



MELTON CITY COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the
Melton City Council**

20 August 2018

**THESE MINUTES CONTAIN REPORTS DEALT WITH AT A
CLOSED MEETING OF COUNCIL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	OPENING PRAYER AND RECONCILIATION STATEMENT	5
2.	APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE	5
3.	CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS	5
4.	DEPUTATIONS	6
5.	DECLARATION OF ANY PECUNIARY INTEREST, OTHER INTEREST OR CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF ANY COUNCILLOR	6
6.	ADOPTION AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	6
7.	RECORD OF ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS	7
	7.1 RECORD OF ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 80A(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1989	7
8.	CORRESPONDENCE INWARD	8
	8.1 PARLIAMENTARIAN AND DEPARTMENTAL LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE MAYOR	8
9.	PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS	9
10.	RESUMPTION OF DEBATE OR OTHER BUSINESS CARRIED OVER FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	9
11.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	9
	15.4 NOTICE OF MOTION 574 (CR RAMSEY)	12
	15.5 NOTICE OF MOTION 575 (CR ABBOUSHI)	12

12.	PRESENTATION OF STAFF REPORTS	13
12.1	AUTHORISING THE AFFIXING OF THE COMMON SEAL OF COUNCIL For Council to adopt the schedule of documents requiring the Common Seal of Council.	13
12.2	ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL - AGGREGATED MEETING MINUTES To present the aggregated minutes of Advisory Committee meetings yet to be considered by Council.	15
12.3	JWS SATISFACTION SURVEY AND METROPOLIS HOUSEHOLD SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS 2018 To present to Council the results of the JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 and the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018.	18
12.4	DIGGERS REST RECREATION RESERVE SPORTS LIGHTING FUNDING To inform Council of the recent announcement by Sport and Recreation Victoria of the successful funding application under the Country Football Netball grant program for Diggers Rest Recreation Reserve Sports lighting project.	24
12.5	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION 538 - INVESTIGATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING OPTIONS AROUND THE KOROROIT CREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL To respond to Notice of Motion 538 (Cr Abboushi) in relation to investigating additional car parking options around Kororoit Creek Primary School.	27
12.6	RESPONSE TO PETITION - WYLIE CIRCUIT AND FORREST STREET, BURNSIDE HEIGHTS PARKING RESTRICTION SIGNAGE To respond to the petition presented at the 28 May 2018 Ordinary Meeting of Council requesting Council to reconsider their decision of parking restriction signage implementation in Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street and investigate an alternative solution that is amicable to both residents and road users.	31
12.7	RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION 546 - INVESTIGATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING OPTIONS AROUND TAYLORS HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL To respond to Notice of Motion 546 (Cr Carli) in relation to investigating additional car parking options around Taylors Hill Primary School.	35
12.8	AMENDMENT C200 - MUNICIPAL STRATEGIC STATEMENT (MSS) To consider submissions received to Planning Scheme Amendment C200 to the Melton Planning Scheme during the exhibition period.	39

12.9	METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT FORUM - MEMBERSHIP	49
	To consider membership of the Metropolitan Transport Forum and highlight the benefits and costs to Council.	
12.10	PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2017/5767/1 - RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AND REMOVAL OF NATIVE VEGETATION AT 44-50 AND 64-74 OLD CALDER HIGHWAY, DIGGERS REST	52
	To consider and determine the above planning application.	
12.11	PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2018/6021 - DEVELOPMENT OF FOUR DOUBLE-STOREY DWELLINGS AT 15 EMPRESS WAY, MELTON WEST	59
	To consider and determine the above planning application.	
12.12	PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2018/6088/1 - USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF A CAMPING AND CARAVAN PARK AND ASSOCIATED NATIVE VEGETATION REMOVAL AT 1376 -1432 CALDER HIGHWAY, DIGGERS REST	65
	To consider a planning permit application for the use and development of a camping and caravan park and associated native vegetation removal.	
12.13	CONTRACT No. 18/012 - PROVISION OF STREET SWEEPING SERVICES	71
	To seek Council's approval for the award of Contract No. 18/012 for the Provision of Street Sweeping Services commencing 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2024 with an option for a further two year extension at Council's discretion.	
12.14	LEASE OF COUNCIL LAND - ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION	74
	For Council to make a decision in relation to offering Powercor Australia Ltd a lease for the purposes of an electrical substation at part of a Council Reserve located at 132 Bridge Road, Strathulloh.	
13.	REPORTS FROM DELEGATES APPOINTED TO OTHER BODIES	76
14.	COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	76
15.	NOTICES OF MOTION	77
15.1	NOTICE OF MOTION 571 (CR ABOUSHI)	77
15.2	NOTICE OF MOTION 572 (CR CARLI)	78
15.3	NOTICE OF MOTION 573 (CR RAMSEY)	79

15.6	NOTICE OF MOTION 576 (CR CARLI)	80
15.7	NOTICE OF MOTION 577 (CR CARLI)	81
15.8	NOTICE OF MOTION 578 (CR TURNER)	82
16.	COUNCILLOR'S QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	83
17.	MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	83
18.	URGENT BUSINESS	83
19.	CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS	84
19.1	CONTRACT No 12/002 - PROVISION OF RECYCLING RECEIPT AND PROCESSING	85
	To update Council on the outcomes of negotiations with the contractor (Visy Recycling Contract) in relation to variation of Contract for Provision of Recycling Receipt and Processing.	
20.	CLOSE OF BUSINESS	88

MELTON CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE MELTON CITY COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC CENTRE, 232 HIGH STREET, MELTON ON 20 AUGUST 2018 AT 7.00PM

Present:

Cr B Turner (Mayor)
Cr K Hardy (Deputy Mayor)
Cr S Abboushi
Cr L Carli
Cr M Mendes
Cr S Ramsey

Mr K Tori, Chief Executive Officer
Mr P Bean, General Manager Corporate Services
Ms C Cramer, Acting General Manager Community Services
Mr L Shannon, General Manager Planning and Development
Mr S Finlay, Acting Manager Planning Services
Ms LJ Mellan, Manager City Design, Strategy and Environment
Ms C Denyer, Manager Legal and Governance
Mr J Whitfield, Governance Coordinator
Ms E Haley, Communications Coordinator

1. OPENING PRAYER AND RECONCILIATION STATEMENT

The Mayor, Cr Turner read the opening prayer and reconciliation statement.

2. APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr M De Santis, Cr G Kesic and Cr K Majdlik.

3. CHANGES TO THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

Procedural Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That Item 15.4, 'Notice of Motion 574 (Cr Ramsey)' and Item 15.5 'Notice of Motion 575 (Cr Abboushi)', be heard immediately before Item 12.1 in the 'Presentation of Staff Reports'.

That Item 13, 'Reports from Delegates Appointed to Other Bodies' and Item 14, 'Councillor Representation and Acknowledgements' be combined with Councillors having up to 3 minutes and the Mayor up to 5 minutes to give their reports.

CARRIED

4. DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

5. DECLARATION OF ANY PECUNIARY INTEREST, OTHER INTEREST OR CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF ANY COUNCILLOR

Nil.

6. ADOPTION AND CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 23 July 2018 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

7. RECORD OF ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS

7.1 RECORD OF ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 80A(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1989

- 23 July 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
- 30 July 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
- 6 August 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
- 13 August 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Record of Assembly of Councillors dated 23 & 30 July 2018 and 6 & 13 August 2018, attached to this Agenda be received and noted.

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Carli.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. 23 July 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
2. 30 July 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
3. 6 August 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors
4. 13 August 2018 Record of Assembly of Councillors

8. CORRESPONDENCE INWARD

8.1 PARLIAMENTARIAN AND DEPARTMENTAL LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE MAYOR

- The Hon Luke Donnellan MP – Minister for Roads and Safety & Minister for Ports – Melton Highway and Leakes Road Intersection.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Parliamentarian and Departmental letters received by the Mayor be received and noted.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Correspondence Inwards - Hon Luke Donnellan MP - dated 13 July 2018

9. PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS

Nil.

10. RESUMPTION OF DEBATE OR OTHER BUSINESS CARRIED OVER FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

Nil.

11. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Name	Question asked of Council
David O'Connor	<p>Given the recent high winds throughout Victoria, building materials have become strewn along Plumpton and Diggers Rest Coimadai Road in Diggers Rest.</p> <p>These materials, in particular the polystyrene blocks, pose an extreme risk to passing motorists, farm animals and wildlife.</p> <p>Ultimately, in the result of an injury or death, who is responsible and what measures could Council undertake to minimise the potential risk in the event that this may happen again?</p>
David O'Connor	Would Council please confirm that a tavern site in the Bloomdale Estate has recently settled and is close to the planning application stage?
REDACTED	In order to address the unavailability of car parking including public car parking around the Kororoit Primary School precinct, can Melton Council review opportunities to increase car spaces on the undeveloped area of land on the corner of Millport and Tenterfield Drive?
REDACTED	Would the Council consider a 3-way funding arrangement with Kings, the DET and Council to develop car parking on the land at the corner of Millport and Tenterfield Drive or would it prefer to self fund?
Ralf Schumann	<p>Re community consultation Melbourne Islamic Centre project in Harkness Road.</p> <p>Will the Mayor please explain why Councillors failed to comply with their own guidelines concerning community engagement and consultation, in particular with reference to council's Community Engagement Policy V2.0 (June 2015) and Community Engagement Guidelines (June 2015)?</p>
Ralf Schumann	Will Mr Shannon please state how many staff members (full-time equivalent) currently work in the Melton Planning Department?

Name	Question asked of Council
	<i>[A second part to this question was disallowed under the prescribed terms of the Council's Meeting Procedure Local Law 2013 as the Mayor determined it to be inappropriate because it was objectionable in substance.]</i>
Colin Seabrook	<p>Re: Planning Application PA 2017/5728- Use and development for a place of worship at 171-197 Harkness Road, Harkness.</p> <p>I have presented to the Councillors copies of the objections and the Planning Report (Appendix 5 to Minutes of Council Meeting 30 April 2018). Will Council reinstate these 198 objections as part of the community consultations?</p>
Colin Seabrook	<p>Re: Planning Application PA 2017/5728- Use and development for a place of worship at 171-197 Harkness Road, Harkness.</p> <p>With the recent call by Council for public consultation in the Melton Star Weekly closing on 28 April, will the submissions (198 objections referred to above) be subjected to the same biased and flawed process, or should this matter now be referred to Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission (IBAC)?</p>

Two questions were submitted by Mr Joseph Sciusco. Mr Sciusco was not in the public gallery. As Section 6.9(e)(i) of the Meeting Procedure Local Law 2013 requires the person submitting the question to be in the gallery for the question to be read, the Chief Executive Officer advised the meeting that Mr Sciusco will receive a written reply to both of his questions.

Mr Mario Cachia submitted three items on Question Registration Forms. Mr Cachia was in the gallery and advised the meeting that these were not questions but rather submissions to a panel process. As such, they were not read out.

Item 15.4 was brought forward pursuant to an earlier resolution.

15.4 NOTICE OF MOTION 574 (CR RAMSEY)

Councillor: Sophie Ramsey - Councillor

NOTICE:

That Council formally rescind the resolution of Council, adopted at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 23 July 2018 at item 12.7 - Response to Notice of Motion 566 – City Vista Sports Project.

The Chief Executive Officer drew to the attention of the Mayor and the meeting that under the provisions of Council's Meeting Procedure Local Law 2013 this item cannot be dealt with at this meeting of Council. It is a requirement of that local law that for a Rescission Motion to be considered, there must be at least an equal number of Councillors present in the chamber that were present when the resolution of Council was adopted.

There were seven Councillors present at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 23 July 2018 when the substantive motion in question was adopted by Council and there are only six Councillors present at the Ordinary Meeting of Council of 20 August 2018.

He advised that this matter must lay on the table until the next Ordinary Meeting of Council at which there is an equal or greater number of Councillors present compared to that in attendance at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 23 July 2018.

Item 15.5 was brought forward pursuant to an earlier resolution.

15.5 NOTICE OF MOTION 575 (CR ABBOUSHI)

Councillor: Steve Abboushi - Councillor

NOTICE:

That Council officers, in consultation with existing users, explore options to extend the Brookside Pavilion to:

1. Provide additional space to cater for a current high volume of users, and
2. Plan for an expected growth in the number of users in the future

and that a report with recommendations and options be brought back to Council.

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Mendes.

That Council officers, in consultation with existing users, explore options to extend the Brookside Pavilion to:

1. Provide additional space to cater for a current high volume of users, and
2. Plan for an expected growth in the number of users in the future

and that a report with recommendations and options be brought back to Council.

CARRIED

Cr Ramsey called for a division thereby setting aside the vote.

For:

Crs Abboushi, Carli, Hardy, Mendes, Ramsey and Turner

Against:

Nil

The Mayor declared the Motion CARRIED

Procedural Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendations as printed in Items 12.1, 12.2 and 12.9 be adopted en bloc.

CARRIED

12. PRESENTATION OF STAFF REPORTS

12.1 AUTHORISING THE AFFIXING OF THE COMMON SEAL OF COUNCIL

Author: Rebecca Bartlett - Acting Governance Officer

Presenter: Kel Tori - Chief Executive Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

For Council to adopt the schedule of documents requiring the Common Seal of Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council Seal be affixed to the documentation as detailed in the Schedule for Authorising of Affixing of the Common Seal of Melton City Council dated 20 August 2018.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

Documents requiring the Common Seal to be affixed are detailed in **Appendix 1**.

2. Background/Issues

Use of the Council Seal is required where Council, as a body corporate, executes a document.

The *Local Government Act 1989* (s.5(2) and (3)) prescribes that a Council must have a common seal, and that the common seal must –

- a. bear the name of the Council (which name may refer to the inhabitants of the municipal district) and any other word, letter, sign or device the Council determines should be included
- b. be kept at the Council office
- c. be used in accordance with the local laws of the Council.

Council's Meeting Procedure Local Law (2013) prescribes the use of Council's Common Seal and the authorised officers who must be present and sign every document to which the common seal is affixed.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

5. A high performing organisation demonstrating leadership and advocacy: An organisation operating with innovation, transparency, accountability and sustainability .

5.3 Effective civic leadership, advocacy, partnerships and good governance.

4. Financial Considerations

There are no financial considerations relating to the use of the Council Seal.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

Not applicable.

6. Risk Analysis

Ensuring that the Council Seal is only affixed in accordance with a resolution of Council controls the potential risk of the Seal being incorrectly affixed to a document.

