



Cardinia

MINUTES OF GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING

MONDAY, 17 JULY 2017

MINUTES OF GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING

held in the Council Chambers, 20 Siding Avenue, Officer
on Monday, 17 July 2017

The meeting commenced at 7pm

PRESENT: Mayor, Brett Owen, Chairman

Councillors Michael Schilling, Carol Ryan, Collin Ross, Jodie Owen, Graeme Moore, Ray Brown, Jeff Springfield, Leticia Wilmot

Messrs Garry McQuillan (CEO), Mike Ellis (GMAS), Derek Madden (GMCS), Andrew Paxton (GMPD), Jenny Scicluna (GMCWB), Doug Evans (MG)

OPENING PRAYER

Almighty God we humbly request that you bestow your blessings upon this Council, direct and prosper our deliberations to the advancement of your glory and to the betterment of the peoples of Cardinia Shire. Amen.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF TRADITIONAL LANDOWNERS

The Cardinia Shire Council respectfully acknowledged that we are on the traditional land of the Bunurong and Wurundjeri people.

APOLOGIES:

Nil

RECENT BEREAVEMENTS

Before proceeding to the business before the meeting the Mayor acknowledged the recent passing of some notable individuals, as follows;

Mick Moreland was a long serving councillor with our neighbouring Casey Council and the City of Berwick previously. Mick was a larger than life individual that contributed greatly to local government in the region over an extended period

Norm Joseph from Pakenham was a tireless community worker contributing over an extended period of time to the Pakenham RSL and the Council's Australia Day Committee

Dr Orrie Stewart, Dr Stewart was a GP in Lang Lang for many years and contributed greatly to the local community, so much so that his service to the community was recognised being awarded Council's citizen of the year in 2006 and then with an Order of Australia Medal in 2008.

The Mayor concluded by stating that these local community minded individuals will be sorely missed.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETINGS

Moved Cr G Moore Seconded Cr M Schilling

THAT MINUTES OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS BE CONFIRMED-

- General Council Meeting 19 June 2017
- Town Planning Committee 3 July 2017

Cd.

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY AND OTHER INTERESTS

Nil.

COMMUNITY QUESTION TIME

The Mayor brought community question time forward due to the level of interest and number of questions received.

The Mayor advised a number of questions had been received from numerous people and referred the first question to the GMCWB to respond. First question from Ms Kellie O'Dwyer.

Question 1.

Why and how do you choose to close down a not for profit local business like Kinders Together to outsource jobs away from our community. Why was this process so quietly done and no parents or staff consulted?

Response

Now more than ever Cardinia Shire is facing pressures that impact on what services we deliver and how these are delivered. Over the years through the development of our Council Plan, Liveability Plan, Child and Family Plan and Youth Strategy we have identified a number of service gaps in our community. Through an EOI process our intent was to attract the most appropriate and capable providers to work in partnership with us to help close these gaps and meet the needs of children and families, thereby enhancing the health and wellbeing of our community. It was also our priority to not only attract providers to provide kindergarten programs but also a plethora of additional service enhancements to benefit children, parents, carers and educators of Cardinia Shire. The process began some years ago when Kinders

Together entered into 3 year licences with Cardinia Shire Council and were informed that at the end of the term Council would be conducting an open Expression of Interest process. In addition to many verbal conversations, Council has documented evidence that discussions/emails or meetings on the matter took place on the 26th May 2015, during December 2015, 2 December 2016 and 16 January 2017. Regrettably Council discovered that staff and families under the management of the current EYM were unaware that this process was occurring. Once Council became aware of this, it wrote to all families that it had contact details for. The Expression of Interest was an open public process. Council is certainly aware that residents feel that they should have had opportunity to provide feedback about Kinders Together as part of the Expression of Interest process. However it is important to note that upon entering the EOI process it was incumbent upon Council to ensure that all applicants were given equal opportunity to submit under equal conditions. This includes protection against biasing the panel either towards or against the current provider.

The Mayor referred Ms Kellie McGrath's second question again to GMCWB to respond.

What community consultation was involved in the EOI process for the kindergartens? How are council going to support local residents who lose their jobs with the new kindergarten providers?

Response:

The EOI process is necessarily a confidential process to protect the interests of all applicants. As has been previously mentioned, upon entering the EOI process it was incumbent upon Council to ensure that all applicants were given equal opportunity to submit under equal conditions. This includes protection against biasing the panel either towards or against the current provider. Normally it is the role of the Early Years Manager to survey families about its own performance, however, in response to current community concerns, Council proposes from here on in to annually survey families and educators regarding their level of satisfaction with their Early Years Manager. This will then inform discussions and planning with the providers during the term of their licence. With regards to the circumstances of the current employees, the incoming early years managers have offered existing staff members the opportunity to meet with them to discuss future employment opportunities. Discussion about transition of employees is continuing between the new providers and Kinders Together. This will not be an open competitive process, however after this process any remaining vacancies will be advertised.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Sharyn Ling to the GMCWB to respond. First question from Ms Sharyn Ling:

Question 1:

The national quality frameworks for Early Years Management states that "families are placed to use the framework to review if EYM arrangements are meeting the needs of their children and families". Why was there no consultation with families prior to deciding if a tender was the most appropriate way to review the early years managers in Cardinia Shire?

Response:

As mentioned previously tonight, Council understands that families feel that they should have had opportunity to be involved in a review of the Early Years Manager arrangements. Council has acted on clear statistical data that shows at a high level that the state of Cardinia's children is in decline as well as a broad knowledge of how the early childhood sector across the state has evolved to respond to increasing vulnerability. Council is also aware of current gaps in service delivery that make it increasingly difficult for families to access the supports they need. ****Refer to statistical data. Council has proceeded with this Expression of Interest process in order to maximise the opportunity provided by its stewardship of early childhood facilities to address the service needs of the families and children of Cardinia.

The Mayor referred Ms Sharyn Ling's second question to GMCS to respond.

Question 2.

Can you elaborate on Procurement Policy item 5.9 Tender Evaluation Panels. Specifically "Councillors are precluded from membership of an assessment panel making a recommendation in regard to any procurement related decision". This Procurement document was changed in June this year as a part of the annual review to include this clause. This change in procurement occurred after the Expression of Interest process for EYM in Cardinia Shire Council was commenced. Why wasn't a councillor a part of the panel to select an EYM for our kindergartens? Why was this added to the procurement policy?

Response:

The timing of the Council publication that updated its Procurement Policy on 19 June 2017, had no intended bearing on this EOI. The inclusion of this new clause, as well as a number of other improvement changes (from the previous Policy) was to align Cardinia with Local and State Government best practices. Many Councils across Victoria (including Casey) have adopted this Policy or procedure excluding Councillors from panel participation, following an Ombudsman investigation in 2010 into the disclosure of information by a councillor in the City of Casey.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Maria Mills to the GMCS to respond. First question from Ms Maria Mills:

Question 1

Expression of Interest for Early Years Management - did they conduct due diligence on successful organisations?

