to Coats Street to minimise the visual dominance of the sheer wall forms;

   h) All BESS annotations and measures in accordance with Condition 4;

   i) All permeable and impermeable surfaces clearly noted and all WSUD treatment measures and associated annotations in accordance with the amended STORM report required by Condition 3; and

   j) An amended Landscape Plan in accordance with Condition 7.

When approved, these plans will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.

2. The development as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

3. An amended STORM assessment report must be submitted simultaneously with the submission of amended plans in accordance with Condition 1. The STORM Assessment must obtain a minimum 100% to comply with Clause 22.03-4 (Stormwater Management) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

4. A published BESS report (or equivalent) must be submitted simultaneously with
amended plans in accordance with Condition 1 and must comply with Clause 21.04-3 (Ecologically Sustainable Development) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

5. A minimum 30 days prior to any building or works commencing, all Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) Design Details (relating to the WSUD treatment measures nominated in the approved and complying STORM report), such as cross sections and/or specifications, to assess the technical effectiveness of the proposed stormwater treatment measures, must be submitted for approval by the Responsible Authority.

6. A maximum 30 days following completion of the development, a WSUD Maintenance Program must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority which sets out future operational and maintenance arrangements for all WSUD measures. The program must include, but is not limited to:
   a) Inspection frequency;
   b) Cleanout procedures;
   c) As installed design details/diagrams including a sketch of how the system operates; and
   d) A report confirming completion and commissioning of all WSUD Response treatment measures written by the author of the WSUD Response and STORM or MUSIC model approved pursuant to this permit, or licensed installing/commissioning plumber, or similarly qualified person or company. This report must be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must confirm that all WSUD treatment measures specified in the WSUD Response and STORM or MUSIC model have been completed and implemented in accordance with the approved report.

The WSUD Maintenance Program may form part of a broader Maintenance Program that covers other aspects of maintenance such as a Builder’s User’s Guide or a Building Maintenance Guide.

7. Before the development starts and before any trees or vegetation are removed, an amended landscape plan and schedule to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The amended landscape plan and schedule must be prepared by a person or firm with suitable qualifications to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, drawn to scale and in an electronic format. The amended landscape plan and schedule must be generally in accordance with the landscape plan submitted with the application but modified to show:
   a) Any changes in accordance with Condition 1 of this permit;
   b) All tree protection requirements in accordance with the Arborist Report submitted with the application prepared by, Glenn Waters Arboriculture, dated 5 April 2017;
   c) A planting schedule of all proposed vegetation (trees, shrubs and ground covers) which includes, botanical names, common names, pot size, mature size and total quantities of each plant;
   d) The use of drought tolerant species;
e) The provision of one small canopy tree within the front setback of each dwelling which are able to achieve a minimum mature height of 4 metres;
f) Features such as paths, paving and accessways;
g) All Environmentally Sensitive Design (ESD) design solutions in accordance with the successful STORM/BESS reports;
h) All planting abutting the accessway and land frontage to have a maximum mature height of no more than 900mm in accordance with Clause 52.06-8 (Design Standards for car parking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme; and
i) An appropriate irrigation system.

When approved the amended landscape plan and schedule will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.

Landscaping in accordance with the endorsed landscape plan and schedule must be completed before the building is occupied.

8. A minimum 30 days prior to any building or works commencing, a Construction and Site Management Plan (CSMP) must be submitted to and be approved by the Responsible Authority detailing the construction activity proposed and the site and environmental management methods to be used. The CSMP must be in accordance with Moonee Valley City Council’s CSMP’s guideline and templates.

When approved, the CSMP will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.

The development must be carried out in accordance with the endorsed CSMP and the provisions, requirements and recommendations of the endorsed CSMP must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Development Conditions

9. Floor levels shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered or modified without the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.

10. Before the buildings approved by this permit are occupied, the privacy screens and other measures to prevent overlooking as shown on the endorsed plans must be installed in accordance with Clause 55.04-6 (Standard B22 Overlooking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

All privacy screens and other measures to prevent overlooking as shown on the endorsed plans must at all times be maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

11. All pipes, fixtures, fittings, ducts and vents servicing any building on the land, other than storm water down pipes and gutters above the ground floor storey of the building, must be concealed in service ducts or otherwise hidden from view to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

12. Before the buildings approved by this permit are occupied, concrete vehicular crossing(s) must be constructed to suit the proposed driveway(s) in accordance with the Responsible Authority’s specification and any obsolete, disused or
redundant vehicle crossing(s) must be removed and the area reinstated to footpath, nature strip and kerb and channel to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

All vehicle access points must be located a minimum of 1.0 metre from any infrastructure including service pits. Alternatively, such assets may be incorporated into the crossover with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority and the relevant servicing authority/agency. Subsequent works and costs in association with relocation and/or amendment must be incurred at the owner’s cost, to the satisfaction of the relevant servicing authority/agency and the Responsible Authority.

13. Before the buildings approved by this permit are occupied, the areas set aside for the parking of vehicles, together with the associated driveways and access lanes as shown on the endorsed plans must be:
   a) Constructed;
   b) Available for use in accordance with the endorsed plans;
   c) Properly formed to such levels and drained so that they can be used in accordance with the endorsed plans; and
   d) Finished with a permanent trafficable surface (such as concrete, asphalt or paving),

in accordance with the endorsed plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

The area set aside for the parking of vehicles, together with the associated driveways and access lanes as shown on the endorsed plans must:
   a) Be maintained and made available for such use; and
   b) Not be used for any other purpose,

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

14. The existing street trees on Coats Street must not be removed or damaged as a result of the permitted development.

15. Provision must be made for the drainage of the land including landscaped and pavement areas. The discharge of water from the land must be controlled around its limits to prevent any discharge onto any adjoining or adjacent property or streets other than by means of an underground pipe drain which is discharged to an approved legal point of discharge to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

16. An on-site stormwater detention drainage system must be installed on the land to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Before the development starts a Drainage Layout Plan, including computations and manufacturer’s specifications, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The Drainage Layout Plan must be prepared by a Civil Engineer with suitable qualifications to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must depict an on-site stormwater detention drainage system to be installed on the land.

When approved, the Drainage Layout Plan will form part of this permit.
The on-site stormwater detention drainage system must be installed and the provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Drainage Layout Plan must otherwise be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

17. Prior to the issue of an Occupancy Permit, all new boundary fencing as shown on the endorsed plans must be erected. The cost of such fencing must be met by the owner and carried out to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

18. The development must be provided with external lighting capable of illuminating access to each garage, car parking space and pedestrian walkways. Lighting must be located, directed and shielded and of limited intensity so that no nuisance or loss of amenity is caused to any person within or beyond the land.

19. The garden areas shown on the endorsed plan and schedule must only be used as gardens and must be constructed, completed and maintained in a proper, tidy and healthy condition to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Any tree or shrub damaged, removed or destroyed must be replaced by a tree or shrub of similar size and variety to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

20. This permit will expire if:
   a) The development does not start within two (2) years of the date of issue of this permit, or
   b) The development is not completed within four (4) years of the date of issue of this permit.

Before the permit expires, or within six (6) months afterwards, the owner or occupier of the land may make a written request to the Responsible Authority to extend the expiry date.

If the development commences before the permit expires, within twelve (12) months after the permit expires, the owner or occupier of the land may make a written request to the Responsible Authority to extend the expiry date.