7. Options

Not applicable.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Authorising and Affixing the Common Seal of Council - dated 20 August 2018

12.2 ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL - AGGREGATED MEETING MINUTES

Author: Rebecca Bartlett - Acting Governance Officer
Presenter: Kel Tori - Chief Executive Officer

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the aggregated minutes of Advisory Committee meetings yet to be considered by Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. note the minutes of Advisory Committee meetings at **Appendix 1**.
2. adopt recommendations arising within the Minutes.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

In accordance with section 3(1) of the *Local Government Act* 1989 (the Act), Council may establish a) Advisory Committees for the purpose of providing advice, or b) Special Committees which are delegated powers, duties or functions of Council. The establishment of an Audit Committee, considered an Advisory Committee of Council, is dealt with under section 139 of the Act.

A Council appointed Advisory Committee meeting where at least one Councillor attends and which considers matters that are intended or likely to be the subject to a decision of Council, is considered an assembly of Councillors. In accordance with section 80A of the Act, a written record of an assembly of Councillors must, as soon as practicable, be reported at an ordinary meeting of the Council. The minutes of the Advisory Committees attached to this report forms the written record of the assembly detailing matters considered and any Councillor conflicts disclosed.

2. Background/Issues

Advisory Committees are established by a resolution of Council. The role of an Advisory Committee, including the limits of power, are clearly defined in the Terms of Reference adopted by Council.

The membership of Committees will vary depending upon its specific role. Committee membership will generally comprise a Councillor/s, council staff and community

representatives and may include key stakeholders, subject matter experts and/or community service providers and organisations.

Councillor representation on Advisory Committees is generally for one year and is reviewed annually at the Statutory Meeting of Council. Councillor representation on current Council Committees and to other organisations for 2018 were adopted by Council at the Ordinary Meeting held 13 November 2017.

Advisory Committees meet regularly during the year and minutes of all meetings are scheduled to be presented at the next Ordinary Meeting of Council.

Advisory Committee Meetings minutes attached to this report for Council acknowledgement and endorsement:

Meeting Date	Advisory Committee	Attached
20 July 2018	Preventing Family Violence Advisory Committee	Appendix 1

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

2. A Well Governed and Leading Organisation: Operating with innovation, transparency, accountability and sustainability

2.3 Facilitate community engagement in planning and decision making.

4. Financial Considerations

Advisory Committees are not responsible for operational expenditure and cannot direct Council officers to act without the consent of Council. Operational expenses and administrative actions arising from an Advisory Committee meeting are accommodated within Council's recurrent budgets, unless otherwise requested within the minutes of the meeting and detailed in a recommendation to Council for consideration.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

Advisory Committees are one method of Council consulting and communicating with the community. Such a Committee may be established to provide strategic level input into a broad area of Council operations, such as community safety or arts and culture. An Advisory Committee may also be established for a specific time-limited project, such as a review of a Local Law.

6. Risk Analysis

With a mandatory responsibility to report to Council and restricted to making recommendations for Council consideration, risks attached to Advisory Committee actions are substantially mitigated.

It is prudent for Council to carefully consider any and all recommendations arising from Advisory Committee minutes, as Advisory Committees may canvass significant issues and significant expenditure in their deliberations.

7. Options

Advisory Committees are a Committee of Council, therefore Council has the discretion to accept, reject, amend or seek further information on any of the Committee minutes and/or recommendations.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Preventing Family Violence Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes - dated 20 July 2018

12.3 JWS SATISFACTION SURVEY AND METROPOLIS HOUSEHOLD SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS 2018

Author: Michelle Rowe - Social Planning Officer
Presenter: Coral Crameri - Manager Community Care

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present to Council the results of the JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 and the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the results of the JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 at **Appendix 1** and the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018 at **Appendix 2**.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Mendes.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

Each year Council commissions surveys of the community to determine levels of satisfaction with Council's performance across a number of indicators, and to identify issues that the community wish to prioritise for Council attention and advocacy.

This report presents to Council the key findings of two surveys, (1) the State Government initiated JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 and (2) the Council initiated Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018, and explains the key differences in the results reported between the two survey approaches.

The results of the JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 are attached as **Appendix 1** and the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey results for 2018 attached as **Appendix 2**.

It is important to note that based on the different methodologies and reporting structures, the numerical figures in the two surveys cannot be compared and need to be considered independently.

2. Background/Issues

JWS SATISFACTION SURVEY

The State Government, through Local Government Victoria, conducts a state-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey on behalf of Victorian Local Government Authorities. Local Government Victoria contracts JWS Research to conduct the survey on behalf of subscribing Councils.

Melton City Council currently elected to participate in the JWS Survey again this year. In 2018 a total of 64 of the 79 local governments elected to participate in the survey, which provides a broad database of results from which Council can benchmark performance.

Survey Methodology

The JWS Satisfaction Survey is conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18 years and above within the City of Melton. This survey involved calling residents between Monday and Friday, and included 400 completed individual interviews between 1 February and 30 March 2018.

Key JWS Satisfaction Survey Findings

Results from the JWS Satisfaction Survey (**Appendix 1**) are presented as scores out of 100. Key findings as detailed in the JWS Satisfaction Survey 2018 are:

- Melton Council has improved across all performance measures, with significant improvement in four areas compared to Melton's results in 2017.
- **Council's performance remained the strongest** over the last 12 months, on two core performance measures 'Sealed Local Roads' (63) and 'Customer Service' (73) with both scores being higher than the State and Interface Council group of scores.
- The **overall performance** index of 61 is higher than the State score (59) and one point higher than the Interface score of (60).
- Council performance on **advocacy**, at a score of 58 is observably higher than the State and Interface scores, both being 54.
- **Making community decisions**, at a score of 61, was notably higher than both the Interface score (56) and the State score (54).
- Performance on **Overall Council Direction** at 59, was also significantly higher than both the Interface (53) and State (52) scores.

The below table provides a summary of the JWS Satisfaction Survey results from 2013 to 2018 and includes comparisons with the Interface Council's and State scores for 2018 (note index scores out of 100):

Performance Measures	MCC 2013	MCC 2014	MCC 2015	MCC 2016	MCC 2017	MCC 2018	Inter* 2018	State 2018
Overall Performance	58	59	63	61	59	61	60	59
Community Consultation (Community consultation and engagement)	55	55	59	54	55	59	56	55
Advocacy (Lobbying on behalf of the community)	52	53	58	56	54	58	54	54
Making Community Decisions (Decisions made in the interest of the community)	n/a	57	60	56	55	60	56	54
Sealed Local Roads (Condition of sealed local roads)	n/a	n/a	62	64	62	63	57	53
Customer Service	67	73	70	72	68	73	70	70
Overall Council Direction	54	57	57	56	54	59	53	52

*In 2018, participating Interface Councils included Cardinia, Casey, Mornington Peninsula, Whittlesea and Yarra Ranges

Whilst Sealed Local Roads returned the second highest score of Melton's performance measures, it also was the area most identified as requiring improvement (15%). Other areas identified as requiring improvement were Public Safety (8%) and Traffic Management (7%).

METROPOLIS HOUSEHOLD SATISFACTION SURVEY

The Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey is commissioned by Council, and has been conducted since 2014. The 2015 and 2016 survey results established a high baseline for community satisfaction within the City of Melton. While the 2017 overall satisfaction rating was slightly down when compared to 2016, Council's overall performance returned to trend this year.

The results include satisfaction ratings on performance and core services, as well as 'community opinion and experiences' in relation to a number of topics. Topics include; preferred communication methods; perceptions of public safety; and satisfaction with Council governance and services. Municipal results are presented, and have been benchmarked against the western region and metropolitan Melbourne averages.

Survey Methodology

The Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey is conducted as a door-to-door interview style and involved 800 households across nine precincts between May and July 2018. Trained interviewers conducted the 20 minute face to face surveys during daylight hours on weekends.

The differences in survey methodology used by Metropolis is believed to account for some variation in the results reported by the two different surveys.

It is important to note that based on the different methodologies and reporting structures, the numerical figures in the two surveys cannot be compared and need to be considered independently.

Key Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey Findings

Results from the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey (Appendix II) are presented as scores out of 10. Compared to the 2017 results, key findings as detailed in the Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018 are:

- **Overall satisfaction** - increased 9.3 per cent this year to 7.12 (rated as 'good'), which reversed the unusually large decline recorded last year, and importantly returns satisfaction to a longer-term trend of increasing satisfaction. Since 2015, overall satisfaction has increased 4.1 per cent. The 2018 result of 7.12 is the second highest overall score of the eight participating Councils in 2017 and 2018 (Monash LGA was the highest with 7.44).
- **Governance and leadership** - as a group increased 12.3 per cent in 2018, again reversing the unusually large decline last year. With the exception of the score recorded last year, satisfaction with governance and leadership has been relatively stable at or around seven out of ten (rated as 'good').
- **Customer service** - as a group increased 6.1 per cent this year, which also reversed the unusually large decline on 2017. With the exception of last year, satisfaction with customer service has been relatively stable at or around eight out of ten (rated as 'excellent').
- **Planning and development** - as a group was 7.02 out of ten this year. With new variables included this year, a simple percentage change from last year is not possible. Satisfaction with the four included aspects last year was 6.51, or measurably lower than this year. Planning and development is not a significant issue in the City of Melton - satisfaction is rated 'good' and less than two percent of

respondents raised these as issues to address this year (the metropolitan Melbourne average was 10.9% in 2017).

- **Council services and facilities** - average satisfaction with the 39 included services and facilities declined 4 per cent this year, although it remains 'very good'. The small decline this year is explained by the four new services added to the survey questions this year, where two of these were a slightly lower than average and two were a slightly higher than average.
- **Higher and lower satisfaction with services** - the services and facilities with measurably higher than average satisfaction were regular garbage collection, regular recycling, green waste collection, and the library service. The services and facilities with measurably lower than average satisfaction were parking enforcement, sealed local roads, footpaths, local traffic management, and public toilets. This is consistent with previous years and is a well-established and expected set of results.
- **Improvements in satisfaction with services and facilities** - there were substantial improvements in satisfaction with *Moving Ahead* (up 8.0%), footpaths (up 7.7%), local traffic management (up 6.2%), street trees (up 6.2%), provision of community events (up 5.9%), litter collection in public areas (up 4.2%), and parking enforcement (up 3.9%).
- **Decreases in satisfaction with services and facilities** - there was a decline (but not statistically significant) in satisfaction with services for young people (down 13.1%), services for seniors (down 11.1%), health services for babies, infants, and toddlers (down 8.0%), services and programs for children (down 8.0%), community / neighbourhood houses (down 6.6%), sports grounds and associated facilities (down 6.1%), and services for people with disability (down 5.0%). Despite these small declines all of these services are rated as 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent'. Because of the smaller sample size of users of these services, they tend to be much more volatile than the core services, so as a result there is no concern with the minor decline this year, given the results are still mostly in the 'very good' to 'excellent' range.
- **Issues to address in the City of Melton** - traffic management (25.0% down from 26.5%) and safety, policing and crime issues (19.8% down from 31.8%) were the top two issues again this year. Safety, policing and crime issues have improved significantly this year, although still represent around twice the number of issues for Council than they did in 2016. Consequently, Safety, policing and crime issues continue to exert a mildly negative influence on overall satisfaction with Council, although this is nowhere near as strong an influence as it exerted last year.
- With traffic management not exerting a significant negative influence on overall satisfaction with Council, this suggests that residents are aware of the limitations of Council in fixing these metropolitan traffic congestion issues.
- **Safety at night in the City of Melton** - the perception of safety in the public areas of the City of Melton increased this year, after falling substantially last year (up from 5.33 to 5.64), although it is still well below the result from 2016 of 6.36. Safety across the board improved a little this year, recovering some but not all of the declines recorded last year. Safety from crime is still a very significant issue for many in the community, particularly in Melton West.
- **Issues exerting a negative influence on overall satisfaction** - three issues appear to have exerted a significant negative influence on overall satisfaction this year; road maintenance and repairs, parks and gardens, and street trees. It is important to bear in mind that only around 50 to 60 respondents (from the total of 800) identified each of these three issues, but this small group of respondents for each issue were measurably less satisfied with Council's overall performance than the average.

- **Reasons for dissatisfaction with Council's overall performance** - There were no stand-out issues in the 2018 responses, with a number of respondents mentioning a lack of communication / consultation, a few mentioned rates / spending money, and a few mentioned governance related issues. These comments are consistent and reflect well established trends, within and across the local government sector.

Key Indicator	2015	2016	2017	2018
Overall Satisfaction	6.84	6.92	6.51	7.12
Community (& Leisure)*	7.88	7.93	7.88	7.40 (7.51)
Waste management	7.94	7.85	7.77	7.77
Communications	7.28	7.57	7.09	7.27
Local Laws	7.21	7.22	7.05	7.25
Infrastructure	7.16	7.18	6.79	7.01

* Community facilities were split from recreation and leisure facilities this year, as this new grouping more accurately reflects service operations.

SUMMARY

The JWS Satisfaction Survey results indicate that Council is performing comparatively well overall when measured against both State and Interface Council scores.

The Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey results are also pleasing in an overall sense, with overall satisfaction this year reverting to the previously high levels experienced in 2016 and prior.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.1 A City that strategically plans for growth and development.

4. Financial Considerations

The cost of the survey was budgeted for within Council's annual recurrent budget.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

The JWS and Metropolis Surveys are a form of community consultation, and represent Council's ongoing commitment to engaging with the community to improve performance and service delivery.

6. Risk Analysis

There are no risks identified in receiving the results of the JWS and Metropolis Surveys.

7. Options

Council has the option to endorse the recommendation of the report.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. JWS Satisfaction Survey - dated 2018
2. Metropolis Household Satisfaction Survey 2018 - dated August 2018

12.4 DIGGERS REST RECREATION RESERVE SPORTS LIGHTING FUNDING

Author: Nicole Willis - Recreation Development Officer
Presenter: Coral Crameri - Acting General Manager Community Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform Council of the recent announcement by Sport and Recreation Victoria of the successful funding application under the Country Football Netball grant program for Diggers Rest Recreation Reserve Sports lighting project.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the funding received from the State Government toward the Diggers Rest Sports ground Lighting Project, and that works will begin on this project in December 2018, for anticipated completion date before the commencement of the 2019 Football season.

Motion

Crs Carli/Mendes.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

The Sport and Recreation Victoria Country Football Netball Program provides funding to assist Council to support country football and netball clubs to develop community facilities. The program funds projects to improve change amenities, upgrade playing surfaces and develop or upgrade lighting to facilitate increased participation opportunities in community football and netball programs

The Diggers Rest Recreation Reserve Oval number 1 has a sportsground lighting system that does not meet minimum standards for training impacting the community ability to facilitate participation and growth opportunities in football and netball.