Response:

Yes, the Council as standard practice conducted several diligence checks, prior to final selection of the successful providers. This included Financial (external assessment), Insurances, site and personnel Reference checks as well as Draft Transition Plans.

The Mayor referred Ms Maria Mills' second question to GMCS to respond.

Question 2:

Expression of Interest for Early Years Management -Did they appoint a probity auditor for the EOI?

Response:

The Council did not appoint a probity auditor for this EOI, as it was determined that a panel that included two independent assessors would be engaged to ensure probity (a Consultant and Policy Advisor from MAV, in addition to a Senior Advisor at Department of Education and Early Childhood Development)

As part of normal Council procedure, a formal evaluation criteria and weighting process was determined prior to EOI being released in the market. The panel subsequently conducted an independent assessment of each provider's responses to this criteria during the EOI selection process.

The Mayor referred a third question from Ms Maria Mills to GMCS:

Question 3:

EOI for Early Childhood Services -In reference to CSC Procurement Policy 92016) 4.6 Procurement Thresholds and Competition - How was it determined that this procurement was not considered high risk and therefore not required to go through an open tender process? Was a risk assessment undertaken to support the assessment of risk at this level?

Response:

The Council updated it's Procurement Policy on 19 June 2017. The relevant Section is now 5.7 Procurement Thresholds and Competition, however there is no change of text between versions in this regard.

A Risk Assessment was conducted in May 2017 even though there was no financial thresholds involved, (since Council is not paying for provider services as monies are pass-through at no profit or cost)

The recommendation from this Assessment was to mitigate any risks by implementing a robust and fair EOI assessment procedure, to pursue the best value outcomes from the market. In addition, the EOI should involve an impartial, qualified community consultant sitting on the panel. In practice Cardinia in fact selected two independent assessors on our panel.

Cardinia's EOI did follow an 'open process'. It was advertised in the Age, publicised on Cardinia's website and on our "tendersearch" page which is accessible to all. Anyone could register and download the documents which included some parents and a newspaper.

The Mayor referred a fourth question from Ms Maria Mills to GMCS.

Question 4:

EOI for Early Childhood services - How was the licencing fee determined? Please provide a breakdown of numbers? Will the 3 centres not involve in the Expression of Interest process be paying the new fee? if so, how much? Please provide a breakdown of numbers for these figures.

Response:

The licencing fee detailed in the EOI paperwork is an estimate of costs involved in the asset management of the kindergarten facilities. They include utilities costs, cleaning, building maintenance and grounds maintenance. These charges will be reconciled annually on a purely cost recovery basis and provide no profit for Council. A simialr arrangement is already in place at the Arena and Henry's centre. The stand alone kindergartens which are not part of the EOI and do not fall under Early Years Management arrangements pay all their own asset costs.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Robyn Mete to GMCS to respond.

Question 1:

In the recently revised Procurement Policy, it states that that the council will support local businesses and keep local jobs. Why has this been disregarded in the outcome of the Early Years Management Expression of Interest? Why has one company that is based in Western Australia and another in Glen Waverley be classified as local?

Response:

The revised Policy states under Section 5.14 Support of Local Business that "Council is committed to buying from local business where such purchases may be justified on basis of Value for Money, with identifiable and reasonable benefits. All other factors being equal, Council may give preference to local economic benefit when sourcing products and/or services."

The Early Years Management Expression of Interest applied these factors into the selection process of the successful providers. At the conclusion of both the written submissions and the interview process, the total evaluation scores of the successful bidders exceeded the considerations that was given for the local supplier.

The Mayor referred the next question from Mr Michael Fisher to GMCWB to respond

Question:

In relation to the EYM licences. Are kindergartens able to choose to revert back to a self managed kindergarten. If it is not an option, please explain why, and how this does not constitute anti-competitive behaviour according to the ACCC Exclusive Dealing/Third Line forcing which councils are also obliged to follow.

Response:

We met with the Department of Education and Training on Friday 14 July and put this question to them as the rules around Early Years Management are state government policy and not local government. Our understanding from this discussion with DET is that a dispute needs to exist between the PAG and the existing Early Years Manager and this needs to be resolved in line with the dispute resolution clauses in state policy. Some of the outcomes of a dispute resolution process could be transition to another provider or self managed status. An explanation can be found on Page 12 and 13 of the State's EYM Kindergarten Operating guidelines. Part 2.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Ann Wynne to GMCWB to respond.

Question:

Council claims that Kinders Together were not meeting identified gaps to support families with young children, then how were these gaps identified? And why didn't Council work with Kinders together to meet these needs, as they are now prepared to work with One Tree to help it become an approved Early Years Manager??

Response:

Statistical analysis of data regarding the state of Cardinia's children identified a number of challenges for families and children across Cardinia. In fact the outcomes for children are declining. Access to this data is readily available and has been discussed at length at a number of forums to which Kinders Together has been invited. Kinders Together received feedback about how to strengthen its service delivery from Council when it missed out on the licence for the Arena Centre, at a meeting on January 16 and at another meeting with myself and another Council staff member just prior to the EOI opening. With regards to council assistance to One Tree to become an Early Years Manager, my understanding of the process is that all Council needs to do is to provide consent to the Department of Education and the remainder of the process is managed between the Department and One Tree.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Debbie Charles to GMCWB to respond.

Question:

Regarding the recent EOI decision to remove Kinders Together as Early Years Managers of our kindergartens and appoint 3 different providers from outside the community - and one out of the state.....What community knowledge do the new providers have as is required in the EOI?

Response:

The Expression of Interest Key Selection Criteria required all applicants to demonstrate understanding of the needs of the community in section 3.3.3 c which states "The organisation demonstrates knowledge of the specific needs of the target group and/or the community where the service is provided". Exact details of the applicants responses are not able to be detailed in this forum as the process is strictly confidential, however my understanding is that the three successful applicants were able to clearly demonstrate a high quality response to this criteria. Some of the methods used to gather information included, survey research by a third party, examination of readily available data regarding outcomes for children, discussions with other services and agencies located in the area and currently working with children, local knowledge of staff.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Christine Scully to GMCWB to respond.

Question 1:

Did the Council use the Early Years Management Policy Framework to guide the criteria when developing the EOI as advised by the Victorian Department of Education and Training

Response:

Yes Council based the EOI on the Early Years Management Framework. The strategic context and outcomes of the EYM Framework directly informed the development of the key selection criteria.

The Mayor referred a second question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 2:

What service gaps were identified and how will the new providers fill these gaps with a high level of service.

