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OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY 23 OCTOBER 2012
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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: Janet Cropley, Tracey Cross, Christine Henderson, Michael Redden and Garry Rewell.

Officers: Director Environment and Infrastructure (Johan Louw), Director Corporate Support (Lucy Roffey),
Director Economic and Social Development (Carolyn Wallace) and Manager Governance (Melanie Rogers).

2. APOLOGIES

Councillors Tim Barber and Bronwen Machin.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST / CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

4. MINUTES

4.1. ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL – 9 OCTOBER 2012

The unconfirmed minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Mount Alexander Shire Council held at 7.30pm on
Tuesday 9 October 2012 at the Castlemaine Senior Citizen’s 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 9 October 2012
be confirmed.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
5. **PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN**

That standing orders be suspended.

**SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL**

CARRIED (7.34 pm).

a. Margaret Rasa

Ms Rasa congratulated Council on its achievements for the term and wished those Councillors who were re-standing good luck in the elections.

**MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN**

That standing orders be resumed.

**SECONDED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON**

CARRIED (7.35 pm).

6. **PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS**
7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1. GOLDFIELDS REGIONAL LIBRARY CORPORATION BOARD 27 APRIL 2012 AND 29 JUNE 2012

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes for the Goldfields Regional Library Corporation Board for the meetings held on 27 April 2012 and 29 June 2012 be noted (Attachments 7.1 and 7.2).

MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CROSS

CARRIED.

8. ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS

8.1. ASSEMBLY ON 31 AUGUST 2012 AND 9 OCTOBER 2012

RECOMMENDATION

That the Records for the Assembly of Councillors for the meetings held on 31 August 2012 and 9 October 2012 (Attachments 8.1 and 8.2) be noted.

MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CROSS

CARRIED.
Library Board Meeting
27th April 2012 at 3.30 pm
Cusack Room, Bendigo Library

-Minutes-

1. PRESENT:

City of Greater Bendigo
   Cr Rod Fyffe
   Marg Allan

Mount Alexander Shire
   Cr Michael Redden
   Carolyn Wallace

Loddon Shire Council
   Cr Christine Brooke (Chair)
   John McLinden

Macedon Ranges Shire Council
   Cr Rob Guthrie
   Karen Stevens

Chief Executive Officer
   Carolyn Macvean

Also in attendance:
   Bradley Thomas (Senior Accountant, CoGB Finance Dept.)
   Brenda Skinner (Goldfields Library Corporation)

2. APOLOGIES:
   Cr Henryka Benson (Macedon Ranges Shire Council)

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF GENERAL MEETING: 24th February 2012
   Moved:
   Seconded:
   cr Michael Redden
   Marg Allan

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF GENERAL MEETING: 24th February 2012
   No matters arising.
5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING (including confidential session): 23rd March 2012

   Moved    Cr Rod Fyffe
   Seconded Marg Allan carried ✓

6. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING: 23rd March 2012

   No matters arising.

7. ITEMS FOR DECISION

7.1 Financial Statements for the period 1st July 2011 to 31st March 2012

   Although there is movement in staffing, budget still favourable. Variances are also favourable with the CEO predicting a minor surplus.

   Motion: that the Board adopt the Financial Statements for the period 1st July 2011 to 31st March 2012.

   Moved    Cr Michael Redden
   Seconded Cr Rod Fyffe carried ✓

7.2 Report from the Finance Sub-committee and Goldfields Library Corporation Budget for 2012-2013.

   In looking at cash surplus and projections, the Finance Sub-committee is mindful of the tough financial times in the past and doesn’t want the Corporation to be placed in that position again. The large financial contributions to special projects from the Corporation over the next few years will impact on its sound financial position and may take five years to return to its current position.

   Commitments for the future include $1,000,000 for Bendigo Library Re-development, $800,000 for the introduction of RFID technology, EA 4% wage increase and the replacement of the prime mover next year.

   Council Contribution for this year is 4% and State Government 2%, resulting in the financial burden coming back to Councils as funding is not keeping up with costs. The population figures used are the current ABS figures re: Council Contributions $21.11 per capita for 2012/13.

   The Finance Sub-committee recommend to the Board a 5% increase in Council Contribution in 2013/14 financial year and following years. Council representatives will need to take back to their respective Council's the recommendation for a 5% increase for approval. The Corporation sets the rate to which Councils can agree to or refuse and it is also important to flag what we’re looking at to Councils for their financial forecasts.

   The Finance Sub-Committee discussed ways to trim back the 2012/2013 Budget including a recommendation for the CoGB to bring forward GLCS contribution to the Bendigo Library redevelopment to $500,000 in the 2012/13 and 2013/14 budgets respectively.

   The Finance Sub-committee will meet more regularly.

   Motion: that the Board adopt the Goldfields Library Corporation Draft Budget 2012/2013 for public display.

   Moved    Cr Michael Redden
   Seconded Cr Rod Fyffe carried ✓
7.3 Bendigo Library Redevelopment and Memorandum of Understanding

The Memorandum of Understanding was presented at the last Board meeting but some things were missed regarding governance arrangements. Two signatures only are required on the document. It is a goodwill document which clarifies issues and roles and something to refer to if the project experiences difficulty. A couple of minor changes will be added to the final document.

Motion:
1. The Board note the progress of the Bendigo Library Redevelopment; and

2. The Board adopt the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Greater Bendigo and the Goldfields Library Corporation with corrections.

Moved: John McLinden
Seconded: Cr Rod Ryffle
Carried √

8. GENERAL BUSINESS INCLUDING COUNCIL REPORTS

8.1 CEO Report

Low literacy ranking in Loddon Shire of concern. (See SEIFA Index for advantage/disadvantage)

8.2 City of Greater Bendigo

8.2.1 Eaglehawk Library

(See tabled letter of request from City of Greater Bendigo Council for an additional day of opening at Eaglehawk Library to cater for school aged children and to run programs at the site.)

There is currently a trial of Friday and Saturday morning opening in which the figures show no significant increase in usage but rather a shift from Friday to Saturday morning visits.

The two community consultation sessions organised in response to the 800 signature petition requesting an increase in opening hours was poorly attended.

The issues include the small library space and limited access for disabled people to the building.

GLC will seek permission from the Mechanics Institute Committee of Management for use of the front room to extend library and encourage greater use. Furniture from the Bendigo Library decant can be used at no cost. With an additional room, extended services can be trialled with very little cost.

CoGB Council resolution request is for a full day of opening so as to include after school access for children. CoGB will install a ramp for disabled access.

The Goldfields Library Corporation will assess the full day opening following the completion of Saturday morning opening trial.

The review, to be undertaken in June, provides an opportunity to see what service Goldfields Library Corporation can best provide to the Eaglehawk community and a second review will be undertaken following the opening of the refurbished Bendigo Library to ascertain required service delivery levels. In the short term, the criteria used to determine the case for extended hours are the number of visits and circulation figures and how much it will cost to lend a book at Eaglehawk.

Action: CEO to look at use of the front room and will review the extra day of opening at the end of the six month trial.
Motion: that the CEO write a report at the end of the six month trial.

Moved Cr Michael Redden
Seconded John McLinden carried

8.2.2 Bendigo Library redevelopment
An invitation for an Expressions of Interest for a Head Building Contractor to undertake the redevelopment of the Bendigo Library will be advertised this Saturday closing Thursday 17th May. The formal tender process will commence in June 2012.

The application for a planning permit for the Bendigo Advertiser building re: the decant has been lodged and the final contractual documentation is being prepared by the architects.

8.3 Loddon Shire Council
The Pyramid Hill Transaction Centre building is up for sale – houses both the Neighbourhood House and the library service – distressing for the community.

Low literacy ranking linked with the disadvantages of rural living/community and an issue for the future – Loddon Shire the second most disadvantaged community in the State (see SEIFA index).

8.4 Macedon Ranges Shire Council
Karen Siervogel extended her thanks to the CEO for attending the Woodend Library while the Minister for Local Government Jeanette Powell was visiting the Library.

8.5 Mount Alexander Shire
The “rolling stock” program at the Castlemaine Railway station a good story.

The new Newstead Community bus timetable will include trips to the Castlemaine Library. Statistics show the people are utilising the trial of extended hours at Castlemaine Library.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

9.1 MAC Review update (see table "Tomorrow’s Library" update)
The update recommends member Councils prepare a submission on behalf of their respective Councils regarding library services in the future and notes that Goldfields Library Corporation is preparing a separate submission. Submissions close 31st May 2012. The Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) will lodge a high level submission.

9.2 VECCI Workplace Health Check (see background paper tabled)
The upcoming changes in the Corporation including the Bendigo Library Redevelopment and the new Award make it timely to undergo a workplace health check. A survey to be distributed within the next few weeks will provide all staff with an opportunity to respond to questions regarding how they experience their work environment.

The Corporation has not had a health check in the CEO’s time in office and it is important that staff feel comfortable with the changes ahead.

Ellie Stephens introduced the Managers to the health check process at a special meeting on the 27th March 2012 and will give a presentation at the June Board meeting.
9.3 Victorians Love Libraries campaign (see background paper tabled)

Victorian Love Libraries is a campaign presented by the MAV and PIVN as a part of the National Year of Reading 2012 to encourage more Victorians to use libraries. Bernard Salt, at the National Year of Reading launch in February at the SLV reported that 46% of Australians do not have adequate literacy skills (this includes numeracy).

Cr Rod Fyffe extended thanks to the Senior Accountant on behalf of the Board for his support of the CEO in putting together the 2012/2013 Budget.

10. NEXT MEETING DATE AND TIME:
General Meeting 29th June 2012 at 3.30 pm
Cusack Room, Bendigo Library

MEETING CLOSED: 4.35 pm

Signed Chair ________________________________

Date ________________________________
Library Board Meeting
29th June 2012 at 3.30 pm
Cusack Room, Bendigo Library

-Minutes-

1. PRESENT:
   City of Greater Bendigo
   Cr Rod Fyffe
   Peter Davies (for Marg Allan)

   Mount Alexander Shire
   Cr Michael Redden
   Jill Berham (for Carolyn Wallace)

   Loddon Shire Council
   Cr Christine Brooke (Chair)
   John McInden

   Macedon Ranges Shire Council
   Karen Stevens

   Chief Executive Officer
   Carolyn Macvean

   Also in attendance:
   Brenda Skinner (Goldfields Library Corporation)

2. APOLOGIES:
   Cr Henryka Benson (Macedon Ranges Shire Council)
   Marg Allan (City of Greater Bendigo)
   Carolyn Wallace (Mount Alexander Shire Council)

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF GENERAL MEETING: 27th April 2012
   Moved: Cr Rod Fyffe
   Seconded: Cr Michael Redden
   carried ✓
4. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES
No matters arising.

5. ITEMS FOR DECISION

5.1 Financial Statements for the period 1st July 2011 to 31st May 2012
The CEO is comfortable with finances – all going well with no surprises. The IT budget will be overspent with the purchase of a new phone system for Bendigo. State Government funding has been received in a single payment which will allow for maximum interest on investments.

Motion: the Library Board adopt the Financial Statements for the period 1st July 2011 to 31st May 2012.
Moved: Cr Michael Redden
Seconded: John McLinden

5.2 Goldfields Library Corporation Budget 2012/2013
No submissions were received.

Motion: the Library Board adopt the Goldfields Library Corporation Budget 2012/2013.
Moved: Karen Stevens
Seconded: Cr Michael Redden

5.3 Bendigo Library Re-development update
The Tender specifications were sent out today. The quality of the Expressions of Interest was high, making it difficult to shortlist seven companies from the 31 submissions received. The applications for Tenders closes on the 8th August and a decision is to be made on the successful tender/submission before Council goes into caretaker mode. Building works are anticipated to start late September or early October.

The decent process is moving along well. The Bendigo Advertiser building has been painted, electrical work carried out and is now waiting for the IT infrastructure to be completed. The building is looking good with the freshen up and disability access is being planned for. The Tea Rose building is empty and work will start there next week.

Advertising for the three week closure and relocation will be included in the rate notices posters and bookmarks promoting the changes will be available for the Bendigo Library next week.

A media release went out today to give notice that the crepe myrtles cut the front of the Library are being relocated to the Botanical Gardens next week.

Motion: the Board note the progress of the Bendigo Library re-development.
Moved: Jill Barham
Seconded: Peter Davies

5.4 Review of Goldfields Library Corporation policies
(see Draft Investments, Cash Management and Credit Card Use policies circulated with the Board papers.)
The above policies were due for review.

Only minor changes were needed for the Credit Card Use Policy including the Chair’s authorisation of the CEO’s monthly Credit Card Statement.

The Government Guarantee section has been removed from the Investments Policy as it is no longer applicable. The Senior Accountant (CoGB) changed a couple of words in the Investments Policy.

Changes to the Cash Management Policy now include Eaglehawk and Romsey and note an increase in the petty cash float.

**Action:** Minor amendment to the wording of 3rd line, p.4 of the Credit Card Use Policy regarding the 50% restriction on cards per transaction.

The credit limits written in the Credit Card Use Policy may be insufficient with the proposed restructure and may require a mid-term review.

The Whistle Blower policy and Social Networking policy are to be written in accordance with Goldfields Library Corporation’s Risk Management strategy.

**Motion:** The Library Board adopt the revised Goldfields Library Corporation Investment, Cash Management and Credit Card Use policies.

Moved: Jill Barham
Secended: Peter Davies

**6. GENERAL BUSINESS INCLUDING COUNCIL REPORTS**

**6.1 CEO Report**

Castlemaine Library Manager, Alison Katzen has handed in her resignation to take up a position as Executive Manager, Library and Learning Services with the Geelong Regional Library Corporation. Alison finished with Goldfields Library Corporation in August.

**6.2 City of Greater Bendigo**

Review re: extended hours at Eaglehawk Library. The CEO proposes the trial continue for a further twelve months to include a full one day a week opening. Goldfields Library Corporation will also have the use of the reading room. The number of people visiting the Library during Friday and Saturday mornings is decreasing, possibly due to the colder weather and inadequate heating in the building. An access ramp still needs to be installed (when CoGB 2012/13 Budget is passed).

Discussions with the Eaglehawk Mechanics Institute Committee of Management are continuing regarding the terms and conditions of Goldfields Library Corporation occupancy of the building.

**6.3 Macedon Ranges Shire Council**

The Macedon Ranges Library Advisory Committee is not as effective as it has been in the past and Karen Stevens is working on a proposal that includes a rotation of quarterly meetings to be held at each of the four Macedon Ranges Libraries and, that the meetings be open to the community.

With a population increase in Gisborne, Macedon Ranges Shire Council is developing a plan in which consideration will be given to the re-development of the Gisborne Library at some time in the future.
In this context Karen Stevens proposed a ‘Libraries of the Future’ meeting with the Library Board and Councillors for a future planning workshop as Council Plans and Library Plans don’t always match up. This also fits in with the Bendigo Library redevelopment and how that relates to other libraries in the region, i.e. the impact of pockets of population growth on library services.

Board members agreed regarding the benefit of Councillors (other than representatives on the Board) to be aware of the role of libraries in the community and what they do.

Action: the CEO and Karen Stevens to come back to the Board with suggestions for an activity to involve interested parties and Councils in the future planning of libraries and library services. The workshop activity would be scheduled for after Council elections - new Council term in which the make-up of the Board may change.

6.4 Mount Alexander Shire

The book trolley at the Castlemaine Railway Station is a great success with books disappearing and reappearing in mostly proportionate numbers.

The “Yarn Bombing Extravaganza” at Castlemaine Library was also a huge success and the yarn covered bicycle parked out the front of the library in a yarn covered bike rack continues to amuse passers by.