Permit Notes:

- This is not a building permit under the Building Act. A separate building permit is required to be obtained for any demolition or building works.
- Before the development starts, the permit holder must contact Moonee Valley City Council on 9243 8888 regarding legal point of discharge, vehicular crossings, building over easements, asset protection, road consent/occupancy etc.
- No on street parking permits will be provided to the occupiers of the land.
- All works undertaken within any existing road reserves must accord with the requirements of Moonee Valley City Council and be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- Existing levels along the property line and easements must be maintained. All proposed levels must match to existing surface levels along the property boundary and/or easement. Council will not accept any modifications to existing levels within any road reserve or easement.
- The required on-site detention system must be designed to limit the rate of
stormwater discharge from the property to pre-development levels in accordance with the following: Cw=0.4, tc=10mins, tso=5mins, ARI 1 in 5. An ARI of 1 in 10 shall be used for storage and the greater of post development Cw or Cw=0.80.

- The development authorised by this permit will require the submission of a Construction and Site Management Plan (CSMP) prior to the commencement of any works. All CSMP’s are required to be made via Council’s online system at http://www.mvcc.vic.gov.au/planning-and-building/planning/construction-site-management-plans.aspx or in person at 9 Kellaway Avenue, Moonee Ponds.

1. Introduction

1.1 Subject Site and Surrounds

The subject property is located on the southeast corner of Walker Street and Coats Street, Moonee Ponds. The site is located 90 metres west of Moonee Valley Racecourse and 130 metres east of the Clocktower Centre.

The site is rectangular in shape with a frontage of 15.76 metres to Walker Street and a frontage of 39.07 metres to Coats Street. The site area is 616 square metres. The site has a laneway abuttal along its eastern boundary.

There are no easements on the Certification of Title, however, there is a Restrictive Covenant registered. Restrictive Covenant 0823423 was varied 9 August 2018 and is not breached by this application.

The subject site currently accommodates a single storey brick dwelling with a pitched roof.

Figure 2 – Subject Site (14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds)
Figure 3 – Subject Site (14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds)

The surrounding land is within the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1. Residential developments proximate to the subject site are varied, with a mix of single dwellings on large allotments and multi-unit developments.

The character of the area can be described as transitional as a result of its Activity Centre zoning and proximity to public transport options. External materials are a mixture of brick, weatherboard and rendered finishes in differing colours. Building frontages vary from single to double frontages. Roof forms in the area are predominantly hipped, with some examples of gabled-ended roof forms.

1.2 Proposal

The proposal seeks to construct four triple-storey dwellings and two four-storey dwellings. Dwelling 1 has a frontage to Walker Street while Dwellings 2-6 front Coats Street. Dwellings 1 and 6 are two bedroom dwellings with a single car space at ground level, open plan living at first floor and bedrooms at the upper level. Dwellings 2 and 5 are three bedroom dwellings with two car spaces at ground level, open plan living at first floor and bedrooms at the upper level. Dwellings 3 and 4 are four bedroom dwellings with two car spaces at ground level, open plan living at first floor, three bedrooms at second floor level and another bedroom at the upper level. The development can be generally summarised as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of car spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maximum height 14m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Background

2.1 Relevant Planning History

No previous planning applications have been determined for the subject site.

The owner of the subject site applied to the Supreme Court of Victoria pursuant to Section 84 of the Property Law Act 1958 for the modification of a restrictive covenant.

On 19 July 2018, the Supreme Court ordered that pursuant to section 84(1)(c) of the Property Law Act 1958, the restrictive covenant contained in instrument of transfer No. 823423 dated 26 March 1917 registered in Land Registry, be modified in so far as it affects the land described in folio of the Register volume 8253 folio 977 situated at 14 Walker Street, Moonee Ponds, by deletion of the words struck through in the part of the covenant extracted below, and insertion of the words in bold text and doubled-underlined, so that the covenant as modified reads:

…that not more than one dwellings house six dwellings houses shall be erected or left standing on the land hereby transferred and that such each dwelling house shall be used for residential purposes only…

This modification to Covenant 823423 was registered on the Certificate of Title on 9 August 2018.

2.2 Planning Policies and Decision Guidelines

Planning Policy Framework

Clause 11.01-1R1 Settlement – Metropolitan Melbourne
Clause 11.02-1S Supply of Urban Land
Clause 11.03-1R Activity Centres – Metropolitan Melbourne
Clause 11.03-1S Activity Centres
Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage
Clause 15.01-5S Neighbourhood Character
Clause 15.02 Sustainable development
Clause 16 Housing
Clause 18 Transport
Clause 19.03-3S Stormwater

Local Planning Policy Framework
Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile
Clause 21.02 Key Issues and Influences
Clause 21.03 Vision
Clause 21.04 Sustainable Environment
Clause 21.04-7 Waste
Clause 21.05 Housing
Clause 21.06 Built Environment
Clause 21.07 Activity Centres
Clause 22.03 Stormwater Management (Water Sensitive Urban Design)

Zoning
Clause 37.08 Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1

Overlays
None

Particular and General Provisions
Clause 52.06 Car Parking
Clause 55 Two or More Dwellings on a Lot and Residential Buildings
Clause 64 General Provisions for Use and Development of Land
Clause 65 Decision Guidelines
Clause 66.02 Use and Development Referrals
Clause 71.02-3 Integrated Decision Making

2.3 Referrals
No external referrals were undertaken.
The following internal referrals were undertaken:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Officer</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainable Design</td>
<td>Amended BESS and STORM Report required and all annotations shown on plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transport Unit</td>
<td>No objection subject to standard parking and crossover conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering (Drainage)</td>
<td>No objection subject to standard drainage conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arborist</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Public Notification of the Application

Pursuant to Section 52 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, the application was advertised by mail to adjoining and surrounding properties, with two notices displayed on site for 14 consecutive days.

As a result, 4 objections from 3 properties were received and identified within Appendix A of this report.

The objections are discussed at Section 3.5 of this report.

2.5 Consultation Meeting

A Consultation Meeting was not held as there were less than 10 objections received, which is in accordance with Council’s Statutory Planning Protocols.

3. Discussion

3.1 Does the proposal address the relevant State and Local Planning Policies?

The relevant State and Local Planning Policy Framework objectives are considered to have been satisfied by the proposal. The policy framework objectives broadly encourage consolidation of urban allotments in locations which can provide housing diversity and take advantage of existing public transport and community and commercial services. Relevant policy guidance is contained within ‘Plan Melbourne 2017-2050: Metropolitan Planning Strategy’ and Clauses 11, 15, 16, 18 and 21.05, which all seek to increase the residential supply in these areas.

Clause 21.05 (Housing) of the scheme is applicable, which has the objective of providing a variety of housing choices in appropriate locations to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse range of households. Strategies to achieve this objective generally echo the State Planning Policy directives, encouraging residential development in or near major transport routes.

Clause 21.05 also sets out policy guidelines for three identified categories of growth, being ‘High to Substantial’, and ‘Moderate to High’ and ‘Slight to Moderate’ housing intensification. The Moonee Valley Housing Strategy 2010, listed as a reference document under Clause 21.05-7, sets out a number of principles to define locations within these categories. Applying these principles, the land is considered to fall within the category of High to Substantial housing intensification. Clause 21.05-1 provides the following guideline:

> Consider the majority of housing growth and higher density development to occur within Activity Centres identified in Plan Melbourne, provided that the height, scale and massing of new development is in accordance with the requirements and recommendations of adopted structure plans or strategies for those centres, and that development respects the surrounding built form context.

The Moonee Valley Housing Strategy describes this category as being suitable for apartment style developments at a height that is dependent on strategic policy (i.e. Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1).
The view is that the proposed development represents an acceptable, incremental increase in housing opportunities to meet growing population needs, as well as a diversity of housing choice in an established major activity centre. The development will cater for different demographic groups and for varying household needs as they change over time.