Response:

Several years ago Council undertook a comprehensive review of service delivery across the Shire. Council then used data about outcomes for children and cross referenced where there needed to be more services in place to address community need. This resulted in a document named Services for Success which is a key advocacy document when Council works to attract more services into the Shire. The gaps in service delivery included adult education, volunteering, family support services, support services for new mothers. This document was included in the Expression of interest documentation for all applicants to see and to respond to in their application. Furthermore, Council undertook its own research to develop a report titled State of Cardinia Shire's Children and Young People in September 2016. This report outlines the increasing vulnerability of children in Cardinia from 2009 to 2015. The new providers were able to demonstrate that they had financial capacity, experience and in many cases were already delivering many services themselves that addressed these needs. The new services included before and after kindergarten programs, facilitated playgroups, a range of allied health services, parenting programs, volunteer opportunities, community action research projects, scholarship fund for parents struggling, NDIS services for children with a disability, Family Information Support help, literacy programs.

The Mayor referred a third question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 3:

Were the council aware that One Tree organisation were not signatories to the Victorian Early Childhood Teachers and Educators Agreement (2016) and that they planned to make all kinder teams redundant. As this has happened

in the past in Victoria when One Tree have been awarded management, how is this due diligence, or ensuring that the Early Years Management Policy Framework is adhered to as EYM's are to 'have initiatives that focus on retaining and recruiting a highly qualified workforce?' (pg.17)

Response:

Yes Council was aware through the EOI process and discussions regarding transition that One Tree did not work to the same employment award as Kinders Together. My understanding is that they have since committed to employ staff under that award in Cardinia. As with many contract transition arrangements, the transitions are negotiated between the outgoing and incoming providers. It is not unusual in these business arrangements to ask that employees are paid out their entitlements, including potential redundancies, before being picked up by the new employer. In the case of this decision, the two successful applicants have different approaches to how they wish to transition staff. Both are legitimate practices.

The Mayor referred a fourth question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 4:

If One Tree is to be providing before and after care in facilities that are not the kindergarten rooms as they have indicated, will they be leasing additional rooms in the councils buildings?

Response:

As part of the EOI process, One Tree presented a range of before and after kinder models for consideration. No finalisation of models has occurred as yet. Council has not been approached regarding the lease of additional spaces at this point in time.

The Mayor referred a fifth question from Ms Sculley to the CEO to respond.

Question 5:

It was of great concern at the community meeting just how wrong the CEO's information appeared to be regarding both how the process was achieved and also what the successful tenders were actually doing..... where is/has this misinformation come from and why

Response:

If I recall my presentation last Thursday evening, I publicly stated that the EOI process would stand up to the highest probity scrutiny and I stated that publicly last Thursday night. Regarding what the successful tenderers were actually doing I had a list of the secondary services that each of the successful providers would bring to Cardinia and in fact I discussed those with a number of people who attended that meeting following my presentation on Thursday, so I'm not sure what misinformation or how wrong my information was.

The Mayor referred a sixth question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 6:

How can the EOI outcome be upheld when the council have consistently expressed that it was a "flawed process" and that "mistakes were made", the council did not follow their own Community Engagement Policy (2013) or uphold their roles and responsibilities as outlined by the EYM Policy Framework?

Response:

The EOI process is necessarily a confidential process to protect the interests of all applicants. As has been previously mentioned, upon entering the EOI process it was incumbent upon Council to ensure that all applicants were given equal opportunity to submit under equal conditions. This includes protection against biasing the panel either towards or against the current provider. Council has carefully re-examined the actual EOI process that began when the EOI opened and has concluded that all appropriate procurement procedures were adhered to. Council proposes from here on in to annually survey families and educators regarding their level of satisfaction with their Early Years Manager. This will then inform discussions and planning with the providers during the term of their licence.

The Mayor referred a seventh question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 7:

"If One Tree are unsuccessful in obtaining registration as an EYM, will they still retain the agreements for the 3 kinders?"

Response:

No. One Tree will need to be a registered Early Years Manager.

The Mayor referred an eighth question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 8:

The new providers have indicated that they will be providing before and after care in facilities that are not the kindergarten rooms, will they be leasing other rooms in the council buildings to provide this service?

Response:

As this question is identical to an earlier question, I will provide the same response. As part of the EOI process, One Tree presented a range of before and after kinder models for consideration. No finalisation of models has occurred as yet. Council has not been approached regarding the lease of additional spaces at this point in time.

The Mayor referred a ninth question from Ms Sculley to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 9:

If, as the council say, they want to ensure the highest quality service for families, why was the EOI process strategically designed to target perceived (and questionable) service gaps, rather than all

candidates to prove their ability to meet all the current services provided by Kinders Together, in addition to meeting any alleged service gaps

Response:

It is absolutely the intention that any new providers will meet the same services that Kinders Together provides plus more. I am wondering if you might be referring to the inclusion support program known as KISS? I am aware that some parents are under the impression that this won't be available with the new providers. This is a state funded program available to be delivered in all funded kindergartens and will continue into the future.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Katherine Bartlett to the GMCWB to respond. First question from Ms Katherine Bartlett:

Question:

The EYM Expression of Interest process had several errors throughout. How have you rectified errors? Why wasn't this process stopped when you realised it was flawed?

Response:

The EYM process was thoroughly planned and followed Council procurement policy guidelines. After review by the Procurement Consultant it was deemed a robust and thorough process which would stand up to scrutiny.

The Mayor referred the next question from Mr Brett Larkins to the GMCWB to respond.

Question:

Prior to the decision made by council to appoint 'Bestchance' as a provider of Early Childhood Education Services, was any input sought from Parent or PAGs on dropping Kinders Together as a provider? Or were only information sessions offered after the decision was made?

Response:

Council's intention was to run an open Expression of Interest process in 2017 as the current licences for Kinders Together expire at the end of the year. Documented evidence shows that this was discussed with Kinders Together Management on at least 4 occasions - 26 May 2015, December 2015, 2 December 2016, 16 January 2017.

Kinders Together participated in the expression of interest process in the same way as all other applicants and had equal opportunity to demonstrate its suitability to continue to operate the kinders many of the kinders in the Shire. This process was overseen by a procurement specialist and a panel of four - two council staff members working in Early Childhood, a consultant and a staff member from the Department of education and training. The panel recommendation did not include Kinders Together as a future provider based on the scores at each part of the process. I believe that the information session that you are referring to was the one held last Wednesday night. This session was for families who have children enrolled in kindergarten for next year, 2018, and was the opportunity for parents to meet the new providers, collect relevant information from them and to ask any questions. As this session was held recently, then it was clearly after the EOI process closed and the new providers were told of their success in the process."

The Mayor referred the next question from Mr Matt King to the GMCWB to respond.

Question:

"My question is in regards to the EOI that was recently completed for the group of Kinders within the Upper Beaconsfield and surrounding areas. I was apart of the original PAG that decided for our two kinders that Kinders Together would manage our two kinders for us as a cluster. I am now unsure how that process and decision has

been removed from our power and the Council has decided to make this decision for us. This decision has been made without any prior consultation with our PAG and Kinder itself. Also how

they have now administered a management fee of which is absorbent to the actual cost of the roles outlined under the management fee."