The Diggers Rest Recreation Reserve lighting system was identified in Council's sportsground lighting upgrade program as a priority for upgrade in 2018/19. Officers submitted a successful grant application to the Sport and Recreation Victoria Country Football Netball program securing \$100,000 toward the project. The project will upgrade lightning infrastructure on oval 1 up to competition standard that will improve player safety during training and allow night matches to be scheduled growing the participation opportunities available at this site.

The grant funding was announced at a launch on 19 July 2018 at the Diggers Reset Recreation Reserve and project is planned for commencement in December 2018.

2. Background/Issues

The Diggers Rest Recreation Reserve is home to the Diggers Rest Senior and Junior Football Netball Clubs, Diggers Rest Senior and Junior Cricket Club and Diggers Rest

Tennis Club along with an Auskick centre. With the suburb experiencing significant growth, clubs are experiencing an increase in participation numbers and is expected to continue over the next 5 years. However, current oval lightning infrastructure is inhibiting the clubs ability to develop existing players and attract new players. It should be noted this is the only recreation reserve in Diggers Rest.

The lighting system was identified in Council's sportsground lighting upgrade program as a priority for upgrade in 2018/19 as it does not meet current AFL guidelines or the minimum Australian standard for training. The project will include removal of non - compliant lighting infrastructure from oval 1 with the installation of compliant lux levels for training and competition. This will ensure the sportsground is safe for use at all times and support the clubs to increase program opportunities and program training more efficiently.

Officers submitted a successful grant application to the Sport and Recreation Victoria Country Football Netball program securing \$100,000 (maximum grant funding available) toward the project.

The grant funding was announced at a launch on 19 July 2018 at the Diggers Reset Recreation Reserve and project is planned for commencement in December 2018.

A pretender estimate provided by a quantity surveyor indicated the total cost of the project to be \$186,000 plus GST. Council currently has allocated in the 2018/19 budget \$84,000 to contribute to the project. When combined with the \$100,000 grant funding received provides a \$184,000 budget for this project. There is also a \$10,000 contingency factored into the pretender estimate.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.2 Community facilities, infrastructure and services that are equitably planned for, provided and maintained.

4. Financial Considerations

Total cost of the project has been estimated pretender at \$186,000 plus GST. There is a \$10,000 contingency factored into the pretender estimate.

Funding received of \$100,000 and Council commitment of \$84,000.

The funding agreement with the State Government requires any overrun in the project to be underwritten by Council.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

As part of developing the project for a grant funding submission, engagement was undertaken with the following key stakeholders:

- Diggers Rest Senior Football Netball Club
- Diggers Rest Junior Football Netball Club
- Diggers Rest Auskick
- AFL Victoria
- AFL Goldfields
- Sport and Recreation Victoria

6. Risk Analysis

If latent conditions not identified in the quantity surveyor pretender estimate became apparent, Council would be at risk of exceeding the allocated budget.

7. Options

Council has options to:

1. Accept the recommendation of the report
2. Not proceed with the project and return the funding to Sport and Recreation Victoria.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Nil

12.5 RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION 538 - INVESTIGATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING OPTIONS AROUND THE KOROROIT CREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Author: Kerry Walton - Coordinator Traffic and Transport
Presenter: Luke Shannon - General Manager Planning & Development

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To respond to Notice of Motion 538 (Cr Abboushi) in relation to investigating additional car parking options around Kororoit Creek Primary School.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council;

1. Continues to manage the on street car parking within the existing road network through education and enforcement.
2. Further liaise with the school and educate the school community on where car parking can be found and provide the school via the development of a parking brochure and map and work on promoting alternate modes of travel to the school.
3. Note that the Masterplan for Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve provides for an additional 40 space car park.

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Mendes.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

At its ordinary meeting of Council held on 5 March 2018 Council resolved via a Notice of Motion 538;

'That Council officers investigate additional parking options around the Kororoit Creek Primary School area and report to Council.

Kororoit Primary School is a government primary school located in Burnside Heights with a school population of 1178 students with 72 teaching and 43 administration staff members accordingly to latest data obtained from the myschool.edu.au database for Australian Schools.

The current parking arrangements have been inspected at the peak period and analysed to determine how the car parking has been used by the school community.

The Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve has been included in the assessment as the car park is available for use during school drop off and pick up times.

The results of the of the parking investigation indicate that of the total 560 available car spaces within the road network and the recreation reserve, 425 were occupied leaving approximately 135 available car spaces unused which are located within a short walking distance.

Options to include additional car parking facilities for the school are confined as Council owned land is limited to the Burnside Recreation Reserve opposite the school. The Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve Master Plan includes the provision of a car park that will provide an additional 40 spaces adjacent to Freelands Drive, and will be available for use by the school community.

2. Background/Issues

Kororoit Primary School

Kororoit Primary School is a government primary school located in Burnside Heights with a school population of 1178 students with 72 teaching and 43 administrative staff members.

The school is located adjacent a Kings Swim Centre and the Kororoit Creek Early Learning Centre and opposite the Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve. The below table indicates the car parking provision for each facility.

Parking arrangement	Number of Spaces
Kings Swim Centre	44 (including 1 disabled space)
Early Learning Centre	24 (including 1 disabled space , 2 MCHH)
Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve	118
Kororoit Creek Primary School	71
Kerb side parking within 300m of	442
Total Number of Spaces	699

A map identifying the car parking provided in the vicinity of Kororoit Creek Primary School is provided in **Appendix 1**:

Car Parking Analysis

Like all schools in the municipality, the peak parking time is the afternoon period where parents/caregivers arrive to collect their children and seek to park as close as possible to the school gate(s).

The current parking arrangements have been inspected at the peak period and analysed to determine how the car parking has been used by the school community. For the purpose of the analysis the Kings Swim Centre Car Park and the Early Learning Centre car park are considered to be 100% occupied as parking in these areas are associated with their business operation. The school car parks have also been omitted as they are not accessible by the public and provided for staff use only.

The Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve Car Park has been included as the car park is available for use during the afternoon school pick up times.

A summary of available parking is provided below and map showing locations is provided in **Appendix 1**.

Car parking location	Available parking spaces (<300m distance)	Parking Occupancy (no. of spaces used)	No. of unoccupied spaces
On Street	442	325	117
Recreation reserve car parks	118	100	18
Total	560	425	135

The results indicate that of the total 560 car spaces within the road network and the recreation reserve only 425 were occupied leaving approximately 135 available car spaces unused which are located within a short walking distance. Also at the time of the surveys 8 car spaces in Leichhardt Avenue were occupied by construction activities along with 20 car spaces at the recreation reserve also as a result of construction activities which would otherwise be available.

Based on the above analysis it is considered that there is sufficient parking availability to cater for the current school population which are located within 300m (5 minute walking time).

Additional Parking Options

The Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve is located opposite the school on the south side of Tenterfield Drive. This reserve is owned and managed by Council and provides the only opportunity to support additional car parking for the school.

The Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve Master Plan (**Appendix 2**) includes the construction of a car park that will provide an additional 40 spaces adjacent to Freelands Drive and will be available for use by the school community. This is included in the Capital Works Program for 2019/2020.

As shown on the Masterplan, the reserve is surrounded by indigenous grasslands which restricts the opportunity to extend parking in those areas. Should Council seek to include more car parking in the reserve it would be at the expense of recreation facilities.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.2 Community facilities, infrastructure and services that are equitably planned for, provided and maintained.

4. Financial Considerations

Nil

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

Nil

6. Risk Analysis

Option 1

The risk of adopting Option 1 is minimal as it is expected that parents/ caregivers seeking to park around a school do so by parking within available public car parks and surrounding road network.

Option 2

Any additional car parking at the Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve would be at the expense of sporting facilities which have been strategically planned for the community which spreads wider than the immediate school community.

This would also have a capital expenditure cost for the design and delivery of additional car parking spaces and may impact the delivery of other sporting infrastructure.

7. Options

Option 1 – Do Nothing. Parking to continue to utilise existing car parks and surrounding road network.

Council to further liaise with the school and educate the school community on where car parking can be found and provide the school via the development of a parking brochure and map and work on promoting alternate modes of travel to the school to reduce parking demand.

Option 2 – Revise the Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve Masterplan to include more car parking spaces in addition to the 40 spaces proposed which are in the Capital Works Program for 2019/2020 financial year for delivery. The cost of this option is unknown at this stage as it is dependent on how many car spaces would be provided to service the school and the cost of removing sporting facilities at the reserve to accommodate the additional parking.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Car parking locations and survey data results - undated
2. Burnside Heights Recreation Reserve Masterplan - dated September 2012

12.6 RESPONSE TO PETITION - WYLIE CIRCUIT AND FORREST STREET, BURNSIDE HEIGHTS PARKING RESTRICTION SIGNAGE

Author: Kerry Walton - Coordinator Traffic and Transport
Presenter: Luke Shannon - General Manager Planning & Development

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To respond to the petition presented at the 28 May 2018 Ordinary Meeting of Council requesting Council to reconsider their decision of parking restriction signage implementation in Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street and investigate an alternative solution that is amicable to both residents and road users.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council reinstate the parking restrictions as per the original proposal.
2. That the lead signatory on the petition be advised of Council's decision.

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Ramsey.

That the recommendation be adopted.

Procedural Motion

Crs Abboushi/Ramsey.

That the Motion be withdrawn with the leave of the Council.

CARRIED

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Hardy.

That the status quo remain; no parking restrictions in Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

At the 28 May 2018 Ordinary Meeting of Council a petition with 44 signatures was tabled seeking Council to overturn the decision of parking restrictions installed in Wylie Circuit and Forrest Streets, Burnside Heights and come up with an alternative solution that is amicable to both residents and road users.

The concerns raised in the petition have been investigated and on site surveys conducted during peak times. Based on the site survey results and the consultation that was undertaken prior to the parking restriction signage being installed, officers recommend that signage be reinstated to improve access to properties, improve the safety of vehicles travelling through the streets, and improve access for emergency vehicles and pedestrians walking in the area.

2. Background/Issues

In November 2017 Council received an enquiry from a resident within the street expressing that traffic from the nearby school are parking such that causes difficulty for residents to enter and exit their properties. Council officers investigated the streets during the school times and noted that vehicles were parking on both sides of the road making it difficult to travel down the road as well as restricting residential access due to parking too close to vehicle driveways. The issues observed were not dissimilar to many other residential streets around schools where Council's approach to improve the road network has involved the installation of parking restrictions.

Correspondence to residents within Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street provided background relating to traffic concerns during school times, with a proposal to install parking restrictions on one side of the street to alleviate residents' concerns. A copy of this letter is provided at **Appendix 1**.

Following the consultation period, a total of 22 responses was received. These are summarised as follows:

Consultation question	Responses received
I do not support the proposed parking restrictions along Forrest Street and Wylie Circuit in Burnside Heights;	7
I do support the proposed parking restrictions along Forrest Street and Wylie Circuit in Burnside Heights, with no stopping signs during school hours, from 8:00am to 9:30am and 2:30pm to 4:00pm on school days on the north and west side of Wylie Circuit and the east side of Forrest Street.	15

The above results indicated that 68% of respondents supported the parking restrictions proposed. Further to this, a review of the responses in context of the proposed signage revealed 5 residents opposing the restrictions were not affected by the proposal (ie. parking in front of their property would be retained) and therefore not subject to the restrictions. Given this, letters were distributed to residents advising the outcome and confirming that signs would be installed to improve safety in the area.

A plan showing the location of parking restrictions is provided at **Appendix 2**. The plan also illustrates where unrestricted parking would be retained.

Following the installation of signs, a petition of approximately 44 signatures was tabled at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held 28 May 2018.

The petition followed the recent installation of parking restriction signage on Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street in Burnside Heights following a community consultation process. The signage has since been removed due to vandalism and subsequent outcome of this petition.

The petition calls for Melton City Council to overturn the decision of parking restrictions in Wylie Circuit and Forrest Street and come up with alternative solutions, amicable to both residents and road users. Residents' concerns include;

- The belief there will be a decrease in property value

- The loss of one (1) on street car space per property without restrictions, as per council overlay on our initial purchase of property
- That the Council has misled residents through the vague notification and statement that residents would not be affected by final decision

In response to the petition it is considered that the parking restrictions would unlikely affect a house property value as on street parking is still available in the street. Furthermore, properties along these street have double garages and driveways that can accommodate an additional 1- 2 vehicles.

With respect to point two, there is no Council overlay that states each property has an allowance of at least 1 on street car space without restrictions. The following is an extract from Councils Website:

“Generally our local road network will provide sufficient space to allow at least 1 on street car space per property for use by visitors however this may not always be directly in front of the property. In the instance visitor parking is not available in front of the property visitors may need to park further down the road and walk to their destination.”

As noted above the on street parking is primary use is for visitor parking and in some instances may not be available directly adjacent to the property.

The petition also states the notification letters were misleading and vague. The letters clearly stated the intent relating to parking restrictions, the streets to which the restrictions would apply, the side of the road the restrictions applied to and noted there will be no parking exemptions to residents and their visitors.

Following receipt of the petition, officers completed a further investigation and inspected the streets in the morning and afternoon prior to the parking restriction times. Whilst there were some properties affected by the parking restrictions, there was adequate parking within the road carriageway in the vicinity of their properties.

The concerns raised in the petition have been investigated and on site surveys conducted during peak times. Based on the site survey results and the consultation that was undertaken prior to the parking restriction signage being installed, officers recommend that signage be reinstated to improve access to properties, improve the safety of vehicles travelling through the streets, and improve access for emergency vehicles and pedestrians walking in the area.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way
 - 3.4 *A flexible, safe and health promoting transport network that enables people to move around.*

4. Financial Considerations

There will be a cost of approximately \$650 to reinstall the signage.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

The submitted petition was signed by 44 residents.

The petition states ‘We, the undersigned residents of Burnside Heights, hereby petition Melton City Council to overturn decision of parking restrictions in our streets and come up with alternative solutions, amicable to both residents and road users. This is due to:

- The belief there will be a decrease in our property value
- We are losing our allowance of at least 1 on street car space per property without restrictions, as per council overlay on our initial purchase property
- That council has mislead residence through a vague notification and statement that Residence would not be affected by final decision.'

Council's decision regarding this petition will be communicated to the petition facilitator.

If Option 1 is adopted, the residents in the street will be notified of the outcome in accordance with the normal consultation process.

6. Risk Analysis

Option 1 – The risk of retaining the original proposal of parking restrictions is that the residents who signed the petition would not be fully satisfied despite the road having more than sufficient parking opportunities to park unrestricted within their street.

Option 2 – The risk is as per Option 1 however residents would be able to park unrestricted in the morning period.

Option 3 – The risk is that vehicles would continue to park on both sides of the street which impacts the ability to safely travel through the street particularly for emergency vehicles such as Ambulance and Fire Brigade. Vehicles would continue to park such that restricts access to residential properties and/ or park on the nature strip causing damage to which the residents would be required to amend.