The site offers an opportunity for redevelopment considering its size, Activity Centre zoning, corner position, and proximity to public transport, which already features a range of dwelling densities. The proposed development responds to the objectives and strategies of 21.06-4 (Urban Design). The key concepts of this clause are assessed in Section 3.2.

The proposal has the potential to comply with Clause 21.04 (Sustainable Environment) and Clause 22.02 (Storm Water Management) through the use of ecological sustainable design principles as highlighted within the submitted BESS assessment and STORM reports, subject to appropriate conditions on any permit issued requiring additional details on the development plans and an amended STORM report showing all impermeable areas.

The proposal accords with objectives of Clause 21.04-4 (Waste) as it relates to encouraging the use of recycling and achieving best practice in waste minimisation. Waste collection will be undertaken by Council's waste collection services.

The proposed development is consistent with the policy guidelines of Clause 21.07-1 (Moonee Ponds Activity Centre) as discussed in Section 3.2 of this report.

### 3.2 Does the proposal represent an appropriate built form outcome within the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1?

In determining whether the development represents an appropriate built form outcome, there is guidance provided within state policy at Clause 15.01-1S (Urban Design), as well as local policy at the first objective and associated strategies of Clause 21.06-4 (Urban Design).

The subject site is located within sub-precinct 8D under the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1. This precinct has a mandatory maximum building height of 14 metres and the Coats Street interface is noted as a Type 1 Residential Front Interface, which states that development should comply with Standard B6 (Street Setback) of Clause 55.03-1 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

The development is considered an acceptable response to the immediate context and requirements of the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule as follows:

- The contemporary built form of the development is consistent with both the emerging built form of the area and responsive to the high degree of change expected by policy in this location. The proposed architectural theme will contribute to the built form character of the area, whilst also achieving an acceptable and site responsive design outcome.

- The siting and massing of the development is compatible with the pattern of development which has occurred in the immediate and wider area and with new infill occurring to the north in the Activity Centre. The provision of a setback of 3.06 metres to Walker Street instead of the zero metres...
required under the zone, is regarded to be an appropriate outcome which responds to the residential character of the street without undermining the objective of the zone and relevant precinct.

- The setback to Coats Street while not compliant with the requirements of the Activity Centre Zone is acceptable in this instance due to its corner location and is consistent with average setback of the adjoining properties to the east and west. This is discussed in Section 3.4 of this report.

- The height of the development at three-four storeys (12.7 metres) is consistent with the emerging character of the area and well within the preferred height of 14 metres identified within the schedule to the Activity Centre Zone. The fourth levels of Dwellings 3 and 4 are centralised and articulated to reduce their dominance as viewed from the streetscapes and visually sensitive interfaces. Further, the height of the development presents a transition in building heights from the south through to the north. The image below demonstrates the maximum building heights allowable under the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme. Properties to the south of the subject site can be a maximum of 14 metres, while properties to the north on the opposite side of Coats Street can be 11 metres. The proposed 12.7 metre height presents an appropriate transition between the Activity Centre and the land zoned General Residential on the periphery.

Figure 4 – Maximum heights of the surrounding land
• The development is acceptably articulated through a variety of setbacks, window forms, roofing styles, materials and finishes that together present a contemporary and visually engaging built form. The materials and finishes complement the existing and emerging character of built form in the area and are consistent with this form of development, however it is appropriate to include a condition requiring greater variation of materials and finishes to limit the sheer walls to Coats Street.

• The façade treatment to Walker Street provides little interaction with the streetscape at the upper levels. It is appropriate to include conditions requiring the development to better address the Walker Street streetscape through providing more interaction using window treatments and activation.

• Landscaped areas are provided within the front setbacks to accommodate planting which will contribute to the garden character of the area, and filter views of new built form. Canopy planting will be achieved within the front setback and northern boundary. Further, the development has been designed to maintain the existing established street trees within Coats Street which are a valued character element within the streetscape and filter views of the built form.

• The use of the rear Right of Way to access the ground level garaging ensures car parking is concealed entirely within the site and has been appropriately designed to ensure its functional and convenient use. This use of the rear Right of Way allows the proposal an active and landscaped presentation to the street, its immediate residential interfaces as well as internal pedestrian approaches.

• The attached form of the development is appropriate in this instance as it maintains the existing built form pattern of the existing building to the east and is reflective of the building typology encouraged within Activity Centre locations.

• The proposed 1m high front fencing proposed to both Walker Street and Coats Street is appropriate and maintains views of the landscaped frontages while delineating public and private land.

3.3 Does the proposal comply with Clause 52.06 (Car Parking) and Clause 52.34 (Bicycle Facilities)?

The proposal provides car parking as set out in the table below:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two x two bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two x three bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two x four bedroom dwellings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development fully complies with the statutory parking requirements of Clause 52.06-5 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme as demonstrated in the table above.

The design of car spaces and accessways generally complies with the requirements of Clause 52.06-9.

The application was referred to Council’s Traffic and Transport Unit who do not object to the proposal subject to conditions relating to the crossover construction.

The proposal provides two bicycle spaces within the Walker Street frontage, which complies with the two spaces required under Clause 52.34 (Bicycle Facilities) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme. While bicycle provision complies with the requirements of this Clause, a condition is appropriate on any permit issued relocating the spaces to an area easily accessible by residents or visitors to the site. As proposed, the spaces are within a landscaped area with limited access.

3.4 Does the proposal appropriately address the requirements of Clause 55?

The subject site is located within the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1, as such, the Standards and Objectives of Clause 55 do not specifically apply to the proposed development. The Decision Guidelines require however, the Responsible Authority to consider the Objectives and Standards of Clause 55 where appropriate. The proposal is considered to appropriately address the relevant provisions of Clause 55 with exceptions as assessed below:

Table 4 – Areas of non-compliance with Standards & Objectives of Cl55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res Code Standard</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.03-1 (Standard B6 - Street Setback)</td>
<td>The proposed street setback to Walker Street of 3.04 – 4.13 metres does not comply with the 9 metre setback requirement of this Standard. However, the Activity Centre Zone states that all buildings up to 11 metres in height should have a zero metre front setback unless noted as a residential interface. Under the zone, only Coats Street is noted to have a Residential Interface setback requirement. The proposed setback to Walker Street is found to be acceptable given its Activity Centre zoning and the consistency of the setback both with existing dwellings within the streetscape and recently approved developments. In particular, 10 Walter Street includes a solid arbour on the street boundary, 8 Walter Street is setback approximately 4.5 metres from the street boundary, and a recently approved development for 5 dwellings at 6 Walker Street (MV/108/2017) has an approved street setback of 2.4 metres. As noted above, the subject site is located within precinct 8D under the Activity Centre Zone, Schedule 1. The frontage to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Code Standard</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coats Street is noted as 'Residential Front Interface – Type 1', which detailed that properties should provide front setbacks in accordance with Standard B6. The proposed setback of Dwellings 2-6 at 2 – 2.1 metres does not comply with the 3 metre setback requirement of this Standard. It is considered the proposed setback is acceptable in this instance as the setback is generally consistent with the average setback for this side of Coats Street, which is 2.1 metres, and there is sufficient area within the setback for landscaping. Additionally, there is no unreasonable impact to the existing street trees within Coats Street. It is noted that the setback for Dwelling 1 at 2 metres is compliant with this Standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.04-1 (Standard B17 - Side and Rear Setbacks)</td>
<td>The proposed southern setbacks at both the third and fourth level do not comply with the requirements of this Standard. A variation of between 1.69 – 1.89 metres is required at the third level, and a variation of between 1.79 – 2.09 metres is required at the fourth level. The proposed variations sought are considered acceptable given the site’s physical context and location within the Activity Centre Zone, where more robust built forms are appropriate. The area of non-compliance at the fourth level is centrally located within the site and not opposite any sensitive areas of the adjoining property to the south. Additionally, the proposed area of non-compliance at the fourth level is relatively minimal in width (7 metres) within the overall width of the building (35 metres) with the remainder of this level complying with this Standard, and having regard for the fact the assessment must only consider the Objectives and Standards of Clause 55 rather than comply with ResCode. The proposed setbacks of Dwelling 6 to the eastern boundary at all levels do not comply with the requirements of this Standard. It is regarded the setbacks are appropriate given the site’s abuttal with the laneway and its interface with the Quest Apartments further to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.04-5 (Standard B21 Overshadowing)</td>
<td>The proposed development will result in increased overshadowing impacts to the secluded private open space area of 12 Walker Street from noon onwards. The overshadowing impacts are regarded as acceptable in this instance due to the site’s Activity Centre zoning with its expectation of large built forms. Additionally, the layout of the open space of 12 Walker Street is such that the primary usable space is located within the eastern section of the property opposite the garage due to the existing vegetation on the site and 2.3 metre high boundary fencing; this area is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Code Standard</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.04-6 (Standard B22 - Overlooking)</td>
<td>It is appropriate to include a condition requiring all habitable room windows be screened in accordance with Clause 55.04-6 (Standard B22 Overlooking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.5 Objections (Discussion)