Response:

I feel that the first part of your question has already been addressed prior so will respond briefly. The EOI simply outlined that the potential costs involved in managing the buildings so that applicants had a clear understanding of accumulated facility related expenses. These fees will cover such facility related issues as cleaning, utilities, grounds maintenance and building maintenance. It is proposed under the new licencing arrangements that Council charge once per annum for these actual costs rather than running the payment and reimbursement system with the EYM that is currently in place. These charges will be calculated on an actual cost recovery basis and will provide no profit to Council. This is currently the process used at Arena Child and Family Centre and Henry Family Children's Centre (which is currently operated by Kinders Together). This will free up the EYM to focus on working with the kindergartens rather than dealing with asset matters. Council does not fund the Early Years Managers and therefore no financial bids formed part of the application process.

The Mayor referred the next question from Mrs Gloria O'Connor to the GMCWB to respond.

Question

Will Council act to review the situation concerning kindergarten management in Cardinia Shire to address the serious concerns raised at the recent public meeting and expressed in the resolution passed at conclusion of the meeting?

Response:

Council is aware that the decision to award the Licences to alternative providers has raised concerns amongst the community and also that there is a good deal of misinformation circulating about the arrangements and the process. Councillors and officers have met on numerous occasions to discuss this issue and to determine a way forward.

The Mayor referred the next question again from Mrs O'Connor to the GMPD to respond.

Question

Is it acceptable according to Council policy for a property developer to consult and negotiate with local residents in order to strengthen his position relating to possible rezoning of various land holdings for residential development?

Response

We encourage all developers to liaise with adjoining land owners for any changes to their land in a hope that issues may be addressed prior to lodging an application.

The Mayor referred the next question again from Mrs O'Connor to the MG to respond.

Question

Could you please give some information about the Council meetings held on the basis of a Consensus Agenda? Is this a common practice among Victorian councils and what is its purpose?

Response

Cardinia Shire Council has used the consent agenda approach for the conduct of its meetings for many years. The reasoning behind the consent agenda is that all reports listed in the relevant agenda are very detailed and provide sufficient information for the Council to consider the particular matters and for the public to be able to gain an understanding of the matters also.

Only those items on the agenda where a councillor particularly wishes to debate or highlight a particular matter are discussed and debated at the meeting. All other items are resolved on en masse.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Kerryn Catheray to the GMCWB to respond.

Question:

Do any of the proposed new kindergarten providers offer ongoing inclusion support via field officers who support and work one on one with children with special needs and their families in their own home environment and support and work on site with kindergarten educators to build relationships, implement strategies and support the intergration of children with special needs to kindergarten

Response:

I understand that this is a model of support that Kinders Together has instigated in some of its services. All funded Kindergarten programs have access to the KISS funding and the inclusion support program will continue with the new providers. Bestchance provides a range of NDIS services and other models to support children with additional needs in kindergarten. I encourage you to speak with Bestchance when they meet with your kindergarten to find out more detail about exactly what they can offer to respond to the needs of your kinder's families.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Karen Chugg to the GMCWB to respond.

Question:

If, as the council say, they want to ensure the highest quality early childhood service for families, why was the EOI process strategically designed to target perceived (and questionable) service gaps rather than require all candidates to prove their ability to meet all the current services provided by Kinders Together IN ADDITION TO meeting any alleged service gaps?

Response:

Several years ago Council undertook a comprehensive review of service delivery across the Shire. Council then used data about outcomes for children and cross referenced where there needed to be more services in place to address community need. This resulted in a document named Services for Success which is a key advocacy document when Council works to attract more services into the Shire. The gaps in service delivery included adult education, volunteering, family support services, support services for new mothers. This document was included in the Expression of interest documentation for all applicants to see and to respond to in their application. Furthermore, Council undertook its own research to develop a report titled State of Cardinia Shire's Children and Young People in September 2016. This report outlines the increasing vulnerability of children in Cardinia from 2009 to 2015. It is expected that the new providers will build on the current suite of services currently provided by Kinders Together and include new services and opportunities beyond what is currently on offer.

The Mayor referred the next question from Ms Bri Holder to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 1:

Families and Parent Advisory Groups are major stakeholders in the EOI process with ownership of majority of the 'fitout' at each of the kindergartens. Please explain your rationale in not consulting families and PAG's as major stakeholders before and during the commencement EOI process?

Response:

Council understands that families and PAGs would have preferred Council to consult with them before and during the EOI process. Council will put measures in place such as an annual survey with parents and teachers/educators over the term of the next 5 year licence to ensure that these stakeholders have an opportunity to provide feedback about their current provider. This is not possible during the EOI process as all applicants need to be considered on their merits from a basis of an even playing field without bias either for or against any particular provider.

The Mayor referred the second question from Ms Bri Holder to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 2:

In recent public meetings about the EOI process for EYM, Cardinia Shire officers and CEO have acknowledge that there were things they got wrong and things they would do differently next time. Please elaborate on this?

Response:

There are several aspects of the Memorandum of Understanding with the new providers which will serve to strengthen the partnerships between Council, the EYMs and families. Council will undergo an annual survey regarding the satisfaction with the EYM and use this information to direct planning and performance conversations with the EYM. Council will require the EYM to provide it with contact details of PAG members. Council will require the EYMs to share their parent and staff survey results with Council.

The Mayor referred the third question from Ms Bri Holder to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 3:

Throughout the Expression Of Interest process for Early Years Management, please elaborate on the service gaps that council have identified specifically for each individual kindergarten.

Response:

Several years ago Council undertook a comprehensive review of service delivery across the Shire. Council then used data about outcomes for children and cross referenced where there needed to be more services in place to address community need. This resulted in a document named Services for Success which is a key advocacy document when Council works to attract more services into the Shire. The gaps in service delivery included adult education, volunteering, family support services, support services for new mothers. This document was included in the Expression of interest documentation for all applicants to see and to respond to in their application. Furthermore, Council undertook its own research to develop a report titled State of Cardinia Shire's Children and Young People in September 2016. This report outlines the increasing vulnerability of children in Cardinia from 2009 to 2015

The Mayor referred the next question from Mr Matthew Gardner to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 1:

How can a prior winner of Cardinia's business of the year be over looked to run early years management and beaten by companies that are not even based in the shire?

Response:

Kinders Together participated in a competitive expression of interest process that was open to the market. It was scored on the same selection criteria as all other applicants and was unsuccessful. The Early Years Management sector has been evolving for some time and many EYMs have diversified in response to the need for additional services at a local level. Other applicants were able to demonstrate their capacity to add value to a high quality kinder program.

The Mayor referred the second question from Mr Matthew Gardner to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 2:

Is council intending to create hub where Kindergartens will be combined with Maternal Health nurses and childcare in the future?

