MINUTES

OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL
HELD ON
TUESDAY 17 APRIL 2018
AT 6.30 PM IN THE
COUNCIL CHAMBER,
MOUNT ALEXANDER SHIRE CIVIC CENTRE
CORNER LYTTLETON AND LLOYD STREETS, CASTLEMAINE.
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ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

To start the official proceedings
I would like to acknowledge that we are meeting on Jaara country
of which the members and elders of the Jaara Jaara community and their
forebears have been custodians for many centuries
and have performed age old ceremonies of celebration, initiation and renewal.
We acknowledge their living culture and their unique role in the life of this region.

1. PRESENT

Councillors: Tony Cordy, Stephen Gardner, Christine Henderson, Max Lesser,
Bronwen Machin, John Nieman and Dave Petrusma.

Officers: Chief Executive Officer (Darren Fuzzard), Director Corporate and
Community Services (Lisa Knight), Acting Director Sustainable
Development (Rebecca Stockfeld), Acting Executive Manager
Organisational Capability (Kevin Pittman).

2. APOLOGIES

Nil.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil.

4. MINUTES

4.1. MEETINGS OF COUNCIL – 20 MARCH 2018

The unconfirmed minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Mount Alexander Shire Council
held at 6.30 pm on 20 March 2018 at the Mount Alexander Shire Civic Centre have been
circulated to Councillors. The unconfirmed minutes have also been posted on the Mount
Alexander Shire Council website, pending confirmation at this meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Mount Alexander Shire Council
held on 20 March 2018 at 6.30 pm be confirmed.

MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR LESSER

CARRIED.
5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

MOVED COUNCILLOR NIEMAN
That standing orders be suspended at 6.34 pm.
SECONDED COUNCILLOR CORDY
CARRIED.

The Mayor responded to a question on notice brought up by Mr Robin Taylor at the Ordinary Meeting of Council 20 March 2018, regarding road sealing program.

The Mayor noted that Mr Taylor was absent and thanked him for his question. The Mayor advised that officers have been developing a trial of a new seal type which has a significantly lower cost than the traditional road seal used.

The lower cost technique is suitable for low volume, unsealed roads.

Council has used the new lower cost technique on Wallace Street, Wesley Hill and Brigade Ave, Campbells Creek. These streets were selected for the trial because of their different conditions and traffic types.

The work was completed approximately one month ago in March. The trial sites will be monitored for defects for at least 12 months before any conclusions can be drawn.

These works were completed with in-house expertise and allocated funding from the reseal budget, as approved by Council. There were no changes to the existing reseal program because the trial had always been budgeted for.

The Mayor advised that Mr Taylor would receive a written response in accordance with the above advice.

a. Mr Glen Braybrook

Mr Braybrook congratulated Councillor Lesser on becoming a Councillor. He also raised concerns over retirement options within the Shire and asked if Council is going to pursue options for a retirement village.

- The Mayor thanked Mr Braybrook for his positive comments.
- The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) thanked Mr Braybrook and advised that Councillors have included the development of a retirement village in the Shire within their Council Plan. He further noted that the Councillors will soon be participating in a workshop with industry experts to explore what kind of retirement village could be provided and mechanisms to achieve this.

b. Mr Tony Bell

Mr Bell referred to questions that he had asked at previous Ordinary Meetings of Council regarding the Castlemaine Landfill. He noted that the current rate of compaction is making an appreciable difference at the Landfill and asked why hadn’t this level of compaction been provided from the commencement of the new cell.
• The CEO advised that Council is still waiting on the test results of the compaction trial to determine the value of the compaction compared with its cost.

Mr Bell further stated that the issue of Moscript Street flooding had been part of Council’s budget deliberations since 2012 and still nothing had happened. He asked when something would be done.
• The Mayor referred to Mr Bell’s mention of flood overlays and noted that Council had been briefed and was aware that the overlay could be amended when works had been completed.
• Councillor Henderson advised that considerable funding had been set aside in the proposed Budget 2018/2019, which if it were adopted, would go towards implementing works designed in 2017/2018.

c. Mr Genis Wylde, objector to Item ECO 15 of the Agenda.

Mr Wylde outlined the basis for his objections to the proposed signage, in particular, potential driver distraction on what was already a difficult and sometimes dangerous stretch of road.
• The Mayor thanked Mr Wylde for his comments and noted that the matter would be dealt with later in the meeting.

d. Ms Kerrie-Ann Duff, objector to Item ECO 15 of the Agenda.

Ms Duff reiterated some of Mr Wild’s objections and the visual impact on her home which would be opposite the sign.
• The Mayor thanked Ms Duff for her comments and noted that the matter would be dealt with later in the meeting.

MOVED COUNCILLOR PETRUSMA

That standing orders be resumed at 6.56 pm.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

CARRIED.

6. PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS

Nil.

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Nil.
8. ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS

Responsible Director: Chief Executive Officer
Responsible Officer: Principal Governance Officer

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide the record of any assemblies of Councillors, held since the last Council Meeting, so they may be incorporated into the Minutes as required under the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act).

The Act defines an assembly of councillors as a meeting of an advisory committee of the Council, if at least one Councillor is present, or a planned or scheduled meeting of at least half of the Councillors and one member of Council staff which considers matters that are intended or likely to be:

- The subject of a decision of the Council; or
- Subject to the exercise of a function, duty or power of the Council that has been delegated to a person or committee.

The definition does not include a meeting of the Council, a special committee of the Council, an audit committee established under section 139, a club, association, peak body, political party or other organisation.

The Act requires that the CEO must ensure that a written record of an assembly of councillors is kept and that it include:

1. The names of all Councillors and members of Council staff attending;
2. The matters considered;
3. Any conflict of interest disclosures made by a Councillor attending; and
4. Whether a Councillor who has disclosed a conflict of interest leaves the assembly.