6.5 Loddon Shire

A review of Mobile Library stops is in the CEO’s diary to complete. There has been a population groundswell in some of the smaller communities.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 MAC Review update

Approximately 60 formal submissions and approximately 1,000 informal submissions were received. The Statewide Project workgroup meetings ‘Victorian Public Libraries 2030’ overlaps with the MAC Review in looking at global trends and the opportunities and challenges facing public libraries in the future. The first speaker at the first meeting created scenarios from which he worked backwards to see how they worked out. This will be a very useful tool for the Corporation to use. Two more meetings are scheduled with a report from the consultant to follow.

7.2 VECCI Health Check update

The Health Check has been delayed due to another VECCI matter taking longer to finalise than expected. Once that matter is complete, the health check process can begin with each staff member being given the opportunity to speak about their experience of the Goldfields Library Corporation workplace. Position Descriptions will also be updated during this process.

7.3 VAGO Interim Management Letter for Goldfields Library Corporation

The recommendation to review and update Goldfields Library Corporation Investment, Cash Management and Credit Card Use policies have been followed (see policy drafts). The auditors also recommended the Corporation develop a Whistle blower’s Policy

7.4 The MOUs for the Secure Storage of Confidential Records and the Provision of Financial Services are due for renewal and revised drafts are with the City of Greater Bendigo for comment.

The Procurement Policy exempts the Goldfields Library Corporation from seeking additional quotes for the provision of financial services.
7.6 When Councils are in Caretaker mode Council Officers remain on the Board and current Councillors also remain members until representatives from the next Council cycle are selected which allows the CEO to ask for direction if needed.

Meeting closed: 4.30 pm

NEXT MEETING DATE AND TIME:
31st August 2012 at 3.30 pm
Woodend Library

Signed Chair ____________________________

Date _________________________________
ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD
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TIME 1.00 PM AT THE
HALFORD STREET MEETING ROOM
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1. **PRESENT**

   Councillors: Christine Henderson, Bronwen Machin.

   Officers: Director Economic and Social Development (Carolyn Wallace), Director Environment and Infrastructure (Johan Louw), Manager Infrastructure (David Ward).

   Others: Public Transport Victoria (Lidia Sucki and Jon Gunby).

2. **APOLOGIES**

   Councillors Michael Redden, Tim Barber, Janet Cropley, Councillor Gary Rawell.

3. **PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

   The purpose of the meeting was to provide feedback on the Mount Alexander Bus network review.

4. **RECORD OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter Discussed</th>
<th>Councillor Conflict?</th>
<th>Councillor Name</th>
<th>Cr left meeting?</th>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the Mount Alexander Bus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   * Councillors are required to leave the Meeting if they have declared an interest in an item that is being discussed. Councillors who have left the Meeting must not be able to see or hear the proceedings.

5. **MEETING CLOSE**

   Meeting closed at 3:05pm.
ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD
9 OCTOBER 2012
6.00 PM AT THE
CASTLEMAINE SENIOR CITIZEN’S CENTRE.
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Attachment 8.2
1. **PRESENT**

   Councillors: Tim Barber, Janet Cropley, Tracey Cross, Bronwen Machin, and Michael Redden.

   Officers: Chief Executive Officer (Phil Rowland), Director Corporate Support (Lucy Roffey), Director Environment and Infrastructure (Johan Louw), Director Economic and Social Development (Carolyn Wallace).

2. **APOLOGIES**

   Councillors Christine Henderson and Garry Rewell.

3. **PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

   The purpose of the meeting was to brief Councillors on items that will be considered at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 9 October 2012 and to discuss other matters which may come to Council at a future meeting.

4. **RECORD OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter Discussed</th>
<th>Councillor Conflict?</th>
<th>Councillor Name</th>
<th>Councillor left meeting?</th>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM 29 Request for Consent under Section 12(2)(B) of the Road Management Act 2004 to Discontinue Roads (Parcel 1 on SP 22232 and Parcel 109 on SP 21576)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR 23 Bendigo Regional Tourism Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR 24 Appointments to Special Committees of Council (s.88 Committee of Management - Camp Reserve Committee of Management)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR 25 Appointments to Special Committees of Council (s.88 Committee of Management - Taradale Recreation Reserve Committee of Management)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR 26 Appointments to Special Committees of Council (s.88 Committee of Management - Baringup Community Association Committee of Management)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT 79 Officer Delegations - Manager Infrastructure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Dog Friendly Parks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on School of Mines refurbishment project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Management Study</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councilors are required to leave the Meeting if they have declared an interest in an item that is being discussed. Councilors who have left the Meeting must not be able to see or hear the proceedings.

5. **MEETING CLOSE**

Meeting closed at 6:55 pm.
9. OFFICER REPORTS

9.1. STRENGTHENING OUR COMMUNITY (COM)

COM 30 HEARING OF S. 223 SUBMISSIONS - DISCONTINUATION OF GOVERNMENT ROAD – RECREATION AVENUE, NEWSTEAD ADJACENT TO NEWSTEAD RECREATION RESERVE

Responsible Officer: Manager Infrastructure
Original Document: DOC/12/88925

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the hearing of objections made under Section 223 of the Local Government Act to the proposed discontinuation of the Government Road known as Recreation Avenue, adjacent to Newstead Recreation Reserve between Hillier Street and Panmure Street, Newstead.

Refer to Confidential Attachment COM 30A: Submission received

2. Background

Council resolved at its Ordinary Meeting held on 28 August 2012 to:

1. Give Public Notice in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 of its intention to discontinue Recreation Avenue (Dundas Street extension) between Hillier Street and Panmure Street as a public road;

2. Publish the Public Notice in the Midland Express as a newspaper generally circulating in the municipal district of the Council on 11 September 2012;

3. Accept written submissions on the matter with a closing date of 5.00 pm on 9 October 2012;

4. Hear any persons who in their written submissions wish to be heard in support of their submission at the Ordinary Meeting of Council at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 23 October 2012 in the Castlemaine Senior Citizen's Centre; and

5. Having considered submissions, determine whether to proceed with the proposed discontinuation on the terms and conditions set out above at the Ordinary Meeting of Council at 7.30 pm on Tuesday 13 November 2012 in the Castlemaine Senior Citizen’s Centre.

A Public Notice advertising the proposed discontinuation of Recreation Avenue Newstead adjacent to the Newstead Recreation Reserve between Hillier Street and Panmure Street, Newstead under Section 206 of the Local Government Act and inviting submissions was published in the Midland Express on Tuesday 11 September 2012 and submissions closed at 5pm on Tuesday 9 October 2012.

One written objection was received on 1 October 2012. The submitter’s objection was acknowledged in writing and they have been invited to be heard by Council at this Meeting, they have not confirmed if they wish to be heard.
3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

The Local Government Act 1989 - Section 206 provides Councils with the following powers over roads.

The powers of a Council in relation to roads in its municipal district include the powers set out in Schedule 10.

Local Government Act 1989 - Schedule 10 3. Power to discontinue roads

A Council may -
(a) discontinue a road, or part of a road, by a notice published in the Government Gazette; and
(b) sell the land from that road (if it is not Crown land), transfer the land to the Crown or itself or retain the land.

Under the Local Government Act 1989 Section 223 Council is required to give notice of its intention to discontinue Recreation Avenue between Hillier Street and Panmure Street as a public road and accept written submissions and hear any person who wishes to speak to their submission.

4. Issues

At the time submissions closed, one submission was received and at the time of writing the submitter has not indicated or confirmed they wish to be heard at the Council Meeting on 23 October 2012. Officers will continue to attempt to make contact with the submitter to determine whether they wish to be heard.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

There will be administration costs associated with advertising and preparing notices in accordance with the Local Government Act. These will be funded from Council's annual operational budget.

6. Consultation

Council must now consider the submission and determine at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 13 November 2012 in the Castlemaine Senior Citizen's Centre whether to proceed with the proposed discontinuation.

7. Conclusion

A written objection was received from one submitter to the proposed discontinuation of the government road Recreation Avenue Newstead adjacent to the Newstead Recreation Reserve between Hillier Street and Panmure Street Newstead. Council will formally consider this submission at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 13 November 2012.
RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Note the submission objecting to the proposed discontinuation of the government road Recreation Avenue Newstead adjacent to the Newstead Recreation Reserve between Hiller Street and Panmure Street Newstead; and

2. Formally consider the submission at the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 13 November 2012 and determine whether to proceed with the proposed discontinuation of Recreation Avenue between Hillier Street and Panmure Street Newstead.

MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CROSS
9.2. PARTNERING FOR BETTER SERVICES (PAR)

PAR 27 MOUNT ALEXANDER SHIRE NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFER PLACES – PLACES OF LAST RESORT IN CASTLEMAINE AND TARADALE

Responsible Officer: Director Environment and Infrastructure
Original Document: DOC/12/90527

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider an amendment to the proposed Neighbourhood Safer Places - Places of Last Resort (NSPs) in Castlemaine as presented to Council on 25 September 2012, and to inform Council of the temporary decommissioning of the Taradale NSP.

The recommended decision is not a 'Major Policy Decision' as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

2. Background

The need for NSPs has been initiated by the Victorian Government arising from the 2009 Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission. NSPs are intended to be “Places of Last Resort” during a bushfire. The Royal Commission has noted that safer places “may increase a person’s chance of survival, but still entail some risk, both in moving to them during a fire and while sheltering in them. They cannot be considered, nor should they be described as, “safe”.

Changes to NSPs must be approved by the Country Fire Authority (CFA), endorsed by the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC), approved formally by Council and then finally notified to the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) before being a registered NSP.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

The Council Plan 2009–2013 contains an objective to “support the community in preparing and responding to emergency events”. This objective complements a number of other intentions to support the priority area of Partnering for Better Services (4.2). Council will partner with relevant parties to better prepare for emergency events.

The Country Fire Authority (CFA) Act 1958 Section 50J Annual Assessment of Designated Neighbourhood Safer Places states:

(1) A municipal council must, by 31 August in each year, conduct a review of each designated neighbourhood safer place in its municipal district to determine if it is still suitable to be designated as a neighbourhood safer place.

(2) In conducting an annual review, the municipal council must ask the Authority to assess each neighbourhood safer place in its municipal district in accordance with the Country Fire Authority Assessment Guidelines.

(3) On receiving a request, the Authority must—

(a) Assess the place; and

(b) if the place meets the criteria set out in the Country Fire Authority Assessment Guidelines, certify in writing that the place meets those criteria.
(4) If the Authority’s assessment determines that a designated neighbourhood safer place is no longer suitable, it must be decommissioned.

(5) The municipal council may also decommission a designated neighbourhood safer place if:
   (a) the Authority has certified the place under this section but the council is satisfied on reasonable grounds that it is not appropriate for the place to continue to be a designated neighbourhood safer place; or
   (b) the place is on non-council land and the occupier or the person in control of the land has withdrawn consent to the designation of the place as a neighbourhood safer place.

4. Issues

Castlemaine NSP

At its Ordinary Meeting on 25 September 2012, Council adopted a recommendation for the Castlemaine NSP at the Western Reserve to be revoked. In its annual review of NSP’s the CFA determined the Western Reserve site in Castlemaine as non-compliant due to the reed growth in the adjacent creek.

The CFA recommended and approved the area bounded by Templeton Street, Barker Street, Forest Street, Hargraves Street and Mostyn Street in the Castlemaine Central Business District as a replacement NSP.

After the Council Meeting on 25 September 2012, the MAV advised the CFA and Council that a smaller area would be more appropriate. Therefore an alteration to the proposed site considered by Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 25 September is recommended.

It is proposed to contain the NSP in the Castlemaine CBD to one street, Mostyn Street between Barker Street and Hargraves Street, instead of the larger area as first proposed. DSE has provided consent for Victory Park on Mostyn Street to be included in the NSP. VicRoads has also supported the proposal.

The alteration is currently awaiting CFA endorsement. The CFA has assessed the site and advised the process to have it signed off can be concluded quickly.

Council is anticipating CFA and MAV endorsement of the amended Castlemaine CBD location in time for the summer and bushfire season.

Taradale NSP

The designated NSP at Taradale is the Taradale Hall, which was commissioned in December 2009. The Hall requires repairs to the floor due to termite damage, and is currently unsuitable for use as an NSP. Hence it has been temporarily decommissioned while repairs are completed, which is expected to be by the end of November 2012. The NSP will then reinstated prior to the fire season.

While, it is not expected that the location of the NSP at Taradale at the Hall will need to be changed for the coming fire season, as a precautionary measure Council has requested CFA assess alternative sites. These include the Taradale Fire Shed and the Taradale Primary School. This will establish approved alternatives if ever needed in the future.
5. Financial and Resource Implications

The only cost implications for Council, apart from the current cost to maintain NSPs, is to relocate the signage at Western Reserve to the Castlemaine Central Business District at either end of Mostyn Street.

6. Consultation

The MEMPC endorsed the decommissioning of the NSP at Western Reserve and endorsed relocation to the CBD at its meeting on 5 September 2012. As the amendment does not propose a new location, but a scaling down of the area as endorsed by the MEMPC, it is not considered necessary for further MEMPC endorsement. The MEMPC will be advised of the alteration.

Council will communicate the new NSP and the temporary decommissioning of the Taradale NSP to the community via the media, signage and on Council’s website.

7. Conclusion

At its Ordinary Meeting of 22 December 2009, Council adopted its current NSPs. Under the Country Fire Authority (CFA) Act 1958 Section 50J Council must, by 31 August in each year, conduct a review of each designated neighbourhood safer place in its municipal district to determine if it is still suitable to be designated as a Neighbourhood Safer Place. The CFA assessed current NSPs and found Western Reserve in Castlemaine to be non-compliant. The Castlemaine Central Business District was nominated as an alternative NSP to Western Reserve. The CFA has assessed the Castlemaine Central Business District and found it to be complaint. This proposed site has been scaled back as recommended by the MAV.

The Taradale NSP is currently unavailable, but is expected to be able to be used as an NSP before the fire season in 2012. A strategy for assessing other sites in Taradale will provide alternatives should the Hall become unavailable in the future.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Endorse the modification of the proposed Castlemaine NSP as recommended at the 25 September 2012 Council Meeting from the area bounded by Templeton Street, Barker Street, Forest Street, Hargraves Street and Mostyn Street to Mostyn Street between Barker Street and Hargraves Street.

2. Following final MAV approval of the Castlemaine NSP, amend the Council website and Council community bushfire information (including relevant township protection plans) and advise the community via the media to reflect the changes in designation of these two sites and install signage;


4. Note the temporary decommissioning of the Taradale NSP and anticipation of the NSP being reinstated prior to summer and advise the community via the media, signage and on Council’s website.

MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
PAR 28 APPOINTMENTS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL (S.86 COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT) – SUTTON GRANGE HALL COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

Responsible Officer: Manager Governance  
Document Number: DOC/12/90806

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request Council formally appoint the membership of the Sutton Grange Hall Committee of Management for the 2012/2013 year:

2. Background

This Committee is constituted as a s.86 Committee of Council (pursuant to the Local Government Act 1989 – Section 86 (3) and the Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984 – Section 41A).

The function of this Committee is to manage the Sutton Grange Hall and act as policy development, planning, promotion and coordinating body for the Sutton Grange Hall.

The membership of the Committee, as provided for in its Instrument of Delegation is:

1. The Committee shall comprise of no fewer than five members of the public appointed by resolution of Council and one Councillor of Mount Alexander Shire Council.

Members are appointed for 12 months, and were last appointed to the Committee in November 2011.

