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10.1 48 Holmes Road, Moonee Ponds (Lot 1 on TP803507A) - Demolition of a fence and construction of a three-storey apartment building in a Heritage Overlay

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning File No.</th>
<th>MV/598/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proposal          | Demolition of a fence and construction of a three storey apartment building in a Heritage Overlay containing:  
|                   | • 24 car spaces within a basement level; and  
|                   | • 12, three bedroom dwellings. |
| Applicant         | Big J Corp Pty Ltd |
| Owner             | Jason Brandi and David Brandi |
| Planning Scheme Controls | General Residential Zone  
|                    | Heritage Overlay (HO12) |
| Planning Permit Requirement | Clause 32.08-6 –Construct two or more dwellings on a lot.  
|                    | Clause 43.01-1 –Demolish or remove a building and to construct a building or construct or carry out works. |
| Car Parking Requirements (Clause 52.06) | Required: 24 car spaces  
|                    | Proposed: 24 car spaces |
| Bicycle Requirements | N/A |
| Restrictive Covenants | None |
| Easements | None |
| Site Area | 1,164m² |
| Number Of Objections | 16 objections from 12 properties |
| Consultation Meeting | 21 November 2018 |
Executive Summary

- The application seeks approval for the demolition of a fence and construction of a three storey apartment building in a Heritage Overlay containing 12 dwellings.
- The site area is approximately 1,164m$^2$ and located on the northwest corner of Holmes Road and Sydenham Street. The site abuts the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre to the east on the opposite side of Sydenham Street.
- The application was advertised and 16 objections from 12 properties were received. Concerns were raised in relation to over-development, neighbourhood character, scale, heritage impacts, impacts on traffic and parking and amenity impacts.
- A Consultation Meeting was held on 21 November 2018 and attended by Councillor Marshall, objectors, the permit applicant and Council's Planning Officer.
- “Without prejudice” plans have were received after the Consultation Meeting reducing the dwellings from 12 to 11 and addressing setbacks, crossovers, basement access ramps and maintaining the 11 metre height restriction;
- The application was referred to various internal departments who have not objected to the application, subject to conditions on any issued planning permit, with the exception of Council’s Heritage Advisor who has concerns with the built form.
- 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 proximate to public transport, commercial, community and public facilities. The architectural response is considered appropriate within the site context and presents a high level of articulation.
- The proposal achieves an acceptable level of compliance with the Standards of Clause 55, with three technical areas of non-compliance. The variations are associated with dwelling diversity within the development, street setbacks and front fence heights and are considered appropriate. The proposed development, as amended, depicts 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 issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit, subject to conditions.
Recommendation

That Council issues a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit in relation to Planning Permit Application No. MV/598/2018 for the demolition of a fence and construction of a three storey apartment building in a Heritage Overlay at 48 Holmes Road, Moonee Ponds (Lot 1 on TP803507A), 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) Alterations to the built form in accordance with the without prejudice plans being sheets 997-TP.02, 997-TP.03, 997-TP.05 (sketch), 997-TP.07 (sketch), 997-TP.10, and 997-TP.Z, Revision B dated 1 March 2019;
   b) All habitable room windows on the northern and western elevations and the western elevation of the roof terrace to be screened in accordance with Standard B22 of Clause 55.04-6 (Overlooking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme;
   c) A reduction in the built form within the tree protection zone of Tree 11 so that there is no more than 10% encroachment by the combined built form of the basement and ground floor;
   d) The location of all mailboxes and site services;
   e) All tree protection requirements in accordance with the Arborist Report submitted with the application prepared by, Treemap Arboriculture, dated...
September 2018;

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

g) The basement ramp to be redesigned to have no gradient steeper than 1:6.5 in accordance with the relevant Australian Standard to allow convenient access to waste collection vehicles;

h) Double glazing to all habitable room windows within the southern and eastern elevations;

i) The setback of the second floor to be increased a further 2 metres from the northern boundary;

j) The setback dimensions from all property boundaries for all levels on the floor plans and all wall heights and overall building heights on the elevations plans;

k) A materials and finishes schedule, including colour swatches;

l) Trench grates with a width of 300mm at the bottom of the basement ramp;

m) A notation clearly shown on the plans stating that the existing signage within Sydenham Street in proximity to the proposed crossover will be relocated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;

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

o) 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;

p) A notation preventing a roof on the roof terrace;

q) Any alterations to the basement and access arrangement in accordance with the Car Parking Management Plan required by Condition 10; and

r) 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 as required by Condition 1 of this permit;
b) All tree protection requirements in accordance with the Arborist Report
submitted with the application prepared by, Treemap Arboriculture, dated
September 2018;
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.

9. Before the development starts, an Amended Waste Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority.

The Amended Waste Management Plan must be in accordance with the City of Moonee Valley’s 'Waste Management Plans – Guidelines for Applicants' in relation to expected recycling rates and bin capacities.

When approved the Waste Management Plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.

The provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Waste Management Plan must be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

10. Before the development starts, a Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) prepared by a suitably qualified person or firm to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must be submitted in an electronic format and approved by the Responsible Authority. The CPMP must include, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority:

a) All car spaces, loading areas, passing areas, etc. to be signed and lined marked;

b) Details of the stop and go system;

c) All access controls, such as boom gates, roller doors etc.;

d) Lighting of parking areas, entries and exits;

e) All directional signage (occupants, visitors, pedestrians, cyclists etc.) within the carpark; and
f) Any waste collection arrangements in accordance with the endorsed waste management plan.

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

Development Conditions

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

12. 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.

13. All pipes, fixtures, fittings, ducts and vents servicing any building on the land, other than stormwater 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. The existing street tree on Holmes Road must not be removed or damaged as a result of the permitted development.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. A Council drain (minimum 300mm dia uPVC or FRC or RCP RRJ) must be constructed to reach the approved point of discharge. Before the development commences, Engineering Design Plans and a Drainage Layout Plan (with computations) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The Engineering Design Plans and Drainage Layout Plan must be prepared by a Civil Engineer with suitable qualifications to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must accord with Council’s Drainage Design Guidelines.

When approved, the Engineering Design Plans and Drainage Layout Plan will be endorsed and will form part of this permit.