The Chief Executive Officer must ensure that the written record of an assembly of Councillors is, as soon as practicable:

1. Reported at an ordinary meeting of the Council; and
2. Incorporated in the minutes of that Council meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council notes the records for the Assemblies of Councillors, as required under the Local Government Act 1989.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CORDY

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR NIEMAN

CARRIED.
### ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD

**COUNCILLOR BRIEFING SESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASSEMBLY DETAILS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> 6 March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time:</strong> 3.00 pm to 6.52 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Cnr Lloyd and Lyttleton Streets, Castlemaine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ATTENDANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Councillors:</strong> Tony Cordy, Stephen Gardner, Christine Henderson, Bronwen Machin, John Nieman and Dave Petrusma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers:</strong> Chief Executive Officer (Darren Fuzzard), Director Corporate and Community Services (Lisa Knight), Acting Director Sustainable Development (Rebecca Stockfeld), Acting Executive Manager Business Develop (Kevin Pittman), Acting manager Development Services (Louise Johnston, Items 5.1 – 5.5 and Item 5.10), Coordinator Strategic Planning (Dominique Trickey, Item 5.5), Manager Community Places and Spaces (Ben Grounds, Items 5.7 and 5.8), Active Communities Team Leader (Item 5.7 and 5.8), Active Communities Officer (Edwina Reid, Item 5.8), Acting Manager Infrastructure (Marcus Goonan, Item 5.9) and Executive Manager Business Performance (Bradley Thomas, Item 5.11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitors:</strong> Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apologies:</strong> Nil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MATTERS DISCUSSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning Permit Application 263/2017 - Subdivision of Land into Three Lots at 8 - 10 Grigg Street, Maldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planning Permit Application 249/2017 - Subdivision of Land into Two Lots at 36 Parkins Reef Road, Maldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planning Permit Application 106/2017- Partial Demolitions and Construction of Dwelling Additions and Alterations at 21 Reef Street, Maldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning Permit Application 160/2016 - 2 Lot Subdivision at 76 Bull Street, Castlemaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mount Alexander Planning Scheme Amendment C082 Consideration of Submissions – Implementation of the Castlemaine, Campbells Creek and Chewton Flood Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of the CFA Land at Wesley Hill Recreation Reserve for an Off Leash Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pool Management Contract Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Victory Park Play Space Concept Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Proposed Works along Kennedy Street, Castlemaine between the Train Station and Forrest Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tiny Houses in Mount Alexander Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pricing Policy Update and Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Confidentiality
13. Staffing Structure
14. Apology Noted
15. Roadside Timber Collection
16. Damaged House - Duke Street, Castlemaine
17. Camp Reserve, Castlemaine
18. Pavement Rehabilitation and Culvert Replacement Sutton Grange-Redesdale Road, Sutton Grange

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter No.</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer name and description of interest</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer left the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD

COUNCILLOR BRIEFING SESSION

ASSEMBLY DETAILS

Date: 13 March 2018
Time: 3.00 pm to 6.40 pm
Location: Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Cnr Lloyd and Lyttleton Streets, Castlemaine

ATTENDANCE

Councillors: Tony Cordy, Stephen Gardner, Max Lesser, Bronwen Machin, John Nieman, Dave Petrusma and Christine Henderson (left at 4.30 pm).

Officers: Chief Executive Officer (Darren Fuzzard), Director Corporate and Community Services (Lisa Knight), Acting Director Sustainable Development (Rebecca Stockfeld), Acting Executive Manager Organisational Capability (Kevin Pittman), Acting Manager Healthy Environments (Casey Hearps, Item 5.1), Climate Change Coordinator (Jay Smith, Item 5.1), Executive Manager Business Performance (Bradley Thomas, Item 5.2), Manager Community Places and Spaces (Ben Grounds, Item 5.3) and Active Communities Team Leader (Jacqui Phiddian, Item 5.3).


Apologies: Nil.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. Deputation – Central Victorian Greenhouse Alliance
2. Contracts within Chief Executive Officer Delegation
3. Recreation Services and Infrastructure Plan Discussion Paper (including Workshop)
4. Executive Presentation to Councillors – Key Priorities
5. Current Status of Waste Management

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter No.</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer name and description of interest</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer left the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD
### COUNCILLOR BRIEFING SESSION

### ASSEMBLY DETAILS

**Date:** 13 March 2018  
**Time:** 6.40 pm to 7.00 pm  
**Location:** Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Cnr Lloyd and Lyttleton Streets, Castlemaine

### ATTENDANCE

**Councillors:** Tony Cordy, Stephen Gardner, Max Lesser, Bronwen Machin, John Nieman, Dave Petrusma and Christine Henderson (left at 4.30 pm).  
**Officers:** Chief Executive Officer (Darren Fuzzard).  
**Visitors:** Nil.  
**Apologies:** Nil.

### MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. HR matters  
2. Post Council meeting procedures

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter No.</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer name and description of interest</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer left the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD
COUNCILLOR BRIEFING MEETING

ASSEMBLY DETAILS
Date: 20 March 2018
Time 5.30 pm to 6.15 pm
Location Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Cnr Lloyd and Lyttleton Streets, Castlemaine

ATTENDANCE
Councillors: Tony Cordy, Stephen Gardner, Christine Henderson, Max Lesser, Bronwen Machin, John Nieman and Dave Petrusma.
Officers: Chief Executive Officer (Darren Fuzzard), Director Corporate and Community Services (Lisa Knight), Acting Director Sustainable Development (Rebecca Stockfeld) and Acting Executive Manager Organisational Capability (Kevin Pittman),
Visitors: Nil.
Apologies: Nil.

MATTERS DISCUSSED
2. Pricing Policy - Update and Review.
4. Planning Permit Application 263/2017 - Subdivision of Land into Three Lots at 8 - 10 Grigg Street, Maldon.
5. Planning Permit Application 249/2017 - Subdivision Of Land into Two Lots at 36 Parkins Reef Road, Maldon.
7. Planning Permit Application 160/2016 - 2 Lot Subdivision at 76 Bull Street, Castlemaine.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter No.</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer name and description of interest</th>
<th>Councillor / Officer left the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. OFFICER REPORTS

9.1. OUR PLACE (PLA)

PLA 05 RESPONSE TO PETITION TO COMPLETE THE FENCING OF THE PLAYGROUND AT THE TARADALE MINERAL SPRINGS RESERVE

Responsible Director: Acting Director Sustainable Development
Responsible Officer: Building Projects Coordinator
Original Document: DOC/18/10220

Executive Summary

Council received a petition on 21 February 2018, requesting “Mount Alexander Shire to complete fencing the perimeter of the children’s [sic] playground at the Taradale Mineral Springs Reserve.” This petition was tabled at the Council Meeting on 20 March 2018.

The petition refers to the proximity of the play space to car parking and roads, as well as the distance to the barbecue area, making it difficult for parents to safely supervise their children.

Officer advice, based on modern play space design protocol and guidance from expert bodies, is that no additional fencing is required. Council may however wish to consider this request as part of budget deliberations.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Write to the organiser of the petition to inform them that Council will consider the request as part of its annual budget deliberations.

MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That Council:

1. Write to the organiser of the petition to inform them that Council will consider the request as part of its annual budget deliberations.

2. After the Annual Budget has been adopted, write to the petition organiser to inform them of the outcome in relation to funding for a playground fence.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR PETRUSMA

CARRIED.
Context

The Taradale Mineral Springs Reserve play space was constructed in the 2015/16 financial year at a cost of $137,279, with a $78,283 grant contribution. The play space was designed by professional, qualified designers.