7. Options

Council has a range of options for consideration.

Option 1 - reinstate the parking restrictions as per original proposal.

Option 2 – amend the parking restriction times to the afternoon period only.

Option 3 – remove the parking restrictions entirely from Wylie circuit and Forrest Streets.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Initial resident consultation letters -dated 12 January 2018
2. Wylie Circuit Locality Map and Parking Restrictions - undated

12.7 RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF MOTION 546 - INVESTIGATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING OPTIONS AROUND TAYLORS HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Author: Kerry Walton - Coordinator Traffic and Transport
Presenter: Luke Shannon - General Manager Planning & Development

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To respond to Notice of Motion 546 (Cr Carli) in relation to investigating additional car parking options around Taylors Hill Primary School.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the car parking options available in the vicinity of Taylors Hill Primary School, and prepare a parking management brochure for use by the school indicating where available parking exists in the surrounding road network.

Motion

Crs Carli/Mendes.

1. That Council note the car parking options available in the vicinity of Taylors Hill Primary School, and prepare a parking management brochure for use by the school indicating where available parking exists in the surrounding road network.
2. That a report be brought back to Council on Option 2; to consider additional car parking facilities within the Bloomsbury Drive Reserve with the report to include the number of car parking spaces that can be made at this location and the cost of providing the additional car parking spaces

CARRIED

Cr Carli called for a division thereby setting aside the vote.

For:

Crs Abboushi, Carli, Hardy, Mendes, Ramsey and Turner

Against:

Nil

The Mayor declared the Motion CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

At its ordinary meeting of Council held on 26 March 2018 Council resolved via a Notice of Motion 546;

'That Council officers investigate additional parking options around Taylors Hill Primary School, Taylors Hill.'

Taylors Hill Primary School is a government primary school located in Taylors Hill with a school population of 838 students with 52 teaching and 28 administration staff members.

The school is located adjacent a YMCA Early Learning Centre and has a car park comprising approximately 59 car spaces for their staff. Further to this, the surrounding road network provides 421 car spaces within a 400m walking distance (approximate 5 – 6 minute walk).

The current parking arrangements have been inspected during the peak period and analysed to determine and where additional car parking options are available.

Based on an analysis of available car parking within the Taylors Hill Primary School vicinity, of the 421 car spaces available there is a current parking demand of 64 spaces. Given this, there is adequate parking available for use by the school community.

2. Background/Issues

Taylors Hill Primary School

Taylors Hill Primary School is a government primary school located in Taylors Hill with a school population of 838 students with 52 teaching and 28 administration staff members.

The school is located adjacent a YMCA Early Learning Centre. The below table indicates the car parking provision for each facility.

Parking arrangement	Number of Spaces
Early Learning Centre	19 (including 1 disabled space)
Taylors Hill Primary School - formal car park	35
Taylors Hill Primary School - informal car park	24
Kerb side parking within 400m of	421
Total Number of Spaces	499

A map showing the car parking and occupancy is provided in the vicinity of Taylors Hill Primary School is provided in **Appendix 1**:

Car Parking Analysis

Like all schools in the municipality the peak parking time is the afternoon period where parents/caregivers arrive to collect their children and seek to park as close as possible to the school gate(s). For the analysis we considered parking within 400m is appropriate as this equates to a walking time approximately 5-6 minute walk.

The current parking arrangements have been inspected at the peak period and analysed to determine how the car parking has been used by the school community. For the purpose of the analysis the Early Learning Centre car park are considered to be 100% occupied as parking in these areas are associated with their business operation. The school car parks have also been omitted as they are not accessible by the public as they are provided for staff use only.

A summary of available parking is provided below.

Car parking location	Available parking spaces (<400m distance)	Parking Occupancy (no. of spaces used)	No. of unoccupied spaces
On Street	421	207	214

The results indicate that of the total 421 car spaces within the road network only 207 were occupied leaving approximately 214 available car spaces unused which are located within a short walking distance.

Based on the above analysis it is considered that there is sufficient parking availability to cater for the current school population which are located within 400m (5 minute walking time).

Additional Parking Options

The Bloomsbury Drive Reserve is located adjacent the school and Early Learning Centre and comprises approximately 1.27 hectares of open space area, BBQ facilities and children's playground. The reserve is considered a passive recreation reserve for the use of the wider community.

As this is the only Council owned land in the vicinity of the school it would be the only option for Council to consider additional parking for the school however this would be at the expense of recreation facilities and amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way
 - 3.2 *Community facilities, infrastructure and services that are equitably planned for, provided and maintained.*

4. Financial Considerations

Nil

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

Nil

6. Risk Analysis

Option 1

The risk of adopting Option 1 is minimal as it is expected that parents/ caregivers seeking to park around a school do so by parking within available public car parks and surrounding road network.

Option 2

Any additional car parking would be at the expense of recreation facilities which have been strategically planned for the community which spreads wider than the immediate school community.

Additional off street car parks can impact the amenity of the area particularly residents as they would be underutilised outside of the school times and may attract illegal activity, rubbish etc.

This would also have a capital expenditure cost for the design and delivery of additional car parking spaces and may impact the delivery of other sporting infrastructure.

7. Options

Option 1 – Do Nothing. Parking to continue to utilize existing car parks and surrounding road network.

Council to further liaise with the school and educate the school community on where car parking can be found and provide the school via the development of a parking brochure and map and work on promoting alternate modes of travel to the school to reduce parking demand.

Option 2 – Consider additional car parking facilities within the Bloomsbury Drive Reserve. The cost of this option is unknown at this stage as it is dependent on how many car spaces would be provided to service the school and the cost of removing recreation reserve infrastructure at the reserve to accommodate the additional parking.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Car parking provision and occupancy map - undated

12.8 AMENDMENT C200 - MUNICIPAL STRATEGIC STATEMENT (MSS)

Author: Kate Barclay - Senior Strategic Planner

Presenter: Laura-Jo Mellan - Manager City Design, Strategy & Environment

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider submissions received to Planning Scheme Amendment C200 to the Melton Planning Scheme during the exhibition period.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Request the Minister for Planning to establish an independent Planning Panel to consider unresolved submissions received in response to Amendment C200 in accordance with the *Planning & Environment Act 1987*.
2. Authorise the General Manager Planning and Development and the Manager City Design, Strategy and Environment to negotiate and resolve issues that are raised during the Planning Panel process prior to the Amendment being reported back to Council for consideration.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

Amendment C200 seeks to ensure the Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) is consistent with, and is underpinned by the structure and themes at the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) level. The amendment aligns the municipal profile, key issues and influences, vision and strategic framework plan with the *Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021*.

At its ordinary meeting on 24 July 2017, Council resolved to prepare and exhibit Amendment C200 to the Melton Planning Scheme. Following this resolution, Council officers sought authorisation to commence the amendment from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP).

Authorisation was received on 3 April 2018 and the amendment was publicly exhibited from the 17 May 2018 to 16 July 2018. Eight submissions were received (see submissions table at **Appendix 1**).

It is recommended that Council request the Minister for Planning to establish an independent Planning Panel to consider unresolved submissions received in response to Amendment C200 in accordance with the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

2. Background/Issues

Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS)

The MSS provides the policy foundation for the Melton Planning Scheme. The MSS also provides an opportunity for an integrated approach to planning across all areas of Council's operations and should express links to the Council Plan.

The MSS is dynamic and enables community involvement in its ongoing review. The MSS should be continually refined as a planning authority develops and revises its strategic directions in response to the changing needs of the community.

Amendment C200 will deliver a revised and up to date MSS, it will ensure the Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) is consistent with, and is underpinned by the structure and themes at the State planning Policy Framework (SPPF) level. The MSS, municipal profile and vision is aligned with the *Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021* and provides an updated strategic framework plan reflective of the City of Melton in 2018 and beyond.

Legislative Requirements

A planning scheme review must comply with Section 12B of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (the Act) and *Planning Practice Note 32 - Review of Planning Schemes* (Practice Note). Councils are required to undertake a review of their planning scheme every four years. The Practice Note recommends the planning scheme review occur following the review of the Council Plan, and states:

'The review also provides the opportunity to evaluate the planning scheme to ensure it:

- *Is consistent in form and content with any directions or guidelines issued by the Minister under section 7(5) of the Act*
- *Sets out effectively the policy objectives for use and development of land in the area to which the planning scheme applies*
- *Makes effective use of State provisions and local provisions to give effect to State and local planning policy objectives.'*

The Practice Note also states: *'the review is an audit of the performance of the planning scheme at a point of time and will inform the continuous improvement of the planning scheme by addressing ... what has been achieved since the last review.'*

The Act and Practice Note also require a planning scheme to be consistent with the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF), including the metropolitan planning strategy, Plan Melbourne.

The Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF), which includes the MSS, contains land use and development policies adopted by Council. Hierarchically, the content of the LPPF must be consistent with any policies within the SPPF.

Strategic Work to Date

A number of strategies and plans have been prepared to specifically inform the re-write of the MSS as directed by the Minister for Planning. These strategies and plans have been adopted by Council over the last three years and include:

- *City of Melton Environment Plan 2017-2021* (Adopted 24 July 2017)
- *Significant Landscape Features Strategy* (Adopted 2 May 2016)
- *Melton Open Space Plan 2016-2026*, (Adopted 4 April 2016)
- *Moving Melton – Integrated Transport Strategy November 2015*, (Adopted 15 December 2015)
- *House Rules – Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines* (Adopted 13 October 2015)

- *Western Plains North Green Wedge Management Plan September 2014*, (Adopted 23 September 2014)
- *House Smart – Housing Diversity Strategy March 2014*, (Adopted 27 May 2014)
- *Melton Retail and Activity Centres Strategy March 2014*, (Adopted 1 April 2014)

In addition to the abovementioned strategies and plans, work on a range of other strategies, plans and guidelines has also been undertaken as detailed in the *MSS Background Report June 2017*.

Amendment C200

The Amendment proposes to implement the findings of the *Municipal Strategic Statement Rewrite Background Report June 2017*.

It proposes to rewrite and update the Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) by replacing the existing Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS) at Clause 21 of the Melton Planning Scheme with a new MSS to improve its usability and align with the structure and themes of the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF).

The amendment also makes subsequent changes and deletes several local policies at Clause 22 as many of these have been updated and included at Clause 21 consistent with the current recommended structure of the MSS.

The amendment replaces the current LPPF with a new LPPF by:

- Replacing the existing MSS - Clauses 21.00 to 21.05 inclusive with new Clauses 21.01 to 21.12.
- Replacing Clauses: 22.02 to 22.05 and 22.07 to 22.09 with [no content] and incorporating relevant policy into the revised MSS where appropriate.

The revised MSS replaces six existing clauses and inserts an additional six clauses, while the number of local planning policies has been reduced from 12 to five.

The changes to the amendment are summarised in the table below:

Proposed Clause	Old Clause	Key Changes
Clause 21.01 Introduction	Clause 21.00 Municipal Strategic Statement Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014 Clause 21.02 Key Issues in the City Clause 21.03 Planning Visions and Objectives for Melton	Updates the strategic directions of the municipality, key land use issues and includes relevant sections of the <i>Melton Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021</i> .
Clause 21.02 Settlement	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014 Clause 21.03 Planning Visions and Objectives for Melton Clause 21.04 Housing within the Established Residential areas	Incorporates sections of the existing clauses that are still relevant and inserts issues and objectives from recently adopted Council strategies that inform the current direction for settlement within the municipality.

Proposed Clause	Old Clause	Key Changes
Clause 21.03 Environment and Landscape Values	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014 Clause 21.03 Planning Visions and Objectives for Melton	Expands upon the existing Clause 21.01-11 Environment and Landscape Character. It Includes the relevant land use initiatives from the recently adopted City of Melton <i>Environment Plan 2017- 2027</i> and the <i>Significant Landscape Features Strategy May 2016</i> .
Clause 21.04 Environmental Risk	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014	Expands on issues relating to planning for flood and fire events and introduces objectives relating to planning for and mitigating climate change. It Includes the relevant land use initiatives from the recently adopted City of Melton <i>Environment Plan 2017- 2027</i> and the <i>Significant Landscape Features Strategy May 2016</i> .
Clause 21.05 Natural Resource Management	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014	Expands on issues relating to agriculture and supports Clause 13 (Environmental risk) of the State Planning Policy Framework
Clause 21.06 Activity Centre and Retail Provision	Clause 21.05 Activity Centres and Retail Provision	Reformats and rewords the recently adopted Clause that implements the <i>City of Melton Retail and Activity Centres Strategy, March 2014</i> to accord with the format specified in the Practice Note and advice from the Department of Environment Land Water and Planning.
Clause 21.07 Built Environment and Heritage	None	Introduces strategies from the recently adopted <i>Melton Housing Character Assessment Guidelines: Character Statements and Guidelines, September 2015</i> as well as other built form, principles and initiatives. Objectives and Strategies relating to Heritage are also introduced for the first time.
Clause 21.08 Housing	Clause 21.04 Housing within Established Residential Areas	Updates the directions introduced by Council's <i>Housing Diversity Strategy</i> in <i>2014</i> and introduces well-being initiatives relating to harm minimisation and liveability.
Clause 21.09 Economic Development	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014	Updates and expands upon Clause 21.01-6 (Melton's Economic Base) and introduces objectives and strategies relating to Council's <i>Economic Development and Tourism Plan 2014- 2030</i> and other economic initiatives.

Proposed Clause	Old Clause	Key Changes
Clause 21.10 Transport	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014	Introduces Council's integrated Transport Strategy – <i>Moving Melton - Melton Integrated Transport Strategy, November 2015</i>
Clause 21.11 Infrastructure	Clause 21.01 Snapshot of Melton City in 2014	Introduces priorities for the delivery of specific infrastructure in accordance with <i>Melton Advocacy Priorities</i> .
Clause 21.12 Local Areas	Clause 22.09 Eynesbury Station Policy	Deletes the local policy for Eynesbury and updates and includes the planning policy for Eynesbury in the Local Areas Clause, consistent with the current MSS format.
	Clause 22.02 Sustainable Environment	Deletes the Sustainable Environment local policy and incorporates relevant policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.03 Recreation and Open Space Networks	Deletes the Recreation and Open Space Networks local policy and incorporates policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.04 Urban Development	Deletes the Urban Development local policy and incorporates policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.05 Employment	Deletes the Employment local policy incorporates policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.07 Transport and Movement	Deletes the Transport and Movement local policy and incorporates policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.08 Rural Land Use	Deletes the Rural Land Use local policy and incorporates policy into MSS where appropriate. Replace with [no content].
	Clause 22.09 Eynesbury Station Policy	Deletes the local policy for Eynesbury and updates and includes the planning policy for Eynesbury in the Local Areas Clause, consistent with the current MSS format. Replace with [no content].