The drainage must be constructed in accordance with the endorsed Engineering Design Plans and Drainage Layout Plan and the provisions, recommendations and requirements of the endorsed Engineering Design Plans and Drainage Layout Plan must otherwise be implemented and complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

After the drainage works have been constructed and before the building/s approved by this permit is/are occupied, as constructed plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority.
All costs associated with the preparation of the plans and installation and construction of the required drainage works must be borne by the permit holder.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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 a corner site with a frontage to Holmes Road to the south and Sydenham Street to the east.

The site is rectangular in shape with a frontage of 19.49 metres and a depth of 60.96 metres. The site area is 1,164 square metres.

There are no easements or covenants registered on the Certificate of Title.

The subject site is currently vacant with the only buildings remaining on-site being a post and wire front fence.

Figure 2 – Subject Site (48 Holmes Road, Moonee Ponds)

The surrounding land is a mix of residential uses and commercial uses due to its location abutting the western edge of the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre on the opposite side of Sydenham Street.

In particular, the adjoining properties to the east and southeast of the subject site are a mix of commercial uses by virtue of their location within the Activity Centre Zone. The properties to the south of the subject site are occupied by a row of attached townhouses. The adjoining property to the west contains a
double storey property within a Heritage Overlay that has been used for aged care purposes and includes a car park to the rear of the site. The properties to the north of the subject site are residential.

1.2 Proposal

The proposal seeks to construct a three storey apartment building containing 12 dwellings with a basement level for 24 car spaces and a roof terrace associated with Dwelling 9. Each dwelling has three bedrooms and two car spaces.

Table 1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of dwellings</td>
<td>12 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of car spaces</td>
<td>24 car spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Building Height</td>
<td>11 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mandatory requirement: 11 metres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>59.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Area</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer Appendix B Advertised Plans (separately circulated).

2. Background

2.1 Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history has been identified for the land. It is noted that a number of applications were lodged in the 1980’s, however, these are not relevant to this application.

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 15 Built Environment and Heritage
Clause 15.01-1S Urban Design
Clause 15.01-5s Neighbourhood Character
Clause 15.02 Sustainable Development
Clause 16 Housing
Clause 19 Infrastructure
Clause 19.03-3S Stormwater

Local Planning Policy Framework

Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile
2.3 Referrals

The no external referrals were undertaken.

The following internal referrals were undertaken:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Referrals</th>
<th>Comments/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transport Unit</td>
<td>No objections, subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering (Drainage) Unit</td>
<td>No objection, subject to standard drainage conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Advisor</td>
<td>Does not support the proposal, however, as discussed in Section 3.3 of this Report the built form, with additional conditions is appropriate to its context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainable Design (ESD) Officer</td>
<td>No objection, subject to amended STORM and BESS reports.</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, 16 objections were received from 12 properties identified within Appendix A of this report.

The objections are discussed at Section 3.6 of this report.

2.5 Consultation Meeting

A Consultation Meeting was held on 21 November 2018, which was attended by Councillor Marshall, Objectors, the Permit Applicant and Council’s Planning Officer. No resolution was achieved at this meeting.

Following the Consultation Meeting ‘Without Prejudice’ plans were provided to address comments raised in the meeting and Council’s concerns. In general the plans proposed the following alterations:

- Alterations to the basement layout to clarify the stop-go waiting area;
- Alterations to the basement ramp grades;
- Alterations to the crossover layout;
- Increase in the third storey setback to Holmes Road by 2 metres;
- Dwellings 9 and 10 combined into one dwelling resulting in a reduction in the number of dwellings from 12 to 11; and
- Alterations to the roof terrace layout to ensure that the overall height is no more than 11 metres.

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 surrounding area is generally typified by a mix of large family homes, townhouses, apartment buildings and commercial uses. The subject site is located on the western boundary of the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre and is well serviced with schools, shops, recreation facilities and with a high level of public transport. The policy framework objectives broadly encourage increased density in locations to 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 and activity centres.

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. In relation to the High to Substantial intensification area, these are sites that are generally:

- Within 400 metres safe walking distance to train or tram stations within principal or major activity centres;
- Within 400 metres safe walk of a range of community facilities and services;
- Within areas where the housing market produces a greater level of diversification than typically found in the area;
- The site while located within a Heritage Overlay, is not a contributory building and is a vacant site; and
- Where the surrounding character is evolving and includes a mix of new and old built forms.

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 applicable discretionary policy guidelines:

> 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.

It is acknowledged the subject site is not located with within the Moonee Ponds Activity Centre, however, the site directly abuts the centre. It is considered 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 on the border of an established major activity centre and an area where there is a great diversity in built form. The development will cater for different demographic groups and for varying household needs as they change over time.

The Moonee Valley Housing Strategy provides further characteristics for determining the level of intensification expected in certain areas. In relation to the High to Substantial intensification area, these are sites that are generally:

- Within 400 metres safe walking distance to train or tram stations within major activity centres;
- Within 400 metres safe walk of a range of community facilities and services;
- The housing market produces a greater level of diversification than typically found in the area; and
• The surrounding character is evolving and includes a mix of new and old built forms.

It is considered 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 on the border of an established major activity centre and an area where there is a great diversity in built form. 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 and location in a residential area abutting an activity centre. The site offers excellent access to public green space for residents. The proposed development responds to the objectives and strategies of 21.06 (Built Environment). The key concepts of this clause are assessed against the relevant Neighbourhood Character Precinct Profile Guidelines in Section 3.2.

The proposal has the ability 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. Conditions will be included on any permit issued requiring additional details on the development plans and an amended BESS and STORM report to be submitted.

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. A condition of the permit will require private waste collection and a waste management plan.

On this basis, the proposed development is consistent with both State and Local policy directions.

3.2 Does the proposal accord with the preferred character of the area?

The subject land is identified as being within character area ‘Garden Suburban 5’ within the Moonee Valley Neighbourhood Precinct Profiles 2012.

It is noted that the subject site is a vacant site located within Heritage Overlay HO12. An assessment of the development against the relevant requirements of the Heritage Overlay and Moonee Valley Heritage Guidelines is undertaken in Section 3.3 of this report. Further, the corner profile of the site and its location abutting a major activity centre are factors that must be considered when assessing the site’s response to the neighbourhood character of the area.

The development is considered a suitable response to the immediate context and the preferred character statement and design guidelines of the precinct as follows:

• The proposed built form is contemporary in style and reflective of the emerging character in the surrounding area.