The play space is assessed annually by an independent risk assessor (as are all council play spaces), as well as being assessed by trained staff regularly. The play space was designed and constructed with fencing on the west side (adjacent to the High Street), and without fencing on all other sides.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Relevant policies, strategies and plans

Council adopted the Investing in Play play space strategy in 2014. The strategy describes 6 principles for the provision of play spaces, as well as defining three levels of classification of play spaces – local, district, and municipal. The classification of play spaces dictates the level of provision at that facility. Investing in Play describes many elements of good play space design, as well as providing some commentary on fencing.

Issues

Fencing play spaces is generally not supported by leading industry groups, with some specific exceptions. Play Australia, Australia’s leading industry body for play space design and management, states in their information sheet Fencing and Public Playspaces that “Councils are not encouraged to erect structures such as fences or gates intended to separate adults from children but to design stimulating play spaces that will foster greater use by children and their families”. The play space is stimulating and fun; a side fence is not required as children use the play space as intended.

Council’s Investing in Play 2014 - 2024 strategy states that Council aims to minimise fencing.

KidSafe produce a fact sheet ‘Fencing Playspaces’ that proximity to a busy road is a factor to consider in fencing a play space. Sport and Recreation Victoria’s Good Play Space Guide support this, as does Play Australia. KidSafe also suggest exploring opportunities to design hedges as a ‘softer’ barrier. Council’s Parks and Gardens Team has already install hedging on the northern edge of the play space, adjacent to Jackson Street.

Play space fencing has a number of disadvantages, including ‘caging’ play into a contained space, and making it virtually impossible for a person in a wheel chair to open a gate with a child proof lock. It should not be used to negate the requirement for parents and carers to supervise their children at all times. Play Australia advises councils regularly to inform their communities that parents and/or carers are responsible for the supervision of their children.

One of the three points the petition uses as justification for additional fencing is “the distance of the playground from eating and cooking facilities in the park which reduces the capacity for the constant supervision of young children,” indicating that to some degree the argument for the fencing is based on reduced parent/carer supervision.

The two other points the petition uses as justification for additional fencing are traffic safety related.

Play Australia, KidSafe, Sport and Recreation Victoria, and Council’s own Investing in Play strategy all identify nearby busy roads as a factor for considering fencing (part of) a play space.
The road that is adjacent to the unfenced side of the play space – Jackson Street – is not a busy road (114 average vehicle movements per day). The VicRoads advice (cited in the petition) about traffic safety with children is targeted at children navigating traffic environments – for example, road crossings and footpaths. Nonetheless, the VicRoads advice corroborates the Play Australia advice that parents and carers need to take the appropriate actions to supervise their children.

The use of footpaths by children is a useful comparison. Rarely are footpaths protected from trafficable lanes by pedestrian fencing. If there was a footpath in a similar environment, even if it was a path aimed at high use by children, no additional barriers would be warranted.

If fencing were to be installed, it would need to include additional works to formalise the road shoulder area used for parking, which would reduce car parking spaces. The location of any underground services and infrastructure in the road reserve in the vicinity is currently unknown.

**Alternate Options**

Hedging can be used to provide some level of barrier instead of fencing. This has already been agreed to and planted.

Seating could be installed in appropriate locations (that is, on the north side of the play space, near the hedging) to allow parents and carers to supervise from a position they feel more comfortable in managing their risks. This is a supported option.

**Financial and Resource Implications**

The cost of installing a fence, when considering other works like car parking changes and bollards, could reasonably be expected to be approximately $20,000.

**Consultation**

The originator of the petition was contacted before preparing this report and they expanded on the reasoning behind the petition.
PLA 06  FLAGS POLICY

Responsible Director:  Chief Executive Officer
Responsible Officer:  Acting Principal Governance Officer
Original Document:  DOC/18/12338

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council adopt a Flying of Flags Policy. The need to formulate the policy was initiated by Councillors as a result of their desire to allow community flags to be flown on a designated flagpole at the Market Building.

Refer to:
Attachment PLA 06A:  Draft Flying of Flags Policy

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopt the draft Flying of Flags Policy.

MOVED COUNCILLOR NIEMAN

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR PETRUSMA

CARRIED.
Context

Protocols, procedures, orders of precedence and other matters related to the flying and treatment of official flags is dictated by the Protocol Branch of the Department of Prime Minister & Cabinet. It is expected that these official flags – the Australian, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander flags – will be the only flags that will be flown on the flagpoles situated at the Civic Centre.

Hence, this paper is primarily concerned with the prospective use of a “community flagpole” at the Market Centre.

Issues

- Council is required to follow mandated procedures, protocols and order of precedence of official flags. These are the Australian flag, the Aboriginal flag and the Torres Strait Islander flag. Those protocols etc. are determined by the Department of Prime Minister & Cabinet from time to time.
- Council has reserved use of the flagpoles situated at the Civic Centre to its own use and for those official flags only.
- One of the flagpoles at the Market Centre provides the opportunity for Council to allow somewhat broader use of flags to promote various community causes. However, this raises an issue of contention, if more than one group wants to use the facility at the same time, and issues of appropriateness, e.g. flying of flags that might prospectively cause deep offense within the community.

Proposed Policy

The use of Council’s flagpoles situated at the Civic Centre is reserved to official flags using the protocols, procedures and order of precedence set from time to time by the Protocol Branch of the Department of Prime Minister & Cabinet.

The use of Council’s “community flagpole” situated at the Market Building is to be subject to two primary criteria:

- Council may elect to reserve the flagpole for its own use on appropriate occasions, to fly any flag approved by Council resolution.
- When not being used by Council, recognised community groups, interest groups or organisations, e.g. Rotary, or organisations supported by some section of the community, e.g. Salvation Army, may ask permission to fly a flag identifying or emblematic of their cause, organisation or group. Such requests must be made in the appropriate format via Council’s website and must be made sufficiently in advance of the proposed date(s) the flag is to be flown to allow time for Council to make an informed decision.

Proposed Procedure

Community flags may be flown on the flagpole situated at the Market Building.

Community and interest groups in Mount Alexander Shire may request approval from Council to fly a flag emblematic of or representing their organisation or group at any time.

Those requests must be made in writing (normally) at least 8 (eight) weeks in advance of the date when it is requested the flag be flown. Late applications will not normally be accepted.
Council will consider and be responsible for approval of any request, doing so frequently enough to allow relevant community groups to arrange for approved flags in a timely manner.

Groups will be responsible for the appropriate provision, quality, raising, lowering and removal of their flags. Council cannot provide any assistance in this matter other than unlocking the facility.