The following table provides a discussion of the concerns raised within the objections to the application:

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.4 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Character</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.2 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>The proposed height at 12.7 metres is consistent with the 14 metre mandatory maximum height requirement under Schedule 1 of the Activity Centre Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliant setbacks</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.4 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of private open space</td>
<td>The proposed development complies with the requirements of Clause 55.05-4 (Standard B28 Private Open Space) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme, which requires at least 8sqm of private open space with a minimum width of 1.6 metre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site coverage</td>
<td>The proposed development complies with Clause 55.03-3 (Standard B8 Site Coverage) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise impacts</td>
<td>It is considered that there will be no unreasonable noise impacts above that normally experienced within an urban environment as a result of this development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daylight to windows</td>
<td>The proposed development complies with Clauses 55.04-3 (Standard B19 Daylight to Existing Windows) and 55.04-4 (Standard B20 North-facing Windows) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overshadowing</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.4 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Bulk</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.2 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Will the development impact upon the existing street trees in Coats Street?

Coats Street includes two large established street trees opposite the proposed development. An Arborist Report, prepared by Glen Waters Arboriculture, was submitted with the application which identified a number of tree protection measures to ensure the retention of these trees. Council’s Arborist has reviewed this report and does not object to the proposal subject to conditions requiring compliance with the nominated tree protection measures. A condition to this affect can be included on any permit issued.

4. Human Rights

The application process and decision making is in line with the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities 2006 (Section 18 – Taking part in public life).

5. Council Plan/Policy

On 26 June 2018, Council adopted the MV2040 Strategy as its long-term plan for the city. It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the relevant strategic directions set out in the MV2040 Strategy, including:

- Strategic Direction 3: A city where people are healthy and safe
- Strategic Direction 5: A city with housing for all
- Strategic Direction 11: A city with streets and spaces for people
- Strategic Direction 14: A city that is green and water-sensitive
- Strategic Direction 16: A city that is cool and climate-adapted
- Strategic Direction 17: A city that fosters local identity
- Strategic Direction 18: A city of high-quality design
- Strategic Direction 20: A city in a beautiful landscape setting

6. Conclusion

The application has been assessed against the relevant provisions of the State Planning Policy Framework, Local Planning Policy Framework, zoning controls, the relevant Particular and General Provisions, and the decision guidelines at Clause 65 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

Additionally, consideration has been given to the requirements of Section 60(1B) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 with respect to the number of objections received, and it is considered the proposal would not have a significant social effect.

On balance the proposal demonstrates general compliance with the requirements of these provisions and policies. The application is supported as detailed above within the recommendation section.

Attachments
A: Objector Location (separately circulated)
B: Advertised Plans (separately circulated)
10.2 Airport West Station

Author: Colin Harris - Senior Project Manager Infrastructure and Land Use Developments

Directorate: Asset Planning and Strategic Projects

1. Purpose

1.1 To consider the Airport West Station Study report (the Report), commissioned by Council, which investigates the opportunities created by establishing a new railway station at Airport West/Keilor Park, as part of the future State and Commonwealth Governments’ commitment to new passenger rail infrastructure. The Report will be used as a tool to support Council’s Advocacy Strategy by outlining the evidence base behind our campaign for a station at this location.

2. Background

2.1 Council has consistently identified the lack of provision of major public transport in the north-west region of the municipality. The need for a new station has been endorsed by Council as one of the key items in the adopted Advocacy Strategy and is a key Implementation Initiative in MV2040.

2.2 The need for public transport provision in this area has long been recognised as a key issue since as early last century. Records show that matter was raised in Parliament in 1927, during the 1930s and again during the 1950s. The matter was raised in detail during Parliamentary debates by the State Member for Niddrie on 27 April, 1976. The Member referred to the deficiencies in Transport services in Niddrie, with 100,000 people who live with “no trains and practically no trams”.

The need for a station has been a consistent theme in Council’s adopted policies, including the Integrated Transport Strategy in 2008.

2.3 The State and Commonwealth Governments have each made a commitment to the Melbourne Airport Rail Link (MARL). The State Government has also committed to a Suburban Rail Loop (SRL). These proposed rail projects are set to be built within the Albion-Broadmeadows Rail Corridor, passing through Airport West/Keilor Park.

2.4 Each of these projects has the potential to transform the North-Western Suburbs of Melbourne. The State Government has commenced the development of initial business cases for each project. This process represents the best opportunity for Council to advocate for a new station beyond what was already proposed.

2.5 The Report highlights the local and regional benefits of an additional station at Airport West/Keilor Park. The nature of the report is such that it identifies high level opportunities that can be assessed further in a detailed cost benefit analysis.
2.6 The Report has been developed in order that it can be provided to all levels of Government, elected representatives and the relevant consultants that are in the process of the Business Case preparation.

3. Issues

3.1 The Report identifies the lack of provision of rail services for the residents of Airport West/Keilor Park compared to the surrounding area.

3.2 In addition there is significant growth anticipated for Melbourne Airport in terms of passenger and freight over the next decade, with visitation expected to double in the next twenty years, which will generate demand for passenger movement to and from the CBD. Similarly there is major residential growth expected to the west of metropolitan Melbourne.

3.3 A site has been previously identified for a new station at Airport West/Keilor Park as part of previous studies and is currently incorporated into the Brimbank Planning Scheme, having been the subject of a detailed Airport Rail Link planning assessment in 2007. The site and surrounding area is suitably located within close proximity to the Calder Freeway – Ring Road junction and the Airport West retail precinct.

3.4 The Report supports the development of a station at Airport West/Keilor Park as part of the MARL and SRL.

3.5 The Report recommends that if funding is not available to construct a new Station as part of the initial project then the State government should commit to protecting the station site and investigating the potential costs and benefits of a station that serves the existing passenger track or a combination of those tracks and the future MARL and SRL track sets.

3.6 The Report prepared by Movement and Place Consulting in consultation with Council officers is found at Attachment B.

3.7 It is proposed to provide this information and Council’s advocacy communication materials Attachment C and D to Local, State and Federal representatives.