• The proposed siting of the development is consistent with its corner location and responds appropriately to the adjoining built form. In particular, the setback of the built form from Holmes Road is generally
consistent with the setback of the adjoining property to the west and is reflective of the setbacks of the townhouses on the opposite side of Holmes Road. Further, the setback provides an appropriate transition between the 0 metre setbacks of the Activity Centre Zone land to the east to the residential area further to the west.

The setback to Sydenham Street provides a setback generally between 2.5 – 3.7 metres with two sections that are essentially on the boundary (0.3 metre setback). This is an appropriate built form that addresses the 0 metre setback of the medical centre on the opposite side of Sydenham Street and the 0 metre setback of the townhouses to the south to Learmonth Street. Again, an appropriate transition in street setbacks to Sydenham Street that is responsive to this corner location.

- The neighbourhood character design guidelines encourages a 1.5 metre setback from at least one boundary. The development has been setback 3 metres from the western property boundary at the abuttal with the adjoining residential property. This setback reduces to 2.1 to the rear of the site with a section of wall that is built on the adjoining property. This is an appropriate built form outcome that maintains the established and preferred siting within this section of Holmes Road.

- The overall three storey height is consistent with the zoning of the subject site and is reflective of the expected height in locations such as this. Further, the height provides an appropriate transition between the expected building heights within the Activity Centre and the residential hinterland to the north and west. The overall height is compliant with the 11 metre mandatory height for the General Residential Zone. It is noted that the lift over-run to the roof terrace of Dwelling 9 is higher than the 11 metres, however, this is an allowable encroachment. The remainder of the terrace area is within the 11 metre height requirement.

- The building elevations are appropriately articulated through the use of varied setbacks, balcony indents, window locations and a mix of materials and finishes. Amended ‘without prejudice’ plans have been provided, which provide further setbacks of the upper level from Holmes Road to match the setback of the adjoining property to the west. This is an appropriate response and provide further articulation to the façade.

- The proposed materials and finishes are consistent with the surrounding built form and include an appropriate mix of warm colours such as reds, browns, greys and creams.

- Appropriate areas for landscaping have been provided within the Holmes Road frontage to contribute to the garden character of the streetscape. Further landscaping opportunities have been provided within the Sydenham Street frontage in the form of planter boxes to provide a green edge to the development. There are additional areas available for landscaping along the western boundary. It is noted that due to the location of existing trees on the adjoining property to the north, opportunities for landscaping along this interface are limited to low scale planting. The landscaping proposed is appropriate to the site.
• Fencing to both Holmes Road and Sydenham Street is up to 1.8 metres in height, which is not in keeping with the neighbourhood character precinct for this area. However, the fencing has been setback from the boundary to allow for a planter box with a height of 900mm to be provided along the boundary interface. It is considered that this is an appropriate design response that provides for a green edge to the development that screens the higher section of fencing behind while providing appropriate amenity to the ground floor dwellings. Additionally, given the location of the site abutting the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre, this is an appropriate design response to ensure internal amenity is protected.

• Car parking is located within a basement level with access from Sydenham Street. It is considered that the parking location is appropriate and car parking will not dominate the frontages.

• A roof terrace associated with Dwelling 9 has been provided, which is fully contained within the 11 metre height of the built form and does not add any unreasonable bulk to the overall building.

3.3 Is the proposal consistent with the requirements of the Heritage Overlay?

The subject site is located within a Heritage Overlay Precinct (HO12). This precinct is the Holmes Road Residential Precinct and includes two separate sections of Holmes Road (as shown in the image below).

The subject site is located at the eastern edge of the precinct and is listed as a non-contributory building within the precinct. Further, it is noted that the subject site is vacant with the only buildings remaining on-site being a post and wire fence.

Clause 43.01-8 (Heritage Overlay) sets out decision guidelines for the assessment of applications within the overlay, which are augmented by Clause 22.01 (Heritage) and the Moonee Valley Heritage Guidelines 2016 which is a reference document under Clause 22.01. In general, these policies and documents seek to:

• Encourage contextual contemporary design that respects and complements the form, scale, colours, materials, rhythm, siting and spacing of Significant and Contributory buildings;
• Discourage new buildings that would be visually dominant; and
• Discourage new buildings that copy historical styles in detail.

The application was referred to Council’s Heritage Advisor who does not support the proposed built form as it is not consistent with the spatial characteristics of the other heritage properties within the precinct in relation to scale and siting of the building.

Notwithstanding the comments of the Heritage Advisor, the proposed development is consistent with the decision guidelines of Clause 43.01-8, Clause 22.01 and the Moonee Valley Heritage Guidelines 2016 for the following reasons:

• The proposed development is consistent with State Planning policy within the Planning Policy Framework and is consistent with the neighbourhood character of the surrounding area as discussed in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of this report;
• The subject site is currently vacant and by virtue of its location at the eastern most edge of the precinct, the site does not read as part of the precinct when viewed from the streetscapes;
• The demolition of the existing fence is acceptable given its state of disrepair and it not being a contributory element within the precinct;
• The built form is consistent with its site context as discussed in Section 3.2 of this report. In particular, it appropriately responds to its corner location, surrounding built form in the surrounding area and its abuttal to the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre;
• The overall height of the built form and its siting is consistent with the Holmes Road streetscape and is comparable to the scale of the other properties within the precinct to the west as shown in the image below;
• The setback of the development from the western boundary of 3 metres is consistent with the spacing of the other buildings within the precinct;
• The overall scale of the development is consistent with the building massing of 54-56 Holmes Road, which are the western most significant buildings within this section of the precinct. Amended ‘without prejudice’ plans have been provided, which provide further setbacks of the upper level from Holmes Road to match the setback of the adjoining property to the west. This is an appropriate response and provide further articulation to the façade;
• The contemporary built form is clearly separate from the precinct and incorporates materials and finishes that are consistent with the heritage precinct, including brick and warm tones;
• The built form is not visually dominant and provides an appropriate level of transition between the activity centre to the east and the heritage properties to the west; and

• The properties to the north at 1-9 Sydenham Street have been listed within the Heritage Gap Study of having potential heritage significance. It is considered that the proposed setback from the northern boundary is generally sufficient and will not detract from this series of dwellings and is clearly differentiated from these buildings, however, it is appropriate to include a condition requiring the second floor of the development to be setback a further 2 metres from the northern boundary to provide a greater transition in height.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposed built form presents an acceptable built form within the Heritage Precinct and will not have a detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the precinct.