Response:

Council has built a number of integrated children's centres (hubs) in recent years as there is much evidence and research that supports the benefits for children and families with this model. However, this model is not suitable at every site across Cardinia and there is much value in the stand-alone model as well. Council has no intention of providing buildings for long day care and wishes to maintain choice for families with regards to the kinder provision model that suits them best. No decision to change the service model at any kinder would take place without consultation

with the Early Years Manager, PAGs and broader community. Council has no plans to transform current stand alone kinders into a hub model.

The Mayor referred the third question from Mr Matthew Gardner to the GMCWB to respond.

Question 3:

Why didn't Council make a condition for the new early years providers to carry staff and their entitlements, particularly educators over.

Response:

Council is not in a position to direct the incoming Early Years Managers with regards to the transition arrangements but it is certainly in a position to advocate and influence on this matter. Several meetings with the new providers have already taken place on the matter of transition for staff and this has also been included in the Memorandum of Understanding for the new providers to sign. My understanding is that meetings between KT and the new providers are already underway. Ultimately the new providers have final say over what they will accept as a suitable transition process but Council continues to advocate for continuity for existing staff.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice of Motion 1034, as amended

Moved Cr R Brown seconded Cr M Schilling.

That in regard to the Expression of Interest process undertaken for the management of Early Years Education and Secondary Services for various kindergarten centres within the Shire and the decision to award Best chance, One Tree Community Services and ECMS the licences to deliver these services and following the concerns expressed to Council regarding this decision Council resolves as follows:

That the Chief Executive Officer be asked to re-negotiate the award of Early Years Management so that the following outcome is achieved:

ECMS be appointed to manage the Gum Scrub Creek Early Years Centre and Best chance be appointed to manage the other centres outlined in the EOI process, and the CEO negotiate job security as a priority.

And that Council undertake an annual survey of kinder families and educators regarding their experience and satisfaction with the Early Years Manager and that this directly informs the discussions between the Early Years Manager and Council regarding quality performance and community expectation.

Cd

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 9.48 pm and reconvened at 10.01pm.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMUNITY QUESTION TIME3

NOTICES OF MOTION..... 14

TOWN PLANNING 16

 1. DEVELOPMENT OF 19 DWELLINGS, 360 PRINCES HIGHWAY OFFICER.....16

GENERAL REPORTS38

 2. CONTRACT 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11) - SEASONAL ROADSIDE AND FIRE
 PREVENTION SLASHING38

 3. COCKATOO-GEMBROOK MULTI USE TRAIL41

 4. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE EMERALD VILLAGE COMMITTEE45

 5. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO NOBELIUS HERITAGE PARK AND
 EMERALD MUSEUM COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.....48

 6. DOCUMENTS FOR SEALING51

ACTIVITY REPORTS54

 7. MAJOR PROJECT AND STRATEGIES ACTIVITY REPORT.....54

REPORTS OR MINUTES OF COMMITTEES57

REPORTS BY DELEGATES.....57

REPORT BY THE MAYOR58

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS.....58

TOWN PLANNING
1 DEVELOPMENT OF 19 DWELLINGS, 360 PRINCES HIGHWAY OFFICER

FILE REFERENCE INT1745486

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Andrew Paxton

AUTHOR Stephen Powell

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the without prejudice plans submitted to Council with respect to planning permit application T160600 and VCAT reference P1056/2017 be supported subject to conditions and a consent order provided to VCAT allowing Planning Permit T160600 be issued authorising the development of a nineteen (19) dwellings at 360 Princes Highway (proposed lot A PS738353A).

Attachments

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|
| 1 | Locality plan | 1 Page |
| 2 | Development plans | 5 Pages |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

APPLICATION NO.:	T160600
APPLICANT:	Emma Hawking, Oreana Property Group
LAND:	360 Princes Highway, Officer VIC 3809
PROPOSAL:	Development of the land for nineteen (19) dwellings and associated works
PLANNING CONTROLS:	Urban Growth Zone Schedule 3 Development Contributions Plan Overlay Schedule 4
NOTIFICATION & OBJECTIONS:	Pursuant to Clause 37.07-13 the application is exempt
KEY PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:	Officer Precinct Structure Plan and Compliance with Clause 55
RECOMMENDATION:	That the without prejudice plans submitted to Council with respect to planning permit application T160600 and VCAT reference P1056/2017 be supported subject to the conditions outlined below and a consent order provided to VCAT.

BACKGROUND:

The subject site has been subject to previous planning approvals including Planning Permit T120482 issued on 11 May 2015 for the subdivision of land which created the subject site within South Siding Estate. The endorsed plans for the subdivision permit have noted the site for medium density development.

Planning Permit application T160600 for the 'development of the land for twenty-one (21) dwellings and associated works' was refused by Council on 4 May 2017 on the following grounds:

1. *The proposal is inconsistent with Clause 15.01-1 (Urban Design) and Clause 21.06-1 (Design and Built form) as the proposal does not promote good urban design that respects the preferred neighbourhood character and fails to achieve architectural and urban design outcomes that contribute positively to local urban character or enhance the public realm.*
2. *The proposal is inconsistent with the purpose of Clause 37.07 (Urban Growth Zone) as the proposed development does not achieve the objectives of Section 4.2 Housing of the Officer Precinct Structure Plan September 2009.*
3. *The proposal fails to satisfy the objectives and standards of;*
 - a) *Clause 55.02-1 (Neighbourhood character) as the design does not adequately address each street frontage and presents a continuous double storey built form with limited separation at upper level.*
 - b) *Clause 55.02-5 (Integration with the Street) as the proposal does not provide an appropriate presentation to the Heathcote Grove frontage and has a poor design response with garage located in key corner locations.*
 - c) *Clause 55.03-1 (Street Setback) as the proposed setbacks do not meet Standard B6 to Pioneer Way and Heathcote Grove and does not respect the preferred neighbourhood character resulting in a detrimental streetscape impact.*
 - d) *Clauses 55.03-5 (Energy efficiency) as dwellings 12 -21 are provided with poor energy efficiencies with limited sunlight access to the secluded private open space areas and the lack north facing windows.*
 - e) *Clause 55.03-6 (Open space) & Clause 55.03-7 Standard B12 (Safety) as the design results in extensive fencing along the proposed accessway which restrict surveillance of this area and creates safety concerns.*
 - f) *Clause 55.03-10 (Parking Location) as the proposed visitor parking spaces are not conveniently located for the majority of the dwellings and their design does not ensure that vehicles will not obstruct the adjacent accessway.*
 - g) *Clause 55.04-8 (Noise Impacts) as the design has not provided any features that will protect future residents from the noise impact of the future arterial road.*
 - h) *Clause 55.05-4 (Private Open space) Standard B28 as dwellings 15, 16 and 19 have not been provided with the minimum secluded open space areas and dwellings 12 and 16 do not meet the total minimum requirement of 40 square metres.*
 - i) *Clause 55.06-1 (Storage) Standard B30 as dwelling 6 is not provided with any external storage are to meet the minimum requirements of this standard.*
 - j) *Clause 55.06-2 (Design Detail) Standard B31 as the proposed development provides limited façade articulation and design that is inconsistent with the preferred neighbourhood character.*
 - k) *Clause 55.06-4 (Common Property) Standard B33 as the common area will not achieve a functional area that can be efficiently managed as the design presents a number of conflict points at the north east corner of the accessway.*

of the Cardinia Planning Scheme.