**Alternate Options**

There is no suggested alternative.
Flying of Flags Policy

Note: The ‘draft’ stamp can only be removed by Governance upon approval by CEO or Council.

Category: Governance
Adoption: Council or CEO Date: (Adoption/most recent revision)
Review period: Five years
Responsible Manager: Principal Governance Officer
CEO Signature Date

Purpose / Objective:

This Policy covers the flying of flags on Council controlled flag poles.

This Policy defines how applications from the Mount Alexander Shire community to fly flags on specific days will be considered.

Background / reasons for Policy:

This Policy has been developed because from time to time community groups have requested permission to use various flag poles to celebrate or support various causes and Council has not had a formal position to ensure equity and consistency of decision making.

Council controlled flag poles locations

Mount Alexander Shire Council proactively flies flags at:
- Civic Centre on Lloyd Street, Castlemaine (three flagpoles)
- Market Building, Mostyn Street, Castlemaine (one flagpole on top and one flagpole either side of the building)

Castlemaine Town Hall, Lyttleton Street has one flagpole that has ceased to be used because it was made obsolete by the three flag poles outside the Civic Centre and it is dangerous to use.

Any other flagpoles under Council’s direct control, apart from those mentioned above, may fly only flags approved in accordance with Australian Flag protocols. Flag poles managed by Section 86 Committees of Council are not covered by this policy.
Flying of Flags Policy

Overriding legislation and protocols

Council will at all times follow the guidelines set out by the Australian Government and the Victorian Department of Premier and Cabinet – Protocols Unit. This ensures Council is meeting its obligations regarding the national protocols for flying the Australian flag and complying with special arrangements for flying flags at half-mast on days of significance or in remembrance of persons or events.

Policy content:

Flags to be flown on Council controlled flag poles

Civic Centre on Lloyd St. Castlemaine

These flagpoles are reserved for Council use. Only the Australian Flag, Aboriginal Flag and Torres Strait Island Flag will be flown on the three flag poles at this site.

Market Building, Mostyn Street Castlemaine

The Australian Flag will be flown on top of the Market Building and an information flag will be flown on the flag pole on the Barker Street side of the Market Building.

Unless otherwise approved from time to time in accordance with this Policy, an information flag will be flown on the flag pole located on the Hargraves Street side of the Market Building.

None of the flag poles identified in this Policy may be used to fly flags for commercial or decorative purposes and any flag flown that has not been approved in accordance with this Policy will be removed immediately by Council staff.

Community requests to fly flags

Community requests for the flying of a flag on the flag pole located on the Hargraves Street side of the Market Building will be considered by Council subject to the following requirements:

1. An application must be made in writing and be submitted to Council no less than 8 weeks prior to the proposed start date for flying of the flag.
2. The application must be made by a resident or community group from within the Mount Alexander Shire.
3. The application must indicate how the flying of the flag would support one of more of the following:
   a. The vision, values and strategies stated in the adopted Council Plan;
   b. Recognition of a social, cultural, environmental, economic, political or historical matter of Local, State and/or National significance that has direct relevance to the Mount Alexander Shire community;
   c. Encouragement of values that promote respect for all;
   d. Encouragement of values that promote a sense of belonging and enhanced community life for all.
4. The application must indicate what period of time the flag is requested to be flown and the reasons for this. No flag shall be permitted to be flown for longer than seven days and

Flying of Flags Policy
Flying of Flags Policy

Council reserves the right to determine the period of time that any approved flag may be flown.

5. Irrespective of any other requirement of this Policy, should there be a voting process enacted or be reasonably anticipated to be enacted by the State or Federal Government that requires or invites the citizens of Mount Alexander Shire to vote, then no flag associated with the matter to be voted on shall be permitted to be flown during that period.

6. The applicant must confirm that they will raise the flag each morning and lower it each evening throughout the period approved. No flag shall be left flying over night and a failure to meet this requirement will result in approval being immediately rescinded.

7. Any flag proposed to be flown must be provided by the applicant at his/her cost, be in good condition and meet appropriate dimensions noted in the Australian Flags Act 1953.

Responsibilities:

The Principal Governance Officer shall administer this Policy.

Related Policies:

Nil

Relevant Legislation:

The Australian Flags Act 1953
9.2. OUR ECONOMY (ECO)

ECO 15 PLANNING PERMIT APPLICATION PA029/2018 – DISPLAY OF A MAJOR PROMOTION SIGN AT LOT 2 ON LP116233 AND CROWN ALLOTMENT 6 ON SECTION A OF THE PARISH OF CASTLEMAINE, 42-44 JOHNSTONE STREET, CASTLEMAINE.

Responsible Director: Director Sustainable Development
Responsible Officer: Manager Development Services
Original Document: DOC/18/8620

Executive Summary

Council has received an application for the display of a major promotion sign at Lot 2 on LP116233 and Crown Allotment 6 on Section A of the Township of Castlemaine, 42-44 Johnstone Street, Castlemaine.

The site is located within the Commercial 1 Zone and is not subject to any overlays.

Public notice of the application has resulted in twenty-eight (28) written objections.

The sign application has been assessed against the policy and specific controls of the planning scheme. The proposed sign is excessive in size and is incompatible with the identified landscape character of the area, which is defined by the open space and greenery of the creek-side landscape and established mature trees lining the road. Further, already the site hosts a number of signs; the cumulative impact of these signs with the addition of the proposed sign would create an unattractive cluttering of advertising.

It is recommended that a Notice of Refusal to grant a planning permit be issued.
RECOMMENDATION

That Council issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse a Planning Permit for the display of a major promotion sign at Crown Allotment 6 on Section A of the Township of Castlemaine, 42-44 Johnstone Street, Castlemaine, on the following grounds:

1. The sign would negatively impact on the significant landscape character of this gateway location, which has identified values outlined in local policy.

2. The visibility of the sign from the adjacent residential area would result in detriment to these properties.

3. The proposed sign would not enhance this entry to Castlemaine, as required in policy.

4. The sign is excessive in scale to its surroundings and does not have any regard to the recognised and preferred landscape character that provides a welcoming entrance to the town.

5. The sign would dominate the existing treed Creekside reserve area and streetscape.

MOVED COUNCILLOR PETRUSMA

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR LESSER

CARRIED.
Context

The purpose of this report is to enable Council to make a determination on Planning Permit Application 029/2018 for the for the display of a major promotion sign at Crown Allotment 6 on Section A of the Township of Castlemaine, 42-44 Johnstone Street, Castlemaine.

The application has been referred to Council for a decision as officers are recommending refusal.