The current members are:

Marge Townrow  President
Sue Nachmann  Secretary / Treasurer
Steve Barty  Committee Member
Mavis Collison  Committee Member
Noel Davis  Committee Member
Max Davis  Committee Member
Vivienne Pells  Committee Member
John Barty  Committee Member
Mark Collison  Committee Member
Chris Moule  Committee Member
Jenny Leishman  Committee Member
Ron Townrow  Committee Member
Judy Houlahan  Committee Member
Paul Leishman  Committee Member

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

This Committee was initially formed in order to control and manage Council properties and to act as a policy development, planning, promotion and co-ordinating body for the associated properties. Its powers and administration are governed by an Instrument of Delegation from Council under S.86 of the Local Government Act (1989).

4. Issues

Council is the only party able to appoint persons to s.86 committees. Appointment enables insurance coverage from Council’s insurance company and also provides the basis of appropriate governance arrangements for the Committees in accordance with the Local Government Act.

The Committee held its AGM on 26 September 2012 and has subsequently advised Council of proposed changes to its membership.
5. **Financial and Resource Implications**

Nil.

6. **Consultation**

The Sutton Grange Hall Committee of Management has advised Council of a proposed change to their membership and has requested Council appointment as set out in their Instrument of Delegation.

7. **Conclusion**

As set out in the Instruments of Delegation, Council appointment of the membership is required. The proposed appointments are consistent with the Committee’s Instrument of Delegation. Only Council can make these appointments.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

1. Appoint the following persons to the Sutton Grange Hall Committee of Management listed for the period 26 September 2012 to 25 September 2013;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie McCarthy</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marge Townrow</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Nachmann</td>
<td>Secretary/Treasurer</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Barty</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavis Collison</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Davis</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Davis</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivenne Pells</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barty</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Collison</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moule</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Leishman</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Townrow</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Leishman</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Marie Monda</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>25 September 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Write to the Committee confirming these appointments;

3. Write to the returning Committee members being John Barty, Sue Nachmann, Vivienne Pells, Mark Collison, Mavis Collison, Steve Barty, Max Davis, Noel Davis, Chris Moule, Jenny Leishman, Marge Townrow Paul Leishman and Ron Townrow thanking them for their contribution to the Committee and their local community in the last 12 months.

4. Write to the new Committee members Natalie McCarthy and Anne-Marie Monda welcoming them to the Committee; and

5. Write to retiring Committee member Judy Houlahan thanking her for her contribution to the Committee and her local community in the last 12 months.
MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request Council formally appoint the membership of the Maldon Easter Fair Committee of Management for the 2012/2013 year:

2. Background

This Committee is constituted as a s. 86 Committee of Council (pursuant to the Local Government Act 1989 – s. 86 (3) and the Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984 – Section 41A).

The function of this Committee is to manage the Maldon Easter Fair, act as policy development, planning, promotion and coordinating body for the Maldon Easter Fair and act as an advisory and liaison body to Council regarding the Maldon Easter Fair.

Members are appointed for 12 months, and were last appointed to the Committee in June 2011.

The current members are:

Peter Thompson    President
Daryl Walker    Treasurer
Alan Lang    Vice President
Jenny Fitzpatrick    Secretary
Jill Bullen    Property Officer
Jeanette McKnight    Public Officer
Ken Fitzpatrick    Committee Member
Wendy Williams    Committee Member
Richard Leitch    Committee Member
Michael Williamson    Committee Member
Janet Williamson    Committee Member
Robert Thompson    Committee Member
Samantha Thompson    Committee Member
Renee Thompson    Committee Member
Daniel Clarke    Committee Member

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

This Committee was initially formed in order to control and manage the Maldon Easter Fair and to act as a policy development, planning, promotion and co-ordinating body with Council. Its powers and administration are governed by an Instrument of Delegation from Council under Section .86 of the Local Government Act (1989).

4. Issues

Currently, the Maldon Easter Fair Committee is both a s.86 Committee and an incorporated body, meaning it is classed as having two legal entities. Council's Manager Economic Development and Tourism is currently in discussions with the Committee with the view of determining a single legal entity for the Committee. The implication of this may mean that the Instrument of Delegation of the Committee may be revoked in the future or the Committee may need to dissolve the Incorporated Association.

A further report will come to Council at a future meeting to resolve the legal status of the Committee.
Advice from Council's Risk and Insurance Officer is that provided the Committee operates within its Instrument of Delegation, Council's insurers will cover the activities of the Committee. Hence it is important to appoint these members consistent with their Instrument of Delegation while the matter of the legal standing of the Committee is resolved.

Council is the only party able to appoint persons to Section 86 committees. Appointment enables insurance coverage from Council's insurance company and also provides the basis of appropriate governance arrangements for the Committees in accordance with the Local Government Act.

The Committee held its AGM on 29 August 2012 and has subsequently advised Council of proposed changes to its membership.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

Nil.

6. Consultation

The Maldon Easter Fair Committee of Management has advised Council of a proposed change to their membership and has requested Council appointment as set out in their Instrument of Delegation. The Manager Economic Development and Tourism, with support from the Manager Governance, is discussing the most appropriate legal entity for the Committee with them with a view to resolving their s.86 status. Council’s Risk and Safety Officer has been consulted to confirm the Committee maintains insurance coverage while this is resolved.

7. Conclusion

As set out in the Instrument of Delegation, Council appointment of the membership is required. The proposed appointments are consistent with the Committee’s Instrument of Delegation. Only Council can make these appointments.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. Appoint the following persons to the Maldon Easter Fair Committee of Management listed for the period 29 August 2012 to 30 June 2013;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Thompson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Walker</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Lang</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Bullen</td>
<td>Property Officer</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette McKnight</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Leitch</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Williamson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Williamson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Thompson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Thompson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Thompson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Clark</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha Mulholland</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damien Nolan</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Thompson</td>
<td>Committee Member</td>
<td>30 June 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Write to the Committee confirming these appointments;
3. Write to the returning Committee members being Peter Thompson, Alan Lang, Daryl Walker, Jill Bullen, Jeanette McKnight, Richard Leitch, Janet Williamson, Michael Williamson, Robert Thompson, Renee Thompson, Samantha Thompson and Daniel Clark thanking them for their contribution to the Committee and their local community in the last 12 months.

4. Write to the new Committee members Alisha Mulholland, Damien Nolan and Matthew Thompson welcoming them to the Committee;

5. Write to retiring Committee members Jenny Fitzpatrick, Ken Fitzpatrick and Wendy Williams thanking them for their contribution to the Committee; and

6. Receive a further report at a future Ordinary Meeting of Council to resolve the legal status of the Maldon Easter Fair Committee.

MOVED COUNCILLOR REWELL

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CROSS

CARRIED.
9.3. ENSURING A PROSPEROUS AND DIVERSE LOCAL ECONOMY (ECO)

NO REPORTS.
9.4. CREATING A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE (FUT)

MOVED COUNCILLOR REWELL

That standing orders be suspended.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

CARRIED (7.43 pm)

OBJECTORS

Margaret Keogh lives at 19 Hargreaves St and owns 21a Hargreaves St

Ms Keogh spoke to her concern that the double storey will block out light in the living areas of her building. Although she was generally pleased that the building is being developed she would expect that some of the new building should be single storey so light is not blocked to neighbouring properties.

Christopher Whitehead, 21a Hargreaves Street as a tenant of Ms Keogh

Mr Whitehead noted that his courtyard will be in shadow including garden that he has developed over five years. He also requires 24 hour clearway for ambulance access due to health concerns.

He queried where builders might park and put building materials during construction. He noted that parking is at a premium in the area and this development will exacerbate the problem. He also stated that the design of the facade is not in keeping with Heritage of the streetscape.

Joyce Sanders

Ms Sanders’ concerns were around sustainability and heritage. She noted that the west facing windows on the first floor will be in sun all day and the air conditioner will need to run all day to make the first floor useable. She noted that there should be an awning or verandah out the front to protect the building from the sun.

In regard to heritage she noted that he building should be in harmony rather than in contrast and choice of materials should be in harmony with other buildings and that the planned building doesn’t meet this requirement.

She stated that in her opinion this is a major policy decision as is first major in fill building in ten years in the CBD.

John Campbell, resident on the corner of Lyttleton and Hargreaves Streets

Mr Campbell stated that his building has been a residence for 150 years and in 14 years as owner he has worked to save the building to preserve it. He noted that his view that will be blocked by the new building. Has has invested considerable sums on his the building including the new verandah which will be wasted if the development proceeds.

Andy Bull, owner and occupier in property directly behind the building

Mr Bulle expressed concern about sun being blocked in the winter and overlooking impinging on privacy. He noted that he is landlocked and is concerned that the entrance to building will be in laneway which is not safe. He also noted that he often gets parked in and the development will make it worse. As a resident he needs right of way and access. He also noted concern in relation to the noise of air conditioning which will impact on his amenity.
APPLICANTS

Geoff Crosby, architect

Mr Crosby agreed that it can be difficult for residential and businesses to co-exist, but that it is important to develop and create more life in the business zone of Castlemaine. The Heritage Advisor had been supportive of the design. The building has been pulled back from boundary to reduce overlooking. Only 3.8 metres at the back of the building impact overshadowing. He noted that most of the objections were either not planning matters or had been dealt with by the conditions proposed by planning officers.

He noted that parking would be difficult to accommodate on site but parking in CBD is adequate for current CBD activity. He stated that the development was using sophisticated insulation to reduce heat load and meets the requirements of Section J of the Building Act and that the air conditioner will be new and quieter than old models on existing buildings in the area.

He stated that they don’t want the building to mock the rest of the streetscape and that Castlemaine has many different buildings sitting alongside each other well rather one homogenous streetscape. This was also an opportunity to activate the laneway showcasing the potential to reinvigorate lane ways in Castlemaine.

Dean Mawby owner

Mr Mawby stated that the site was one where an old building had been demolished years ago and replaced with a 50s building and it was his understood that it is not a good thing to replicate heritage buildings that it is better to infill with modern buildings that are complementary as they do in European cities. He noted that there was a need for single consulting rooms for professionals so they can live and work locally and there is a shortage of this type of business accommodation in Castlemaine.

MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

That standing orders be resumed.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED (8.31 pm)

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to enable Council to make a determination on an application for the demolition of an existing building, development of a commercial building and waiver of car parking requirements on land at 25 Hargraves Street, Castlemaine.

This application has been referred to Council for a decision as six objections to the proposal have been received and not withdrawn.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

Refer to Attachment FUT 080A for the site plan, elevations and streetscape perspectives.

2. Background

The subject site is located on the eastern fringe of the central Castlemaine business area, on the west side of Hargraves Street.

The site is aligned on an east-west axis with a street frontage of 8.18 metres to Hargraves Street and a side boundary of 24.38 metres to the rear boundary. The site covers a total area of 202m². The land has a gentle decline from the front to the rear.

The site is developed with a single storey red brick building of only 38m² constructed to the front boundary, the north boundary and to the carriageway easement to the south. There are two small sheds at the rear. The single storey red brick building has until recently been used as an art shop.

The subject site is burdened by a 3.35 metre wide carriageway easement running along the full extent of the southern boundary. The easement benefits the land to the south and also the land to the west. Both these lots are developed with dwellings.

There is currently space at the rear of the shop for informal car parking. Immediately to the north of the subject site is a four metre wide laneway which provides vehicle access to a property facing Lyttleton Street.

Surrounding land within the Business 1 zoned central business area shows evidence of successive subdivision and is mostly developed with heritage buildings of various architectural eras displaying variance in design and scale, though mostly developed and utilised for a range of commercial activities. Unusually there is a small cluster of dwellings within this commercial block.

The application proposes the demolition of the existing buildings on the site; the development of a two storey brick, concrete block and timber commercial building; and the complete waiver of car parking requirements.

The application will comprise the construction of a two storey building with a footprint of 171m² built to the north and east boundaries and to the carriageway easement to the south and setback 5.25 metres from the west rear boundary. The building is designed with a recycled brick facade to Hargraves Street.
(utilising bricks from the demolished existing building), a concrete block wall to the north boundary, and
ground floor concrete block walls to the south and west elevations with timber clad first floor elevations.
Roofing will be galvanised corrugated steel.

The plans show an alternative medicine clinic on the ground floor with pedestrian access from the
carriageway easement setback approximately 3.5 metres from the street frontage.

The first floor shows space for four offices which are accessed from Hargraves Street.

3. **Policy and Statutory Implications**

*Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.*

**Policy Implications**

**State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)**

**Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage**

This clause includes the goal to create urban environments that are safe, functional and of good quality,
and to ensure the conservation of places of heritage significance.

**Clause 15.03 Heritage**

This clause aims to assist the conservation of places that have a natural, environmental, aesthetic,
historic, cultural, scientific, or social significance or other special value important for scientific and research
purposes, as a means of understanding our past, as well as maintaining and enhancing Victoria’s image
and making a contribution to the economic and cultural growth of the Shire.

**Clause 17 Economic Development**

The intent of this clause is that planning should provide for a strong and innovative economy, and
contribute to the economic well being of communities and the State by supporting and fostering economic
growth.

**Clause 17.01-1 Commercial/Business**

This clause seeks to encourage development which meets the communities’ needs for commercial
services and provides net community benefit in relation to accessibility, efficient infrastructure use and the
aggregation and sustainability of commercial facilities.

**Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)**

**Clause 21.03 – Municipal Vision and Framework Plan**

This clause sets out the land use planning and development vision for the Shire. It states that the land
use planning and development vision for the Shire will be achieved in part, by “facilitation of economic
development opportunities”.

**Clause 21.04 -2 Strengthening Castlemaine’s Regional Role**

This clause identifies the need to protect the heritage character of the Castlemaine Central Conservation
Area and particularly the visual quality of the Highway entrances to the town, whilst acknowledging the
need for a diversity of affordable housing within the town centre.

**Clause 21.04-5 – Built and Cultural Heritage**

This clause recognises the importance of Aboriginal and European heritage places and seeks to protect
the significance, character and appearance of these places, precincts, buildings, streetscapes, places and
structures. It also encourages sympathetic renovation and restoration that will enhance the heritage value
of such places. Further, it states that new development within Heritage Overlays should harmoniously
integrate with the heritage character of the area.
Clause 22.01 Castlemaine
The relevant objectives of this clause, as they relate to commercial development, are to protect the primacy of the Castlemaine Central Business District by reinforcing the role of the Centre and by accommodating commercial development within the District. The clause also states that the redevelopment of land within the existing retail area will be encouraged.

It is also policy in the Castlemaine Central Conservation Area (HO667) precinct that:
- the remaining evidence of buildings and works of the Victorian and Edwardian era are preserved;
- new development is compatible and in harmony with the character of the area;
- the building line for any new building should be that of the existing buildings in the street and where this line is not uniform, it should be the line of the adjoining neighbouring building whose setback is the greater;
- the design of new buildings should be in harmony (rather than in contrast) with other buildings in the vicinity in terms of size, proportion and distribution of openings and other elements; and
- the choice of materials for new buildings should harmonise with the materials that create the character of Castlemaine and should also harmonise with the materials of neighbouring buildings.

Clause 22.11 Streetscape
This policy applies to the entrances and main streets of all towns and aims to ensure that development enhances the presentation of main road entrances into townships and enhances the immediate environment.

Clause 22.20 –Natural and Cultural Heritage
This objective of this clause is to ensure the Shire’s local heritage is preserved, to recognise the elements that contribute to the historical and architectural significance and to ensure that new development is in harmony and complements the surrounds.

The application is for the demolition of a single storey red brick building that is not identified as being of individual heritage significance. The proposed building will be two storey and be constructed of a mix of traditional and contemporary materials, however the frontage width and setback of the existing building will be maintained as will the open space between the buildings. The proposed height also remains lower than that of the surrounding significant buildings.