3.4 Does the proposal comply with Clause 52.06 (Car Parking)?

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

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dwellings</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 three-bedroom</td>
<td>24 (22 for the “without prejudice” plans)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor car space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal complies with the statutory parking requirements of Clause 52.06-5 of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme.

‘Without Prejudice’ amended plans were submitted providing additional detail to the parking layout. Additionally, in providing an increased setback at the upper level to Holmes Road as discussed above, Dwellings 9 and 10 have been combined into one dwelling so that only 11 dwellings will be provided within the development, with no reduction in car parking provided. As such, the development would require 22 car spaces of which 24 is provided.

The application was referred to Council’s Traffic and Transport Unit who do not object to the proposal, subject to conditions on the permit relating to the basement ramp and internal alterations.

3.5 Does the proposal comply with the requirements of Clause 55?

The proposal is considered to generally comply with the provisions of Clause 55 as set out in the assessment table (refer to Appendix C). The development achieves a high level of compliance with the Standards of Clause 55 and fully complies with all Objectives of the relevant Standards. On this basis, it is considered that the development provides a good level of internal amenity for
future residents while limiting amenity impacts to the adjoining properties. The following points of non-compliance with the Standard of Clause 55 are assessed below:

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res Code Standard</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.02-3 (Standard B3 – Dwelling Diversity)</td>
<td>The proposed development seeks approval for 12 dwellings of which they are all 3 bedroom dwellings. While there is a variation in the internal layouts it is considered that the proposed development does not comply with this Standard. It is noted that ‘without prejudice’ plans have been provided which reduce the overall number of dwellings to 11, however, there has been no significant alteration in the internal layouts. Consequently, the provision of all 3 bedroom dwellings within an apartment form is acceptable in this instance as it provides for a diversity in dwelling type within the wider area, particularly to the north and west. It is acknowledged that there are a number of apartments within the activity centre to the east, however, these apartments are dominated by 1-2 bedroom apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 55.03-1 (Standard B6 – Street Setback)</td>
<td>The proposed setback to both Holmes Road and Sydenham Street does not comply with this Standard. The proposed setback to Holmes Road of 6.01 metres does not comply with the 9 metre setback requirement. It is considered that the proposed setback is appropriate given the site context and for the reasons discussed in Section 3.2 and 3.3 of this Report. Appropriate areas of landscaping are provided and the setback is an appropriate transition between the commercial areas to the east and residential areas to the west. The proposed setback of 0.3 – 2.5 metres to Sydenham Street does not comply with the 3 metre setback requirement of this Standard. The proposed setback is regarded to be appropriate as the areas of non-compliance are limited to the two access stair enclosures and the walls associated with the dining area of Dwelling 1 and the wall of Bedroom 1 of Dwelling 4. The remaining wall is compliant with the 3 metre setback requirement. It is considered that the setback is appropriate and reflective of the surrounding built form such as the residential properties on the opposite side of Holmes Road on the corner of Learmonth St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is considered that the proposed street setbacks are appropriate for the built form and consistent with the Objective of this Standard.

Clause 55.06-2 (Standard B32 – Front Fences) Fencing to both Holmes Road and Sydenham Street is proposed to be 1.8 metres in height, which does not comply with the 1.5 metre height requirement of this Standard. It is considered that the fencing is appropriate as the fencing has been setback from the boundary to allow for a planter box with a height of 900mm to be provided along the front boundary interface. It is considered that this is an appropriate design response that provides for a green edge to the development that screens the higher section of fencing behind while providing appropriate amenity to the ground floor dwellings. Additionally, given the location of the site abutting the Moonee Ponds Major Activity Centre, this is an appropriate design response to ensure internal amenity is protected.

3.6 Objections

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Character</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.2 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdevelopment</td>
<td>The proposal is compliant with the requirements for site coverage, permeability, gardens and maximum building height and is therefore, considered to be an appropriate development of the subject site. The proposed density of the development is consistent with the site’s corner location within an established residential area and abuttal with a major activity centre. Further, the proposal is consistent with State and Local Planning Policy as discussed in Section 3.1 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Massing and setbacks</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.2 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>A condition on any permit issued will require the submission of a Waste Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, safety and emergency vehicles</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.4 of this report for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Will the development impact upon the existing trees on adjoining properties?

The subject site is located proximate to established trees on adjoining properties to the west and north. An Arborist Report, prepared by Treemap Arboriculture, was submitted which identified a number of tree protection measures to ensure the retention of these trees. A condition ensuring these measures are followed will be included on any permit issued. It is noted that the report states that there is no more than 10% encroachment into the tree protection zone of Tree 11 located on the adjoining property to the west. However, on review of the development plans, there appears to be a greater level of encroachment (approx. 13%) due to the ground floor encroachment. It is considered appropriate to include a condition reducing the built form to encroach no more than 10% in this tree protection zone.

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 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.

It is considered 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)
C: Clause 55 Table (separately circulated)
D: Without Prejudice Plans (separately circulated)
10.2  1A Clarks Road, Keilor East (Reserve 1 on PS438596U) - Use of the land as a car park

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning File No.</th>
<th>MV/164/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Use of the land known as ‘Steele Creek Drive Reserve’ shown in Figure 1 as a car park with 10 car spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Moonee Valley City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Moonee Valley City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme Controls</td>
<td>General Residential Zone Urban Floodway Zone (part) Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (part) It is noted that the proposal is fully contained within the General Residential Zone area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Permit Requirement</td>
<td>Clause 32.08-1 – Use of the land as a car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking Requirements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Requirements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Covenants</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easements</td>
<td>An electricity supply easement and a sewerage and drainage easement affect the subject site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>2.798ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Of Objections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Summary
- The application seeks approval for the use of the land as a car park for 10 vehicles.
The site area is approximately 2.798ha, however, the area of works is limited to a section with an area of approximately 370m². The site is located opposite 24 Craig Street and is located within the Steele Creek Reserve.

The application was advertised and one objection was received. Concerns were raised in relation to the appropriateness of the use of public land, loss of public open space, loss of vegetation, inappropriate access to the site and the car park not being included within the Steele Creek Masterplan.

In accordance with Council’s protocols, a Consultation Meeting was not held as less than 10 objections were received.

The application was externally referred to AusNet and 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 and is considered an acceptable use in this instance.

This report recommends Council issues a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit, subject to conditions.