4. *The site represents an overdevelopment of the site, in failing to respond appropriately to its opportunities and constraints resulting in unreasonable impact on the character of the area, streetscape and amenity for future occupants.*
5. *The proposal is inconsistent with the purpose of Clause 52.06 Car Parking as the visitor*

parking spaces have not been appropriately located or dimensioned to ensure that layout create a safe environment for the future occupants.

On 22 May 2017, Council received notice from the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) that an Application to Review had been received pursuant to Section 77 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

On 28 June 2017, Council received without prejudice plans for Council's consideration prior to the scheduled VCAT Compulsory Conference on 24 July 2017. The plans were prepared in response to Councils' grounds of refusal and propose key design changes and removal of two dwellings.

SUBJECT SITE

The subject site is located within South Siding Estate and is known as proposed Lot A on Plan of Subdivision PS738353A created under planning permit T120482. The site is an irregular shaped allotment with an area of 3,529 square metres and is one of two lots within the subdivision earmarked for a future medium density proposal. The site is currently vacant, with works commenced on the approved subdivision.

The site has a road frontage to Pioneer Way to the north boundary and a future arterial road along the eastern boundary, Ethan Road to the west and Heathcote Grove to the south. Pioneer Way is a connector street as identified in the Officer Development Contribution Plan (DCP). The future arterial road is also identified within the Officer DCP and the land will be vested with VicRoads.

PROPOSAL

The permit applicant now seeks consent from Council to the without prejudice plans submitted on 28 June 2016.

Key changes to the plans previously refused are as follows:

- Deletion of two units (known as Units 14 and 19 previously) and its consequential amendments;
- Rearrangement of Unit 1 to provide an active corner presentation to Pioneer Way and Eades Street
- Rearrangement of Unit 6 to provide a 3.56 metre separation to Unit 7 at level 1;
- Incorporation of additional fenestration to the side wall of dwellings with frontage to a side street
- Increase in setbacks from the northern, eastern and western setbacks at ground and first level
- Reduction of one (1) visitor car space as a result of the deletion of two dwellings (now compliant with Clause 52.06);
- Rearrangement of visitor car spaces;
- Reduction to width of ground level service yards to increase landscaping opportunities;
- Increase to height of service yard fence to 1.5m with a minimum visual transparency of 40%.

The application now seeks the development of nineteen (19) dwellings and associated works as described below:

- **Site Layout:** The overall layout incorporates dwellings designed to front Pioneer Way, and the future arterial road adjacent to the east boundary. Eleven (11) attached dwellings are proposed along Pioneer Way and future arterial road frontages with nine attached dwellings located in a

'U' shaped arrangement in the south west corner portion of the site, including four dwellings fronting Eades Road with remaining dwellings addressing the internal driveway. The first floors are attached with some separation between two dwellings on Pioneer Way and the future arterial road.

The ground floor is generally setback 4 metres from the street frontages with some minor porch encroachments into the setback. The first floors include balcony areas setback between 1.9 and 2 metres from site frontages.

- **Vehicle Access & Parking:** The layout includes a common accessway with double crossover on Eades Road and Heathcote Grove, a 5.5 metre wide accessway is proposed to service fifteen (15) dwellings. With two cross-overs provided to Eades Road to provide access to four (4) dwellings which front the road.

The dwellings are provided with individual single garages and tandem space. The proposal has included the inclusion of 3 visitor car parking spaces.

- **Dwelling Design, Height and Form:** The development provides a mixture of three or four bedroom dwellings. The proposal includes double storey dwellings throughout the site. Interfaces to all roads contain balconies, with some living spaces at first floor level. Floor to ceiling heights are typically 2.7 metres at the ground level and 2.4 metres to the upper level, with an overall maximum height of approx. between 6.4 and 6.9 metres above the natural ground level. The proposed dwellings are a contemporary design with flat roofs.
- **Colours & Materials:** Dwellings will be constructed using face render and timber cladding.
- **Private and Open Space:** The proposed dwellings are provided with private open space either to the rear of the dwellings or to upper balconies where fronting Pioneer Way, Eades Road and Heathcote Grove and of the future arterial road.

PLANNING SCHEME PROVISIONS

State Planning Policy Framework (SPPF)

The relevant clauses of the SPPF are:

- Clause 11 Settlement
 - Clause 11.02-2 Structure Planning
 - Clause 11.02-3 Planning for Growth Areas
 - Clause 11.02-4 Sequencing of development
- Clause 15.01-1 Urban Design
 - Clause 15.01-3 Neighborhood and Subdivision Design
 - Clause 15.01-4 Design for Safety
 - Clause 15.01-5 Cultural Identity and neighbourhood character
 - Clause 15.02-1 Energy and resource Efficiency
- Clause 16 Housing
 - Clause 16.01-1 Integrated Housing
 - Clause 16.01-3 Housing opportunity areas
 - Clause 16.01-4 Housing diversity
 - Clause 16.01-5 Housing Affordability
- Clause 19 Infrastructure
 - Clause 19.03-1 Development contribution plans

- Clause 19.03-2 Water supply, sewerage and drainage
- Clause 19.03-3 Stormwater
- Clause 19.03-4 Telecommunications

Local Planning Policy Framework (LPPF)

The relevant clauses of the SPPF are:

- Clause 21.03 Settlement and Housing
 - Clause 21.03-1 Housing
 - Clause 21.03-2 Urban growth area
- Clause 21.05 Infrastructure
 - Clause 21.05-1 Infrastructure provision
 - Clause 21.05-3 Local roads
 - Clause 21.05-4 Public transport
 - Clause 21.05-5 Pedestrian and bicycle network
- Clause 21.06 Particular Uses and Development
 - Clause 21.06-1 Design and built form
 - Clause 21.06-2 Community Safety

Relevant particular/general provisions and relevant incorporated or reference documents

The relevant provisions/documents are:

- Clause 52.06 Car Parking
- Clause 55 Two dwellings on a lot
- Clause 65 Decision Guidelines
- Officer Precinct Structure Plan (2011)
- Officer Development Contributions Plan (2011)
- Officer Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (2011)

Zone

The land is subject to the Urban Growth Zone Schedule 3

Overlays

The land is subject to the following overlays:

- Development Contributions Plan Overlay Schedule 4 (DCPO4)

PLANNING PERMIT TRIGGERS

The proposal for the development of the land for nineteen (19) dwellings requires a planning permit under the following clauses of the Cardinia Planning Scheme:

- Pursuant to Clause 32.08-4 of the General Residential Zone (GRZ) (applied zone under UGZ3) a permit is required to construct two or more dwellings on a lot. Pursuant to Part B of the UGZ where a structure plan applies (approved September 2008 and incorporated into the scheme), the provisions of Clauses 37.07-9 to 37.07-16 apply. Any permit issued must be generally in accordance with the precinct structure plan applying to the land.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Pursuant to Clause 37.07-13 of the Urban Growth Zone any provision of this scheme which is generally in accordance with the precinct structure plan applying to the land is exempt from the notice requirements of section 52(1)(a), (b) and (d) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

REFERRALS

No external referrals required

DISCUSSION

1. State & Local Planning Policy Framework

The development generally accords with the State and Local Policy through encouraging the consolidation of existing urban areas within growth regions.