Refer to:

Attachment ECO 15A: PA029/2018 - Context and site aerial
Attachment ECO 15B: PA029/2018 - Final plans submitted with application

This application was lodged on 30 January 2018 and seeks approval for the display of a major promotion sign.

The subject site is located on Johnstone Street, the main southern entrance/exit to Castlemaine. The site consists of two separate lots with a combined total area of around 2300m². There is an existing large commercial building built across the lot boundaries, car parking areas, some existing signage, and fencing on the site, which is currently being used by a carpet sales business.

The site forms part of a small Commercial 1 Zone area along this side of the road which extends only 90 metres to the north to Gaulton Street. The other two properties in this zone are a single dwelling and the Klua Sathorn Thai restaurant.

To the south is a long area of well treed parkland reserve and trails alongside Campbell’s creek, while the land on the opposite side of the road is in the General Residential Zone, and consists of a mixture of residential dwellings, with the sole exception of a service station on the corner of Maclise Street.

It is noted that the applicant has referred to the site as being in an ‘industrial/commercial area’. This is incorrect, as there is no industrial zoned land or industrial uses in this area. The predominant land use of the surrounding area is residential, with dwellings all along the south side of the road, while the site itself forms part of a small isolated area of the Commercial 1 Zone with two other properties.

The proposed major promotion sign would be 12.6 metres long and 3.35 metres high having an advertising area of 42.21 m², with an additional 0.65 metre high cladding area underneath with only a small corporate logo of the owning advertising company, and would stand upon 2.25 metre high supports. No illumination of the billboard is proposed.

Only the side of the sign facing north is proposed to be used with a single large panel advertisement, primarily facing any traffic exiting Castlemaine, while also in effect facing the adjacent residential properties on the other side of the street in doing so.

The advertising panel is proposed to be changed between different advertisements whenever desired at the discretion of the signage company, acting as a commercial billboard for paying customers.

The subject site is not subject to any overlays.

Amendment C82

The site is subject to a proposed Planning Scheme Amendment currently in progress; ‘Amendment C82 – Update to Land Subject to Flood Inundation Overlay and introduction of Floodway Overlay.’
This amendment proposes to apply the Land Subject to Inundation Overlay (LSIO) to the entirety of the subject site, and the Floodway overlay (FO) to small areas of the site which have a more severe flood risk, including the area of the proposed major promotion sign.

The display of signage would not be a permit trigger under either of these overlays, and as it is proposed to be raised upon 2.25 metre high supports the sign is not expected to be impacted by flooding and is unlikely to cause significant impacts to water flows during any potential flooding events.

**Policy and Statutory Implications**

**State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)**

**Clause 11 Settlement**

This clause outlines that planning is to recognise the need for, and as far as practicable contribute towards achieving a number of key principles, including achieving a high standard of urban design and amenity.

At Clause 11.04 Open Space, the policy includes objectives relating to the creation and maintenance of suitable open space for the community, with strategies which include to:

- ‘Ensure that land use and development adjoining regional open space networks, national parks and conservation reserves complements the open space in terms of visual and noise impacts, treatment of waste water to reduce turbidity or pollution and the preservation of vegetation.’
- ‘Protect sites and features of high scientific, nature conservation, biodiversity, heritage, geological or landscape value.’

**Clause 12 Environmental and Landscape Values**

This clause outlines that Planning should protect sites and features of nature conservation, biodiversity, geological or landscape value.

**Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage**

At Clause 15.01-1 Urban design this policy includes the objective:

‘To create urban environments that are safe, functional and provide good quality environments with a sense of place and cultural identity.’

Relevant strategies for achieving this objective include:

- Promote good urban design to make the environment more liveable and attractive.
- Require development to respond to its context in terms of urban character, cultural heritage, natural features, surrounding landscape and climate.
- Ensure sensitive landscape areas such as the bays and coastlines are protected and that new development does not detract from their natural quality.
- Ensure transport corridors integrate land use planning, urban design and transport planning and are developed and managed with particular attention to urban design aspects.

At Clause 15.01-2 Urban Design Principles the policy includes the objective:

‘To achieve architectural and urban design outcomes that contribute positively to local urban character and enhance the public realm while minimising detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

Relevant strategies include applying the following relevant design principles:
Context

- Development must take into account the natural, cultural and strategic context of its location.
- Planning authorities should emphasise urban design policies and frameworks for key locations or precincts.
- A comprehensive site analysis should be the starting point of the design process and form the basis for consideration of height, scale and massing of new development.

The public realm

- The public realm, which includes main pedestrian spaces, streets, squares, parks and walkways, should be protected and enhanced.

Landmarks, views and vistas

- Landmarks, views and vistas should be protected and enhanced or, where appropriate, created by new additions to the built environment.

Pedestrian spaces

- Design of interfaces between buildings and public spaces, including the arrangement of adjoining activities, entrances, windows, and architectural detailing, should enhance the visual and social experience of the user.

Landscape architecture

- Recognition should be given to the setting in which buildings are designed and the integrating role of landscape architecture.

Clause 18.02 Transport

This clause includes the following relevant strategies:

- Plan or regulate new uses or development of land near an existing or proposed transport route to avoid detriment to, and where possible enhance the service, safety and amenity desirable for that transport route in the short and long terms.
- Plan and regulate the design of transport routes and nearby areas to achieve visual standards appropriate to the importance of the route with particular reference to landscaping, the control of outdoor advertising and, where appropriate, the provision of buffer zones and resting places.

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)

Clause 21.02-4 Strategic Framework Plan

This policy includes the Mount Alexander Strategic Framework Plan, which sets out strategic objectives for the municipality. One of the objectives for Castlemaine is to ‘Enhance town and shire entrances.’

Clause 21.04 Environmental and Landscape Values

This clause outlines the environmental and landscape features and values that are spread across the municipality, and proposed strategies for their protection.

21.07 Built Environment and Heritage

This policy states:

Castlemaine has four highway entrances that play an important role for commercial and tourism development and act as the gateways to the township. These are:
• Pyrenees Highway / Elizabeth Street
• Pyrenees Highway / Duke Street and Forest Street
• Midland Highway / Barker Street
• Midland Highway / Johnstone Street

Policy includes:

• Encouraging the development of underutilised commercial buildings and sites in ways that respect traditional building forms and heritage character.
• Ensuring that highway entrances provide opportunities for commercial and tourism uses whilst respecting township character, heritage values and sensitive streetscapes.

**Objective 1**
The identity and existing urban character of the Shire’s townships.

**Strategy 1.3** Encourage land use and development to deliver positive urban design outcomes.

**Objective 5**
To maintain the identity of the Shire’s townships and create positive impressions for visitors.

**Strategies**

Strategy 5.1 Ensure that development protects the important character attributes and function of the reservations at the main entrances to townships.