Statutory Implications
The site is located within the Business 1 Zone (B1Z) and covered by a Heritage Overlay (HO667 – Castlemaine Central Conservation Area).

The Mount Alexander Planning Scheme includes a medical centre within the definition of office. A planning permit is not required for the use of the land for office in the Business 1 Zone (B1Z), subject to conditions, which the design of the proposed building fulfils.

The application requires a planning permit for buildings and works under the provisions of both the Business 1 Zone and the Heritage Overlay, and for the waiver of car parking requirements under Clause 52.06 – Car parking of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme.

Zones
Clause 34.01 Business 1 Zone
The intent of the Business 1 Zone is to encourage the intensive development of business centres for retailing and other complementary commercial, entertainment and community uses.

All development must be assessed against the decision guidelines of the Business 1 Zone, particularly:
- the provision of car-parking;
- the interface with adjoining zones, especially the relationship with residential areas;
• impact of development on the streetscape, including the conservation of buildings, the design of
veranda, access from the street front, protecting active frontages to pedestrian areas, the treatment of
the fronts and backs of buildings;
• the availability of services;
• the design of buildings to provide for solar access;
• the objectives, standards and decision guidelines of Clause 54 and Clause 55.

The policy context of the Business 1 Zone offers clear support for the redevelopment and more intensive
commercial use of the site. It is normal in commercial developments within the Business 1 Zone to build
to the boundary as there are no setback or site coverage requirements. The design of the proposed
building is modest in scale, will be subservient to surrounding buildings, and takes reference in a
contemporary manner from design elements of an earlier era. The proposed building will be setback more
than three metres from surrounding buildings, thus still allowing for the provision of solar access to
surrounding residences.

The proposal is considered to comply with the intent, objectives and decision guidelines of the Business 1
Zone.

Overlays

Clause 43.01 Heritage Overlay – Castlemaine Central Conservation Area (HO667)
The purpose of the Heritage Overlay is to protect, conserve and enhance heritage places and to ensure
that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places. The Castlemaine Central
Conservation Area Overlay imposes controls over development, external treatments, and removal of
vegetation.

All development must be assessed against the decision guidelines of the Heritage Overlay, in particular:
• the significance of the heritage place and whether the proposal will adversely affect the natural or
cultural significance of the place;
• any applicable statement of significance, heritage study and any applicable conservation policy;
• whether the location, bulk, form or appearance of the proposed building will adversely affect the
significance of the heritage place;
• whether the bulk, form or appearance of the proposed building is in keeping with the character and
appearance of adjacent buildings and the heritage place.

The application has been referred to Council’s Heritage Advisor who has commented that:
“the design of the building which is to be inserted between buildings of heritage value will make a
positive contribution through its scale, form, setback from the street and materials. The facade
design will be a clear statement of contemporary design, which is encouraged in the Heritage
Overlay guidelines.”

The proposed development takes its form and scale from existing heritage buildings in the street and has
been designed to harmonise with and not dominate the streetscape. The development as proposed is
considered to comply with the purpose of the Heritage Overlay - Castlemaine Central Conservation Area.
Particular Provisions

Clause 52.06 – Car parking

According to this clause, six on-site car spaces should be provided i.e. five spaces for the medical practitioner and three spaces for the 60 m² net office area, with a deduction of two spaces for the previous use as a shop. The application seeks a waiver of all car parking requirements.

The proposed redevelopment does not allow for the provision of any car parking on site. The application is generally supported by the purpose and decision guidelines of the Business 1 Zone and relevant policy within the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme relating to the intensification and redevelopment of sites within the identified business area of Castlemaine, with the exception of the provision of car parking.

It must be decided then if the lack of car parking should be sufficient reason to refuse this application. Clause 52.06-6 allows for the reduction of car parking requirements, including to zero, having regard to among other matters, the assessment of likely car parking requirements, available off site car parking, multi-purpose trips within the area, the availability of public transport and the variation of car parking demand over time.

It is considered appropriate to waive car parking requirements based on the following:

- A visual survey conducted at various times of the day has identified ample on-street parking always available along this section of Hargraves Street.
- The site will provide bicycle space within the rear courtyard.
- There is public transport available to the central business area from outlying regions.
- It is likely that people will combine attendance at the clinic with the usual visit to the supermarket or other regular retail activity within the central business area.

Based on the above, it is considered that the requirement for the reduction of on-site car parking is compliant with the purpose of Clause 52.06.

VCAT has determined on occasions that car parking should not be the determining factor on the determination of a planning permit; that in certain circumstances it should not be an individual site’s responsibility to provide for car parking short falls, rather car parking should be determined on a centre wide basis and that it is the responsibility of the Council to, either by a parking precinct plan or a special rate scheme, ensure that there is ample parking available, if it wishes to retain and promote commercial activity centres.

4. Issues

Six objections to the proposal have been received following the notification process and can be summarised as follows, with officer's comments following:

- The height of the proposed development will block sunlight to the private open space of the adjoining dwelling to the south and west.

It is noted that there will be some reduction of sunlight available to the north facing windows of the neighbouring building to the south at both the ground and first floors, however reasonable amounts of sunlight will be available to the first floor balcony for much of the day and to the ground floor courtyard. Both these areas are expected to retain full sunlight for periods. The dwelling to the west may suffer a reduction in sunlight until approximately 10 am at the equinox.

- The height of the proposed development will block out the skyline.
Though the proposed development is two storeys, the overall height is less than that of the neighbouring building to the south and less than the greatest part of Herons Gallery to the north. The open space between the proposed building and buildings on adjoining sites is retained.

- The proposed development does not make reference to adjoining historic buildings and will not be in keeping with the historic streetscape.

Though used in a contemporary manner the application provides a detailed analysis of the elements of the design that have been adopted from the surrounds and from other heritage buildings within Castlemaine, such as:

- a shallow decorative facade extended as a parapet to the top and returned on the side elevations;
- the proportions of the building are based on the classical “golden rectangle” which has determined the height;
- the proportional use of solid to void (openings) in the facade; and
- the reuse of red bricks from the site gives reference to early construction.

- There will be an increased demand for car parking generated by the increase in area of the new building.

Refer to the car parking assessment above.

- The adjoining dwelling to the west will suffer loss of privacy due to overlooking from the upstairs western windows.

The most westerly window on the south elevation proposes the use of translucent glass to 1700mm above floor level, which has the affect of blurring images viewed though it. A permit condition also asks for screening of other windows. The subject site is located within the Business 1 Zone, as are the neighbouring dwellings. Whilst it is desirable to maintain some basic residential amenity for the area, it must be expected that commercial activity will occur in an area zoned for such a purpose and residential expectations must be balanced against well designed commercial development.

- The carriageway easement along the southern portion of the subject site will be blocked by tradespeople during construction, this would cause inconvenience to the western neighbour and be potentially life threatening to the neighbour to the south who suffers a congenital heart condition and regularly requires ambulance assistance.

The easement on the subject site confers the right of carriageway to the subject land and sites to the south and east, implicit in this right is that this carriageway must be available for this purpose, however a condition will be placed on the permit requiring a Construction Management Plan be submitted detailing free accessway along the easement for land benefitted.

- The development will increase stormwater issues on the property to the north-west.

The legal point of discharge for the site is to Hargraves Street at the front of the lot. Permit conditions will require drainage plans to be approved and works to comply with the approved plans, it is likely the proposed development will improve the current state where stormwater flows across the subject site to the property at the rear.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

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

Advertising

Notice of the application was given to adjoining property owners/occupiers by registered mail and a sign was placed on site. Six objections were received following this notice period.

The applicant was not willing to make concessions to the design of the building that might have satisfied objectors. It was therefore considered that as an applicant/objector meeting was unlikely to result in resolution of objections, that objections were either not based on planning policy or could be resolved with permit conditions, that an applicant/objector meeting would not be held.

Referrals

External Referrals
Nil

Internal Referrals
Council’s Infrastructure Unit – no objections were received, recommended conditions.
Council’s Heritage Advisor – no objections, modifications to the design suggested.

7. Conclusion

Council has received an application for the demolition of an existing building, development of a commercial building and waiver of car parking requirements on land at 25 Hargraves Street, Castlemaine. The land is located within the Business 1 Zone and covered by a Heritage Overlay relating to the Castlemaine Central Conservation Area.

Six objections have been received and have not been withdrawn.

In assessing this proposal consideration must be given to the purpose of the zone and the policy framework of the Planning Scheme, the impact the proposed development may have on the significance of the heritage place, any unreasonable off-site amenity impacts, and the waiver of car parking requirements.

The proposal is supported by policy that encourages the redevelopment of land within the existing retail area. The design of the proposed building does not seek to replicate heritage development but takes many of the design elements that are typical of early settlement buildings and uses them in a contemporary manner. The design is supported by Council’s Heritage Advisor.

It is acknowledged that the proposed development will have some impacts on the adjoining sites to the south and west. However the modest height of the proposed building and the retention of considerable setback distances from the south and east title boundaries of the subject site ensures that these impacts have been kept to reasonable levels especially when consideration is given to the strategic context of the site and the business zoning which applies to both the subject site and the neighbouring dwellings to the south and west. It is considered that neighbouring residents may continue to enjoy reasonable residential amenity in the business area.

Given that the proposal accords with the strategic intent of the Business 1 Zone, it is considered that a lack of on-site car parking should not be the determining factor in the assessment of this application.

Overall this development is considered to offer a positive use and development of a small site within the Business 1 Zone and the Central Conservation Area, it is therefore recommended that the application be approved.
RECOMMENDATION

That Council having considered the application and being of the opinion that the grant of a planning permit would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area, resolve to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit for the demolition of an existing building, development of a commercial building and waiver of car parking requirements on land at 25 Hargraves Street, Castlemaine, generally in accordance with the plans submitted with the application subject to the following conditions:

1. MODIFIED PLANS

1.1. Before the permitted development starts, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority in consultation with Council’s Heritage Advisor, must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plans must be no larger than A3 in size, drawn to scale with dimensions and three copies must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the plans submitted with the application but modified to show:

- An external colour schedule for the whole of the building.

1.2 Prior to the completion of the development, further plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved these plans will form part of the permit. The plans must show:

- Window treatment to the upper floor west and south elevations (excluding the front office), so that direct viewing into the balcony and private open space of surrounding dwellings is obstructed.

1.3 Prior to the installation of the signage, plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority in consultation with Council’s Heritage Advisor, must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plans must show:

- Details of Business Identification Signage relating to the Chiropractic use of the land.

2. NO LAYOUT ALTERATION

2.1 The development allowed by this permit as shown on the endorsed plan(s) and/or described in the endorsed documents must not be altered or modified (for any reason) except with the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority.

3. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 Prior to the commencement of any works, a Construction Management Plan must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The Construction Management Plan must address, but is not limited to:

- Hours of construction, control of noise and airborne matter, deliveries, vehicle access, worker car parking, damage to public assets, and a contact number for complaints.
- The prohibition of delivery/tradesmen’s vehicles from obstructing the carriageway easement during the construction phase.

All works must accord with the approved Construction Management Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
4. PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

4.1 Any ancillary items including air conditioner units will not unreasonably impact the amenity of the dwellings on adjoining sites in compliance with the relevant State Environment Protection Policy.

5. INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

5.1 Prior to the commencement of any construction works associated with the development, detailed access and drainage construction plans must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved the plans will be endorsed and form part of the permit. All works constructed or carried out must be in accordance with these endorsed plans. If required, minor amendments may be approved by Council's Infrastructure Unit to the standards stipulated in the below conditions provided a similar outcome is achieved.

5.2 The development must be drained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The drainage system shall include provision of a storm water retention system to limit flow downstream to pre-development levels in accordance with the current Australian Rainfall and Run-off – Flood Analysis and Design for a five year annual recurrence interval. The Legal point of Discharge to the development is to the proposed underground drainage system to Hargraves Street and to the existing drainage assets.

5.3 The developer must restrict sediment discharges from any construction sites within the land in accordance with Construction Techniques for Sediment Pollution Control (EPA 1991).

5.4 Where external lighting is to be provided it must be fitted with suitable baffles and located so to prevent the emission of direct light onto adjoining properties or roadways to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

6. COMPLETION OF DEVELOPMENT

6.1 This permit will expire if the development permitted by this permit, is not completed within two years from the date of this permit.

Council may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within three months afterwards and an extension is approved.

PERMIT NOTES:

Business Identification Signage related to the use of the office space will require separate planning permission.

Prior to the commencement of any works on the road reserve the owner/applicant must submit an application and be issued a permit to occupy the road for works pursuant to Local Laws No 2.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is for Council to make a determination on an application for the subdivision of land into seven lots at 9 Penhallurick Street and 3 Hillside Court, Campbells Creek.

This application has been referred to Council for a decision as one objection to the proposal has been received and not withdrawn.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

Refer to Attachment FUT 081A for a copy of the site plan and an aerial image of the neighbourhood.

2. Background

The subject site comprising two allotments is located in the far north of Campbells Creek and to the south of Castlemaine, in an area that historically provided the buffer between the two townships. Since the installation of reticulated sewerage to Campbells Creek this area has been progressively subdivided into smaller lots.

The existing northern lot is a north-south aligned rectangle with a frontage of 40.23 metres to Penhallurick Street, a depth of 80.47 metres and a total area of 3237m². The site is currently vacant and has been cleared of vegetation. The site has a moderate incline from the front to the rear where it shares a common boundary of 33 metres with the second site.

The existing southern lot is also a north-south aligned rectangle with dimensions of 70 metres by 159 metres and a total area of approximately 1.2 hectares. This site inclines from the north and the west boundaries to the south-east corner. The site is developed with a dwelling and shed in this corner. Vehicle access is from Hillside Court in the south east corner. This site is dotted with some sparse vegetation, mostly domestic plantings, however one native tree remains to the north.

Surrounding land is divided into lots of varying sizes and mostly developed with dwellings.

The application proposes the subdivision of the land into seven lots and the removal of one native tree as follows:

- Lot 1 to the south is proposed to measure 6751m². It will contain the existing dwelling and associated outbuilding and retain vehicular access from Hillside Court.
- Lot 2 will also be accessed from Hillside Court and will have an area of 1850m².
- Lots 3 – 7 will all be accessed via a common property area from Penhallurick Street. The proposed sizes for these lots range between 718m² and 1474m².
- The common property area is proposed as six metres wide along the west boundary of the northern lot.
3. Policy and Statutory Implications

*Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.*

**Policy Implications**

**State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)**

*Clause 15 Built Environment and Heritage*
This clause includes the goal for the creation of urban environments that are safe, functional and provide good quality environments and to ensure the conservation of places of heritage significance.

*Clause 16.01 Residential Development*
This clause aims for the provision of a diversity of housing stock to meet the requirements of community needs and affordability, in areas that have access to services and infrastructure.

*Clause 19 - Infrastructure*
This clause seeks the efficient and equitable provision of social and physical infrastructure, partly through the use of development contributions (levies) as a funding mechanism.

**Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)**

*Clause 21.03 – Municipal Vision and Framework Plan*
This clause sets out the land use planning and development vision for the Shire. It contains planning directions for the Shire as a whole and for towns and areas within the Shire. Plan 1 (Strategic Framework Plan) identifies Castlemaine, including Campbells Creek, as the preferred location for future commercial, industrial and residential expansion. Plan 3 (Castlemaine Framework Plan) indicates that the subject site is within the Castlemaine Urban Boundary. The Castlemaine Residential Strategy supports opportunities for residential infill and consolidation and recommends more housing opportunities be made available close to and within the town centre.