Recommendation
That Council issues a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit in relation to Planning Permit Application No. MV/164/2019 for the use of the land as a car park at 1A Clarks Road, Keilor East, subject to the following conditions:

1. Before the use starts, amended plans must be submitted in an electronic format, and drawn to scale with all relevant dimensions. The plans must be generally in accordance with the plans submitted and assessed with the application but modified to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority to show:
a) The location and details of all signage identifying the public car park;
b) The width of the proposed vehicle crossing dimensioned on the plans and a notation that the crossing is at least 1.0 metre clear of the side entry pit and 2.0 metres from any utility pole;
c) Pedestrian visibility splays in accordance with Clause 52.06-9 (Car Parking) of the Moonee Valley Planning Scheme;
d) Wheel stops for all car spaces; and

e) The grades of the car spaces be more than 1:20 and 1:16 for all other directions.

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. Before the use approved by this permit commences, 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) Line marked or provided with another adequate means of ensuring that the boundaries of vehicle spaces are clearly indicated on the ground; and
d) Properly formed to such levels and drained so that they can be used in accordance with the endorsed plans,
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.

4. Before the use starts, signs must be erected in association with the car parking hereby provided, including at the entrance to 24 Craig Street, allowing for the identification of the car park, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

5. Before use approved by this permit commences, concrete vehicular crossings must be constructed in accordance with Council’s Design Standards and any obsolete, disused or redundant vehicle crossings 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 and 2.0 metres from any street tree. 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.

6. 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.

7. This permit will expire if:
   a) The use does not start within (2) years of the date of this permit, or
   b) The use is discontinued for a period of two (2) years.

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.

**Permit Notes**

- This is not a building permit under the *Building Act 1993*. 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.

- All works undertaken within any existing road reserves must accord with the requirements of the Moonee Valley City Council’s Technical Services Department and be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

1. **Introduction**

   1.1 **Subject Site and Surrounds**

   The subject site is located with the Steele Creek Reserve opposite the development at 24 Craig Street, Keilor East. The site form part of the Steele Creek Reserve area. The land is currently used as an informal gravel car park.
1.2 Proposal

The proposal seeks to use the land as a public car park for 10 vehicles. The car park is located within an area currently informally used for parking.

Refer Appendix A – Advertised Plans (separately circulated).

2. Background

2.1 Relevant Site History

At the 11 December 2018 Ordinary Council Meeting (Attachment B – Officer Report and Meeting Minutes), Council resolved to enter into an Agreement with the Owners Corporation 1 Plan No. PS6410110W (24 Craig Street, Keilor East) outlining their respective intentions to the establishment of the car park on the Steele Creek Drive Reserve and the grant of carriageway easements on 24 Craig St, Keilor East for public access to the proposed car park. Easements will be located over the internal vehicular access of 24 Craig Street to provide public vehicular access to the carpark while further easements will be located over the pedestrian path through 24 Craig Street to allow public pedestrian access not only to the car park but also to the Steele Creek Reserve. It was also resolved that Council would seek planning approval for the car park.

2.2 Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history has been identified for the land.

2.3 Planning Policies and Decision Guidelines

Planning Policy Framework

Clause 11.01-1R1 Settlement – Metropolitan Melbourne

Clause 12 Environmental and Landscape Values
Clause 13  Environmental Risks and Amenity
Clause 15  Built Environment and Heritage
Clause 18  Transport

Local Planning Policy Framework
Clause 21.01  Municipal Profile
Clause 21.02  Key Issues and Influences
Clause 21.03  Vision
Clause 21.09  Transport

Zoning
Clause 32.08  General Residential Zone
Clause 37.03  Urban Floodway Zone

Overlays
Clause 44.04  Land Subject to Inundation Overlay

Particular and General Provisions
Clause 52.06  Car Parking
Clause 62  General Exemptions
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

2.4 Referrals
The following external referrals were undertaken:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Referrals</th>
<th>Comments/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AusNet (Electricity)</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following internal referrals were undertaken:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Referrals</th>
<th>Comments/Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transport Unit</td>
<td>No objections, subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Engineering (Drainage) Unit</td>
<td>No objection, subject to standard drainage conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 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. As a result, one objection was received from the following property:

- 23 Spring Street, Niddrie

The objections raised are discussed at Section 3.4 of this report.

2.6 Consultation Meeting
In accordance with the Statutory Planning Protocols, no Consultation Meeting was held as there were less than 10 objections received.

3. Discussion

3.1 Does the proposed use 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 surrounding area is generally used for public open space with residential properties surrounding this area. The proposed car park will provide public parking to further activate the Steele Creek reserve area.

The design of the car park limits impacts to existing vegetation within the vicinity by being constructed generally on the area currently used for informal parking. The gravel construction of the car park will maximise the permeability of the site.

The location of the car park is such that it blends into the slope of the site and will not present a visually intrusive form to the reserve.

On this basis, the proposed development is consistent with both State and Local policy directions.

3.2 How will public access to the car park be achieved?

The location of the proposed car park currently lacks access to the public road network and will only be accessible from a private road through the neighbouring development at 24 Craig Street.

As noted in Section 2.1 of this Report, Council has entered into an agreement with the Owners Corporation of 24 Craig Street to create carriageway easements over both the vehicular and pedestrian access within 24 Craig Street to allow public access to both the proposed car park and the Steele Creek Reserve area. Additionally, appropriate signage identifying the location of the public car park will be provided at the entrance to 24 Craig Street.

On this basis, appropriate public access can be provided to the car park to ensure that the use of the land as a car park will be of benefit to the community and increase patronage of the reserve area.
3.3 Does the proposal comply with Clause 52.06 (Car Parking)?

Pursuant to Clause 62.02 (Buildings and Works), the proposed buildings and works associated with the use as a car park are exempt from the need for a planning permit as the buildings and works are estimated to cost less than $1,000,000 and are being carried out by the Municipality.

However, it is considered appropriate to have regard to the design guidelines of Clause 52.06-9 (Car Parking) to ensure that the use is effectively implemented.

The application was referred to Council’s Traffic and Transport Unit who do not object to the proposal, subject to conditions on the permit relating to the gradients of the parking spaces and vehicle access point. Additional comments relating to the use of an unsealed surface have also been raised, however, it is appropriate to maintain the unsealed construction to maximise site permeability and impacts to the existing reserve.

On this basis, it is considered that the proposed car park appropriately addresses the design guidelines of Clause 52.06-9 (Car Parking).