The exhibited MSS clauses 21.01 to 21.12 included in **Appendix 2** to this report may be subject to further change dependent on the planning panel process as ongoing discussions occur with DELWP, submitters and key stakeholders.

Strategic Assessment

Ministerial Direction No 11 requires amendments to be assessed against a number of guidelines. This strategic assessment has been undertaken and it is considered that the amendment adequately addresses the guidelines for the reasons outlined below.

Melton City Council has recently adopted its 2017-2021 Council Plan, and for the first time has incorporated the Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan into the Plan, known as the *Melton Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021*. This Amendment incorporates key initiatives from this Plan into the MSS.

Council has also undertaken a considerable amount of strategic planning work over the past four years which has resulted in a number strategies, plans and policies being adopted by Council which are required to be implemented into the planning scheme. This Amendment incorporates key initiatives, objectives and directions from these adopted documents into the MSS to provide an appropriate policy framework to guide the future land use and development of the City of Melton.

The Amendment will provide the Melton City Council and the community with an up to date planning scheme that includes relevant recent strategies adopted by Council. It also formats the scheme to accord with the Ministerial Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes, the Practice Note Writing a Municipal Strategic Statement and aligns the themes so they are consistent with the State Planning Policy Framework.

The amendment implements the following objectives as set out in Section 4(1) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* and the *Transport Integration Act 2010* by introducing an up to date planning scheme that is consistent with state policy and provides clear strategic directions for land use and development within the municipality.

The Amendment will deliver positive environmental, social and economic outcomes by updating policies and addressing policy gaps in the current Melton Planning Scheme by integrating policy directions from a range of adopted plans, strategies and guidelines.

As previously discussed, the new MSS is aligned with the *Melton Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021* which provides the basis for a much stronger focus on health and wellbeing in all of Council's initiatives, including the strategic direction of the Melton Planning Scheme.

In addition, key directions from Council's economic development and tourism strategies have been included in the MSS. This will provide specific support for initiatives that generate local employment opportunities and position the municipality as a leading vibrant and diverse place of business and visitor experience.

Overall, the Amendment will ensure that the Melton Planning Scheme provides the framework to achieve positive environmental social and economic development outcomes within the municipality.

The Amendment strengthens local planning policy in respect to bushfire by ensuring development specifically addresses bushfire risk through appropriate design and siting and where possible avoiding new development in areas of high bushfire risk.

The updated local planning policy introduced by this amendment accords with current state government policies and planning initiatives. The MSS structure is now consistent with the structure of the State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF) and closely aligns with the nine themes in the SPPF.

In particular, the Amendment is consistent with Ministerial Direction No. 9 Metropolitan Planning Strategy in that it is consistent with the directions and policies in *Plan Melbourne 2017-2050: Metropolitan Planning Strategy* and will assist in the implementation of the strategy. In particular, the amendment supports the following policies:

- The development of a network of Activity Centres, linked by transport
- An increase in local access to local employment
- Housing choice in locations close to jobs and services
- Social and affordable housing
- An integrated transport system
- A liveable city with quality design and amenity
- Design for healthy and safe communities
- Environmentally Sustainable Development
- Protection of the natural environment.

The amendment introduces a new Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) into the Melton Planning Scheme. It includes Council's recently adopted strategies and deletes references to superseded policies or planning objectives. The structure of the themes closely aligns with the SPPF structure but varies slightly to reflect local issues.

The Amendment provides clearer strategic direction by improving the structure and format of the MSS and addressing current policy gaps. In particular, it includes relevant objectives relating to community wellbeing from the *Melton Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021* in respect to land use and development which is a current priority for Council.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.1 A City that strategically plans for growth and development.

4. Financial Considerations

Council officer time and resources are involved in the preparation, exhibition, and adoption of the amendment. Statutory fees such as those associated with a Planning Panel are required to be borne by Council as the Responsible Authority. Planning scheme amendments and the associated panel costs are budgeted for within the unit's recurrent budget.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

The amendment was on public exhibition from 17 May 2018 to 16 July 2018 and involved the following forms of notification:

Public notices were placed in the local newspapers, the *Melton and Moorabool Star Weekly*, the *Brimbank and Northwest Star Weekly* and the Victorian Government Gazette.

The amendment was also posted on DELWP's and Councils website during the exhibition period.

The adjoining municipalities of Brimbank, Moorabool, Macedon, Wyndham and Hume were also notified of the amendment, in addition letters were sent to prescribed Ministers.

Letters were sent to the following Government Departments and Agencies previously notified of the commencement of the work to update the MSS:

- Victorian Planning Authority
- Telstra
- VicRoads
- Australian Pipelines Association

- Transport for Victoria
- Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning
- VicTrack
- Public Transport Victoria
- Melbourne Airport
- Melbourne Water
- Transport for Victoria
- VicRoads
- Southern Rural Water
- Western Water
- City West Water
- Ausnet
- Citipower & Powercor Australia
- Country Fire Authority
- Downer Utilities Australia Pty Ltd
- Jemena
- Heritage Victoria
- Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources
- Environment Protection Agency Victoria
- Victoria Police – Melton
- Aboriginal Victoria

During the exhibition period community consultation drop in sessions were held across the municipality, these sessions were advertised in the local newspaper as follows:

- 5th June - Caroline Springs
- 12th June - Diggers Rest
- 14th June - Melton

The sessions held across the three locations were well attended by approximately 60 members of the community and provided an opportunity to discuss the changes to the MSS and other recent strategies and plans adopted by council.

Submissions

A total of eight written submissions were received in response to the amendment, a response to the submissions is detailed in **Appendix 1**.

Six of the submissions requested changes to the amendment in some form.

A summary of issues raised through submissions to be considered by the Planning Panel are detailed below:

- Reference should be made to mitigating the potential for land use conflicts with the Parwan Waste Water Treatment Plant.
- Reference should be made to mitigating the potential for future land use conflict in the non-urban areas adjacent the parts of Moorabool identified for future development in Parwan and Hopetoun Park North as part of the Bacchus Marsh Urban Growth Framework.
- Clause 21.01 Municipal Profile, should reference the role of industrial land and industry of state-wide significance. This should include reference to Ravenhall Precinct, Melbourne Regional Landfill, closed Melton landfill, waste water treatment plants, high pressure pipelines and materials recycling.
- Clause 21.01-3.2 Non-Urban Land, could be strengthened with regard to protecting and maintaining separation distances between existing industry and infrastructure to avoid land use conflicts.
- Regional Park boundaries shown on Figure 2 - Strategic Framework Plan are inconsistent with GC99 and should be amended.

- Clause 21.03 Environment and Landscape Values, should be amended to include further strategic work to remove land from the Environment Significant Overlay where no significant environmental factors are demonstrated.
- Melton Landscape – Significant Landscape Features Strategy May 2016 should not be a reference document within Clause 21.03 as it does not display an accurate position of the environmental values of the Kororoit Regional Park area, noted as “*Conservation Areas and Parklands*” within that reference document.
- Clause 21.04-2 Floodplains, should be amended as the two functions of protecting the community from flooding and maintaining environmental process are not exclusive, “where possible and practical for the development” should be added to the two strategies.
- Clause 21.11-2.1 Protection of Infrastructure, should be improved for clarity with respect to the roles of City West Water and Western Water.
- Clause 21.11 Infrastructure, contradicts the State Planning Policy Framework, in that it does not seek a balance between the provision of important telecommunications services and the need to protect the environment from adverse impacts arising from telecommunications infrastructure.
- Clause 21.11 Infrastructure, is not sufficiently linked to an objective or strategy in the MSS, will not help council make a decision, will not help any other person to understand whether a proposal is likely to be supported or not, and is not clear.

Council officers will continue to work through the submissions received with a view to resolving as many submissions as possible prior to the Panel directions hearing scheduled for September 2018.

6. Risk Analysis

Proceeding with an independent Planning Panel, will provide submitters the opportunity to be heard by an independent third party and for Council to present their position on the issues referred to the Panel in accordance with the Planning & Environment Act 1987. The recommendations of the Panel will be reported to Council for consideration.

Council has a statutory obligation to review its planning scheme. Should Council choose to not proceed with Amendment C200 then Council will be continuing to operate with an outdated MSS inconsistent with the recently adopted *Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021* and therefore not meeting a statutory obligation.

In addition, if the amendment to revise the MSS does not proceed, it will result in a number of Council adopted strategies, policies and guidelines not being implemented into the planning scheme as intended.

7. Options

Council can resolve to either:

- a. Request the Minister for Planning to establish an independent Planning Panel to consider unresolved submissions received in response to Amendment C200 in accordance with the *Planning & Environment Act 1987* and authorise the General Manager Planning and Development and the Manager City Design, Strategy and Environment to negotiate and resolve issues that are raised during the Planning Panel process prior to the Amendment being reported back to Council for consideration.
- b. Abandon Amendment C200 to the Melton Planning Scheme.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Submissions Table - undated
2. Exhibited Clauses - undated

12.9 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT FORUM - MEMBERSHIP

Author: Jonathan Liston - Principal Planning Engineer
Presenter: Luke Shannon - General Manager Planning & Development

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider membership of the Metropolitan Transport Forum and highlight the benefits and costs to Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council joins the Metropolitan Transport Forum as a member and commits to regularly attend meetings and provide resources where necessary.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

The Metropolitan Transport Forum (MTF) is a transport interest, information and advocacy group for local governments in metropolitan Melbourne and has been established for 25 years.

The aim of the MTF is to work towards effective, efficient and equitable transport in metropolitan Melbourne by providing a forum for debate, research and policy development, and sharing and disseminating information to improve transport choices.

Joining the MTF as a member Council represents an opportunity for Melton to raise the profile of its key transport-related advocacy items and build relations with local and state government officers.

2. Background/Issues

The Metropolitan Transport Forum (MTF) is a transport interest, information and advocacy group for local governments in metropolitan Melbourne and has been established for 25 years. The MTF works towards effective, efficient and equitable transport in metropolitan Melbourne by providing a forum for debate, research and policy development, and sharing and disseminating information to improve transport choices.

The MTF constitutes 26 metropolitan local governments, along with associated members from across the transport sector as detailed below:

- Bill Chandler Consultancy
- Department of Economic Development (EcoDev) which includes transport
- LeadWest

- Metro Trains
- Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV)
- Public Transport Users Association (PTUA)
- Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA)
- Transdev
- Travellers Aid
- Victoria Local Governance Association
- Victoria Walks
- Yarra Trams

The MTF meets monthly to discuss transport topics of current interest and also distributes information across the sector, hosts events of topical interest, makes submissions to government and conducts research to better inform policy. In addition the MTF fosters relationships with state government agencies to better represent local governments' viewpoint, establish partnerships and improve project delivery.

The MTF has a history of working constructively with the State Government on transport issues and consistently seeks to meet with key personnel in the sector. The MTF also seeks to work constructively and collaborate with other local government groups and pursue areas of shared interest.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.4 A flexible, safe and health promoting transport network that enables people to move around.

4. Financial Considerations

The annual membership cost for Council members is \$1,500. This can be accommodated within the existing Engineering Services budget.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

No public consultation or submission is required to join the MTF.

6. Risk Analysis

Joining the MTF provides a low cost and resource efficient way for Melton to promote its advocacy agenda in regards to transport.

If Council does not proceed with the recommendation to join the MTF then it risks missing out on opportunities to leverage the collaborative benefits associated with the organisation and having a less effective advocacy campaign for its required transport items.

7. Options

Council can either choose to:

- 1) Join the MTF as a member Council and commits to regularly attend meetings and provide resources where necessary.
- 2) Not join the MTF.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Nil

12.10 PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2017/5767/1 - RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AND REMOVAL OF NATIVE VEGETATION AT 44-50 AND 64-74 OLD CALDER HIGHWAY, DIGGERS REST

Author: Simon Temple - Principal Planner

Presenter: Bob Baggio - Manager Planning Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider and determine the above planning application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit subject to the proposed conditions outlined in **Appendix 6** of this report.

Motion

Crs Mendes/Carli.

A: That Council issue a Notice of Refusal for Planning Application PA2017/5767 for the residential subdivision and associated removal of native vegetation on land at 44-50 and 64-74 Old Calder Highway, Diggers Rest on the following grounds:

1. Given the number of allotments proposed and the provision of only a single entry and exit point for the subdivision, this will result in traffic congestion and adverse traffic and pedestrian safety impacts on the locality.
2. Given the number of allotments proposed in the subdivision, the proposal fails to respect or complement the established and preferred neighbourhood character of the area.
3. Given the number of allotments proposed in the subdivision, the proposal is inconsistent with the relevant State and Local Planning Policies relating to Housing, Council's Housing Diversity Strategy and Council's Housing Character Assessment Guidelines.
4. The proposed subdivision represents an overdevelopment of the land.

B: That Council undertake further consultation with the permit applicant and surrounding residents to investigate the possibility of a second, more permanent access point to and from the subdivision.

CARRIED

Cr Mendes called for a division thereby setting aside the vote.

For:

Crs Abboushi, Carli, Hardy, Mendes, Ramsey and Turner

Against:

Nil

The Mayor declared the Motion CARRIED

REPORT**1. Background****Executive Summary**

Applicant:	Veris Australia Pty Ltd
Proposal:	Residential Subdivision and removal of native vegetation
Existing Land Use:	Existing single storey dwelling
Zone:	General Residential (Schedule 1)
Overlays:	Nil
Number of Objections:	Twelve
Key Planning Issues:	Traffic congestion and conflict on Old Calder Highway in proximity to existing railway crossing. Lot size and density inconsistent with the neighbourhood character of the area. Potential flooding impacts from proposed drainage reserve to the adjoining property at 52-62 Old Calder Highway.
Recommendation:	Approve Application

The Land and Surrounding Area

The subject site consists of two separate, adjacent properties that have a combined area of 5.69 hectares and are located on the eastern side of Old Calder Highway in Diggers Rest. Other features of the site are as follows:

- The subject land is irregular in shape, relatively flat and is predominantly vacant with the exception of a single storey dwelling located on 64-74 Old Calder Highway.
- Existing trees are located within the northern portion of 44-50 Old Calder Highway.
- Two existing drainage easements run through the northern parcel (44-50 Old Calder Highway), one running parallel to the railway reserve and the other running north-easterly across this land.
- The subject land is bordered by the Calder Freeway to the north-east and east and the Sunbury railway line (including Diggers Rest Railway Station) to the west.