Recommendation

That Council resolves to:

a. Note the lack of public transport services currently available in Airport West /Keilor Park area.

b. Note the Airport West Station Study report prepared by Movement and Place Consulting.

c. Reaffirm its support for the recommendation to advocate for a station at Airport West /Keilor Park, with a preference that the station be constructed as part of the MARL and SRL project.

d. Note advocacy undertaken to date since its previous motion of 22 May 2018, including a meeting with Minister for Transport Infrastructure, the Hon Jacinta Allan MP in March 2019.
e. Continue this advocacy by providing a copy of the Report, along with advocacy communications materials to the following representatives:

- The Hon. Bill Shorten MP, Federal Member for Maribyrnong and Opposition Leader
- Other candidates for the Federal Electorate of Maribyrnong
- Deputy Prime Minister and Federal Minister for Infrastructure, the Hon. Michael McCormack
- Shadow Federal Minister for Infrastructure, the Hon. Anthony Albanese MP
- Victorian Minister for Transport Infrastructure, the Hon. Jacinta Allan MP
- Victorian Shadow Minister for Public Transport (Metropolitan), the Hon. David Davis
- Member for Niddrie, the Hon. Ben Carroll MP
- Mayor of Brimbank City Council

Attachments
A: Impact Assessment
B: Airport West Station Study (separately circulated)
C: A Station for Airport West flyer (separately circulated)
D: Draft letter to Local, State and Federal representatives (separately circulated)
Impact assessment

This impact assessment has been carried out on the report prepared by Movement and Place Consulting commissioned by Council to investigate the issues and opportunities associated with a new Station at Airport West/Keilor Park.

1. Relationship to Council commitment MV2040 or Council Plan

1.1 In presenting this report, Council is working to achieve its strategic objective ‘A connected city of accessible, active and sustainable transport choices’ in accordance with Council Plan 2017-21 Theme: Connected (Yanonin Maggoolee, which means “travel here” in Woi wurrung language).

2. Legislative obligations

2.1 The nature of the Report is for use as an Advocacy document and it has not been prepared as a result of any Statutory obligations.

3. Legal implications


4. Risks

4.1 No key risks have been identified in the preparation of this report.

5. Social impact assessment

5.1 A detailed Social Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report. However the Report does identify that the residents of Airport West/Keilor are currently, and will be further disadvantaged by the lack of public transport options. This imbalance will likely be exacerbated in the event that the State Government proceeds without safe guarding a Station in the location identified in the Report.

6. Economic impact assessment

6.1 A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report.

7. Environmental impact assessment

7.1 A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report.

8. Reputational impact assessment

8.1 Council has consistently advocated for a Station in the general vicinity of Airport West/Keilor. Given that the State Government is in the process of undertaking detailed planning and Business Case Development, it is considered incumbent on Council to use available resources to identify
the opportunities available, and to continue to advocate in a timely manner.

8.2 By undertaking a high level assessment of the opportunities available by the infrastructure investment in the west of the municipality, Council continuing to meeting its stated objective of advocating for a new station.

9. Financial implications
   9.1 The report does not commit Council to any further significant expenditure at this stage.

10. Sensitivity / scenario analysis
    10.1 Not applicable.

11. Conflict of interest declaration
    11.1 No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest in this matter or the decision.

12. Consultation undertaken or planned
    12.1 In the preparation of the Report Officers have engaged with officers from the City of Brimbank. There has been no engagement with the wider community to date in relation to the attached report.
10.3 Timor-Leste Partnership Agreements

Author: Craig Dodson - Community Planning Officer
Directorate: Planning and Development

1. Purpose
1.1 To seek approval for two Moonee Valley/ Liquiçá Timor-Leste Friendship City partnership projects, in line with Council’s Timor-Leste Liquiçá Friendship City Relationship Program endorsed in July 2018.

2. Background
2.1 At its 12 July 2018 Ordinary Meeting, Council endorsed the Moonee Valley/Timor-Leste Liquiçá Friendship City Relationship Program Review (Review) to inform future program delivery. (Refer Attachment B – separately circulated).

2.2 The Review recommended Council enter into strategic partnerships with agencies in Liquiçá for the 2017-21 Council term through formal funding agreements. The aim of these partnerships would be to address key identified needs in Timor-Leste (such as food and water security, climate change, population health, employment). Agencies eligible to apply are those who are already working on the ground in Liquiçá, and with whom Council has experience working with.

2.3 Moneys raised through previous Council fundraising for Liquiçá Timor-Leste initiatives are held in a separate Moonee Valley City Council account (Program Account). The Program Account currently has $20,861.98 available to fund partnership agreements.

2.4 Over the past 15 years, Council has supported a number of projects on the ground in Liquiçá, providing practical assistance and funding for (typically) community development projects, services or infrastructure. Key findings of the Review included that:

2.4.1 There is still a real need for on-going support for projects in Timor Leste, particularly in the areas of food and water security, climate change, population health and employment

2.4.2 Local councils’ support is most effective when it is provided in association with locally based partners in East Timor; and that locally based partners (with a physical presence in Timor Leste) are also vital in assisting Council to understand needs and priorities.

2.5 The main projects delivered in partnership with Timor based non-profit organisations to date include the following:

2.5.1 2009 - Upgrade of a Garianna School in partnership with Life Love Health and River Diversion (Lepa) Project

2.5.2 2012-2013 - Technology Resource Hub in Liquiçá, in partnership with Info Timor and the Xpand Foundation

2.5.3 2017 - Provided smart phones for Maternal and Child Health nurses providing neo-natal care to pregnant women in remote areas of the Liquiçá district, in partnership with Health Alliance International
2.5.4 **2018** – Purchased carbon offset certificates from the Xpand Foundation initiative called ‘WithOneSeed’ which encourages organisations to offset their CO2 emissions; and provides a modest income to small farmers involved a Community Forestry Program. Note: this was supported through Council’s carbon offset budget, not from the fundraising account.

2.6 In recent months, Council has received two partnership project proposals from the Xpand Foundation and Health Alliance International.

2.7 The Moonee Valley/Timor-Leste Liquiçá Friendship City Relationship Program Review recommended Council apply a decision making framework when assessing partnership proposals (See Attachment C).

3. **Issues**

3.1 The Review found it is more effective to support long term projects with self-sustaining objectives. Funding short term projects were seen to be disruptive and unhelpful.

3.2 The Xpand Foundation submitted a proposal to develop a new enterprise to support a community farming project for local farmers in the Liquiçá region to harvest and develop markets in Australia for cured vanilla. Funds will be used to ship a motor vehicle from Melbourne to Dili to assist with transferring supplies from remote locations and for training and tools needed to help develop the enterprise (See project proposal in Attachment D).

3.3 Health Alliance International (HAI) submitted a proposal requesting support for a new program to strengthen the capacity of government health staff in Liquiçá to respond to obstetric and newborn emergencies. Funds will be used to support the purchase of hospital staff training equipment (mannequins, equipment trolleys, monitoring devices etc.) for the Liquiçá Community Health Center (See project proposal in Attachment E).

3.4 As outlined in the decision making framework, feedback has been sought from key program stakeholders including the Victorian State Government (Local Government Timor-Leste Partnership Network Program), Victoria University (Community Engagement Unit) and Ave Maria College (who have a partnership with a school in Venilale, Timor Leste). All stakeholders are supportive of the projects proposed by the Xpand Foundation and Health Alliance International.

3.5 It is recommended each project receives funding of $10,000 - $5,000 per financial year (18/19 and 19/20), across a two-year year partnership agreement. The funding for the 2019/20 financial year would be subject to receipt of a satisfactory acquittal report for the 2018/19 financial year.

3.6 Of the $20,000 in total recommended, $16,000 will be contributed from available funds in Council’s Timor-Leste Program Account of $20,861.98. In line with review recommendations, the remaining $4,000 ($2,000 per annum), will be committed to future partnership agreements from Council’s Community (Bi-annual) Grants program to augment annual staff fundraising efforts. This is summarised in Table One below.
**Table One: funding summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor-Leste Program Account</td>
<td>Bi-annual Grants Program Account</td>
<td>Timor-Leste Program Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xpand</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAI</td>
<td>$4000</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8000</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td>$8000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Council officers will undertake a range of staff fundraising initiatives to raise further funds to support future partnership agreements.