*Clause 21.04-1 – Management of Urban Growth*
This clause refers to the Mount Alexander Urban Living Strategy and promotes the planned urban infill and expansion of Castlemaine. The settlement objectives of the clause aim to encourage increased housing choice to meet the needs of a diversity of household types and provide for increased residential densities close to retail, health and community facilities.

*Clause 21.04-5 – Built and Cultural Heritage*
This clause recognises the importance of Aboriginal and European Heritage places and seeks to protect the significance, character and appearance of Aboriginal and European heritage places, precincts, buildings, streetscapes, places and structures; to protect significant natural and cultural heritage landscapes of the Shire and rehabilitate identified places of environmental and archaeological significance; and to encourage sympathetic renovation and restoration that will enhance the heritage value of the place.

*Clause 22.03 Campbells Creek*
This clause seeks urban infill within the Campbells Creek urban area that is complementary to the maintenance of the town character and its historic attributes.

*Clause 22.20 –Natural and Cultural Heritage*
This objective of this clause is to ensure the Shire’s local heritage is preserved, to recognise the elements that contribute to the historical and architectural significance and to ensure that new development is in harmony and complements the surrounds.
Clause 22.26 Residential infrastructure
A principle objective of this policy is that new urban development should, as far as practical, utilise or build on existing infrastructure.

Statutory Implications

The site is located within the Township Zone (TZ) and is not affected by any overlays. Under the provisions of the Township Zone a planning permit is required for the subdivision of the land. A planning permit is also required under the provisions of Clause 52.17 of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme for the removal of the native tree.

Zones

Clause 32.05 Township Zone
The intent of the Township Zone is to implement the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, to provide for residential development and a range of commercial, industrial and other uses in small towns, and to encourage residential development that respects neighbourhood character.

Subdivision in the Township Zone must be assessed against the decision guidelines of the TZ. The Responsible Authority must consider:
- The State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework including the MSS and local policies.
- The objectives and standards of Clause 56.

The proposal is considered to comply with the intent, objectives and decision guidelines of the Township Zone and with the objectives and standards of Clause 56.

Particular Provisions

Clause 52.17 – Native vegetation
The purpose of this clause is to protect and conserve native vegetation. An application for the removal of native vegetation must address the three step approach to native vegetation removal – avoid, minimise, and offset.

The tree is sited within the property boundary of the proposed Lot 4. Though it cannot be determined at this time if the future owners of this site would wish to keep the tree it must be assumed that it is likely to be removed to site a future dwelling.

The application is considered to have addressed the three step approach. The efficient subdivision of the land which accords with relevant policy, means that it is not possible to avoid all removal of vegetation. The tree proposed to be removed is a small and poor specimen. Visual inspection determined that it is already partially dead.

Council must consider the goal of net gain when assessing applications for the removal of native vegetation. Appropriate offsets can be incorporated into landscaping along the west boundary of the common property area.

Clause 56 – Residential Subdivision
An application for subdivision in the Township Zone must meet the standards and objectives of Clause 56 of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme. An assessment of the application against this Clause accompanied the application and demonstrates that the proposal meets all the relevant objectives.

The application includes an assessment of the compliance with the requirements of Clause 56. Overall the proposal represents an appropriate subdivision of the site and is compliant with the objectives and standards of Clause 56.
4. **Issues**

One objection to the proposal has been received following the notification process and can be summarised as follows:

- **The density of the development is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood and will destroy the rural feel of the area.**

The subject site is within the Township Zone and with no specified neighbourhood character. It is only within this recently subdivided area between Castlemaine and Campbells Creek that sites are larger than that normally required for residential living purposes. The lots as proposed are still considered more than modest by residential standards and are consistent with lots further to the south in the original area of the Campbells Creek township.

5. **Financial and Resource Implications**

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

6. **Consultation**

**Advertising**

Notice of the application was given to adjoining property owners/occupiers by registered mail and a sign was placed on site. One objection was received following this notice period.

Given that the objection related to a personal preference of the objector rather than to planning policy, and the applicant was disinclined to participate, it was determined that mediation was unlikely to achieve any resolution.

**Referrals**

*External Referrals*
Coliban Water – no objections subject to conditions.
Telstra – no objections subject to conditions.
Powercor – no objections subject to conditions.
Tenix - no objections subject to conditions.

*Internal Referrals*
Council’s Infrastructure Unit – no objections were received, recommended conditions.

7. **Conclusion**

Council has received an application for the subdivision of the land into seven lots and the removal of one native tree on land at 9 Penhallurick Street and 3 Hillside Court Campbells Creek. The land is located within the Township Zone and not covered by any Overlays.

One objection has been received and not withdrawn.

The subdivision as proposed offers lots that are smaller than others in the immediate neighbourhood, however the proposed lots are still of a considerable area and more than sufficiently sized to accommodate infrastructure and services whilst retaining solar access, open space and other elements of Rescode.

Policy within the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme encourages medium density development within centrally located areas and refers to increasing dwelling density and consolidation within existing urban areas while ensuring new development contributes to the neighbourhood character.

The site is located within a residential enclave between Castlemaine and Campbells Creek in an area already provided with services.
The site is not within an area of identified neighbourhood character, surrounding dwellings reflect a trend for contemporary design, and the design any future development of the lot is unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood. The proposal is considered to comply with all relevant policy.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council having considered the application and being of the opinion that the grant of a planning permit would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area, resolve to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit for a seven lot subdivision on land at 9 Penhallurick Street and 3 Hillside Court, Campbells Creek, generally in accordance with the plans submitted with the application subject to the following conditions:

1. PRELIMINARY LAYOUT PLANS

1.1. The subdivision, as shown on the preliminary plan(s), must not be altered except to accord with the final plan(s) prepared by a Licensed Surveyor. Once approved, the final plan(s) will be endorsed as part of the planning permit and must not be further altered without the prior written consent of Responsible Authority.

2. LANDSCAPE PLAN

2.1. Prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance a Landscape Plan must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The plan must show shrubby plantings along the western edge of the common property area.

2.2. The landscaped area shown on the endorsed plan shall be maintained in a proper, tidy and healthy condition to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, unless with the written permission of the Responsible Authority.

3. PAYMENT IN LIEU OF OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENT

3.1. The applicant or owner must pay to Council the sum equivalent to 2% of the value of the land in the subdivision. This payment must be made before a Statement of Compliance is issued and may be varied under Section 19 of the Subdivision Act, 1988.

3.2. The applicant or owner must pay on demand to Council, the Council’s reasonable costs and expenses to provide valuation for payment in lieu of open space.

4. INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS

4.1. All existing and proposed easements and sites for existing and required utility services must be set aside in favour of the Relevant Authority for which the easement or site is to be created on the plan of subdivision submitted for certification under the Subdivision Act 1988.

4.2. Prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance the internal road, drainage and driveway works must be undertaken to the satisfaction of Council in accordance with the approved plans.

4.3. Prior to the commencement of any works the applicant must submit detailed construction plans for the road/drainage works associated with the development, to the satisfaction of Council.
4.4 Council is to be paid a fee of 0.75% of the total construction costs for these works for the approval of the said plans plus 2.5% for supervision of construction. Said fees to be paid prior to the commencement of any road/drainage works.

4.5. The proposed development must be drained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The drainage system shall include provision of a storm water retention system to limit flows downstream from each lot to pre-development levels in accordance with the current Australian Rainfall and Runoff – Flood Analysis and Design for a five year annual recurrence interval. The drainage system shall include as a minimum:

- Easement drains with access pits or connection points are to be provided to all lots by way of a drainage system to harvest, provide retention, transportation and disposal of storm water to Penhallurick Street and Hillside Court drainage systems.

4.6 Where an underground stormwater retention system is impracticable the landowner will be required to enter into an agreement under Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 with Council which affects each lot within the subdivision. Such agreement shall require the landowner to provide for suitable above ground stormwater retention system. Such agreement will be prepared and/or verified at the cost of the landowner and a Statement of Compliance under the Subdivision Act will not be issued until the landowner provides satisfactory proof that the agreement has been lodged with the Office of Title's at the cost of the landowner. This requirement shall be waived if construction of an approved above ground retention system is undertaken.

4.7 The legal point of discharge to the subdivision is to be the existing drainage assets owned by Council.

4.8 The applicant must construct the new common roadway access for Lots 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 to similar existing standards to connect to Penhallurick Street to the satisfaction of Council in accordance with current engineering standards. The access to Lot 2 shall be provided in accordance with Council’s current standards and the maintenance of the common access driveway from the edge of the designated carriageways in Penhallurick Street and Hillside Court to the property boundary, is the responsibility of the landowner.

4.9 Internal traffic movements are to comply with the current engineering traffic practice and Australian Standards for turning movements within the subject land and ingress and egress onto Penhallurick Street and Hillside Court shall be by way of forward movements.

4.10 Prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance, the applicant shall demonstrate that existing buildings with respect to title boundaries are compliant with the Building Regulations.

4.11 The developer must restrict sediment discharges from any construction sites within the land in accordance with Construction Techniques for Sediment Pollution Control (EPA 1991) and Environmental Guidelines for Major Construction Sites (EPA 1995).

4.12 All existing road reservation assets are to be protected throughout the works including all utility services. Any damage is to be restored to prior construction condition at the developer’s cost.

5. COLIBAN WATER REQUIREMENTS

5.1 The owner is required to provide reticulated water and sewerage services to each of the lots within the subdivision. Services are to be provided in accordance with Coliban Water specifications.
5.2 All Coliban Water assets within the subdivision, both existing and proposed, are to be protected by an easement in favour of Coliban Region Water Corporation.

6. **POWERCOR REQUIREMENTS**

6.1. The plan of subdivision submitted for certification under the Subdivision Act 1988 shall be referred to Powercor Australia Ltd in accordance with Section 8 of that Act.

6.2. The applicant shall:

   • provide an electricity supply to all lots in the subdivision in accordance with Powercor’s requirements and standards, including the extension, augmentation or re-arrangement of any existing electricity supply system, as required by Powercor;

   • where buildings or other installations exist on the land to be subdivided and are connected to the electricity supply, they shall be brought into compliance with the Service and Installation Rules issued by the Victorian Electricity Supply Industry. The applicant shall arrange compliance through a Registered Electrical Contractor and provide to Powercor Australia Ltd a completed Electrical Safety Certificate in accordance with Electricity Safe Victoria’s Electrical Safety System;

   • provide to Powercor Australia Ltd, a copy of the version of the plan of subdivision submitted for certification, which shows any amendments which have been required;

   • any buildings must comply with the clearances required by the Electrical Safety (Network Assets) Regulations;

   • any construction work must comply with Energy Safe Victoria’s “No Go Zone” rules.

7. **TELSTRA REQUIREMENTS**

7.1 The Plan of Subdivision submitted for certification be referred to Telstra in accordance with Section 8 of the Subdivision Act 1988.

8. **TENIX REQUIREMENTS**

8.1 The plan of subdivision submitted for certification must be referred to SPAusNet (Gas) in accordance with Section 8 of the Subdivision Act 1988.

9. **COMPLETION OF DEVELOPMENT**

9.1 This permit will expire if one of the following circumstances applies:

   • The subdivision is not started within two years of the date of this permit.
   • The subdivision is not completed within five years of the date of starting.

Council may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within three months afterwards.

*(N.B. The starting of a subdivision is regarded by Section 68(3A) of the Planning and Environment Act, 1987 as the certification of a plan under Section 6 of the Subdivision Act, 1988. Completion is regarded as registration of the subdivision).*
PERMIT NOTE:

INFRASTRUCTURE:

Prior to the commencement of any works on the road reserve the applicant/owner must submit an application and be issued a permit to occupy the road for works pursuant to Local Laws No 2.

COLIBAN WATER:

Specific requirements for the servicing of the new lots will be provided to the applicant after a plan for certification has been referred to us.

POWERCOR:

It is recommended that, at an early date, the applicant commences negotiations with Powercor for supply of electricity in order that supply arrangements can be worked out in detail.

Prospective purchasers of lots in this subdivision should contact Powercor Australia Ltd to determine the availability of a supply of electricity. Financial contributions may be required.

TELSTRA:

Approval does not cover alterations to existing Telstra Plant or Network. Locations of existing network can be obtained from Dial Before You Dig – Ph: 1100.

Telstra plant reticulation in this development, please refer to www.telstrasmartcommunity.com to Register your Development and Apply for Reticulation.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of an application for a four lot subdivision. The application has been referred to Council for determination as one objection was received and remains outstanding.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 189 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012.

Refer to:
Attachment FUT 082A: Aerial photograph.
Attachment FUT 082B: Proposed subdivision layout.

2. Background

Subject site

The subject site is located on the south side of North Street, approximately 100 metres west of Blakely Road and 105 metres to the east of Hargraves Street. The site has an overall area of 2,070m² and is occupied by a single dwelling located in the north-west corner of the site. A shed is located adjacent to the dwelling.

Surrounding Area

The site is located within an established residential area. Most lots within North Street are rectangular in size and contain a detached dwelling within the site frontage. Lots in North Street are generally 600m² to 900m² in area.

Proposal

It is proposed to subdivide the land into four lots as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Proposed Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (to contain existing dwelling)</td>
<td>405m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>566m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>617m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>483m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lots 1 and 4 will have frontage to North Street and Lots 2 and 3 will be located to the rear of the block and will be battle-axe style blocks to allow vehicle access from North Street.
3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

State Planning Policy Framework

Clause 16.01 - Residential Development for Single Dwellings
This policy ensures that subdivisions are located where they have access to physical and community infrastructure. It also ensures that subdivisions provide a range of lots sizes, a convenient and safe road network, and appropriate pedestrian and cycle paths. These aspects have been considered in the application.

Clause 19 - Infrastructure
This clause seeks the efficient and equitable provision of social and physical infrastructure partly through the use of development contributions (levies) in the funding of infrastructure.

Local Planning Policy Framework

Clause 21.03 – Municipal vision and framework plan
This covers the land use planning and vision for the Shire. The Municipal Strategic Statement encourages urban growth and an increase in housing choice, in sympathy with the environment.

The proposal is to increase housing lots within Castlemaine which is consistent with the above objective and will provide residential lots in an expanding area of the town. The site is located within the ‘Urban Boundary’ of Castlemaine as identified on Plan 3 Castlemaine Land Use Framework.

Clause 21.05-2 Ageing Community
The policy seeks to increase housing choice to accommodate future population needs and provide medium density housing in close proximity to retail, health and community facilities.

Clause 22.01 - Castlemaine
It is policy that:
- Opportunities for urban infill within the Castlemaine urban area are provided;
- Special attention is to be paid to maintenance of the town character and historic attributes; and
- Medium density housing is to be encouraged in centrally located areas.

The proposed subdivision is located within the ‘Urban Boundary’ of Castlemaine and provides an opportunity for infill development in an existing residential area of Castlemaine.

Clause 22.26 – Residential infrastructure
A principal objective of this policy is to ensure that all existing and future forms of residential development is serviced with reticulated sewerage when available and practical, water, electricity and other services.

It is policy that proposals for subdivision of land for residential purposes may be requested to provide a report which demonstrates how the site can be connected to reticulated water, sewerage and power where available.

It is expected the proposed development will be serviced with reticulated sewerage, water, electricity and other services.

Zones

Clause 32.01 – Residential 1 Zone
The subject site is located within a Residential 1 Zone. The objective of this zone is to provide for residential development at a range of densities with a variety of dwellings to meet the housing needs of all households and to encourage residential development that respects the neighbourhood character.
Under the Residential 1 Zone a planning permit is required to subdivide land and proposals must meet the requirements in Clause 56 of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme.

Overlays

The property is not located within any planning overlays.

Particular Provisions

Clause 56 – Residential Subdivision

An application for subdivision in the Residential 1 Zone must meet the standards and objectives of Clause 56 of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme.