The surrounding area can be characterised as an existing residential area which is part of the Diggers Rest Township. The only exceptions are an existing single storey brick building occupied by a Café on land between the subject site and land adjacent to the south west corner of the site which contains a single storey building occupied by a Post Office. The adjoining land to the south consists of an established low density residential (Punjel Drive) area comprising single detached dwellings on lots ranging from 2,000 to 5,000 square metres. However, some lots have been subdivided into lots ranging from 1,500 to 2,000 square metres. Land to the immediate north-west consists of vacant land while further north-west contains a recent residential subdivision comprising single detached and semi attached brick dwellings on lots ranging from 300 square metres to 500 square metres. The land to the west (on the other side of the Sunbury railway line) consists of an established residential area comprising single storey detached dwellings including medium density housing.

The subject land is located in proximity to existing community facilities and infrastructure including Diggers Rest Railway Station, Punjel Drive Recreation Reserve, Stan Payne Recreation Reserve, Norm Raven Recreation Reserve and local shops.

Refer to **Appendix 1** for a locality plan.

The Application

The application proposes the residential subdivision of the subject land and removal of associated native vegetation.

The proposal is summarised as follows:

- The subdivision comprises 93 lots (including a designated medium density housing lot) ranging from 301 square metres to 605 square metres with an average lot size of 390 square metres and a density of 17 dwellings per hectare.
- A designated medium density housing site (0.28 hectares) located in the south-east corner of the site adjacent to the existing Punjel Drive Recreation Reserve.
- An internal road network comprising 14-16 metre wide road reserves with access from Old Calder Highway.
- Access for emergency service vehicles via an existing 15.3 metre wide carriageway easement along the southern boundary of the Punjel Drive reserve between the southern boundary of the subject land and Punjel Drive.
- A drainage reserve/retarding basin (1,521 square metres) in the south-west corner of the proposed subdivision.
- Removal of native vegetation in the form of scattered trees and spiny rice flower in accordance with the Metropolitan Strategic Assessment (MSA) and Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (BCS).

Refer to **Appendix 2** for plans of the proposal.

Planning Controls

Zone	(Clause 32.08 – General Residential Zone)	Permit required to subdivide land.
Overlays	Nil	
Particular Provisions	(Clause 52.01 – Public Open Space)	An application to subdivide land must make a contribution to Council for public open space in an amount specified in the schedule to this clause. As no amount is specified in the schedule to this clause, a public open space contribution equivalent to 5 per cent of the value of the land must be provided in the form of open space, a cash contribution or a combination of both.
	(Clause 52.02 – Easements, Restrictions and Reserves)	Permit required to create, vary or remove an easement or restriction under Section 23 of the Subdivision Act 1988.
	(Clause 52.17 – Native Vegetation)	Permit required to destroy, lope or remove native vegetation. Offset requirements are to be made in the form of habitat compensation fees in accordance with the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy (BCS)

A full assessment of the proposal against the relevant State and Local planning policies is included in **Appendix 3**.

Clause 56 – ResCode

Under the requirements of the zone, the subdivision of land must meet the requirements of Clause 56 of the Planning Scheme. Clause 56 requires that a subdivision:

- must meet all of the objectives

- should meet all the standards.

If the Council however is satisfied that an application for an alternative design solution meets the objective, the alternative design solution may be considered.

House Rules - Housing Character Assessment & Design Guidelines

The *Housing Character Assessment & Design Guidelines* as adopted at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 13 October 2015. The site is located within the Compact Suburban 1 character area. The essential components of the CS1 character area which need to be maintained into the future are:

- Limited visual separation between dwellings
- Majority of the front setback used as permeable garden landscape
- Absence of front fencing

The preferred Character Statement requires that as change occurs, space will be provided for more tree planting, so these areas can become greener and leafier, by:

- Retaining sufficient space to grow a canopy tree in the front setback
- Minimising interruption of nature strips by driveways, so that regularly-spaced street tree avenues can be planted or retained).

Is the land affected by a Restrictive Covenant?

The land is not affected by a Restrictive Covenant.

Is the land of Cultural Heritage Sensitivity?

The land is considered to be of cultural heritage sensitivity under the *Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2007*; and an approved cultural heritage management plan (CHMP 15260 has been submitted with the planning application.

2. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way.

3.1 A City that strategically plans for growth and development.

3.1.4 Advocate and support development and availability of diverse and affordable housing options.

3. Financial Considerations

No Council related financial considerations are involved with the application.

4. Consultation/Public Submissions

Public notification of the application

The application was subject to notification. The notification was satisfactorily completed and 12 objections were received.

The grounds of objection may be summarised as follows:

- The proposal will result in traffic congestion and conflicts on Old Calder Highway in proximity to the existing railway crossing.
- The proposal will result in potential flooding to the adjoining property (52-62 Old Calder Highway)

- The proposed lot sizes are inconsistent with the neighbourhood character of the area and do not provide a suitable interface with the adjoining lots to the south of the subject land.
- Lack of public open space provision in the proposed subdivision.
- Loss of privacy and replacement of fencing.

A response to the objections is provided in **Appendix 4**.

Referral of the application

The application was referred to a number of Council Departments for comment and advice. The application was also required to be referred to VicRoads, Country Fire Authority, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP), Downer, Jemena, Melbourne Water, Transport for Victoria and Western Water who are all determining referral authorities in this case. The application was also referred to Melbourne Airport Corporation who are a recommending authority. A complete list of responses is included in **Appendix 5**.

Of particular note is Council's Engineering area who initially raised concerns regarding the conflict of vehicle access points on Old Calder Highway, provision of a right turn lane on Old Calder Highway to enable access to the subdivision from the south-east, ensure that all 'Access Place' roads provide two way access without impacting on-street parked vehicles and clarification on whether waste collection for lots within the subdivision will be by Council's Waste Collection Service or by a private waste collection service.

Of particular note is Council's City Design area who initially raised concerns in relation to the layout of the subdivision and interface with the Calder Freeway and Sunbury rail line, indicative layout and orientation of lots within the nominated medium density sites (A and B), housing typologies for all lots and detailed housing design guidelines for the subdivision.

Council's Environmental Services area advises that the proposed subdivision involves the removal of native vegetation and threatened species habitat which would trigger payment of habitat compensation fees in accordance with the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy for Melbourne's Growth Corridors (2013).

5. Issues

Planning Assessment

The proposed subdivision is considered to be consistent with the State and Local Planning Policy Framework (including Council's Municipal Strategic Statement, Housing within the Established Residential Areas Policy and Housing Diversity Policy) and the purpose of the General Residential Zone in terms of providing housing diversity and choice and increasing residential densities in locations offering good access to services and transport. The subject land is located directly opposite the Diggers Rest Railway Station and well located in relation to local shops, public open space and other community facilities within the Diggers Rest Township.

The layout, orientation and size of lots proposed within the subdivision will enable a diversity of dwelling types (single dwellings and medium density housing) to be accommodated, will complement the established neighbourhood character of the area and provide a suitable interface with the existing low density residential area to the south through the provision of larger lots (500-600 square metres) along the southern boundary of the proposed subdivision.

The proposal is also consistent with Council's Housing Diversity Strategy, Housing in Established Residential Areas Policy, Housing Diversity Policy (Clause 22.12 of the Melton Planning Scheme) and the guidelines for the Compact Suburban 1 character area under Council's Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines.

The proposal generally satisfies the objectives and standards of Res Code under Clause 56 of the Melton Planning Scheme.

A key issue raised by Council's Engineering (Traffic and Transport) area revolves around the proposed vehicle access arrangements from the subject land onto Old Calder Highway and the potential for conflict to occur with the existing vehicle access points to the immediate north and south associated with the existing café (Houdini's) and Post Office. Council's Engineering (Traffic and Transport area) has also recommended that a right turn lane be provided onto Old Calder Highway to enable vehicles to access the subject land from the south-east.

The applicant has submitted a traffic impact assessment report which has concluded that traffic entering and exiting the subject land onto Old Calder Highway will not result in unreasonable delays to vehicles travelling along this road, particularly, when the railway crossing is in operation. A standard T intersection is considered an appropriate treatment with priority afforded to vehicles travelling along Old Calder Highway. As a result, the report states that the proposal will not have any detrimental impacts on the operation of this intersection or the surrounding road network.

The traffic report states that no mitigating works are required on Old Calder Highway as part of the proposed subdivision, however, it acknowledges that a short channelised right turn treatment can be provided at the access point to the subject land. This can be requested as a condition should Council resolve to approve the proposed subdivision.

Council has sought an independent review of the traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicant. The review has found that the internal design of the subdivision meets all relevant requirements and is appropriate from a traffic perspective. The location of the site access point to Old Calder Highway is acceptable subject to the provision of a right turn deceleration lane onto Old Calder Highway as shown on the functional layout plan prepared by the applicant's traffic consultant. This can be addressed as a condition of the permit.

The report recommends the provision of vehicle crossovers between the proposed internal road servicing the subdivision and the existing Houdini's café occupying the adjoining land at 52-62 Old Calder Highway to improve safety. The report also recommends the removal of a section of car parking adjacent to the frontage of Houdini's café to improve driver sight lines.

The provision of additional vehicle crossovers between the proposed internal road servicing the proposed subdivision and Houdini's café could improve vehicle safety and also assist with reducing potential conflict between the existing access point for the café and the access point for the proposed subdivision. This could be addressed as a condition should Council resolve to approve the application.

The section of car parking in front of Houdini's café is located within an existing Council road reserve. It is considered that Council can monitor this car parking area and implement parking restrictions or any other measures (including prohibiting parking altogether) if it is found that it adversely impacts on driver sight lines.

The initial concerns raised by Council's City Design area have generally been addressed by modifications to the layout of the subdivision and internal road network. City Design has requested that an internal loop road be provided all around the proposed subdivision resulting in the loss of two lots and that Lots 61 and 62 are oriented towards the drainage reserve to provide better surveillance.

These changes to the plan of subdivision are not warranted. While a loop road would create a buffer between residential lots and the existing railway line, it will result in lots with a side boundary adjoining this road which is not considered to be a suitable urban design outcome. The re-orientation of Lots 61 and 62 towards the drainage reserve is not warranted as it is unclear how vehicle access could be achieved to these lots if they were to be reoriented, in particular, Lot 62 without creating a battle axe style arrangement which is not considered to be an appropriate outcome.

The other issue raised is the potential for flooding from the proposed drainage reserve to the adjoining property at 52-62 Old Calder Highway. A stormwater management strategy has been prepared and submitted as part of the application. The strategy identifies that the size of the drainage reserve is sufficient to accommodate a wetland/retarding basin to cater for drainage for the proposed subdivision and is unlikely to result in any adverse flooding impacts from stormwater flooding for rainfall events.

The strategy has recommended that a detailed survey of the floor level of the adjoining property (52-62 Old Calder Highway) be undertaken to ensure that the freeboard (100mm) provided for the drainage reserve is sufficient. In the event that a freeboard of 600mm is required, the report recommends that Lot 62 be deleted from the plans to increase the storage capacity of the drainage reserve.

The proposal has been assessed by Council's Engineering (Infrastructure Planning) Department and Melbourne Water. Council's Engineering (Infrastructure Planning) have advised verbally that a freeboard of 600mm will be required. Therefore, the plan of subdivision will need to be amended in accordance with the stormwater management strategy. This can be addressed as a condition should Council resolve to approve the application.

The grounds of objection are acknowledged, however, it is considered that the concerns raised have been adequately addressed or can be adequately addressed through conditions should Council resolve to approve the proposed subdivision.

6. Options

Council can either support the application by issuing a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit or not support the proposal by issuing a Notice of Refusal.

7. Conclusion

The application has been assessed against the State Planning Policy Framework, Local Planning Policy Framework, Zone/Overlay provisions and Clause 65 of the Melton Planning Scheme.

It is considered that the proposal generally complies with the relevant requirements of the Planning Scheme.

Therefore, it is recommended that the application be approved as outlined in **Appendix 6**.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Locality Map - dated 3 August 2018
2. Subdivision Plans - dated 15 February 2018
3. Assessment against Planning Scheme - undated
4. Response to Objections - undated
5. Referral Comments - undated
6. Proposed Conditions - undated

12.11 PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2018/6021 - DEVELOPMENT OF FOUR DOUBLE-STOREY DWELLINGS AT 15 EMPRESS WAY, MELTON WEST

Author: Cam Luong - Development Planner
Presenter: Bob Baggio - Manager Planning Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider and determine the above planning application.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit subject to the proposed conditions outlined in **Appendix 6** of this report.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That Council issue a Notice of Refusal to Grant a Permit for the development of the land with four double-storey dwellings at 15 Empress Way, Melton West on the following grounds:

1. The density and form of the proposed development is excessive and fails to respect or complement the neighbourhood character of the area.
2. The proposal does not satisfactorily address the objectives and standards of Res Code pursuant to Clause 55 of the Melton Planning Scheme, with respect to neighbourhood character.
3. The proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. In particular, the combination of the double-storey building elements, minimal separation between the dwellings, mass and visual bulk of the dwellings creates the impression that the proposed dwellings are being squeezed onto the subject land.

CARRIED

Cr Ramsey called for a division thereby setting aside the vote.

For:

Crs Abboushi, Carli, Hardy, Mendes, Ramsey and Turner

Against:

Nil

The Mayor declared the Motion CARRIED

REPORT**1. Background****Executive Summary**

Applicant:	Luka Mrkonjic Town Planning Services
Proposal:	Four double-storey dwellings
Existing Land Use:	Existing single-storey dwelling
Zone:	General Residential (Schedule 1)
Overlays:	None
Number of Objections:	Nine objections and one petition
Key Planning Issues:	Strategic justification Respect for Neighbourhood Character Off-site amenity impacts Car parking and Traffic
Recommendation:	Approve application

The Land and Surrounding Area

The subject site has an area of 829m² and is located on the south east corner of Empress Way and Odette Place in Melton West. Other features of the site are as follows:

- It is a corner allotment and irregular in shape.
- It contains an existing single storey dwelling located near the front of the site.
- Existing easements are located adjoining the road frontages and southern boundary of the site.

The surrounding area can be characterised as an established residential area with a blend of early 1980's to 2000 housing stock. The area generally displays a mixture of single and double storey housing stock with brick construction. Lots sizes are more generous, with medium setbacks and predominant cul-de-sac arrangements. Allotment sizes are generous lots sizes being between 600 and 900sqm. There are moderate setbacks located throughout, which vary due to the cul-de-sac and curvilinear road pattern.

Refer to **Appendix 1** for a locality plan.

The Application

The application proposes the development of four double-storey dwellings on the land.

The proposed development is summarised as follows:

- The existing dwelling is to be demolished and replaced with the proposed dwellings.
- The dwellings are labelled as Townhouses on the Plans.
- Townhouse 1 is located on the corner and designed to address Odette Place, and Townhouses 2, 3, and 4 have been designed to address Empress Way.
- Each dwelling contains three bedrooms and provided with two car parking spaces (one being in the form of a garage or carport).
- The dwellings have a contemporary design with a range of external wall materials including brick, cladding, and render, with zincalume roofing.
- The development has been designed to provide separation between dwellings on the ground floor.