Strategy 5.2 Encourage design, signage and landscape treatments that enhance the sense of arrival in the Shire’s townships.

**Clause 21.09 Economic Development**
This policy encourages focusing commercial development primarily within and around the retail core of Castlemaine, and supporting the use of under-utilised existing commercial buildings and sites in the retail core and small towns. It does not provide any relevant specific guidance on promotional advertising signage.

**Clause 21.12-1 Castlemaine and Clause 21.12-2 Castlemaine Commercial Centre**
The second of these two related clauses has includes objective 2: ‘To recognise and strengthen the roles of the highway entrances to Castlemaine.’

This objective is to be achieved by strategies which include “implementing the ‘Land Use Concepts’ in the Castlemaine Town Entrances Land Use Strategy (2002), as modified by the recommendations of the Addendum Report (2007).”

The strategy also recognised the importance of the landscape character of this section of road with the established Elm trees and creek reserve views creating a welcoming entrance, and further supplementary tree planting being recommended.

**Zoning**

**Clause 34.01 Commercial 1 Zone (C1Z)**
The land is located partly within the Commercial 1 Zone which includes in its objectives:

• To create vibrant mixed use commercial centres for retail, office, business, entertainment and community uses.
• To provide for residential uses at densities complementary to the role and scale of the commercial centre.

The relevant decision Guidelines of this zone include:

• The interface with adjoining zones, especially the relationship with residential areas.

This zone is a Category 1 area for advertising signs.

Overlays

There are no planning overlays on the subject site.

Particular provisions

Clause 52.05 Advertising Signs

The purpose of this clause includes:

• To provide for signs that are compatible with the amenity and visual appearance of an area, including the existing or desired future character.
• To ensure signs do not contribute to excessive visual clutter or visual disorder.
• To ensure that signs do not cause loss of amenity or adversely affect the natural or built environment or the safety, appearance or efficiency of a road.

This clause includes extensive decision guidelines specific to the assessment of advertising signage applications.

Clause 65 Decision Guidelines

Because a permit can be granted does not imply that a permit should or will be granted. The responsible authority must decide whether the proposal will produce acceptable outcomes in terms of the decision guidelines of this clause.

Issues

Council has a number of policies which aim to enhance town entrances and encourage design, signage and landscape treatments that enhance the sense of arrival in the Shire’s townships.

The policy setting acknowledges the need to provide opportunities for commercial and tourism uses at highway entrances, but this must be done in a manner that respects the township character, heritage values and the scale of the streetscapes.

This site forms part of the southern entranceway to Castlemaine. It is an area with recognised landscape character serving much traffic including tourists to the town, to Maldon, to Daylesford, and to the surrounding central goldfields region.

The proposed sign does not enhance this entry to Castlemaine. It would dominate the location, is excessive in scale to its surroundings and does not have any regard to the recognised and preferred landscape character that provides a welcoming entrance to the town.

Impact on Landscape Character

Acknowledged as a reference document to Clause 21.12-2 Castlemaine Commercial Centre, the Castlemaine Town Entrances Land Use Strategy (2002) recognises the importance of the landscape character of this section of road with the established Elm trees and creek reserve views creating a welcoming entrance, and further
supplementary tree planting works being recommended. This is a well appreciated
existing landscape character which is recognised by planning policy.

The applicant in their submission has stated that the large commercial billboard will ‘add
visual interest to an otherwise mundane streetscape, without affecting road safety or
amenity.’

The creek-side reserve and mature vegetation are recognised in planning policy for the
significant and obvious importance they hold in this southern entrance area to
Castlemaine. The recognised landscape values would not benefit by being obscured and
interrupted with a large, elevated, 42m² commercial billboard.

Residential nature of the area
The proposed sign would follow the alignment of the property boundary, and in effect
face not only oncoming south-bound traffic but also the residential properties on the
south side of the street. This a predominantly residential area, with eleven (11) dwellings
on the south side of Johnstone street between Maclise Street and Steward Street, and
there are nine (9) residential dwellings on the South side of the road which will
potentially have views of the major promotion sign.

The residents of 39, 1/37, 2/37, 35, 33 and 31 Johnstone Street will have substantial
views with the 42 m² advertisement located across the street and within as little as 38
metres of their lot boundaries, while the other properties will have more distant or
interrupted views.

A key decision guideline specific to the Commercial 1 Zone, and the only unique
guideline of this zone which is applicable to the proposed signage, is to have regard for
‘The interface with adjoining zones, especially the relationship with residential areas.’

The proposed sign would result in significant detriment to the residents of these existing
dwellings.

While the site itself is in the Commercial 1 Zone with ‘minimum limitation’ the visual
amenity impact of such a large sign will obviously be primarily to the land that it faces,
and the sign is to be erected facing away from the site itself and towards the southern
side of the street, an area of existing dwellings entirely in the General Residential Zone
(GRZ) which is a sensitive category 3 ‘high amenity’ area. This would have significant
negative amenity impacts for the residents.

Assessment against Clause 52.05 Advertising Signs

Decision guidelines under this clause relevant to this proposal include:

The character of the area including:

- The sensitivity of the area in terms of the natural environment, heritage values,
  waterways and open space, rural landscape or residential character.
- The compatibility of the proposed sign with the existing or desired future character
  of the area in which it is proposed to be located.
- The cumulative impact of signs on the character of an area or route, including the
  need to avoid visual disorder or clutter of signs.

The proposed commercial billboard is incompatible with the identified landscape
character of the area which is defined by the open space and greenery of the creek-side
landscape and established mature trees lining the road.
There is already a number of signs on the site, and the combination of these with the proposed sign has the potential for a significant cumulative impact, with the combination of various signage creating a major cluttering of advertising.

If approved, the combined signage on site would include:

- The existing ‘Welcome to Castlemaine’ promotional sign, 4.8 metres x 2.4 metres (11.52m²)
- An existing business identification sign on the store, 7 metres x 1 metre (7m²)
- An existing standalone business identification sign, 2.4 metres x 1.2 metres (2.88m²) on supporting poles.
- The proposed 42m² major promotion sign, 3.35 metres x 12.66 metres (42.41m²), with a 0.65 metre high cladding area and small corporate logo sign, elevated on 2.25 metre high support struts.

This would be a combined total of 63.81m². The addition if a large billboard style sign would form an unacceptable and unattractive clutter of signs in this location.

Additionally, there is also a large illegally erected billboard very close by on the adjacent Maclise Street corner (attached to the side of the service station). Council is currently investigating this sign.

Impacts on views and vistas:

- The potential to obscure or compromise important views from the public realm.
- The potential to dominate the skyline:
- The potential to impact on the quality of significant public views.