3.4 Objections

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

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of public open space</td>
<td>The proposed car park is for public use and will enhance the usability and access to the surrounding public open space areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of vegetation</td>
<td>It is acknowledged that there will be a loss of existing planted vegetation. However, it is considered that the loss of vegetation will be minimal as the application is formalising the parking area currently located on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a private car park</td>
<td>Refer to Section 2.1 and 3.2 for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impact to Steele Creek</td>
<td>Refer to Section 3.1 for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The car park is not noted within the Steele Creek Master Plan</td>
<td>The car park is not located within the Steele Creek Linear Park Masterplan, however, it is considered that a public car park is appropriate and will promote activation of the reserve area. It is noted that this area is identified for additional planting, which will surround this car park area and the proposed use does not result in unreasonable loss of vegetation in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 impact.

It is considered 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: Advertised Plans (separately circulated) 📄

B: Officer Report and Minutes from 11 December 2018 Ordinary Council Meeting (separately circulated) 📄
10.3 Essendon Fields Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan

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

Directorate: Asset Planning and Strategic Projects

1. Purpose

1.1 To consider the attached Council Response to the Essendon Fields Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan (PDMP).

1.2 The Response outlines the key issues that Council considers require additional consideration by Essendon Airport Pty Ltd (EAPL) the lessee of the Airport land, and next steps.

2. Background

2.1 In accordance with the Airports Act, 1996, Essendon Fields Airport is required to prepare a Master Plan with a 20 year strategic vision. The current Essendon Fields Airport Master Plan must be reviewed this year, and will be established for a period of eight years, above the five years that applied to the current plan. A draft Master Plan for the period 2019 to 2039, is due to be submitted to the Federal Minister by 31 July 2019, by EAPL.

2.2 The Preliminary Draft Master Plan (PDMP) 2019 was released for public comment. The closing date for submissions to the PDMP is 2 July 2019.

2.3 The submission on behalf of Moonee Valley City Council has now been prepared for Council’s consideration and is included in Attachment B.

3. Issues

3.1 The key elements of the Council response includes:

- The impact of the changes to airside (aviation) operations on the amenity of the surrounding area including potential changes to the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) as a result of a proposed introduction of Third Runway at Melbourne Airport. This will ultimately result in a change to the landing and take-off regimes of aircraft at Essendon Fields Airport.

- An outcome will be that many properties (approximately 580 dwellings in the City of Moreland and Moonee Valley) that are not currently impacted by the ANEF will be affected by the ANEF 20-25 noise contour through the life of the Master Plan. An estimated 312 properties currently affected by ANEF contours will be incorporated into a higher ANEF contour. Approximately 1300 dwellings will no longer be affected by the ANEF contours.

- The Master Plan encourages the State, Moonee Valley and Moreland to consider introduction of an Airport Environs Overlay similar to Melbourne Airport. This would assist in managing the impacts of any changes associated with the ANEF outcomes for the surrounding areas.
Subject to further detailed analysis and community engagement, the introduction of an Airport Environ Overlay is supported in principle.

These changes are still some time off given the statutory processes to be undertaken for their implementation, and Council will be in a position to make a formal response at the appropriate time.

The PDMP should identify procedures for addressing key issues such as impacts on existing infrastructure at this strategic planning phase so as to ensure infrastructure needs receive appropriate attention well in advance of development proceeding. A commitment is required to ensure that the surrounding area is not unduly compromised as a result of ongoing development, and that EAPL are responsible for adequate mitigation measures either on, or off site to manage the implications of development. This includes requiring EAPL to fund any drainage infrastructure upgrades external to Essendon Fields Airport to service the Hart Precinct.

In relation to the Ground Transport Plan, the PDMP proposes changes that may potentially have significant impacts on the area surrounding the airport and wider transport network. This includes the addition of new internal loop roads that create the opportunity for through flow traffic movements, and potentially providing access to the surrounding local street network including Lebanon Street and Arvon Road.

Council does not support future additional access points to the surrounding areas to Essendon Fields, and seeks to have further discussions with EAPL in relation to traffic generation, management and mitigation measures.

The need for further investment in public transport in the Essendon Fields Airport/Airport West area.

The need for detailed discussions with the Commonwealth Government in advance of any planning and decision making being commenced for the development or disposal of vacant land, including sites used for Public Open Space in Strathmore. Some of the sites should formally be provided at no cost to Council as public open space rather than being developed for alternative uses.

The PDMP whilst noting employment opportunities closer to home for many local residents, should be expanded to specifically include disadvantaged communities. Recognising the economic importance of the Essendon Fields Airport, Council aims to work with EAPL to identify ways whereby more Moonee Valley residents are employed at Essendon Fields Airport.

Recommendation
That Council resolves to:

a. Endorse the attached “Essendon Fields Airport Preliminary Draft Master Plan 2019, Moonee Valley City Council – Submission”.
b. Seek further meetings with Essendon Airport Pty Ltd to discuss key aspects of the Preliminary Draft Master Plan, prior to the preparation of the final draft Master Plan including their approach to community engagement and public communication.

c. Write to:
   - The Hon. Jacinta Allan MP, Victorian Minister for Transport Infrastructure and
   - The Hon. Ben Carroll MP Member for Niddrie,
   - Mr Danny Pearson MP Member for Essendon.
Seeking greater commitment to public transport provision to service Essendon Fields Airport and the surrounding area and the separation of Bell Street traffic from the east bound Bulla Road off ramp.

d. Write to:
   - The Hon. Michael McCormack MP Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and Regional Development,
   - The Hon. Lily D’Ambrosio MP Minister for Energy, Environment and Climate Change,
   - The Hon. Ben Carroll MP Member for Niddrie,
   - Mr Danny Pearson MP Member for Essendon.
Seeking a meeting to discuss the use of vacant sites in Strathmore currently owned by the Commonwealth Government and leased to EAPL, for public open space.

Attachments
A: Impact Assessment
B: MVCC Submission (separately circulated)
Impact assessment

This impact assessment has been carried out on the Council submission to the Essendon Fields Airport Master Plan 2019 - Preliminary Draft (PDMP)

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 (Yanoninon Maggoolee, which means “travel here” in Woi wurrung language), and Beautiful (Nga-Ango Gunga) objective ‘Growth and Development is Well Managed’.
   1.2 The Implementation Initiatives within MV2040 includes:
      • (39) investigate the potential application of the Airport Environ Overlay.