Refer to **Appendix 2** for plans of the proposal.

Planning Controls

Zone	(Clause 32.08 – General Residential Zone)	Permit required to construct two or more dwellings on a lot
Particular Provisions	(Clause 52.06 – Car Parking)	Two car spaces are required for each dwelling

A full assessment of the proposal against the relevant State and Local planning policies is included in **Appendix 3**.

Clause 55 – ResCode

Under the requirements of the zone, the development of two or more dwellings on a lot must meet the requirements of Clause 55 of the Planning Scheme. Clause 55 requires that a development:

- must meet all of the objectives
- should meet all the standards.

If the Council however is satisfied that an application for an alternative design solution meets the objective, the alternative design solution may be considered.

House Rules - Housing Character Assessment & Design Guidelines

The *Housing Character Assessment & Design Guidelines* as adopted at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 13 October 2015. The site is located within the Garden Court 1 (GC1) character area. The essential components of the (GC1) which need to be maintained into the future are:

- Ample visual separation between dwellings
- Majority of the front setback used as permeable garden landscape
- Front gardens are visible from the street, forming part of the street landscape
- In some areas, an absence of expressed boundary between private and public realms.

The preferred Character Statement requires that as change occurs, space will be provided for more tree planting, so these areas can become greener and leafier, by:

- *Providing for canopy trees in the front and rear garden area*
- *Minimising interruption of nature strips by driveways, so that regularly-spaced street tree avenues can be planted or retained.*

Redevelopment of dwellings will occur in ways that maintain some characteristics of typical Garden Suburban style dwellings in the area, such as:

- *Garages and carports occupy a minor proportion of the dwelling frontage, and are recessively sited*
- *The visual dominance of the roof structure.*

The proposal is considered to be generally compliant with the requirements of the Garden Court 1 Area as outlined in Council's Housing Character Assessment and Design Guidelines.

Is the land affected by a Restrictive Covenant?

The land is affected by a Restrictive Covenant; however the proposal does not breach any conditions of the Covenant.

Is the land of Cultural Heritage Sensitivity?

The land is not considered to be of cultural heritage sensitivity under the *Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2007*.

2. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way.

3.1 A City that strategically plans for growth and development.

3. Financial Considerations

No Council related financial considerations are involved with the application.

4. Consultation/Public Submissions

Public notification of the application

The application was subject to notification. The notification was satisfactorily completed and nine objections and one petition (with 42 signatures) were received. With regard to the petition, section 57(3) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* provides that a number of persons may make one objection. The petition is therefore dealt with as an objection to this application and not in the way petitions are dealt with in the Meeting Procedure Local Law.

The grounds of objection may be summarised as follows:

- The proposed dwellings do not compliment the character of the area
- Increased traffic, and safety concerns (particularly children)
- Garbage collection issues
- Construction noise and traffic
- Development on this type of soil type would create pressure on surrounding properties
- Overlooking and loss of sunlight
- Overcrowding and residential noise
- Property devaluation.

A response to the objections is provided in **Appendix 4**.

Referral of the application

The application was referred to a number of Council Departments for comment and advice. A complete list of responses is included in **Appendix 5**.

5. Issues

Planning Assessment

Strategic justification

The land is zoned General Residential, which allows a modest level of housing growth and diversity. The proposal meets the overarching objectives of housing policies within the State Planning Policy Framework and Local Planning Policy Framework. It provides for urban consolidation in an area which has excellent access to local services and facilities. State policy objectives also encourage development that improves housing choice and accommodates future housing needs.

Neighbourhood character

The immediate surrounding area is generally characterized by detached single and double-storey dwellings. Within the immediate surrounding area double-storey built-form is quite apparent, there are double-storey dwellings located directly opposite at 1 Odette Place and 24 Empress Way, and a double-storey dwelling located on the abutting allotment at 5 Odette

Place. There appears to be limited unit development within the immediate surrounding area, with the only exception being a dual occupancy development (single-storey dwelling at rear of existing dwelling) at 28 Empress Way.

Whilst the form of the development may generally be different to immediate building stock, it is noteworthy that respecting neighbourhood character does not mean replicating what exists. If that was the case there would be virtually no change to the types of dwellings that exist in an area. The planning scheme does not prohibit alternative built form to the existing built form.

Objectors are also concerned that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and that this overdevelopment will adversely affect neighbourhood character. The common indicators of overdevelopment include excessive site coverage, boundary to boundary development, minimal open space provision and visual bulk. In response, the site coverage of the proposal is 47%, which is less than the permitted 60%, permeability is 42%, which is more than the minimum 20%, the development is well setback from all boundaries and each dwelling will have a minimum of 40m² of private open space.

The design response of the proposed development is generally considered an appropriate fit in terms of the preferred neighbourhood character as it will sit comfortably in its context. The proposed dwellings will be detached on the ground floor and additional building recess would be provided on the upper floors to reduce the building mass and provide visual relief from the street.

The palette of materials for the proposed development includes zincalume roofing. This is not supported as it is not in keeping with the predominant roofing material in the area. It is recommended that the development replace zincalume roofing with a more appropriate material such as colorbond cladding, concrete or terracotta tiles.

Off-site amenity impacts

The proposal complies with relevant standards in relation to overlooking, overshadowing, daylight to existing habitable room windows, side and rear setbacks.

Objectors are concerned about the increase in noise from future residents and traffic generated by the proposed development. Whilst noise issues can arise as a result of development, the noise generated will be residential in nature and not unreasonable in a residential area.

Car parking and Traffic

Provision of car parking for each dwelling complies with the requirement of Clause 52.06. Residents have expressed concern regarding traffic congestion, off-street impacts and safety impacts due to increase in traffic volumes as a result of the development. Council's Traffic Engineers are satisfied that the local road network can accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic that will be generated by the proposal.

6. Options

Council can either support the application by issuing a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit or not support the proposal by issuing a Notice of Refusal.

7. Conclusion

The application has been assessed against the State Planning Policy Framework, Local Planning Policy Framework, Zone/Overlay provisions and Clause 65 of the Melton Planning Scheme.

It is considered that the proposal generally complies with the relevant requirements of the Planning Scheme.

Therefore, it is recommended that the application be approved as outlined in **Appendix 6**.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Locality Plan - dated 31 July 2018
2. Plans of Proposal - dated February 2018
3. Assessment against relevant State and Local Planning Policies - undated
4. Response to Objections - undated
5. Referral Responses - undated
6. Proposed Conditions - undated

12.12 PLANNING APPLICATION PA 2018/6088/1 - USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF A CAMPING AND CARAVAN PARK AND ASSOCIATED NATIVE VEGETATION REMOVAL AT 1376 -1432 CALDER HIGHWAY, DIGGERS REST

Author: Valentine Sedze - Development Planner
Presenter: Bob Baggio - Manager Planning Services

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider a planning permit application for the use and development of a camping and caravan park and associated native vegetation removal.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit subject to the grounds outlined in **Appendix 6** of this report.

Motion

Crs Mendes/Carli.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

Cr Ramsey called for a division thereby setting aside the vote.

For:

Crs Abboushi, Carli, Hardy, Mendes, Ramsey and Turner

Against:

Nil

The Mayor declared the Motion CARRIED

REPORT

1. Background

Executive Summary

Applicant:	Dean Slaviero
Proposal:	Camping and caravan park and associated native vegetation removal
Existing Land Use:	Animal grazing
Zone:	Green Wedge
Overlays:	Melbourne Airport Environs Overlay – Schedule 2 (MAEO2) Heritage Overlay (HO46)

Number of Submissions:	140 objections Two submissions in support of proposal
Key Planning Issues:	Strategic justification Site location suitability Permanent residency Provision of accommodation in an area affected by the MAE02 Compatibility with surrounding land uses Landscape character Community concerns
Recommendation:	Refuse application

The Land and Surrounding Area

The subject site comprises two allotments with a total area of 18.23 hectares and is approximately located 350m south of the Diggers Rest Train Station. The site is bounded by the Melbourne – Bendigo railway to the west and the Punjel Drive area across the Old Calder Highway to the east. Adjoining the site to the south is the remains of the Diggers Rest Hotel. Other features of the site are as follows:

- The site is irregular in shape.
- It contains an existing small weatherboard dwelling, general debris, buildings and associated workshops that were the former Diggers Rest service station located on the north eastern corner of the site.
- The existing dwelling is affected by the heritage overlay and will be retained.
- The site is currently used for animal grazing.

The surrounding area is characterised by residential development as well as vacant rural and residential land. To the west of the site is vacant rural and residential land. The Diggers Rest Township is located to the north and east of the site.

Refer to **Appendix 1** for a locality plan.

The Application

The application proposes the use and development of a camping and caravan park and associated native vegetation removal.

The proposed two staged development at the southern end of the site is summarised as follows:

- A total of 85 camping sites, comprising 8 large van sites, 30 medium van sites, 6 small van sites, 6 recreational vehicle sites, 5 large cabins (18m x12m) and 30 standard cabins (15m x10m).
- An office, camp kitchen, two amenities blocks (toilets and laundry).
- 30 visitor car parking spaces.
- A boom gate to control entry and exit to and from the park.
- Recreational facilities including playground, rotunda, basketball half court, trampoline, amphitheatre and walking tracks
- Internal gravel access roads
- Landscaping, including screening shrubs around the perimeter of the site.
- A grassed area for tents.
- Provision of short term stay accommodation.
- Except for the rotunda, all buildings will be relocatable constructed off-site.

- Removal of indigenous wallaby grass scattered throughout the site and the Tree Violet shrub.
- Vehicle access is proposed off Old Calder Highway.

Stage one, will deliver the essential facilities for the initial operation of the camping and caravan park, including one amenities block, visitor car parking, boom gate, some recreational facilities and 22 camping sites comprising of 4 large van sites, 12 medium van sites and 6 small van sites. A temporary office is proposed in Stage one.

Refer to **Appendix 2** for plans of the proposal.

Planning Controls

Zone	(Clause 35.04 – Green Wedge Zone)	Permit required for use and development.
Overlays	(Clause 45.08 – Melbourne Airport Environs Overlay (Schedule 2))	Permit required to use land for use and development.
Particular Provisions	(Clause 52.06 – Car Parking) (Clause 52.17 – Native Vegetation)	Car parking spaces must be provided to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Permit required to remove, destroy or lop native vegetation including dead native vegetation.

A full assessment of the proposal against the relevant State and Local planning policies is included in **Appendix 3**.

Is the land affected by a Restrictive Covenant?

The land is not affected by a Restrictive Covenant.

Is the land of Cultural Heritage Sensitivity?

The land is considered to be of cultural heritage sensitivity under the *Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2007*; however as the activity area is not located within an area of cultural heritage sensitivity the proposal does not require a cultural heritage management plan.

2. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way.

3.1 A City that strategically plans for growth and development.

3. Financial Considerations

No Council related financial considerations are involved with the application.

4. Consultation/Public Submissions

Public notification of the application

The application was subject to notification. The notification was satisfactorily completed and

139 objections and two submissions in support of the proposal were received.

The grounds of objection may be summarised as follows:

- Location not suitable for a camping and caravan park.
- Permanent residents occupying the camping and caravan park.
- Inadequate on-site car parking.
- Traffic congestion and safety concerns.
- Increase in noise.
- Inadequacy of existing infrastructure to support proposal.
- Property devaluation.
- Risk of criminal activity associated with the use and development.
- Proposal not in keeping with character of the area.
- No tourist attractions within the vicinity of the site.
- Loss of vegetation.
- Proposal not located within the property boundaries of the subject site. Part of the proposal is located on the adjoining property at 1434-1466 Calder Highway, Diggers Rest.
- Future outer metropolitan ring road will impact vehicle access to the site.
- The proposed recreational facilities for the camping and caravan park will not benefit the Diggers Rest community as the facilities already exist in the area.
- Proposal contrary to the objectives of the Green Wedge.
- Proposal will impact the rebuilding of the heritage building (Diggers Rest Hotel) on the adjoining site.

A response to the objections is provided in **Appendix 4**.

Referral of the application

The application was referred to a number of Council Departments for comment and advice. The application was also required to be referred to Department of Environment Land Water and Planning, Melbourne Airport, Transport Victoria, VicRoads, Victorian Planning Authority and Western Water. A complete list of responses is included in **Appendix 5**.

Of particular note is City Strategy comments which state that the proposal fails to address the landscape management guidelines in the Significant Landscape Features Strategy and the requirements of Precinct 3 of the Western Plains North Green Wedge Management Plan (WPNGWMP) which emphasises the importance of protecting open landscape and minimising discretionary uses, with the exception of some sites along the Melton Highway. It is considered that the use or scale of the proposal will not be compatible with the site.

5. Issues

Planning Assessment

Whilst one of the seven Green Wedge zone objectives makes reference to *recognising, protecting and conserving green wedge land for its agricultural, environmental, historic, recreational and tourism opportunities*, there is a clear focus within the objectives on protecting, conserving and enhancing agricultural, environmental, open rural and scenic non-urban landscapes, and the biodiversity of the area.

The Planning Policy Framework (PPF), Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF) and Particular Provisions of the Melton Planning Scheme place a strong emphasis on protecting and avoiding the permanent loss of agricultural land, protecting the green wedge areas from inappropriate development, preserving the integrity of the non-urban character of the green

wedge land and discouraging urban based uses in non-urban areas.

The proposed use and development is contrary to the objectives of the zone and policy, in that it is inappropriately located, results in loss of agricultural land and would detract from the landscape character of the surrounding area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is located close to Diggers Rest Township, having a camping and caravan park on the edge of the Urban Growth Boundary is not consistent with the objectives and decision guidelines of the zone, or State and Local policy guiding future development within the green wedge. The Melton Planning Scheme directs urban-based uses to urban locations and seeks to address the issue of retaining a clear delineation between urban and non-urban land. As such, a camping and caravan park should be located further from an urban growth boundary to maintain the distinct character of Diggers Rest Township, the integrity of the urban growth boundary and the landscape values of the green wedge urban interface.

It is acknowledged that tourist development is supported by State and Local Planning Policy, however, these policies support well designed and sited tourist development compatible with the surrounding urban and rural activities. This particular location is not suitable for the proposed use as it presents a poor entry to Diggers Rest and is not strategically located with respect to a tourist attraction.

The subject land falls within the Melbourne Airport Environs Overlay, Schedule 2 (MAEO2) control and between the 20 and 25 Ultimate Capacity Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) 2003 noise contours. Table 2.1 of Australian Standard 2021 designates that a caravan park is 'conditionally acceptable' under the 25 ANEF noise contours.