**Recommendation**

That Council resolves to:

a. Endorse funding of $5,000 (excluding GST) in the 2018/19 financial year to deliver a community farming project as outlined in Attachment D; including $4,000 from the Timor-Leste Program Account and $1,000 from the Bi-annual Grants Program.

b. Endorse funding of $5,000 (excluding GST) in the 2018/19 financial year to Health Alliance International to support the purchase of hospital staff training equipment for the Liquiçá Community Health Center project as outlined in Attachment E; including $4,000 from the Timor-Leste Program Account and $1,000 from the Bi-annual Grants Program.

c. Note this funding forms part of a two year funding agreement with the Health Alliance International as outlined in Table One; and that Council’s funding in the 2019/20 financial year is subject to receipt of satisfactory project acquittals for 2018/19 activity.

**Attachments**

A: Impact assessment - Timor-Leste Partnership Agreements
B: Moonee Valley/Timor-Leste Liquiçá Friendship City Relationship Program Review (separately circulated)
C: Decision making framework (separately circulated)
D: Xpand Foundation proposal (separately circulated)
E: Health Alliance International proposal (separately circulated)
Impact assessment

1. Relationship to Council commitment MV2040 or Council Plan
   1.1 Related objectives in the Council Plan 2017-21 include:
      1.1.1.2 Work with partners to address health and wellbeing priorities including: health inequalities, mental health, alcohol and other drugs, gambling, homelessness, non-communicable diseases and sexual and reproductive health.
      1.1.1.3 Improve health and wellbeing across the life course and address social determinants of health.
      1.3.1.1 Foster resilience and build community capacity in priority populations.
      1.4.1.1 Build capacity and leadership with priority populations and in areas of greatest social and economic disadvantage.
      1.4.1.2 Deliver services and programs using a community development model.
   1.2 Council endorsed the Moonee Valley/Timor-Leste Liquica Friendship City Relationship Program Review and future directions report at its Ordinary Meeting on 12 July 2018.

2. Legislative obligations
   2.1 There are no legislative implications as a result of this activity.

3. Legal implications
   3.1 Funding agreements will be entered into with the Xpand Foundation and Health Alliance International, using Councils standard funding agreement template. This will mitigate the legal risk for Council for any potential non-delivery on agreements.

4. Risks
   4.1 Health Alliance International and the Xpand Foundation are Non-Government Organisation’s who have a long history of successfully delivering projects on the ground in Timor-Leste. Council has successfully partnered with them on projects before and has well established relationships. The risk of partnering with both of these organisations is considered minimal.

5. Social impact assessment
   5.1 In line with Council’s Timor-Leste program support decision making framework, both projects have a positive impact on the ground in Timor-Leste and are responding to community need. Both projects will contribute to long term wellbeing improvements for Liquiçá residents.
6. Economic impact assessment

6.1 The Xpand Foundation project proposal to support the development of farming and markets for cured Vanilla will contribute to the development of a new industry and employment outcomes for local residents in Timor-Leste.

7. Environmental impact assessment

7.1 No environmental impact anticipated.

8. Reputational impact assessment

8.1 No reputational impact anticipated.

9. Financial implications

9.1 To support partnership proposals, it is recommended that each project receives funding of $10,000, comprising of $5,000 per financial year (18/19 and 19/20) across a two-year partnership agreement. $16,000 in total would be used from the available funds in Council’s Timor-Leste Program account of $20,861.98. In line with review recommendations, the remaining total of $4,000 ($2000 per annum) will be committed to future partnership agreements from Council’s community grants program.

10. Sensitivity / scenario analysis

10.1 Not applicable.

11. Conflict of interest declaration

11.1 No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest in this matter or the decision.

12. Consultation undertaken or planned

12.1 The key program stakeholders listed below were contacted and provided with a copy of the partnership proposals from the Xpand Foundation and Health Alliance International and asked to provide their feedback to Council Officers. All partners are supportive of the proposals.

• Dr Rob Brown - Executive Director Engagement & Government Relations, Victoria University
• Nick Oats - Victorian State Government Program Director International, Department of Environment, Land, Water & Planning, Local Government East Timor Partnership Network
• Elizabeth Hanney – Principal, Ave Maria College
10.4 Water Sensitive Urban Design Developer Voluntary Contribution Scheme

Author: Sarah Wigley - Coordinator Sustainability
Directorate: Planning and Development

1. Purpose

1.1 For Council to consider introducing a Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) Developer Voluntary Contribution Scheme, which will allow Council to accept financial contributions from developers in-lieu of complying with up to 20 per cent of their stormwater quality planning requirements. The financial contribution will go towards the delivery of larger scale WSUD projects to achieve equivalent stormwater benefits.

2. Background

2.1 Moonee Valley is bordered in part by both the Maribyrnong River and Moonee Ponds Creek, which make up the lower reaches of the Maribyrnong Catchment before stormwater flows to Port Philip Bay.

2.2 In 2013, Council introduced Clause 22.03 to the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme requiring best practice treatment of stormwater on private developments to reduce pollutants entering local waterways and Port Philip Bay. These requirements are typically met by developers installing rainwater tanks, raingardens and vegetated buffer strips.

2.3 Council’s planning and engineering teams have reported that most developers can meet 80 per cent of their stormwater treatment obligations on-site with a rainwater tank plumbed to all toilets. However, many developers experience difficulty in implementing or maintaining the further 20 per cent compliance measures effectively.

2.4 In December 2016, consultants DesignFlow completed a case study comparing the difference in life cycle costs between a developer delivering on-site stormwater treatment and Council delivering a regional project. The results indicated that for Moonee Valley, regional projects are significantly more cost effective than on-site solutions for improving stormwater quality and reducing mains water use.

2.5 In January 2017, Kingston City Council introduced a ‘Stormwater Quality In-Lieu Contributions Scheme’ and raised $600,000 in the first 18 months. Council used the model adopted by Kingston City Council to investigate creating a similar Scheme for Moonee Valley City Council.

2.6 In August 2018, economic consultants Marsden Jacob, completed an assessment of a proposed WSUD Voluntary Contribution Scheme (the Scheme) for Moonee Valley City Council and proposed a funding mechanism attractive to the development industry and allowing for full cost recovery for Council (Attachment B – separately circulated).

2.7 During October and November 2018, a sample of developers from the local development industry were surveyed to identify the current costs developers pay to deliver WSUD compliance on-site and their willingness
to pay a financial contribution to offset some of the compliance (Attachment C – separately circulated).

2.8 In January 2019, based on the results of the surveys from the local development industry, Marsden Jacob recommended a final pricing structure for the Scheme (Attachment D).

3. **Issues**

3.1 The Scheme aims to improve the quality of local waterways through the delivery of medium to large scale WSUD projects, and to assist developers to meet their stormwater planning requirements, particularly for smaller, more constrained developments, where developers find it difficult to achieve compliance.

3.2 Results of surveys with local developers in 2018 indicated that potentially 70 per cent of small-to-medium sized developments would take up the Scheme (Attachment C – separately circulated).

3.3 The Scheme is voluntary. Developers can choose to meet all of their stormwater treatment obligations on-site or take up the option of the Scheme to pay Council a financial contribution in lieu of meeting up to 20 per cent of their obligations. Every application wishing to use the Scheme will need to achieve a minimum STORM report standard of 80 per cent.