An assessment of the application against this Clause accompanied the application and demonstrates that the proposal meets the relevant standards and objectives.

4. Issues

One objection has been received in relation to the proposal. The objection is summarised below and followed by officer comment:

- **On three occasions during the past year, the property at 25 Myring Street has had large amounts of water flowing into the property from the road. Once the drain on the nature strip cannot cope with the water.**

- **The only thing that has saved 25 Myring Street from flooding is that the water can eventually drain away through the block at the back (the subject site). There is concern that if units are built to the back of the subject site, this will impact on the ability for water to drain from 25 Myring Street.**

The concerns raised above are part of a wider concern in relation to on-going local drainage issues and are not relevant to the assessment of this planning application. It is noted that the subject site is located downhill from Myring Street, meaning that the proposed subdivision will not impact the existing drainage conditions at 25 Myring Street.

Should a planning permit be granted, the permit will include conditions requiring that all drainage for the subdivision is constructed and maintained to the satisfaction of Council.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

Cost of appeal to Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

6. Consultation

Notice of the application was carried out by the sending of notices by registered post to adjoining owners and occupiers and the erection of a sign on site. As a result of advertising, one objection was received.

On 19 June 2012, a meeting was held between the permit applicant, property owner, objector and an officer from Council’s Infrastructure Unit to resolve concerns in relation to the application.

As a result of this meeting, the objection remains outstanding.
7. Conclusion

Council has received an application for a four lot subdivision. The proposal is located within the Residential 1 Zone.

There is currently one outstanding objection in relation to the proposal.

The proposal is considered to be compliant with the Residential 1 Zone which seeks to provide for residential development at a range of densities.

Having considered the objections and relevant policies, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the provisions of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council having considered the application and being of the opinion that the grant of a planning permit would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area, resolve to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit for a four lot subdivision at CA 5A, Section 39A, 30 North Street, Castlemaine.

1. No Layout Alteration

   1.1. The layout and location of the lots as shown on the endorsed plan of subdivision shall not be altered or modified without the written consent of the Responsible Authority.

2. Payment In Lieu Of Open Space

   2.1. The applicant or owner must pay to Council the sum equivalent to 1% of the value of the land in the subdivision. This payment must be made before a Statement of Compliance is issued and may be varied under Section 19 of the Subdivision Act, 1988.

3. Valuation Expenses

   3.1. The applicant or owner must pay on demand to Council, the Council’s reasonable costs and expenses to provide valuation for payment in lieu of open space.

4. Underground Power Condition

   4.1. The electricity supply for the subdivision must be provided underground.

5. Infrastructure Conditions

   5.1. The applicant shall provide a drainage system to drain the four lots to the legal point of discharge. The drainage system shall be for both major and minor rainfall, be fully piped and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the current Australian Rainfall and Runoff – Flood Analysis and Design. The drainage system shall include as a minimum.

   a. Easement drains with access pits shall be provided to all Lots falling away from the Road and/or to all Lots which slope toward adjoining properties.
   b. Erosion control measures at the point of discharge from the development as applicable to the proposed drainage system.
   c. Designation of the minor and major flow paths shall be indicated on drainage plans to ensure the continuity of the overland flow path.
   d. A detailed drainage mitigation plan with engineering solutions to provide harvesting, retention, transport and disposal of the upstream catchment outfalls for the 20% event and management of the 1% probability event in accordance with the current Australian Rainfall and Runoff Flood Analysis and Design.
5.2. All existing and proposed easements and sites for existing and required utility services and roads must be set aside in favour of the Relevant Authority for which the easement or site is to be created on the plan of subdivision submitted for certification under the Subdivision Act 1988.

5.3. Prior to the issue of a Statement of Compliance, all drainage and driveway works must be undertaken to satisfaction of Council in accordance with the approved plans.

5.4. Detailed construction plans must be submitted and approved by Council prior to commencement of works.

5.5. The Legal Point of Discharge to the subdivision is the existing underground drainage in North Street.

5.6. Where an underground stormwater retention system is impractical the landowner will be required to enter into an agreement under Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act, 1987, with Council which affects each Lot within the subdivision. Such agreement shall require the landowner to provide for suitable above ground stormwater retention system. This requirement shall be waived if construction of an approved above ground stormwater retention system is undertaken.

5.7. Vehicle crossovers appropriate to the development and existing site conditions are to be constructed to the levels/requirements of Council. Council’s minimum standards are: -
   - 3.5 metres wide
   - Appropriately sized reinforced concrete pipes 4.8 metres long centred on the crossover. Minimum size is 375 millimetres diameter.
   - Low profile culvert end-walls to all culvert ends
   - 100 millimetre minimum compacted thickness of road base gravel from edge of pavement to property line and a two coat seal shall be applied.
   - No impeding or redirection of existing surface flows as a result of these works
   - Where two crossovers are in close proximity, pipes are to be extended through to create one wide crossover servicing both properties
   - Construction and maintenance of the driveways access, including from the edge of the carriageway to the property boundary, is the responsibility of the landowner and/or developer.

5.8. Where there are existing trees to be removed, Council will calculate the value of the trees using the appropriate model. Council may require the developer to pay a contribution equal to the value of the trees or undertake additional landscape works of an equivalent value adjacent to the site.

5.9. Prior to the commencement of any works on the road reserve the owner/applicant must submit an application and be issued a permit to occupy the road for works pursuant to Local Law No 2.

5.10. Council is to be paid a fee of 0.75% of the total construction costs for these road works for the approval of the said plans plus 2.5% for supervision of construction. Said fees to be paid prior to the commencement of any road/drainage works. Statement of Compliance will not be issued until all road and drainage works are completed to the satisfaction of Council.

5.11. The developer shall restrict sediment discharges from any construction sites within the land in accordance with Construction Techniques for Sediment Pollution Control (EPA 1991) and Environmental Guidelines for Major Construction Sites (EPA 1995).

5.12. The egress and ingress from North Street to the development including the internal traffic movements are to comply with current traffic management practice in accordance with the Australian Standards.
6. Goulburn Murray Water Conditions

6.1. Each lot must be provided with connection to the reticulated sewerage system.

6.2. All works within the subdivision must be done in accordance with EPA Publication 960 “Doing It Right on Subdivisions, Temporary Environmental Protection Measures for Subdivision Construction Sites”, September 2004.

6.3. All stormwater discharged from the site must meet urban run-off management objectives and standard C25 as required by Clause 56.07-4 of the Mount Alexander Planning Scheme. All works must be undertaken to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

7. Coliban Water Conditions

7.1. The applicant or owner is required to reach agreement with Coliban Water for the provision of reticulated water and sewerage services to each of the lots within the subdivision and comply with any requirements arising from any effect of the proposed development on Coliban Water assets.

7.2. The applicant is to provide evidence to the satisfaction of Coliban Water that existing private water pipes and sanitary drains do not cross the boundaries between lots. Where modifications to pipes or drains are required in order to satisfy this requirement, all work is to be carried out in accordance with AS3500 National Plumbing and Drainage Code of Australia and the relevant requirements of Coliban Water. Works to modify Coliban Water assets may only commence with prior approval by Coliban Water.

7.3. All Coliban Water assets within the subdivision, both existing and proposed, are to be protected by Registered Easement in favour of Coliban Region Water Corporation.

7.4. All proposed structures/boundaries must be located at least one metre from an existing or proposed sewer.

8. Powercor Requirements

8.1 The plan of subdivision submitted for certification under the Subdivision Act 1988 shall be referred to Powercor Australia Ltd in accordance with Section 8 of that Act.

8.2 The applicant shall:

- Provide an electricity supply to all lots in the subdivision in accordance with Powercor’s requirements and standards, including the extension, augmentation or re-arrangement of any existing electricity supply system, as required by Powercor (A payment to cover the cost of such work will be required). In the event that a supply is not provided the applicant shall provide a written undertaking to Powercor Australia Ltd that prospective purchasers will be so informed.
- Where buildings or other installations exist on the land to be subdivided and are connected to the electricity supply, they shall be brought into compliance with the Service and Installation Rules issued by the Victorian Electricity Supply Industry. The applicant shall arrange compliance through a Registered Electrical Contractor.
- Any buildings must comply with the clearances required by the Electricity Safety (Network Assets) Regulations.
- Any construction work must comply with the clearances required by the Electricity Safety (Network Assets) Regulations.
Set aside on the plan of subdivision for the use of Powercor Australia Ltd reserves and/or easements satisfactory to Powercor Australia Ltd where any electric substation (other than a pole mounted type) is required to service the subdivision.

Provide easements satisfactory to Powercor Australia Ltd, where easements have not been otherwise provided, for all existing Powercor Australia Ltd electric lines on the land and for any new potential powerlines to service the lots and adjoining land, save for lines located, or to be located on public roads set out in the plan. These easements shall show on the plan an easement(s) in favour of ‘Powercor Australia Ltd’ for ‘Powerline Purposes’ pursuant to Section 88 of the Electricity Industry Act 2000.

Obtain for the use of Powercor Australia Ltd any other easement external to the subdivision required to service the lots.

Adjust the position of any existing easement(s) for powerlines to accord with the position of the lines as determined by survey.

Obtain Powercor Australia Ltd approval for lot boundaries within any area affected by an easement for a powerline and for the construction of any works in such an area.

The applicant shall provide to Powercor Australia Ltd, a copy of the version of the plan of subdivision submitted for certification, which shows any amendments which have been required.

9. Telstra Conditions

9.1 The plan of subdivision submitted for certification must be referred to Telstra in accordance with Section 8 of the Subdivision Act 1988.

9.2 Telstra will not consent to the issue of a Statement of Compliance until such time as the Applicant provides satisfactory evidence of compliance with the above conditions.

10. Tenix Conditions

10.1 The plan of subdivision submitted for certification must be referred to SP Ausnet (gas) in accordance with Section 8 of the Subdivision Act 1988.

11. Permit Expiry

11.1 This permit will expire if one of the following circumstances applies:
   a. The subdivision and development is not started within two years of the date of this permit;
   b. the subdivision and development is not completed within five years of the date of starting.

Council may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing before the permit expires or within three months afterwards.

(N.B. The starting of a subdivision is regarded by Section 68(3A) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 as the certification of a plan under Section 6 of the Subdivision Act 1988. Completion is regarded as registration of the subdivision.)
Permit Notes

INFRASTRUCTURE

Prior to the commencement of any works on the road reserve the owner/applicant must submit an application and be issued a permit to occupy the road for works pursuant to Local Law No 2. Construction and maintenance of any driveway, including from the edge of the carriageway to the property boundary, is the responsibility of the landowner.

TELSTRA

Approval does not cover alterations to existing Telstra Plant or Network. Locations of existing network can be obtained from Dial Before You Dig – Ph: 1100. For co-ordinated Telstra plant reticulation in this development, please refer to www.telstrasmartcommunity.com to register your development.

MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to request Council approve an updated Asset Naming Policy. It is recommended that the Asset Naming Policy be updated every three years. The Policy has been amended to comply with current guidelines.

Refer to Attachment FUT 083A: Asset Naming Policy

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

2. Background

The Asset Naming Policy was first adopted by Council in March 2006. In 2010 the Victorian Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) released a comprehensive set of Guidelines titled Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010 (Guidelines)

The Asset Naming Policy has been updated in keeping with the Geographic Place Names Act 1998 and these Guidelines.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

As the naming authority under the Geographic Place Names Act 1998, Council is required to resolve on all geographic place names in the Shire with the exception of geographic places of State significance.

The Local Government Act 1989, Section 206 and Schedule 10(5) (naming of roads and numbering of premises), confers on Council the authority to name or rename roads. Council is the final determining body for street names. The Registrar of Geographic Names only needs to be informed of the Council decision and requested to officially register the new name.

Nevertheless, when naming or renaming roads, Council must abide by the guidelines set out in the Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010.

The Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010 are mandatory for naming authorities in Victoria. They have been developed through detailed consultation with Councils, government departments and emergency response and public service providers. The Guidelines are based on national standards and policies and provide a strong basis for standardised and unambiguous naming procedures across the State.

The Guidelines are provided for under Section 5 of the Geographic Place Names Act 1998, where it states that:

(a) The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, by Order published in the Government Gazette, may make guidelines relating to procedures to be implemented in selecting, assigning or amending names of places.

(b) Without limiting the generality of subsection (a), the guidelines:
   • Must set out the rules and process to be followed in selecting, assigning or amending a name of a place;
• Must set out the process to be followed before selecting or assigning an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander name of a place;
• Must specify criteria for the assessment of cultural heritage or other significance in relation to the naming of places;
• Must set out requirements for consultation before a name of a place is selected, assigned or amended; and
• May specify any other matter or thing appropriate in relation to the naming of places.

4. Issues

Considerable changes have been made to the Policy in order to provide clearer guidance on the protocols for road naming. The Policy now includes the Guidelines’ key principles, which underpin the protocols for naming a road or feature. The Policy also outlines in greater detail the consultation and registration process as well as elaborating on the naming of roads that fall within subdivisions.

Consideration of names for naming of all Council assets should be against the following criteria:

• The preservation of the heritage and identity of Mount Alexander Shire’s districts;
• The maintenance of the integrity of Council’s naming theme of historical/indigenous names;
• The recognition of prior uses of the land and people associated with those prior use;
• Recognition of deceased notable people or events of the locality;
• Cultural significance to the Shire’s communities;
• Acknowledge the use of locality names for mapping and identification purposes for the benefit of emergency services and tourism; and
• Names in long usage which commemorate or preserve for the historical record, events and people as part of the pattern of settlement and development of the landscape are preferred for the naming of previously unnamed features or where alteration of a name is being considered.

The use of traditional indigenous names is encouraged and preferred for as yet unnamed features, subject to agreement from the relevant indigenous communities.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

The financial implications are minimal with the cost of the erection of street signs as a result of the application of the Policy being met within the Council’s operating budget for this type of expense.

6. Consultation

This policy was forwarded to the Executive Management Team for their comment and approval prior to being presented to Council.

7. Conclusion

The Asset Naming Policy underpins the requirements for renaming roads, streets, bridges, buildings and topographic features within the Shire.

The Policy has been reviewed and updated to clearly define the principles of asset naming, to outline the requirements for consultation and include information on naming roads within subdivisions in line with the Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010.
RECOMMENDATION
That Council approve the Asset Naming Policy.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS
That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON
CARRIED.
Policy Category: Asset Management
Title: Asset Naming Policy
Adoption Method: 1) CEO 2) Council
Date Adopted: March 2006
Review Period: Annually
Date Last Reviewed: October 2012
Responsible Officer: Manager Governance
Next Review Date: October 2015

Purpose / Objective:
The purpose of this Policy is to provide guidelines for the naming of roads and community assets within the Mount Alexander Shire.

All roads or assets put forward for renaming/naming must preserve the Shire’s distinct identity and heritage and reflect the diversity of its community and the history and heritage of its built and natural environment.

Who is Affected by this Policy?
Emergency response services, residents, tourists, Committees of Management and direct users of Council's asset infrastructure.

Background / Reasons for Policy:
1. In Schedule 10(5) to the Local Government Act 1989 Clause for clause 5(2) states that the Council, in exercising a power under paragraph (a) of sub-clause (1) must act in accordance with the guidelines in force for the time being under the Geographic Place Names Act 1998 and must advise the Registrar (for Geographic Names) under that Act of the action it has taken under that paragraph.

2. However, in the case of a proposed deviation (a) through Crown land; or (b) which would result in the vesting of land in a Council under section 207B (2A) this power may only be exercised after the Council has obtained the consent of the Minister administering the Land Act 1958.