Both State and Local Planning policy framework provides clear direction in the need to provide for increased residential densities near and within existing urban areas coupled with the need to diversify housing forms. The proposal offers a housing form, which will provide for a different type of housing that is not generally offered in the wider area. The site is close to a number of services and public transport, public open space, Officer Town Centre and is consistent with the Urban Growth Zone and Precinct Structure Plan. The proposal provides for urban consolidation within an establishing township and which is strongly supported by planning policy with the Cardinia Planning Scheme.

As such it is considered that the proposal is considered consistent with both State and Local policy directions and will provide diversity in housing stock in this rapidly changing PSP area.

2. Zone

The proposed residential subdivision and development within the UGZ3 is consistent with the relevant provisions of the UGZ3 and GRZ as outlined below:

- The parent subdivision (T120482) earmarked this site as a site suitable for future medium density development;
- The site is in close proximity to the future activity centres including the Officer Town Centre and the Neighbourhood Convenience Centre;
- The site is a prominent corner site and the built form outcomes provided in this development (rear loaded with active interface Pioneer Way and the future local arterial road on the east boundary) is a desirable response to the future road networks;
- The site is located in close proximity to public transport routes proposed within the Officer PSP and close Gilbert Reserve to the east.

3. Officer Precinct Structure Plan, Development Contributions Plan and Native Vegetation Precinct Plan

The proposed residential subdivision is generally in accordance with the Officer PSP. A summary of the reasons are provided below:

- The subject site is located within the Residential Land area as shown on Plan 5 of the Officer PSP, with approximately half the site located within medium density and half within standard

density. It is considered that the site is suitable for a higher density than identified in the PSP and is in generally accordance with the Officer PSP on the following basis:

- The site is in close proximity to the future activity centres including the Officer Town Centre and the Neighbourhood Convenience Centre;
 - The site is a prominent corner site and the built form outcomes provided in this development subject. The rear loaded product with an active interface to Pioneer Way and the future local arterial are a desirable response to the future road networks including a round-about on the corner of Pioneer Way and the local arterial road; and
 - The site is located in close proximity to public transport routes proposed within the Officer PSP including along Rix Road.
- The site includes a mix of smaller lots which are within 400 metres of the future NCC to the south east;
 - The application provides for a diversity of housing choice within the precinct by providing attached unit development within a common property arrangement as opposed to single detached housing within nearby estates;
 - Lots along the Pioneer Way and local arterial road are rear loaded (accessed via internal driveway) to encourage a strong built form to the roads, limit any conflict points or garages, and limit garages being the dominant visual feature to the road.
 - A footpath will be provided along the north, east and south boundaries to provide appropriate pedestrian linkages.
 - Dwellings are provided with balconies and a strong integration with the respective street through habitable room windows etc. to ensure street integration and passive surveillance has been maximised.

In addition, this type of built form outcomes reduces the need for fencing along Pioneer Way and the future local arterial road which would otherwise be required to secluded dwellings' private open space.

The minimal street setback combined with the form of development which 'wraps' around the Pioneer Way and the future local arterial, provides an appropriate dominant built form outcome for this prominent corner site (which will be adjacent to a future round-about).

- The site does not include any native vegetation removal and therefore complies with the Native Vegetation Precinct Plan.

4. Clause 52.06 – Car Parking

The proposal provides for one (1) car parking space within a single car garage for the 2 bedroom dwellings and two (2) car parking spaces within a double car garage for the dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms and internal dimensions generally consistent with the standards in Clause 52.06. Further the development provides for 3 visitor spaces in compliance with Clause 52.06.

5. Response to Grounds of Refusal

As discussed above, Planning Permit application T160600 for the 'development of the land for twenty-one (21) dwellings and associated works' was originally refused by Council on a number of design grounds.

It is considered that the without prejudice plans submitted to Council on 28th June 2017 satisfactory address the previous issues raised in Council's grounds of refusal. Below is a summary of how the updated plans now satisfy each ground of refusal.

1. The revised plans are consistent with Clause 15.01-1 (Urban Design) and Clause 21.06-1 (Design and Built Form). The proposed amendments will provide improved landscaping opportunities across the site; passive surveillance to the street and internal driveway and a well-articulated quality development.
2. The revised plans will achieve the objectives of Section 4.2 of the Officer PSP. Specifically:
 - a) It will achieve a minimum of 15 dwellings per net residential hectare across the precinct.
 - b) It will contribute positively to the neighbourhood and streetscape through high quality urban design.
 - c) A variety of housing densities is provided in the context of the broader subdivision estate with the development providing a diversity in housing typology in close proximity to open space, public transport and a future activity centre.
3. The revised plans provide for a high level of compliance with Clause 55. Specifically:
 - a) The increase in front setback and upper storey separation reduce the visual bulk presenting to the streetscape and increase landscaping opportunities within the front setback. The height, scale and setback is in keeping with a comparable development approved to the north of the subject site (T150733).
 - b) The floor layout of Unit 1 has been rearranged so that it presents an active corner frontage to corner frontage to Eades Street/Pioneer Way. Further, the garage has been relocated internal into the site which brings the living rooms to the west side and increases passive surveillance of Eades Street.
 - c) The setbacks provide an acceptable streetscape outcome with setbacks of generally 4 metres to grounds level to all street frontages. Heathcote Grove is provided with a 2 metre setback at ground level which is compliant with Clause 55 Standard B6 requirements.
 - d) The deletion of two dwellings provides an improved solar access into the courtyards of Units 12 to 19 (inclusive) and meets the objectives of Clause 55.03-5 (Energy Efficiency).
 - e) The development provides for relatively low fencing abutting the internal driveway which is 40% transparent. In addition, the floor layout has been amended by including habitable windows facing the internal driveway which will increase increasing passive surveillance opportunities.
 - f) The visitor spaces have been amended to comply with Clause 52.06 and rearranged to allow for convenient access.
 - g) The proposal is considered to satisfies Clause 55.04-8 relating to noise. Any noise above permissible limits generated by the future arterial road will need to be dealt with by the Roads Authority.
 - h) All units have been amended to comply with Standard B28 of Clause 55.05-4 (Private open space).
 - i) All units have been amended to comply with Standard B30 of Clause 55.06-1 (Storage).
 - j) The proposed building expression and materials/finishes have been rationalised and additional windows/punctuation to the elevations incorporated to provide a well articulated building. The rear wall of garages abutting the street will be disguised as room windows to avoid appearing as rear garage to the streetscape. The changes provide a satisfactory response to Standard B31 of Clause 55.06-2 (Design Detail).
4. The revised plans include the deletion of two (2) dwellings which reduces the total number of dwellings on the site to 19. This is a comparable density to an approved multi-dwelling development on the site to the north (T150733), reduces the site coverage to 38.56% and overcomes previous issues with relation to solar access to open space and overshadowing. In this regard, the proposed amended development is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site.