3.4 Council would use the developer contribution funds towards the construction of larger scale wetlands, stormwater harvesting systems, raingardens or other WSUD assets off-site through Council’s capital works projects to deliver equivalent stormwater treatment. The offset projects need to be constructed at the same time as developer projects in order to deliver the equivalent stormwater benefits. For instance, in 2019/20 the Woodlands Park stormwater harvesting project will be constructed to offset developer contributions received in the first year of the Scheme. As such, the funds will not be held.

3.5 Legal advice from Maddocks in November 2017 confirmed as the Scheme is optional for developers, a Planning Scheme Amendment is not required.

3.6 Marsden Jacob considered the cost to Council to construct and maintain large scale WSUD assets, the cost of administering the Scheme and the rate of development in Moonee Valley and recommended a rate of $55 per square metre of impervious area for the Scheme (Attachment D).

3.7 The pricing structure for the Scheme ($55 per square metre of impervious area) is set so the cost for developers to opt-in to offset up to 20 per cent of their compliance requirements, is less than what they pay to construct a WSUD asset onsite for an equivalent stormwater quality benefit.

**Recommendation**

That Council resolves to commence the Water Sensitive Urban Design Voluntary Contribution Scheme from 1 July 2019 and approves a rate of $55 per square metre of impervious area to be applied to the Water Sensitive Urban Design Voluntary Contribution Scheme, to be reviewed annually.
Attachments
A: Impact assessment - WSUD Developer Voluntary Contribution Scheme
B: Marsden Jacob recommendations for a funding mechanism - August 2018 (separately circulated)
C: Local Development Industry Consultation Report - Final report from Jamie Comley Consulting - January 2019 (separately circulated)
D: Marsden Jacob Review of Pricing Structure - January 2019 (separately circulated)
E: Guidelines for planning applicants - Water Sensitive Urban Design Voluntary Contribution Scheme (separately circulated)
Impact assessment

1. Relationship to Council commitment MV2040 or Council Plan
   1.1 A Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) Voluntary Contribution Scheme is an action identified in Council’s draft MV2040 Green Action Plan:
      1.1.1 Implement a voluntary in-lieu developer contribution scheme (similar to the City of Kingston) to enable best practice stormwater requirements for new developments to be partially met off-site.
   1.2 A WSUD Voluntary Contribution Scheme will address a number of key strategies under the following two objectives in the Council Plan 2017 - 2021:
      1.2.1 Theme 4: Green (Wunwarren, which means ‘green’ in Woi wurrung language) - Our natural environment is protected and enhanced. Reduce the impact of development on the natural environment.
      1.2.2 Theme 5: Beautiful (Nga-Ango Gunga, which means ‘breathtaking’ in Woi wurrung language) - Growth and development is well managed.

2. Legislative obligations
   2.1 Legal advice from Maddocks in November 2017 confirmed, that as the WSUD Voluntary Contribution Scheme (the Scheme) is voluntary, a Planning Scheme Amendment is not required.
   2.2 Funds collected and administered through the Scheme will be managed in accordance with financial management (Part 7) and planning and accountability (Part 3) requirements of the Local Government Act 1989.
   2.3 Under Victorian Planning Provisions, Council will ensure the Scheme is administered in a way that enables the Responsible Authority or Tribunal to be satisfied that the best practice objectives for stormwater quality contained Chapter 2.3 of the Best Practice Environmental Management Guidelines, (Victoria Stormwater Committee 1999), will be met through the WSUD projects delivered through the Scheme.

3. Legal implications
   3.1 Council is taking on the responsibility of meeting a portion (up to 20 per cent) of the Clause 22.03 Moonee Valley Planning Scheme requirements on behalf of applicants that choose to take up the Scheme and will be required to deliver the equivalent stormwater benefits through its capital works program.
4. **Risks**

   4.1 There is a risk that Council does not have the capacity to design, deliver and maintain the WSUD projects. This risk is mitigated by the pricing structure for the Scheme which includes resources costs to Council and the suite of stormwater harvesting projects in Council’s future capital works plans. After considering Council’s Risk Matrix, this risk is rated Low.

   4.2 There is a risk that the Scheme may not be an attractive option for developers, however based the City of Kingston’s experience and the feedback from surveys with local developers in October and November 2018, this is an unlikely risk. After considering Council’s Risk Matrix, this risk is rated Low.

5. **Social impact assessment**

   5.1 The benefits of the Scheme within the community include accelerated delivery of medium to large scale WSUD projects within Moonee Valley and improvements to urban cooling, water security and increased amenity.

6. **Economic impact assessment**

   6.1 The recommendations in this report will not have any impact on business or economic development in the municipality or on economic opportunities.

7. **Environmental impact assessment**

   7.1 The outcomes of the Scheme will be improved quality of stormwater entering local waterways (Maribyrnong River and Moonee Ponds Creek) and then flowing into Port Phillip Bay, through increased implementation of WSUD projects.

   7.2 For the benefit of improved water quality in local waterways, it is appropriate to deliver medium to large scale WSUD projects through the Scheme that contribute to whole of catchment health within Moonee Valley.

   7.3 Melbourne Water have advised that stormwater treatment anywhere within the municipality will help meet the required catchment water quality outcomes.

   7.4 The Scheme funds will be allocated to the following projects identified in the Council Plan 2017-21, pending annual budget processes:
Table 1: WSUD Capital Works Projects in Council Plan 2017-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSUD Capital Works Projects</th>
<th>Expected nitrogen removal (kg/year)</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Woodlands Park stormwater harvesting</em></td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>Buckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This project involves upgrading the existing ponds into a stormwater treatment and harvesting system to improve stormwater quality and provide an improved sustainable and reliable irrigation supply for a high profile open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosehill Park Wetland</em></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Rose Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This wetland project will enable an informal field to be established for social games and the entire park will be irrigated year round.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ascot Chase stormwater harvesting scheme</em></td>
<td>145.7</td>
<td>Mynong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This project will provide water for irrigating Walter Street Reserve and other potential sites such as Fairbairn Park and Riverside Golf Club.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Reputational impact assessment

8.1 Introduction of the Scheme would further demonstrate Council’s leadership in implementing WSUD projects and commitment to reduce stormwater pollution in the Maribyrnong Waterway Catchment and Port Phillip Bay.

8.2 The Scheme would never be available as a full replacement for developers meeting their on-site stormwater quality planning requirements under Clause 22.03 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme in its entirety.

8.3 The Scheme is expected to provide an improved experience for the local development community in meeting their Clause 22.03 Moonee Valley Planning Scheme requirements.

8.4 Council will establish clear and transparent reporting arrangements to demonstrate collection, expenditure and allocation of funds collected through the Scheme to show the community where the funds have been spent.
9. Financial implications

9.1 The pricing structure recommended by Marsden Jacobs of $55 per square metre is based on developed impervious area, which is the key factor that determines stormwater runoff from development sites.

9.2 The pricing structure achieves full cost recovery for all costs incurred by Council for the off-site WSUD project and the ongoing maintenance, plus the costs of administering the Scheme (including additional staff resources), the return on capital so this can be used for asset renewal, plus any debt financing costs.

9.3 Council can review the fees charged to developers annually to ensure the funds raised will cover the full cost of any future projects.

9.4 Economic modelling by economic consultants Marsden Jacobs, estimates that the forecast income to Council in the first two years of the Scheme is $1.2 million. This forecast assumes an opt-in rate of developers using the Scheme of around 40%. This assumption is based on:

9.4.1 evidence from Council’s initial consultation with developers in October and November 2018;

9.4.2 Council proactively promoting the Scheme with developers before it commences; and

9.4.3 opt-in rates for the Kingston City Council in-lieu mechanism.