3. The Local Government Act 1989, Section 206 and Schedule 10(5) (naming of roads and numbering of premises), confers on Council the authority to name or re-name roads. Council is the final determining body for street names.


Irrespective of how many properties may use the new street name as their address, conferral of a name does not infer any obligation on the Council to improve, upgrade or maintain the roadway beyond the level of service that preceded the naming of the road.
Scope:

In consideration of naming requests, Council is required to abide by the Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010 (Guidelines). The Guidelines are intended as guide to naming, renaming and adjusting the boundaries of features, localities and roads in Victoria. Compliance with these Guidelines is mandatory.

A geographic place is defined by law to mean, any place or building that is, or is likely to be, of public or historical interest and includes but is not restricted to:

- Suburbs (bounded by regional districts)
- Localities (unbounded localities)
- Reserves, parks, gardens and public open space
- Streets, roads, bridges and other road features
- Public facilities and buildings, and
- Rivers, streams, creeks and other topographical features.

Policy Content:

Asset Naming Criteria

Naming authorities are usually municipal Councils, government departments or authorities responsible for submitting a naming proposal to the Registrar of Geographic Names.

Any individual, community group, organisation, government department or authority can propose a new name, change to an existing name or boundary change.

Consideration of names for naming of all Council assets should be against the following criteria:

- The preservation of the heritage and identity of Mount Alexander Shire’s districts;
- The maintenance of the integrity of Council’s naming theme of historical/indigenous names;
- The recognition of prior uses of the land and people associated with those prior uses;
- Recognition of deceased notable people or events of the locality;
- Geographical features, either man-made or natural. Local flora and fauna may also be used;
- Cultural significance to the Shire’s communities;
- Acknowledge the use of locality names for mapping and identification purposes for the benefit of emergency services and tourism;
- Names in long usage which commemorate or preserve for the historical record, events and people as part of the pattern of settlement and development of the landscape are preferred for the naming of previously unnamed features or where alteration of a name is being considered; and
- The use of traditional indigenous names is encouraged and preferred for as yet unnamed features or roads, subject to agreement from the relevant indigenous communities.

Road Naming

The types of roads requiring naming are:

*New or Established Roads*

- Established but un-named roads, sometimes called Government Roads;
- Roads in new subdivisions;
- Roads with two or more names; and
- Duplicate road names within close proximity with the same or similar names within a given radius. (Road
names must not be duplicated within five kilometres in metropolitan areas; within 15 kilometres in regional urban areas and within 30 kilometres in rural or remote areas.)

**Roads with Two or More Names**

Where a name has long usage and acceptance, this name continues.

Priority is given to the first known name.

- Where the European name has little or no associated information, but had been recorded on maps for a considerable time, and the origin and meaning of the Indigenous name are well documented, the Indigenous name should take precedence over the European name (appearing as the primary name on official maps).

**Principles for Road Naming**

Road naming is underpinned by the Principles as outlined in the Guidelines. All road naming proposals need to comply with the following Principles.

- **Principle 1A.** Geographic names must be written in standard Australian English or a recognised format of an Australian Indigenous language local to the area of the feature, locality or road.
- **Principle 1B.** Regard needs to be given to the long-term consequences and effects upon the wider community of naming, renaming or adjusting the boundary of a feature, locality or road.
- **Principle 1C.** Ensuring public safety. Geographic names and boundaries must not risk public and operational safety for emergency response, or cause confusion for transport, communication and mail services.
- **Principle 1D.** Ensuring names are not duplicated. Duplicates are considered to be two or more names within close proximity with identical or similar spelling or pronunciation. Duplication is not allowed within a regional urban area within 15 kilometres; and within a rural or remote area within 30 kilometres.
- **Principle 1E.** Directional names to be avoided. Cardinal directions must be avoided.
- **Principle 1F.** Assigning extent to a feature, locality or road. The naming authority must clearly define the area and/or extent to which the name will apply.
- **Principle 1G.** Linking the name to the place. Place names should be relevant to the local area, with preference given to unofficial names used by the local community.
- **Principle 1H.** Using commemorative names. The names of people who are still alive should be avoided. The initials of a given name are not to be used in any instances.
- **Principle 1I.** The use of commercial and business names, trade names or not-for-profit names should not be used.
- **Principle 1J.** Names must not be discriminatory. Place names must not cause offence on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, disability, religion, sexuality or gender.
- **Principle 1K.** Recognition and use of Indigenous Australian names/Indigenous Australian names. The use of traditional Indigenous Australian names is encouraged, subject to agreement from the relevant Indigenous communities.
- **Principle 1L.** Dual names are used as a means of recognising the names given to places by different enduring cultural and language groups. In Victoria the approach to giving simultaneous and joint recognition of two cultures through naming is to form a dual name with two distinct name parts.
- **Principle 1M.** Consulting with the public. Naming authorities must consult with the public on any naming proposal.
- **Principle 1N.** Lodging, considering and addressing objections. Any person or organisation can lodge objections to a naming renaming or boundary change proposal during the consultation period and must be lodged within 30 days allocated for feedback.
- **Principle 1O.** Only after a naming authority receives notification from the Registrar of Geographic Names that a name is registered, can members of the community be informed.
- **Principle 1P.** Signage. Naming authorities must not erect or display signage prior to receiving advice from the Registrar of Geographic Names.
Consultation and Registration

The Guidelines stipulate that a thorough consultation process must be undertaken, following these steps:

- Members of the general public, key stakeholders and community groups develop a request to name a road and forwards to Council.
- The staff member responsible for road naming checks the proposal meets the requirements outlined in the Guidelines.
- Initial consultation is carried out with local historical societies, the indigenous community and emergency services for naming suggestions. The immediate or extended community are surveyed with the opportunity to put forward a different name.
- Councils can generate a naming proposal in-house.
- All responses to the road naming proposal are collated and the most popular name that meets the Guidelines is selected and a report submitted to a Council meeting to approve the newly named road.
- Once Council has approved the proposal, a report is submitted to the Office of Geographic Names for endorsement and gazettal.
- Council is required to advertise the outcome of the road naming proposal in local papers with the option to place information on the Council website. All surveyed residents, historical societies and, where relevant the indigenous community are sent a letter confirming the newly named road(s).
- Council's Revenue Officer is advised of the outcome of the road naming proposal and a Customer Request form is submitted to the Infrastructure Department to erect signage. Signs must be erected within 30 days.
- Correspondence is submitted to all authorities and utilities, informing them of the road name change, such as Emergency Services, Australia Post, the Country Fire Authority, electricity and water supply companies.

Subdivisions

In the case of road naming proposals for subdivisions, a developer building new roads within the subdivision is required to place a road naming request to the designated staff member overseeing road naming. The Department of Infrastructure are required to forward all such requests to the designated staff member.

The proposal is checked to see whether it conforms to the Principles, as outlined in the Guidelines, and an advertisement placed in local newspapers advertising the intention to name roads within a subdivision. If no objections are received, the proposal is lodged with the Office of Geographic Names. The developer is responsible for the payment of newspaper advertisement and erecting signage that complies with Council's standards.

Related Policies

Community Engagement Policy
Community Engagement Framework

Related Legislation

Geographic Place Names Act 1998
Local Government Act 1989
Road Management Act 2004
Planning and Environment Act 1987
Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006
Aboriginal Heritage Regulations 2007
AS/NZS4819 Geographic Information – Rural and Urban Addressing
Survey Coordination Act 1058.

References

Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010.
1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present for Council's consideration the Mount Alexander Shire Council 2011/2012 Annual Report.


The recommended decision is not a 'Major Policy Decision' as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a 'Significant Decision' within the meaning given in Council’s 'Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012'.

2. Background

The Annual Report traces the organisation's performance during 2011/2012 in delivering on Council's vision for Mount Alexander and reports on activities listed in the Council Plan as well as other achievements of Council.

The Financial Statements were included in the Annual Report following resolutions by Council on 11 September 2012, giving approval in-principle to the Standard Statements, Performance Statement and Financial Statements for signing off by the Auditor.

The Annual Report was delivered to the Minister for Local Government by 30 September 2012, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act).

Public Notice was given in the Midland Express that the Annual Report would be considered at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 23 October 2012 and advised where the Annual Report could be viewed in advance of the meeting, as required under the Act.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

The Local Government Act 1989 determines the process by which Council considers and submits its Annual Report to the Minister.

The Annual Report (Report on Operations) is a key accountability document. Council has a statutory obligation to prepare an Annual Report that is in accordance with Section 131 of the Act. The Annual Report must be lodged with the Minister by 30 September each year. The Act requires that Council consider its Annual Report within 30 days following submission of the Annual Report to the Minister for Local Government.

Council's Annual Report must include a report of its operations, audited Standard Statements, audited Financial Statements and an audited Performance Statement. This report addresses the Report on Operations.

The Annual Report is a report on matters that might be of interest to the community as well as a compliance document under the Act. The content of the Annual Report is guided by regulations contained within the Act. It contains information as required by the Local Government Act 1989, Equal Employment Act, Freedom of Information Act, Whistleblowers Act, National Competition Policy and information required by the Department of Planning and Community Development.
4. Issues

The 2011/2012 financial year has been very successful with over $35.6 million in services delivered to the local community and progress made on Council's strategic objectives. The Shire was once again affected by flooding, impacting on the previous works carried out. Significant progress was made on a number of long-standing issues such as an increased capital works program, the adoption of a community engagement framework and the adoption of the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

The financial result for the year has reinforced Council’s improved financial sustainability over recent years. Guided by the Long Term Financial Plan, Council has continued with a strategy of managed debt levels, increased financial reserves, maximising income from grants and channelling increased income towards renewal of major assets, particularly roads, community buildings and sporting facilities.

Council continued to invest in strategic planning and policy development during the year. In each instance, extensive community engagement was undertaken.

5. Financial and Resource Implications

There are no direct or indirect costs relating to this matter.

6. Consultation

The Annual Report was prepared in consultation with Council staff.

7. Conclusion

Council has prepared and submitted its 2011/2012 Annual Report and must now consider the Annual Report at a meeting of the Council as required under the Act.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council consider and endorse the 2011/2012 Mount Alexander Shire Council Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2012.

MOVED COUNCILLOR REDDEN

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
1. Purpose

This report provides information on service activity indicators for the quarter to the 30 September 2012.

Refer to Separate Attachment FUT 085A: Service Activity Indicators Report at 30 September 2012.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

2. Background

These indicators are provided to highlight trends in service activities provided by Council. The indicators are used to monitor performance and improvement and will be reviewed from time to time to ensure they remain relevant and informative.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Whilst there are no statutory requirements for this report, the Council Plan 2009-2013 commits that Council will conduct its affairs openly and this report is presented to enhance this by providing public information concerning service activity levels.

4. Issues

With data now available over a four year period, a number of trends are emerging highlighting changes in demand or activities. Changes are a result of one off events (such as floods), changes in community behaviour (such as increased internet use), and changes in service delivery methodology (delivered meals). Emerging trends and points of note from the service activity indicators for the year ended 30 September 2012 as follows:

- Library visitation and loans continue to grow.
- Demand for service remains constant and hours delivered are within Department of Health budget.
- Number of respite care hours delivered were 14% higher than the previous quarter.
- The number of meals delivered remains within DoH funding and clients continue to be assessed according to Active Service Model principles.
- Septic tank applications have increased by 20% compared with the same period last year.
- Number of planning permits received is similar to last quarter.
- Number of active planning permits is generally consistent with the last quarter.
- 55 private building permits were processed for the quarter. The level of activity remains steady. This is positive relative to other areas of the State where building activity is on the decline.
- Visitation for the September quarter was up 15% on the respective quarter last year.
- Website visits have increased by 11% while enquiries have significantly reduced by 42% over the last quarter.
- Conversely the number of phone enquiries has been consistent with last quarter and for the same period last year.
- The number of customer service requests has reduced significantly compared with last quarter and is in line with the same period last year.
- Number of incidents recorded was 33% less than last quarter.
5. Financial and Resource Implications

There are no financial or resource implications arising from this report and recommendation. However the ongoing monitoring of trends in service activity levels will provide useful information for resource allocation.

6. Consultation

Quantitative data used in the indicators is provided by Service Unit Managers and disseminated throughout the organisation.

7. Conclusion

The service activity indicators are provided to highlight trends in the demand for and level of services provided by Council. With data now available over a four year period, a number of trends are emerging highlighting changes in demand or activities. Changes are a result of one off events (such as floods), changes in community behaviour (such as increased internet use), and changes in service delivery methodology (delivered meals).

RECOMMENDATION

That Council approve the Service Activity Indicators Report for the quarter ended 30 September 2012.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

CARRIED.
FUT 086  FINANCE REPORT FOR PERIOD ENDING 30 SEPTEMBER 2012

Responsible Officer:  Finance Manager
Original Document:  DOC/12/89364

1. Purpose

The detailed Finance Report for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 September 2012 is presented for Council’s consideration.

Refer to:
Attachment FUT 086A:  Explanation of columns in the Finance Report.
Attachment FUT 086B:  Capital Works Expenditure by Project.
Attachment FUT 086C:  Report on Flood Recovery Works.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

2. Background

The report presented includes the following information:

- Income Statement;
- Balance Sheet;
- Statement of Cash Flow; and.
- Statement of Capital Works in Progress.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental Impacts

Regular review of financial performance and reporting of Council activities provides an overview as to how different programs and projects are being delivered. This reporting assists in monitoring Council’s achievement of objectives in the Strategic Resource Plan whilst ensuring that Council is financially sustainable in the long term.

Section 138 of the Local Government Act 1989 requires the Chief Executive Officer to present to the Council at least every 3 months a statement comparing the budgeted income and expenditure with the actual revenue and expenditure.

4. Issues

The operating surplus for the year to 30 September 2012 is $10,321,821 which is $3,648,134 or 26% less than year to date budget. Income is $23,146,539 which is within 1% of year to date budget.

Expenditure including orders is $12,824,718 or 41.5% higher than year to date budget. This total includes expenditure and orders of $5,265,833 in relation to flood recovery works.

A separate report on flood recovery works can be found in Attachment FUT 086C.

An analysis of budget variances by Council Plan Theme is outlined below.
a) **Income Statement by Theme as at reporting date**

Variance are Positive / (Negative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 June 2012 Actual</td>
<td>30 June 2012 Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,098,946</td>
<td>7,056,448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39,613,040</td>
<td>42,734,182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,745,043</td>
<td>12,723,782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,902,106</td>
<td>3,902,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116,759</td>
<td>116,759</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,203,831</td>
<td>1,203,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,005,293</td>
<td>21,005,293</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,863,268</td>
<td>17,863,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,758</td>
<td>63,758</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,636,852</td>
<td>10,636,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37,577,544</td>
<td>37,577,544</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,755,735</td>
<td>2,755,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,057,670</td>
<td>9,057,670</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,035,496</td>
<td>2,035,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus/(Deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,969,955</td>
<td>13,969,955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengthening Our Community**

**Partnering For Better Services**

**Ensuring a Prosperous & Diverse Local Economy**

**Creating a Sustainable Future**
1. Strengthening Our Community income is $584,173 (15%) above year to date budget. This is due to capital grant funding received for flood recovery capital road works and higher plant hire internal charges income.
2. Partnering for Better Services income is $717,206 (60%) less than budget year to date due to a flood recovery grant not yet received.
3. Ensuring a Prosperous & Diverse Local Economy income is 99% above year to date budget, this is due to invoicing of the Official Visitor Guide advertising sales delayed into the current financial year and some incorrect phasing.
4. Strengthening Our Community expenditure is $581,384 (17.5%) above year to date budget, this is mainly due to Street Beautification seasonal expenditure on power line clearing and tree replacement occurring ahead of budget ($148,000), higher seasonal expenditure in Parks and gardens ($93,000) and higher plant hire and other charges in Infrastructure ($170,000).
5. Partnering for Better Services expenditure is 122% above year to date budget this is mainly due to expenditure and orders for flood recovery work estimated ($5.3 million) which is expected to be fully recovered through the NDRRA fund.
b) **Balance Sheet:**
The Balance Sheet shows Council assets, liabilities and residual equity, including reserves, as at reporting date.
d) Cash Flow Statement:

Variance are Positive / (Negative)

The Cash Flow Statement reflects actual cash receipts and payment totals for the year to reporting date. In comparison, the Income Statement is based on accrual accounting, and includes book value items that are not cash – such as depreciation expense and written down value of assets sold. The accrual accounting system includes a cost committal system that recognises, at the date orders are placed for materials or services, expenses and are included in the expense line items in the Income Statement. The result is that in periods where there are large cash payments for prior period commitments, there will be material variances when comparing line items between the Income Statement and the Cash Flow Statement.
e) **Cash Reserve Levels to reporting date:**

The graph below shows cash reserve levels for the year to date in comparison to the last two years.

f) **Investments and Cash Deposits**
**g) Capital Works to reporting date**

The graph below shows capital expenditure for the year to date compared to the annual budget:

Capital Works activity to reporting date totals $1,160,477 plus $1,323,156 commitments a total of $2,483,632 including commitments which is in line with the year to date budget. A large component of the commitments relates to flood damage remediation works ($864,634), bridge construction ($361,060), local roads resealing ($364,417) and buildings ($370,767).