2. Legislative obligations
   2.1 The nature of the Report is for use as Council’s submission to the PDMP that Essendon Airport Pty Ltd (EAPL) has been required to undertake as part of its statutory obligations under Commonwealth Legislation. There is no statutory obligation for Council to respond, however Council has responded in a similar manner to earlier Master Plans.

3. Legal implications

4. Risks
   4.1 No key risks have been identified in the preparation of this report, beyond those outlined within the body of the Council submission.

5. Social impact assessment
   5.1 A detailed Social Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report. However, should any major development applications be proposed throughout the life of the Master Plans, EAPL will be required to fulfill their statutory obligations under the Airport Act, 1996 in particular aircraft noise and traffic flow.

6. Economic impact assessment
   6.1 A detailed Economic Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report. However, should any major development applications be proposed throughout the life of the Master Plans, EAPL will be required to fulfill their statutory obligations under the Airport Act, 1996 Section 91(ga) (ii) and (iii).
7. Environmental impact assessment
   7.1 A detailed Environmental Impact Assessment has not been undertaken as part of the Report. However, should any major development applications be proposed throughout the life of the Master Plans, EAPL will be required to fulfil their statutory obligations under the Airport Act, 1996 including Section 91 (1) (h).

8. Reputational impact assessment
   8.1 Council has consistently advocated for best practice management to be in place of the management of Essendon Fields Airport.
   8.2 By undertaking a high level assessment of the matters raised within the PDMP, Council continues to meet its stated objective of facilitating the continued growth and development of Essendon Fields Airport as an employment and economic hub.

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 Essendon Fields Airport Pty Ltd.
    12.2 Essendon Fields Airport Pty Ltd has notified the community surrounding the Airport by undertaking letter box drops.
    12.3 There has been no engagement with the wider community to date in relation to the attached report by Council. Correspondence directly to Council has been considered in finalising Council's submission.
10.4 Response to Maribyrnong Road Joint Resident Letter - Unsafe Section of Maribyrnong Road

Author: Anna Psarras - Coordinator Transport Management
Directorate: Planning and Development

1. Purpose

1.1 To provide a response to a joint resident letter tabled at Council’s Ordinary Meeting on 14 May 2019, regarding pedestrian safety and public transport issues along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road.

2. Background

2.1 A joint letter (signed by 22 people) from residents of Maribyrnong Road was tabled at Council’s Ordinary Meeting on 14 May 2019.

2.2 The letter raised the following pedestrian safety and public transport issues and requested a response:

2.2.1 The unsafe section of Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road.

2.2.2 The number of occasions members of the community have nearly been hit by speeding motorists while crossing at intersections in the area.

2.2.3 The area becoming highly used by pedestrians enjoying Maribyrnong River, with four tram stops and two bus stops used by commuters and visitors.

2.3 The joint resident letter recommends the following changes and improvements along Maribyrnong Road:

2.3.1 Reduce the speed limit on Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River to Epsom Road to 40km/h or 50km/h.

2.3.2 Change traffic light settings at the corner of Maribyrnong Road and Epsom Road turning right inbound towards the city, so the right turning arrow for vehicles is red when the pedestrian light is green; also make the same change at the corner of Maribyrnong Road and Orford Street inbound, when motorists are turning left.

2.3.3 Improve the pedestrian signage at all three intersections including the pedestrian crossing at Maribyrnong River, the corner of Orford Street and the corner of Epsom Road.

2.3.4 Improve signage and marking at the four tram stops and two bus stops in this area.

2.4 The joint resident letter also notes the community’s:

2.4.1 Concern for safety along this section of Maribyrnong Road.

2.4.2 Support the above recommendations.
2.4.3 Concern if nothing is done to address the road conditions in this area a pedestrian will be struck by a motorist.

3. **Issues**

3.1 Council Officers have undertaken a site inspection and assessed the pedestrian safety and public transport issues along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road.

3.2 A response to the pedestrian safety and public transport issues identified in the joint resident letter is presented in **Attachment B**.

3.3 Maribyrnong Road is classified as a major arterial road and it falls under the responsibility of VicRoads. Therefore, the pedestrian safety issues will be referred to VicRoads for review and assessment and for a response to be provided to the organiser of the joint resident letter.

3.4 Issues related to the bus stops and tram stops also fall under the responsibility of VicRoads, Public Transport Victoria and Yarra Trams. Therefore, this matter will also be referred to Public Transport Victoria and Yarra Trams for review and assessment and for a response to be provided to the organiser of the joint resident letter.

**Recommendation**

That Council resolves to:

a. **Write to VicRoads** and request that the pedestrian safety and public transport concerns raised by residents along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road, are reviewed and addressed, with a direct response provided to the organiser of the joint resident letter.

b. **Write to Public Transport Victoria and Yarra Trams** and request the issues related to the bus stops and tram stops raised by the residents of Maribyrnong Road are reviewed and addressed, and a direct response provided to the organiser of the joint resident letter.

c. Advise the organiser of the joint resident letter of Council’s actions and response on this matter.

**Attachments**

A: Impact Assessment
B: Council Officer's Response to Joint Letter Recommendations (separately circulated)
Impact assessment

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 (Yananinnon Maggoolee, which means ‘travel here’ in Woi wurrung language), including the following:
      1.1.1 STRATEGIC DIRECTION 10: A city where sustainable transport is the easy option
      1.1.2 STRATEGIC DIRECTION 11: A city with streets and spaces for people
   1.2 This report also relates to Council’s resolution at the Ordinary Meeting on 14 May 2019.

2. Legislative obligations
   2.1 There are no legislative or Human Rights implications associated with the recommendation of this report.

3. Legal implications
   3.1 There are no legal implications associated with the recommendation of this report.

4. Risks
   4.1 No significant risks have been identified. The recommendation of this report will refer concerns raised to the appropriate bodies in order to address community concerns regarding pedestrian safety and public transport issues along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road.

5. Social impact assessment
   5.1 The recommendation of this report will address community concerns regarding pedestrian safety and public transport issues along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road.