9.5 All projects funded by the Scheme need to be:

9.5.1 Timely – Council’s investment in WSUD assets should happen as close as practical to the time the development occurs, so the impacts of the development are offset in a timely manner.

9.5.2 Additional – funds received through the Scheme will need to be additional to Council’s own investment in WSUD assets.

9.6 All contribution payments will be accounted for in a specific interest-bearing Reserve Fund, known as the Stormwater Quality Reserve. Council will regularly monitor, report and review the monies received and expended through existing financial reporting processes and in line with the principles of sound financial management as contained in the Local Government Act 1989.

10. Sensitivity / scenario analysis

10.1 As the Scheme is voluntary, it is difficult to ascertain the exact income the Scheme will generate. The income could vary year on year.

11. Conflict of interest declaration

11.1 No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest in this matter or the decision.
12. Consultation undertaken or planned

12.1 Melbourne Water were consulted during the initial development phase of the Scheme and provided advice on the proposed Scheme.

12.2 As Kingston City Council piloted a similar Scheme, they provided advice during development of the Scheme.

12.3 In October and November 2018, consultation with a sample from the local development industry was undertaken to inform Council’s approach to a prospective WSUD Voluntary Contribution Scheme. Consultation findings included:

12.3.1 Considerable support for the concept of the WSUD Voluntary Contribution Scheme.

12.3.2 High degree of support for the minimum 80% on-site treatment requirement.

12.3.3 Potentially, around 70% of small-medium sized developments would take up the Scheme.

12.4 Councillors were briefed on the proposed Scheme at a Strategic Briefing on 5 February 2019.

12.5 Guidelines on the Scheme has been developed for planning applicants, including examples of how the Scheme can be applied to meet up to 20 per cent of an applicant's treatment requirements (Attachment E – separately circulated).

12.6 Engagement and training with the local developer industry on the Scheme will commence following Council endorsement of commencement of the Scheme to ensure that developers are aware of the Scheme as an option to meet a portion of their stormwater quality obligations.
10.5 Assemblies of Councillors

Author: Tracey Classon - Governance Officer
Directorate: Organisational Performance

1. Purpose

1.1 The purpose of this report is to present to Council the written records of Assemblies of Councillors held in accordance with the provisions of Section 80A(2)(a) and (b) of the Local Government Act 1989 ("the Act").

2. Background

2.1 In accordance with Section 80A (1) and (2) of the Act, the Chief Executive Officer is to ensure that a written record of an Assembly of Councillors is, as soon as practicable, reported at an Ordinary Meeting of the Council; and incorporated in the minutes of that Council meeting.

3. Issues

3.1 Section 3(1) of the Act defines an Assembly of Councillors as a meeting of an Advisory Committee of the Council, if at least one Councillor is present, or a planned or scheduled meeting of at least half of the Councillors and one member of Council staff which considers matters that are intended or likely to be:

a) the subject of a decision of the Council; or

b) subject to the exercise of a function, duty or power of the Council, that has been delegated to a person or committee but does not include a meeting of the Council, a Special Committee of the Council, an Audit Committee established under section 139, a club, association, peak body, political party or other organisation.

3.2 Section 80A (1) and (2) of the Act provides that:

3.2.1 At an Assembly of Councillors, the Chief Executive Officer must ensure that a written record is kept of —

a) the names of all Councillors and members of Council staff attending;

b) the matters considered;

c) any conflict of interest disclosures made by a Councillor attending under subsection (3); and

d) whether a Councillor who has disclosed a conflict of interest as required by subsection (3) leaves the assembly.

3.3 The Chief Executive Officer must ensure that the written record of an Assembly of Councillors is, as soon as practicable —

a) reported at an Ordinary Meeting of the Council; and

b) incorporated in the minutes of that Council meeting.
**Recommendation**

That Council resolves to receive the following records of Assemblies of Councillors in accordance with section 80A(2) of the *Local Government Act 1989*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Ordinary Council Meeting pre-meet held on Tuesday 26 March 2019 at 6.00pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matters considered</td>
<td>Ordinary Council Meeting agenda to be held 26 March 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Councillors present | Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)  
Cr Samantha Byrne  
Cr Jim Cusack  
Cr Nicole Marshall  
Cr Cam Nation  
Cr Andrea Surace  
Apologies: Crs Richard Lawrence, Rebecca Gauci Maurici and John Sipek |
| Staff present | Bryan Lancaster (CEO)  
Steven Lambert  
Kendrea Pope  
Peter Gaffney  
Natalie Reiter  
Petrus Barry  
Allison Watt |
| Conflict of interest | Cr Cam Nation declared an indirect conflict of interest in item 14.1 due to conflicting duty, for reasons disclosed to the CEO prior to the meeting. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Strategic Briefing held on Tuesday 2 April 2019 at 6.00pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matters considered | 1. Youth Development presentation Victorian Youth Week  
2. Response to notice of motion 2019/06- safety lighting in public open spaces  
3. FAIR Action Plan update  
4. Racecourse Rd interface issues and opportunities  
5. 2019/20 operating budget  
6. St Columban’s mission  
7. Review of the draft agenda for the Ordinary Council Meeting to be held 9 April 2019  
8. Other business / proposed Notices of Motion |
| Councillors present | Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)  
Cr Samantha Byrne  
Cr Jim Cusack  
Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici  
Cr Richard Lawrence  
Cr Andrea Surace (6.57pm)  
Apologies: Crs Nicole Marshall, Cam Nation and John Sipek |


**Staff present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bryan Lancaster</th>
<th>Kate McCaughey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Reiter</td>
<td>Rachel Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendrea Pope</td>
<td>Sally Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lambert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External**

Joseph Horvat (Acting Senior Sergeant at Avondale Heights Police Station)

**Conflict of interest**

Nil.

---

**Assembly**

| Ordinary Council Meeting pre-meet held on Tuesday 9 April 2019 at 6.00pm. |
| Committee Room, Civic Centre |

**Matters considered**

Ordinary Council Meeting agenda to be held 9 April 2019.

**Councillors present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr Samantha Byrne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Richard Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr John Sipek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies: Cr Andrea Surace

Approved leave of absence: Cr Nicole Marshall and Cr Cam Nation

**Staff present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bryan Lancaster (CEO)</th>
<th>Natalie Reiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lambert</td>
<td>Petrus Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendrea Pope</td>
<td>Allison Watt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gaffney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict of interest**

Nil.

---

**Attachments**

Nil
NOTICES OF MOTION

11.1 Notice Of Motion Report No. 2019/12 - Lincoln Park

From: Councillor Richard Lawrence

Take notice that at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 23 April 2019 it is my intention to move:

That Council investigate, confirm and report on the accuracy of historical information relating to the likelihood that the parkland currently known as Lincoln Park in Buckley Ward Essendon was previously used as an Aboriginal Ceremonial Ground by the Wurundjeri people and other Aboriginal peoples. And that the Council Officers consult with the Wurundjeri people and other stakeholders to confirm further knowledge and deepen our understanding in relation to this possible important historical Aboriginal Ceremonial Ground in Essendon.

And further that Council Officers report back to Council on any historical information and recommend if required any action to be taken regarding a recognition plaque or other recognition as would be appropriate for such an Aboriginal historical Ceremonial Ground site.

Officer Comments

The Notice of Motion is supported. Council officers spoke with Wurundjeri elders at their cultural consultation meeting on 16 April 2019 and they were supportive of this proposal. It is proposed this work would form part of the next Moonee Valley Reconciliation Action Plan which is underway and will be presented to Council for endorsement in late 2019 or early 2020.
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 Drainage Improvement Works Hamilton Street And Ryder Street, Niddrie - Stage 4

Item 14.1 is Confidential under section 89(2) of the Local Government Act 1989 as it contains information relating to: (d) contractual matters.