**h) Capital Works by Asset Class**

**Reference Notes:**

a) For explanations of capital variances please see attached Capital Works by project (Attachment FUT 086B).

5. **Finance and Resource Implications**

The Finance Report for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 September 2012 presented above gives a concise summary of the financial performance of council for the three months.
6. Consultation

Explanations of major variances are provided by officers responsible for the services.

7. Conclusion

The financial result for the three months to 30 September 2012 shows the surplus is less than year to date budget by is $3,648,134 or 26% less than year to date budget mainly as a result of the timing of flood recovery funding and expenditure. Capital works including commitments is in line with the year to date budget.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council note the Quarterly Finance Report for the period 1 July 2012 to 30 September 2012.

MOVED COUNCILLOR CROSS

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR REWELL

CARRIED.
Explanation of Columns in Finance Report

The columns listed on the Finance Report are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Statement</th>
<th>Operational Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget 2012/13</td>
<td>Budget 2012/13</td>
<td>Budget 2012/13</td>
<td>Adopted budget not yet incorporating funding for prior year projects not complete at the commencement of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>The annual budget broken up on a monthly basis and the total applicable to the reporting date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>The Year To Date total of accounts paid and orders placed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (Negative) Variance</td>
<td>% of YTD Budget Spent/ Received</td>
<td>YTD Variance</td>
<td>The difference between YTD Budget &amp; YTD Actual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capital Works projects by asset class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Managers Brief Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Rd</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan Tariffs Bridge</td>
<td>$833,985</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oribi Bridge</td>
<td>$269,031</td>
<td>$111,031</td>
<td>$313,599</td>
<td>($194,568)</td>
<td>Delivery Phase - 30% of deck slab installed. A number of slabs have been rejected due to defects, which has caused delays. The project is now expected to reach practical completion mid September 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Road Bridge</td>
<td>$43,540</td>
<td>$36,220</td>
<td>$37,660</td>
<td>($1,330)</td>
<td>Project has reached practical completion. Powercor advised power pole relocation to take place as 13 September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011 Storm/Flod Damage - Bridges</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$9,780</td>
<td>$77,700</td>
<td>Works continuing with funds expected from DT. See Attachment CC for more information on flood recovery works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Rd</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bridges</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,744,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,811</strong></td>
<td><strong>$361,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>($108,249)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foot & Cycle Paths, K&C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbells Creek Walking/Cycling Track</td>
<td>$87,196</td>
<td>$10,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; Cycling Strategy New Bypass</td>
<td>$552,531</td>
<td>$105,090</td>
<td>$15,460</td>
<td>$39,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking &amp; Cycling Strategy Implementation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and Cycling Strategy</td>
<td>$81,900</td>
<td>$202,560</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$195,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Entrance Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$1,998</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>$74,900</td>
<td>$18,581</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>$73,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Foot &amp; Cycle Paths, K&amp;C</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,544,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>$341,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,412</strong></td>
<td><strong>$318,735</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drainage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Drain Improvements</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Mitigation Strategy - Consultants</td>
<td>$10,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Drainage</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,279</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Parking Study</td>
<td>$89,920</td>
<td>$47,720</td>
<td>$59,389</td>
<td>$18,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Rail Barrier Improvement Program</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$8,748</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braver Road Resurfacing</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,914</td>
<td>($10,914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$572,207</td>
<td>$11,240</td>
<td>$23,875</td>
<td>($5,675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011 Storm/Flod Damage</td>
<td>$5,627,700</td>
<td>$976,673</td>
<td>$106,767</td>
<td>$609,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads Resurfacing</td>
<td>$730,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,760</td>
<td>($34,760)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Upgrade Vaughan Drum and Road</td>
<td>$58,532</td>
<td>$58,532</td>
<td>$58,383</td>
<td>$511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Roads</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,154,329</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,305,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>$359,380</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,213</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Current Budget</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Renewals</td>
<td>$412,000</td>
<td>$100,969</td>
<td>$11,180</td>
<td>$39,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Community Facilities</td>
<td>$161,268</td>
<td>$4,268</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Sustainable Water Use Plan</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$7,497</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlemaine Goul Emergency Repairs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal Costs - Old Castlemaine Well</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,327</td>
<td>($2,327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to early years buildings</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlemaine Caravan Park - Carpark</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
<td>$8,539</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Mines Purchase and Refurbishment</td>
<td>$2,429,051</td>
<td>$112,712</td>
<td>$106,824</td>
<td>$5,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan Parks Asset Renewal</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$27,990</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Works - Caravan Park</td>
<td>$209,300</td>
<td>$52,305</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Buildings</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,787,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$144,311</strong></td>
<td><strong>$133,324</strong></td>
<td><strong>$181,907</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Reserve &amp; Playing Surface Upgrades</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Surface Upgrades- Wesley Hill Netball Courts</td>
<td>$125,070</td>
<td>$31,506</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt Recreation Reserve</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting (RCUP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Sport - Rec'n Blgs Wesley Hill Facility Plane</td>
<td>$133,392</td>
<td>$34,454</td>
<td>$389</td>
<td>$34,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Reserves - Campbell's Creek Park Stage 2</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$19,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Sport - Rec'n Blgs Nevested Pavilion Plan</td>
<td>$116,698</td>
<td>$31,944</td>
<td>$35,255</td>
<td>($3,311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Sport - Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt Res Sec Lighting</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,667</td>
<td>($5,667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of the old CFA site at High St Taradale</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other infrastructure (cont)</td>
<td>Current Budget</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds (Campbells Creek)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownen Tennis Courts</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Oval Upgrades</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>($600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Sport - Landscaping - Maldon &amp; Newtown Reserves</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>($3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt Town Centre Masterplan Initiatives</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$17,493</td>
<td>$6,594</td>
<td>$10,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbells Ct Recreation Paths</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Tennis Courts</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$8,973</td>
<td>$1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Woodfull Reserve Fence</td>
<td>$111,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtownen Cricket Net</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$16,962</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$16,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbells Ct Recreation Reserve Fence Upgrade</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Woodfull Reserve Carpark</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbells Creek Community Centre Play Area</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$6,748</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Replacement</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$9,996</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,673,680</td>
<td>$184,133</td>
<td>$63,398</td>
<td>$120,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlemaine Swimming Pool</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Pool Works</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$24,900</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Swimming Pools</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$24,900</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill - Cell Development</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$9,996</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Shed Construction</td>
<td>$111,031</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Stormwater &amp; Leachate Management Works</td>
<td>$85,472</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$8,357</td>
<td>($6,357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Transfer Station Upgrades</td>
<td>$82,252</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Landfill</td>
<td>$209,355</td>
<td>$11,996</td>
<td>$8,357</td>
<td>$3,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>Current Budget</td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Purchases - Renewal</td>
<td>$453,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Purchases - New</td>
<td>$202,640</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$131,693</td>
<td>$3,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plant - Renewal</td>
<td>$430,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Major Plant Purchases - New</td>
<td>$60,300</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Plant and Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>$1,164,641</td>
<td>$135,001</td>
<td>$131,693</td>
<td>$3,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furniture &amp; Fittings</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Managers Brief Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationship Management System</td>
<td>$39,402</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>Quotes received and assessed by evaluation panel. Site visits completed. Vendor selected subject to reference checks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Equipment</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Replacement</td>
<td>$67,520</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Equipment Repair</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda and Minutes Management System</td>
<td>$32,900</td>
<td>$8,223</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$6,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone System Enhancement</td>
<td>$8,703</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Somenor works to complete project. Carry forward budget requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Fittings</td>
<td>$109,600</td>
<td>$27,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Fittings - Town Hall OH&amp;S Improvements</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$33,069</td>
<td>$52,049</td>
<td>$9,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Replacement</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,515</td>
<td>(915)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Network Switching Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>$23,085</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Document Management System</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Furniture &amp; Fittings</td>
<td>$466,641</td>
<td>$114,424</td>
<td>$78,253</td>
<td>$36,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>$16,351,778</td>
<td>$2,417,196</td>
<td>$1,160,477</td>
<td>$1,256,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Flood Recovery Expenditure Summary 2010 - 2013

**to 30 September 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>On Order</th>
<th>Funding Received to date</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Recovery Relief Co-ordinator Contract Related Expenses</td>
<td>$32,215</td>
<td>$84,749</td>
<td>$26,779</td>
<td>$137,743</td>
<td>$6,843</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>RDV Flood Recovery Co-Ord Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Relief Expenditure</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$13,780</td>
<td>FAHCSA (Families, Housing, Community Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Management Plan - Expenditure</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
<td>$21,512</td>
<td>$21,512</td>
<td>$54,535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>Natural Disaster Resilience Grants Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Clean Up Fund - 2011 Expenditure</td>
<td>$121,515</td>
<td>$142,795</td>
<td>$13,115</td>
<td>$277,425</td>
<td>$7,753</td>
<td>$264,310</td>
<td>PDCD Local Government Clean up Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Capacity Grants Expenditure</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$5,560</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
<td>$7,090</td>
<td>$7,753</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>PDCD Volunteer Capacity Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Community Recovery Fund - Expenditure</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$42,722</td>
<td>$7,18</td>
<td>$43,440</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
<td>$128,250</td>
<td>PDCD Community Recovery Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Fund (RDI) Expenditure</td>
<td>$54,324</td>
<td>$24,776</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$89,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$89,100</td>
<td>Community Infrastructure Fund (RDI) Expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Management Plan - Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Infrastructure Fund (OSI) Expenditure</td>
<td>$103,787</td>
<td>$34,962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$238,749</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$238,749</td>
<td>Community Infrastructure Fund Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010 Storm / Flood Damage</td>
<td>$50,133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,133</td>
<td>NDRA (balance will be from YGC funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010 Storm / Flood Damage</td>
<td>$349,839</td>
<td>$20,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$370,639</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$349,839</td>
<td>NDRA (balance will be from YGC funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011 Storm / Flood Damage</td>
<td>$1,559,673</td>
<td>$3,332,446</td>
<td>$1,425,394</td>
<td>$5,517,513</td>
<td>$1,219,578</td>
<td>$4,314,485</td>
<td>NDRA / Community Infrastructure Fund Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Damage - MV Internal</td>
<td>$1,151</td>
<td>$2,742</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Flood Work - Spring Creek Rd</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$7,977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,977</td>
<td>NDRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011 Storm Flood Damage - Bridge Capital Exp</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$186,797</td>
<td>$3,044,745</td>
<td>$1,937,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,184,322</td>
<td>NDRA (balance will be from YGC funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011 Storm Flood Damage - Road Capital Exp</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$186,797</td>
<td>$3,044,745</td>
<td>$1,937,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,184,322</td>
<td>NDRA (balance will be from YGC funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2012 Storm Flood Damage</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1,384,863</td>
<td>$1,246,882</td>
<td>$3,044,745</td>
<td>$1,937,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NDRA (balance will be from YGC funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure / Revenue to Date</strong></td>
<td>$2,371,505</td>
<td>$5,769,519</td>
<td>$3,207,754</td>
<td>$11,348,778</td>
<td>$3,287,949</td>
<td>$11,685,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose

The purpose of this briefing is to inform Council on actions taken to date in implementing the projects and initiatives contained in the Annual Plan 2012/2013 for the quarter ending 30 September 2012.

Refer to Separate Attachment FUT 087A for a copy of the September 2012 Quarterly Report against the Annual Plan 2012/2013.

The recommended decision is not a ‘Major Policy Decision’ as defined in Section 93A of the Local Government Act 1989 or a ‘Significant Decision’ within the meaning given in Council’s ‘Election Period Caretaker Procedures 2012’.

2. Background

At the time of preparing the Council Plan 2009 to 2013 and in considering the budget for 2012/2013, Council decided to consolidate key projects and initiatives into a comprehensive plan for the year. Council subsequently adopted the 2012/2013 Annual Plan on 10 July 2012.

This report sets out actions taken to date in implementing the projects and initiatives in the Annual Plan 2012/2013. It also includes a small number of projects that follow from the previous Annual Plan and are still being completed.

The Plan is structured around the key priorities in the Council Plan, namely:
- Strengthening our Community;
- Partnering for Better Services;
- Ensuring a Prosperous and Diverse Local Economy; and
- Creating a Sustainable Future.

3. Policy and Statutory Implications

Including consideration of Economic, Social and Environmental impacts.

Council has prepared a Council Plan for 2009 to 2013 and a Budget for 2012/2013 in accordance with the Local Government Act 1989 ("the Act"). The Council Plan sets out the aspirations of the Council and the strategies and objectives to achieve the Council’s vision for the Shire. The Budget allocates resources to the activities and services that Council has identified as important to the achievement of Council’s vision.

The Annual Plan will be prepared each year and progress in delivering projects is reported to Council and the community each quarter and in the Annual Report in accordance with the Act.

4. Issues

This report sets out actions taken to date on specific projects and initiatives in the Annual Plan. Comments are provided on all projects that were planned to commence in the first quarter or identified as being ongoing. Some comments are provided on projects scheduled to commence later in the year where significant progress or other issues need to be reported.

Incomplete projects and initiatives from the Annual Plan 2011/2012 have also been reported against in this report.
5. Financial and Resource Implications

Projects and initiatives contained in the Annual Plan are fully funded. The majority of projects are contained within the Capital Works Program or funded as a one-off initiative. A small number are funded from the Operating Budget.

6. Consultation

Individual projects within the Plan involve community consultation or consultation with relevant stakeholders.

7. Conclusion

At the time of preparing the Council Plan 2009 to 2013 and in considering the budget for 2012/2013, Council decided to consolidate key projects and initiatives into a comprehensive plan for the year. A report is presented to Council each quarter setting out progress on projects.

This report sets out action taken on projects for the period up to 30 September 2012. Incomplete projects from the 2011/2012 Annual Plan have also been reported against in this report.

RECOMMENDATION


MOVED COUNCILLOR HENDERSON

That the recommendation be adopted.

SECONDED COUNCILLOR CROSS

CARRIED.
10. DELEGATES REPORTS

NIL

11. NOTICE OF MOTION

NIL

12. URGENT SPECIAL BUSINESS

NIL

13. MEETING CLOSE. 8.59PM