The proposed advertising billboard will be the largest sign anywhere in the municipality, and with the elevated position provided by supporting struts, the sign would dominate the skyline and significantly impact both the views of adjacent residents, and the views of passing vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

The relationship to the streetscape, setting or landscape:

- The proportion, scale and form of the proposed sign relative to the streetscape, setting or landscape.
- The position of the sign, including the extent to which it protrudes above existing buildings or landscape and natural elements.
- The ability to reduce the number of signs by rationalising or simplifying signs.

At 42m² in size, the sign would be the largest in the municipality and dwarfs the existing signs on site. While there are a number of existing signs on the site, the siting will obscure currently open views of the Creekside reserve.

The position of the sign will place it at elevation and greatly obscure the adjacent line of trees in the creek-side reserve, and the creek-side environs themselves beyond that.

The relationship to the site and building:

- The scale and form of the sign relative to the scale, proportion and any other significant characteristics of the host site and host building.
- The extent to which the sign displays innovation relative to the host site and host building.
- The extent to which the sign requires the removal of vegetation or includes new landscaping.
The proposed signage bears no real relationship with the building, and is positioned away from it to be used for unrelated promotional sign purposes.

**Clause 52.05-6 Major Promotion Sign**

In addition to the basic purpose and decision guidelines of *Clause 52.05 Advertising Signs* which are applicable to all signage, at *Clause 52.05-6 Major Promotion Sign* the policy includes additional objectives and decision guidelines which are specific to the high impact nature of Major Promotion Signs. The proposed sign is a major promotion sign because of its size.

The planning scheme states:

When determining the effect of a proposed major promotion sign, the following locational principles must be taken into account:

- Major promotion signs are encouraged in commercial and industrial locations in a manner which complements or enhances the character of the area.
- Major promotion signs are discouraged along forest and tourist roads, scenic routes or landscaped sections of freeways.
- Major promotion signs are discouraged within open space reserves or corridors and around waterways.
- Major promotion signs are discouraged where they will form a dominant visual element from residential areas, within a heritage place or where they will obstruct significant view lines.
- In areas with a strong built form character, major promotion signs are encouraged only where they are not a dominant element in the streetscape and except for transparent feature signs (such as neon signs), are discouraged from being erected on the roof of a building.

The proposed sign does not meet these locational principles as follows:

- The sign would have a significant detrimental visual impact upon the treed streetscape.
- The sign would have a major impact on the significant landscape character of this gateway location, which has identified values outlined in local policy.
- The sign will greatly impact the amenity of the residents of the directly adjacent residential properties in this location.
- The sign will be adjacent and obscuring the well treed Creekside reserve area and these signs are specifically discouraged in such proximity.

For all the reasons that have been outlined, it is determined that the proposal does not achieve compliance with the purpose and decision guidelines of *Clause 52.05 Advertising Signs* and more specifically *Clause 52.05-6 Major Promotion Signs*.

**Alternative Options**

Council could choose to issue a Notice of Decision to grant a permit. For the reasons outlined in this report, this is not recommended by Council officers.

**Financial and Resource Implications**

Cost of potential appeal to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

**Consultation**

There are twenty-eight (28) outstanding objections to the proposal raising various concerns which can be summarised and addressed as follows:
Traffic Safety Issues

While Johnstone Street as a section of both the Midland and Pyrenees Highway is a busy road, the proposal is not close to any major traffic intersections, and when the proposal was referred to VicRoads as the relevant referral authority responsible for maintenance and safe operation of the road VicRoads responded with no objection and no conditions, indicating they have no significant concerns.

The main safety concern that can be found is the presence of so many direct driveway crossovers onto the road with associated entering and exiting traffic movements due to the residential nature of most of the surrounding area.

Inappropriate siting for Traffic Accident Commission (TAC) signage

While the documents provided with the planning permit application provide and refer to examples of such major promotion signage being used by the Traffic Accident Commission (TAC) for road safety messages, ultimately the proposal is simply for a large sign which can be changed by the signage company at will if it is approved, and may carry any form of advertisement material.

The sign is not specifically for the TAC, and as such this is not relevant to the assessment of the proposal.

Residential nature of the area

As has been outlined in detail earlier in this report, the proposed sign would have a visual amenity impact for the residents of the many existing dwellings on the Southern side of the street which it faces.

Impacts on township entrance and parkland amenity

The proposed sign is in an area of identified landscape character on the southern entrance to Castlemaine, and the impacts on this landscape are considered to be unacceptable when considered against relevant policy and the Castlemaine Town Entrances Land Use Strategy (2002) which is included as a reference document in local policy.

Heritage appearance of Castlemaine

While Castlemaine certainly has high historical significance overall, there are no heritage listed sites anywhere within this stretch of road. As such, concerns with the suitability of the proposed signage for this location primarily relate to visual amenity and landscape impact grounds, rather than impacts upon any specific heritage listing or values.

Potential for cluttering and a precedent for other large signs

Assessment of the proposal is limited to only what is proposed to be erected and what already exists on site. However, it can be noted that there is already a significant proliferation of signage with the several existing business identification signs and ‘welcome to Castlemaine’ promotional sign on the property, which will be added to with the proposed signage.

Combined with the existing signage, this could create a compromised visual environment where further large commercial signage, such as the billboard which seems to have been illegally erected on the Maclise Street corner, may become common-place. In their supporting written submission the applicant has referred to this nearby illegal signage as justification for the approval of their own proposal.
Applicant Objector Meeting

An applicant objector meeting was not held as a majority of objections seemed to be entirely against allowing the proposed major promotion sign in any form, and it was not anticipated that any agreement could be reached between the parties.
ECO 17  APPROVAL OF PROPOSED BUDGET 2018/2019 FOR PUBLIC EXHIBITION

Responsible Director: Director Corporate and Community Services
Responsible Officer: Executive Manager Business Performance
Original Document: DOC/18/12421

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to present the Proposed Budget 2018/2019 for Council approval to commence the statutory procedures to place the Proposed Budget on public exhibition and invite submissions as required under Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act).

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Give Public Notice in accordance with Section 129(1) and Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 that it has prepared a budget for 2018/2019;

2. Make copies of the Proposed Budget 2018/2019 available for inspection at the Civic Centre and on Council’s website;

3. Hear any person who makes a written submission in relation to the Proposed Budget 2018/2019 by 5.00pm 23 May 2018 and who indicates they wish to be heard, at a Special Meeting of Council to be held at the Civic Centre, Castlemaine at 6.30pm on Tuesday 5 June 2018;

4. Consider any submissions made, and adopt the Council Budget 2018/2019 at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 26 June 2018; and

5. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to undertake minor editorial changes to the Proposed Budget 2018/2019 if required.

MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CORDY

CARRIED.
Context

The Proposed Budget 2018/2019 is for the year 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 and is prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 and associated Regulations.


These statements have been prepared for the year ended 30 June 2019 in accordance with the Act and associated Regulations, and are consistent with the annual financial statements which are prepared in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards.

The budget also includes information about the rates and charges to be levied, the capital works program to be undertaken, the human resources required, and other financial information which Council requires in order to make an informed decision about the adoption of the budget.

Refer to:

Mount Alexander Shire Council Proposed Budget 2018/2019 – to be tabled at meeting.

Policy and Statutory Implications

Section 127 of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act) states that Council must prepare a budget for each financial year.

Section 129 of the Act states that Council must give public notice that a budget has been prepared and that a person has a right to make a submission under Section 223 of the Act.

Section 130 of the Act states that Council must adopt the budget by 30 June each year and must submit a copy of the budget to the Minister.

Issues

The Proposed Budget 2018/2019 reflects the key priorities and objectives outlined in the Council Plan 2017-2021. The capital expenditure and special projects have been prioritised based on a number of key strategies adopted by Council including the Council Plan 2017-2021.

Alternate Options

There is no alternative option – Council must publically advertise and then adopt an Annual Budget.

Financial and Resource Implications

The attached Annual Budget 2018/2019 (to be tabled at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 17 April 2018) details the financial and resource implications.

Consultation

Council is required to undertake a public consultation process under Section 223 of the Local Government Act.
The Proposed Budget 2018/2019 will be available on Council’s website and at Council’s offices from 19 April 2018.

Community members are invited to review the Proposed Budget and make a written submission. Submissions close at 5.00pm on Wednesday 23 May 2018. Council will hold a Special Meeting of Council on 5 June 2018 at 6.30pm to hear submissions of those written submissions that note that wish to be heard.
10. DELEGATES REPORTS

Meetings Attended by Chief Executive Officer and Mayor

The Chief Executive Officer tabled meetings attended by the CEO and the Mayor for the period 21 March to 17 April 2018.

Refer to Attachment 10A

The following meetings were noted by the CEO:

- CEO attended the Loddon-Campaspe Regional Partnership Meeting. A Regional Assembly will be held on 3 May 2018 in Kyneton at 5.00 pm and the public and Councillors are encouraged to apply to attend. Topics to be discussed will include the economy, early years, tourism and parks.
- The CEO and senior officers met with the Red Tape Commissioner who reports directly to the Treasurer. The Commissioner has been examining where “red tape” might be reduced in rural areas and particularly in the Loddon Mallee Region. Of the 224 matters referred to the Commissioner, more than 50% were to do with State Government regulations. At the local level, the Commissioner had examined 14 matters to do with Mount Alexander Shire Council. He had noted with approval that planning was acknowledged as having improved considerably over recent years. The CEO would table the Commissioner’s finding with Councillors and would be working with officers to further address the findings.

The following meetings were noted by the Mayor:

- Various meetings with the community and politicians over improvements in female friendly change rooms.
- The Mayor spoke positively about the community feeling at a recent meeting to explain the process for expressing interest in join the LGBTIQ Round Table.

The following meetings were noted by Councillor Cordy:

- Councillor Cordy attended the Calder Highway Improvement Committee meeting that deals with projects and issues along the (roughly) 548 kilometres of the highway. It appears that most of the priority projects for the current twelve months focus on the northern end around Marong to Mildura but the meetings provide opportunities other Local Government groups, such as Mount Alexander Shire, to have their say.
- Councillor Cordy tabled a report from the Committee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>CEO</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Paul Frye &amp; Beth Mellick (Castlemaine Secondary College) regarding matters of common interest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with the Hobo Theatre Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite inspection of Potts &amp; Fryes Road, Taradale with acting Director Sustainable Development and acting Manager Infrastructure</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride to School Day - Castlemaine South</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview and photo at new supermarket site (old Gasworks site)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire Brigade Championships - Harcourt</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Lucy Young regarding deposit scheme on plastic bottles</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Regional Director Loddon Mallee, DELWP regarding matters of common interest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with MAINfm</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Jill Hennessy, Minister for Health with CEO, Castlemaine Health and Chair, Castlemaine Community District Health</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Leever integrated water management meeting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Maree Edwards regarding matters of common interest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Maree Edwards, Workspace Australia &amp; Castlemaine Hot Rod Centre Ltd regarding Etty Street site</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Red Tape Commissioner, Matthew Butlin, regarding the findings of his review into bureaucratic activities causing 'red tape' to development in the region and our Shire</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with VicRoads Regional Director and others to discuss matters of common interest</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Castlemaine Art Museum representatives regarding future plans for CAM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to refugees regarding RAR picnic</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sod turning and funding announcements with Maree Edwards, Member for Bendigo West, and others at Barkers Creek and Wesley Hill recreation reserves</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with VicTrack General Manager Business Services regarding possible works at the railway crossing in Elphinstone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Maldon residents, Cr Gardner and acting Director Sustainable Development regarding the Maldon Design Guidelines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with representatives of Dja Dja Wurrung and Djaandak with acting Executive Manager Organisational Capability and acting Director Sustainable Development regarding opportunities for working together to deliver infrastructure projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big plastic bottle event to support container deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQI Round Table - community information session</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural &amp; Regional Mayors Group bus tour and meeting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddon Campaspe Regional Partnership Meeting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Rick Nelson - Indigenous Round Table agenda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Workshop with Castlemaine Health, Castlemaine &amp; District Community Health, other service providers and Director Corporate &amp; Community Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Castlemaine Community House regarding accommodation options</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with CFA regarding Dog Park</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. NOTICE OF MOTION

11.1. NOTICE OF MOTION 2018/003 – SUPPORT OF STATE CAMPAIGN FOR 2018 NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSES VICTORIA BUDGET SUBMISSION

MOVED COUNCILLOR GARDNER

That Council writes to the relevant Minister and to State Member for Bendigo West, Maree Edwards, in support of the current state-wide campaign seeking increased funding in the forthcoming Victorian Government budget for Neighbourhood Houses.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR PETRUSMA

CARRIED.

Rationale

Mount Alexander Shire recognises that the Neighbourhood Houses in our Shire are an essential part of our community. They develop and deliver services that respond to the needs of our communities. The Mount Alexander Shire calls on the Victorian government to deliver on its 2014 election commitment to support the Neighbourhood Houses through increased funding so that they can meet community needs.

12. URGENT SPECIAL BUSINESS

Nil.

13. MEETING CLOSE

Meeting closed at 7:43 pm.