Melbourne Airport has advised Council that it is currently in the planning phase of the Runway Development Program, including the proposed third runway, an additional east-west runway. The location of the proposed caravan park will be affected by the increase of aircraft in the east-west direction and may be subject to additional aircraft noise. Melbourne Airport has objected to the proposal citing a number of reasons in relation to use of caravans for permanent residency, a discretionary use proposed in the MAEO2, compliance of the proposal with the density limit of one dwelling per 300m², the unsuitability of the land use, non-permanent structures (particularly caravans) not meeting the noise attenuation requirements, and the application's lack of detail with regards to external lighting which has the potential to cause light spillage above the horizontal plane and create visual distraction to pilots. In addition, Melbourne Airport is not satisfied with the acoustic work undertaken by Waston Moss Growcott Pty Ltd as it does not adequately address the requirements for accommodation under the Australian Standard. Melbourne Airport submits that the current conditions on the subject site will not represent the longer term conditions. For the reasons above, the proposal is inconsistent with MAEO2 and relevant state policy.

Of major concern to objectors is the potential for the subject site to being used for residential purposes, raising the potential for residential development by stealth. Having noted this genuine concern, Planning Schemes and planning permits cannot limit the duration of residency in a caravan park pursuant to Section 518 of the Residential Tenancies Act 1997. Given that there is no ability to limit the length of time that camping and caravan park sites can be occupied, there is always the potential for them to become sites for low cost, long term accommodation which in a visual and functional sense are residential settlements.

Other concerns expressed by residents regarding traffic congestion, off-street impacts and safety impacts due to increase in traffic volumes, noise, on-site car parking and site's vehicle access arrangements are acknowledged. Council's Traffic and Transport Unit and VicRoads have reviewed the proposal and have raised no concerns.

The proposed removal of native vegetation is consistent with Clause 52.17 (native vegetation). A Flora and Fauna Assessment prepared by Brett Lane and Associates Pty Ltd dated March 2018 concludes that as no remnant patches or scattered trees (as defined in the Guidelines for the removal, destruction or lopping of native vegetation, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, December 2017) are located in the application area, no vegetation offsets are required.

6. Options

Council can either support the application by issuing a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit or not support the proposal by issuing a Notice of Refusal.

7. Conclusion

The application has been assessed against the State Planning Policy Framework, Local Planning Policy Framework, Zone/Overlay provisions, Particular provisions and Clause 65 of the Melton Planning Scheme.

It is considered that the proposal generally does not comply with the relevant requirements of the Planning Scheme.

Therefore, it is recommended that the application be refused as outlined in **Appendix 6**.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Locality Plan - dated 2 August 2018
2. Plans for the Proposal - dated 11 August 2017
3. Assessment against Planning Scheme - undated
4. Response to Objections - undated
5. Referral Comments - undated
6. Grounds of Refusal - undated

12.13 CONTRACT NO. 18/012 - PROVISION OF STREET SWEEPING SERVICES

Author: Les Stokes - Manager Operations
Presenter: Luke Shannon - General Manager Planning & Development

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek Council's approval for the award of Contract No. 18/012 for the Provision of Street Sweeping Services commencing 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2024 with an option for a further two year extension at Council's discretion.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Awards Contract No. 18/012 for the Provision of Street Sweeping Services submitted by Metro Urban Management Pty Ltd for the sum of \$991,470.63 pa (excl. GST) and the attached schedule of rates (excl. GST) contained in **Confidential Appendix 1**, commencing 1 July 2019 for a period of 5 years.
2. Delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the execution of all contract documents.
3. Advise all Tenderers accordingly.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

This report seeks Council resolution for the award of Contract No. 18/012 for the Provision of Street Sweeping Services.

The service involves the sweeping of Council streets and carparks, as well as the footpaths in town centres and shopping precincts.

2. Background/Issues

This contract involves sweeping of Council streets and carparks, as well as the footpaths in town centres and shopping precincts. The following assets are swept under this contract:

- Council Sealed Roads with Kerb and Channel
- Rural on-road bicycle lanes
- Bridge Decks
- Rural Intersections

- Car parks
- Town Centres (including footpaths)
- Minor Shopping Precincts

The contractor will:

- provide a safe and efficient service to Residents;
- schedule street sweeping in accordance with Council priorities;
- enhance the appearance of road networks in Councils urban and growth areas;
- enhance the appearance of Council's shopping precincts and surrounding areas;
- enhance the appearance of Council assets and surrounding areas;
- minimise Litter from entering the storm water drainage network and waterways and to mitigate the risk of localised flooding;
- minimise the risk of traffic accidents which may be attributable (either wholly or partly) to the condition of the road;
- minimise the likelihood of vehicles sustaining unnecessary wear, tear or damage as a consequence of the condition of any road or carpark.

Currently the Street Sweeping Service is provided Contract 11/005 – Street Sweeping Services delivered by Metro Urban Management Pty Ltd.

Council has undertaken a review of its Street Sweeping Services, in particular the level of service (frequency) current provided. Under Contract 11/005, all residential streets are swept every 6 weeks and 4 weekly in autumn. Council Officers conducted a trial of 8 and 10 weekly frequencies in various suburbs at various times in 2017. Whilst roads remained safe during the extended frequency, there was a discernable increase in the build-up of material in the kerb and channel, resulting in a less aesthetically pleasing street environment.

In order to assist Council to consider its' options with respect to this level of service, Contract 18/012 was advertised seeking options to reduce the non-Autumn service frequency to either 8 weeks or 10 weeks. The cost of these options are discussed further in the **Confidential Appendix**, the conclusion of this discussion is that the frequency remain at 6 weekly.

The provision of these services was tendered at this time, due the expiry of the current contract. Tenders for the above contract were advertised in The Age on 15 June 2018 and closed on 13 July 2018. A total of two tenders were received and assessed on the basis of the evaluation criteria described in the tender documents.

All tenderers were considered conforming and progressed to further evaluation.

No member of the Tender Evaluation Panel declared any conflict of interest in relation to this tender evaluation

3. Council Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The Melton City Council 2017-2021 Council and Wellbeing Plan references:

3. A well planned and built City: A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way

3.3 Public spaces that are vibrant and engaging places for all

4. Financial Considerations

Council's Recurrent Budget contains an allocation of \$1,200,000 for the tendered services.

Based on this assessment the recommended tenderer's price is within the recurrent budget allocation recently adopted by Council.

A financial assessment was undertaken by Corporate Scorecard and returned a satisfactory result.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

As discussed in Section 2 of this report, Council piloted a reduced frequency of street sweeping, this review resulted a recommendation that the frequency remain at 6 weekly.

Due to the routine nature of the services provided, no Tender Briefing was conducted for this contract.

6. Risk Analysis

Should Council choose not to award this contract, the existing service contracts will expire and Council would have to cease providing these services until such time that they were procured under an advertised tender

7. Options

Council has the options to:

1. Adopt the Officers' recommendations as presented in this report.
2. Re-advertise the tender seeking further submissions.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Tender Evaluation Report for the provision of Street Sweeping Services Contract No.18/012 - dated August 2018 - **CONFIDENTIAL**

Designated as confidential by the Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Section 77(2)(c) and Section 89(2)(d) of the *Local Government Act 1989*.

12.14 LEASE OF COUNCIL LAND - ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION

Author: Jaci Wagner - Property Officer

Presenter: Christine Denyer - Manager Legal and Governance

PURPOSE OF REPORT

For Council to make a decision in relation to offering Powercor Australia Ltd a lease for the purposes of an electrical substation at part of a Council Reserve located at 132 Bridge Road, Strathtulloh.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. Decide to offer Powercor Australia Ltd a lease with a maximum term of 50 years at a peppercorn rent of \$1 per annum.
2. Authorise the CEO to execute the lease in the form set out at **Appendix 1**.

Motion

Crs Carli/Ramsey.

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

REPORT

1. Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider Powercor Australia Ltd ("the Lessee") request to enter into a lease for a period of 50 years for a portion of Council reserve at 132 Bridge Road, Strathtulloh.

A report was presented at the Ordinary meeting of Council on the 26 March 2018, where it was resolved that Council bring back a report after publishing a public notice in the local newspaper and allowing 4 weeks for submissions.

After public advertisement of its intention to enter into the lease, Council received no submissions.

The draft lease is attached and is in order for execution.

2. Background/Issues

On the 26 March 2018 a report was presented at the ordinary meeting of Council to commence the process to offer a lease to Powercor Australia Ltd for a term of 50 years at a peppercorn rent of \$1 per annum.

A public notice was placed in the local newspaper on the 15 May 2018 and applications for public submissions closed on the 13 June 2018. There were no public submissions received during the 28 day period that followed the notice.

Powercor has prepared the draft lease and it has been checked and amended by Council officers. The draft lease is attached at **Appendix 1**.

3. Council and Wellbeing Plan Reference and Policy Reference

The electrical substation and lease proposal is in accordance with the following strategies in the Council and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021:

3. A well planned and built city. A City with a clear vision to manage growth in a sustainable and accessible way
 - 3.1. *A City that strategically plans for growth and development.*
 - 3.2. *Community facilities, infrastructure and services that are equitably planned for, provided and maintained.*

4. Financial Considerations

The proposal is for a peppercorn rent of \$1.00 per annum payable on demand and thus financial considerations are not relevant here, but see further risk analysis below.

5. Consultation/Public Submissions

In accordance with Section 190 and 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, Council published a notice in the newspaper on the 15 May 2018 of its intention to lease and invite any submissions from the affected residents.

Submissions closed on the 13 June 2018 and Council officers did not receive any submissions in relation to the proposal.

6. Risk Analysis

The risks associated with not proceeding with the lease at all are twofold. First, the potential liability associated with the construction of the electrical substation and conduits on Council's reserve and secondly, potential legal action by Powercor on the basis of the execution of the Agreement to Lease, which was executed on 13 August 2015 and referred to in the report dated 26 March 2018.

7. Options

Council has the option to:

1. Adopt the recommendation as set out; or
2. Refuse to lease the land to Powercor and request that the any infrastructure on the area of land be removed without further delay.

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Lease agreement for 132 Bridge Road, Strathulloh - undated

13. REPORTS FROM DELEGATES APPOINTED TO OTHER BODIES

Verbal reports were received from Crs Ramsey, Mendes, Carli, Hardy, Abboushi and Mayor Turner.

14. COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Crs Ramsey, Mendes, Carli, Hardy, Abboushi and Mayor Turner addressed the Chamber in respect to a variety of matters of significance.

15. NOTICES OF MOTION**15.1 NOTICE OF MOTION 571 (CR ABBOUSHI)****Councillor: Steve Abboushi - Councillor****NOTICE:**

That Council officers explore options to introduce steam weeding in the municipality specifically around sensitive areas such as kindergartens, community centres, schools, maternal and child health centres and provide a report to Council.

Motion

Crs Abboushi/Carli.

That Council officers explore options to introduce steam weeding in the municipality specifically around sensitive areas such as kindergartens, community centres, schools, maternal and child health centres and provide a report to Council.

CARRIED

15.2 NOTICE OF MOTION 572 (CR CARLI)**Councillor: Lara Carli - Councillor****NOTICE:**

That Council contact the Taylors Hill Retirement Village Management Committee to discuss erecting safety signs for pedestrians and vehicles at the Calder Park Drive entrance of the retirement village.

Motion

Crs Carli/Mendes.

That Council contact the Taylors Hill Retirement Village Management Committee to discuss erecting safety signs for pedestrians and vehicles at the Calder Park Drive entrance of the retirement village.

CARRIED

15.3 NOTICE OF MOTION 573 (CR RAMSEY)**Councillor: Sophie Ramsey - Councillor****NOTICE:**

That Council officers investigate the current lighting at the two pedestrian crossings in front of the Melton Library and the two pedestrian crossings in Palmerston Street, between High Street and McKenzie Street and report back to Council.

Motion

Crs Ramsey/Hardy.

That Council officers investigate the current lighting at the two pedestrian crossings in front of the Melton Library and the two pedestrian crossings in Palmerston Street, between High Street and McKenzie Street and report back to Council.

CARRIED

Items 15.4 and 15.5 were heard before Item 12.1 in the order of business of this Agenda pursuant to an earlier resolution.

15.6 NOTICE OF MOTION 576 (CR CARLI)

Councillor: Lara Carli - Councillor

NOTICE:

That Council write and ask PTV (Public Transport Victoria) to immediately install a bus shelter at the bus stop on Gourlay Road just after Woollahra Parade in Taylors Hill.

Motion

Crs Carli/Abboushi.

That Council write and ask PTV (Public Transport Victoria) to immediately install a bus shelter at the bus stop on Gourlay Road just after Woollahra Parade in Taylors Hill.

CARRIED

15.7 NOTICE OF MOTION 577 (CR CARLI)**Councillor: Lara Carli - Councillor****NOTICE:**

That Council officers review the vehicle access arrangements into the Taylors Hill Shopping Centre (corner Gourlay Road and Hume Drive), in particular the potential to introduce a dedicated right hand turn lane south of the intersection so as to provide the ability for vehicles travelling north along Gourlay Road to turn into the centre and that a report be provided to Council on the options available and the likely cost.

Motion

Crs Carli/Mendes.

That Council officers review the vehicle access arrangements into the Taylors Hill Shopping Centre (corner Gourlay Road and Hume Drive), in particular the potential to introduce a dedicated right hand turn lane south of the intersection so as to provide the ability for vehicles travelling north along Gourlay Road to turn into the centre and that a report be provided to Council on the options available and the likely cost.

CARRIED

15.8 NOTICE OF MOTION 578 (CR TURNER)**Councillor: Bob Turner - Councillor****NOTICE:**

That Council investigate the costs (if any) and the implementation of trialling reverse vending machines in the City of Melton.

The Mayor, Cr B Turner, vacated the Chair and the Deputy Mayor, Cr K Hardy, took the Chair.

Motion

Crs Turner/Ramsey.

That Council investigate the costs (if any) and the implementation of trialling reverse vending machines in the City of Melton.

CARRIED

The Deputy Mayor, Cr K Hardy, vacated the Chair and the Mayor, Cr B Turner, resumed the Chair.

16. COUNCILLOR'S QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Nil.

17. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Nil.

18. URGENT BUSINESS

Nil.

19. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

Procedural Motion

Crs Ramsey/Carli.

That pursuant to section 89(2) of the *Local Government Act 1989* the meeting be closed to the public to consider the following reports, that are considered confidential for the reasons indicated:

- 19.1 Contract No 12/002 - Provision of Recycling Receipt and Processing**
(d) as it relates to contractual matters.

CARRIED

Procedural Motion

Crs Ramsey/Carli.

That the meeting be opened to the public.

CARRIED

20. CLOSE OF BUSINESS

The meeting closed at 8.49pm.

Confirmed

Dated this

.....CHAIRPERSON