6. Economic impact assessment
   6.1 The nature of this report does not have any economic development implications.

7. Environmental impact assessment
   7.1 The nature of this report does not have any environmental implications.

8. Reputational impact assessment
   8.1 The recommendation of this report supports Council’s reputation as a responsible road manager.
9. Financial implications

9.1 There are no financial implications as a result of this report.

10. Sensitivity / scenario analysis

10.1 No significant variables or externalities relating to the recommendation of this report have been identified.

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 Council Officers will engage with VicRoads, Public Transport Victoria and Yarra Trams to ensure pedestrian safety and public transport issues along Maribyrnong Road, between Maribyrnong River and Epsom Road are reviewed and assessed, with a direct response provided to the organiser of the joint letter.
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>Strategic Briefing held on Tuesday 21 May 2019 at 7.10pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Matters considered | 1. Long term capital works plan  
2. Long term financial plan  
3. Introducing MV2040 to the Planning Scheme  
4. Riverside Ball Protection Fencing  
5. Service Planning Update  
6. Review of the draft agenda for the Ordinary Meeting to be held 28 May 2019 |

| Councillors present | Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)  
Cr Samantha Byrne  
Cr Jim Cusack  
Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici  
Cr Richard Lawrence  
Cr Nicole Marshall |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apologies: Crs Sipek, Nation and Surace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Staff present | Bryan Lancaster  
Steven Lambert  
Kendrea Pope  
Gil Richardson  
Jessie Keating  
Allison Watt  
Kate Heissenbuttel  
Kate McCaughey  
Jim Karabinis  
Damian Hogan  
Nikhil Aggarwal  
Morgan Brown  
Jesmond Camilleri  
Carey Patterson  
Nicole Brooks  
Leanne Wilson  
Edward Elliott |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| Conflict of interest | Nil |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly</th>
<th>Budget Submission Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 28 May 2019 at 6.00pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matters considered</td>
<td>Budget Submissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Councillors present | Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)  
Cr Samantha Byrne  
Cr Jim Cusack  
Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici  
Cr Richard Lawrence  
Cr Nicole Marshall  
Cr Andrea Surace |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apologies: Cr Sipek and Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### Ordinary Council Meeting pre-meet held on Tuesday 28 May 2019 at 6.00pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre

#### Matters considered
- Ordinary Council Meeting agenda 28 May 2019

#### Councillors present
- Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)
- Cr Samantha Byrne
- Cr Jim Cusack
- Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici
- Cr Richard Lawrence
- Cr Nicole Marshall
- Cr Andrea Surace

#### Apologies
- Cr Sipek and Nation

#### Staff present
- Kendrea Pope (Acting CEO)
- Steven Lambert
- Natalie Reiter
- Gil Richardson
- Allison Watt
- Damian Hogan
- Cindy Edwards

#### Conflict of interest
- Nil.

### Strategic Briefing held on Tuesday 4 June 2019 at 6.04pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre

#### Matters considered
1. 2019/2020 Budget and Capital Works Plan
2. Service Planning
3. Essendon Fields Master Plan
4. East West Link
5. Review of the draft agenda for the OCM 11 June 2019

#### Councillors present
- Cr John Sipek (Deputy Mayor)
- Cr Samantha Byrne
- Cr Jim Cusack
- Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici
- Cr Nicole Marshall
- Cr Andrea Surace

#### Apologies
- Crs Sharpe, Nation and Lawrence

#### Staff present
- Kendrea Pope (Acting CEO)
- Steven Lambert
- Gil Richardson
- Allison Watt
- Jessie Keating
- Damian Hogan
- Maria Weiss
- Kate Heissenbuttel
- Cindy Edwards

#### Conflict of interest
- Nil.

### Ordinary Council Meeting pre-meet held on Tuesday 11 June 2019 at 6.00pm. Committee Room, Civic Centre

#### Matters considered
- Ordinary Council Meeting agenda 11 June 2019
Councillors present

Cr Narelle Sharpe (Mayor)
Cr John Sipek (Deputy Mayor)
Cr Samantha Byrne
Cr Rebecca Gauci Maurici
Cr Richard Lawrence
Cr Cam Nation
Cr Andrea Surace

Staff present

Kendrea Pope (Acting CEO)
Steven Lambert
Allison Watt
Gil Richardson
Jessie Keating
Maddison Majer

Conflict of interest

Nil.

Attachments

Nil
NOTICES OF MOTION

11.1 Notice of Motion No. 2017 - Pedestrian crossings in Essendon North

From: Councillor Rebecca Gauci Maurici

Take notice that at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 25 June 2019 it is my intention to move:

That Council resolves that a report is brought back to Council with regard to traffic and pedestrian safety in Essendon North Village which identifies:

a) Particular areas or points of concern which have been raised through LATM studies and feedback from the community

b) Work already undertaken or scheduled to be undertaken in the area and timelines

c) Advocacy previously undertaken in this area (details of form taken, to whom and dates)

d) Further potential advocacy to address items of concern

e) Any other relevant matters.

Officer Comments

The Notice of Motion is supported.

The report officers will prepare will provide information gathered by the Fletcher, St Therese and North Essendon Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) studies including improvements undertaken to date and completion timeframes for the balance of the improvements identified within the studies.

The report officers will prepare will identify areas of concerns raised by the community together with advocacy undertaken to date together with recommendations for the future.

Recent advocacy undertaken included writing to the State Member for Essendon, Mr Danny Pearson MP, State Member for Niddrie, The Hon Ben Carroll MP, Minister for Transport Infrastructure, The Hon Jacinta Allan MP and Minister for Roads and Minister for Road Safety and the TAC, The Hon Jaala Pulford MLC requesting their acknowledgment of the unacceptable state of the North Essendon junction and requesting that they take immediate action to address the safety concerns at this location.
11.2 Notice of Motion Report No. 2019/18 Flemington Hub

From: Councillor Andrea Surace

Take notice that at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 25 June 2019 it is my intention to move:

That Council resolves to write to local State and Federal Members of Parliament noting:

- Council's resolution of 11 June 2019 to adopt the Council Budget 2019-20, Strategic Resource Plan 2020-23 and Long-Term Capital Works Plan to 2044-45, including the adjustment made to funding for the Flemington Community Hub project;

- That the Flemington Community Hub project remains a top priority for Council and is vital to the Flemington community and surrounds;

- That the impacts of restrictions such as rate-capping are such that we require the support of partners in order to be able to achieve all of the major goals we have on behalf of the Moonee Valley community;

- That as per the Advocacy Strategy 2018-21, Council is seeking a contribution of $20 million from external partners to help fund the Flemington Community Hub project.

- That we renew our calls on the State Government to partner with us in funding a new Community Hub for Flemington.

Officer Comments

The Notice of Motion is supported and is consistent with Council's endorsed advocacy efforts in relation to this project.