5. The revised plans provide for three (3) visitor spaces which is compliant with Clause 52.06 which requires one (1) space for each 5 dwellings.

It is considered that the proposed amendments satisfactorily overcome the grounds which the application was originally refused upon and result in an acceptable planning outcome in the context of the site.

CONCLUSION

The proposal demonstrates consistency with State and Local Planning Policy, the provisions of the zone and overlay as well as the Precinct Structure Plans. The layout proposed will be able to accommodate the vision of the Officer residential area.

It is recommended that the without prejudice plans submitted to Council with respect to planning permit application T160600 and VCAT reference P1056/2017 be supported subject to conditions and a consent order provided to VCAT allowing Planning Permit T160600 be issued authorising the development of a nineteen (19) dwellings at 360 Princes Highway (proposed lot A PS738353A).

CONDITIONS

1. Before the development starts, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and one (1) copy must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the without prejudice plans submitted to Council on 28th June 2017 (Titled: Multi unit development, Job Number: OFFI.PION.000A, dated 28 June 2017) but modified to show:
 - a. The contours of the site to accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor;
 - b. The finished floor levels of the dwellings, which must accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor;
 - c. The following information on the elevations plans:
 - i. The level of the main roof levels of the buildings; and
 - ii. The maximum wall and building heights of the buildings.Both must accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor.
 - d. Balcony of dwellings 2, 3, 9 & 10 to indicate a minimum width of 1.6 metres and area of 8 square metres consistent with Clause 55.05-4 of the Cardinia Planning Scheme
 - e. Each three bedroom dwelling to include a notation of a tandem parking space with dimensions and clearances consistent with the design standards of Clause 52.06-9.
 - f. References of 'Lot' on elevation plans to be altered to 'Dwelling' or 'Unit'.
 - g. Dwelling 12 and 19 to provide a porch/pedestrian access to Heathcote Grove to provide a sense of address and appropriate interface to Heathcote Grove.
 - h. All rear wall garage windows which face the street to be appropriately tinted to avoid presenting as a garage to the streetscape.

2. The development as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered or modified except with the written consent of the Responsible Authority.
3. Once the development has commenced, it must be continued and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
4. The buildings and works approved under this permit must not be commenced until the title has been issued for the subject site being Lot A PS738353A. A copy of the title must be presented to the building surveyor as evidence.
5. At least 14 days before any works start, a site specific Construction Management Plan (CMP) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved the CMP will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. All works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMP.

The CMP must address all environmental risks and include:

- a. Temporary stormwater management including sedimentation control.
 - b. Provision of pollution and contamination controls including noise and dust.
 - c. Location of stockpiles and stockpile management.
 - d. Location of site office and facilities.
 - e. Equipment, materials and goods management.
 - f. Tree protection zones, trees to be retained and trees to be removed.
6. Before the development starts, a landscape plan prepared by a person suitably qualified or experienced in landscape design to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plan will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plan must be drawn to scale with dimensions and three copies must be provided at an appropriate scale. The landscaping plan must be generally in accordance with the endorsed plans under condition 1, except that the plan must show:
 - a) A planting schedule of all proposed trees, shrubs and ground covers, including botanical names, common names, pot sizes, sizes at maturity, and quantities of each plant for the common property throughout the site to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
 - b) Details of surface finishes of pathways and driveways.
 - c) Details of fencing throughout the development and along common boundaries to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, which must include the height and materials of the proposed fencing. If no fencing is proposed this must be clearly labelled.
 - d) Planting adjacent to the access entrance driveway to create a sense of entry by using a common tree species selection.
 - e) A planted buffer along the footpaths on each street frontage.

All species selected must be drought tolerant and selected to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

7. A Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency, being Cardinia Shire Council, in accordance with the approved Cardinia Road Precinct Contributions Plan. The Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency within the time specified in the Cardinia Road Precinct Development Contributions Plan. If no time is specified in the Cardinia Road Precinct Development Contributions Plan, the Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency, being Cardinia Shire Council before the development

starts, as defined by the issue of a building permit under The Building Act, 1993 unless some other time has been agreed with the Collecting Agency.

Note: This condition will be deemed satisfied if a Development Infrastructure Levy has previously been paid.

8. Prior to any works commencing within 100 metres of the edge of any waterbody which is to be retained, a highly visible fence is to be installed 20 metres from the edge of the water body.
9. Before the development starts, drainage plans must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The plans must show the provision of a stormwater detention system. The stormwater detention system will become the responsibility of the property owner or body corporate to maintain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Note: As the development has an impervious ratio greater than 35%, the developer shall engage the services of a suitably experienced Engineer to design a stormwater detention system that will reduce the intensity of the storm water discharge entering Council's drainage system, i.e.: a detention system. The storm water detention system shall provide for the same five (5) year ARI peak discharge as that for a standard house lot with no storm water detention. A standard house lot is assumed to have a fraction impervious area of 35%. Calculations and a plan shall be submitted to Council for approval prior to construction. The storm water detention system must be constructed prior to the occupation of the proposed development.

10. Before the development starts, the Owner must prepare and submit a waste management plan to the Responsible Authority. The waste management plan must:
 - a) be prepared by a suitably qualified expert;
 - b) provide detail of the proposed arrangements for collection of waste from the land; and
 - c) be consistent with relevant guidelines prepared by Cardinia Shire Council with respect to waste management for new residential and mixed use developments

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

11. Before the commencement of any buildings and works a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be prepared to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The CEMP must specifically address significant flora and fauna where the buildings or works within:
 - a) 50 metres of any native vegetation to be retained in the *Officer Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (September 2011)*;
 - b) 100 metres of any waterbody (including creeks, drains, dams and wetlands) under the provisions of the Officer Precinct Structure Plan Conservation Management Plan (excluding Cardinia Creek) (15 September 2011).
The CEMP must address all requirements specified in the *Officer Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (September 2011)* and the relevant Conservation Management Plan.
12. Stormwater must not be discharged from the subject land other than by means of an underground pipe drain discharged to an outlet in the street or to an underground pipe drain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

13. Stormwater works must be provided on the subject land so as to prevent overflows onto adjacent properties.
14. Earthworks must be undertaken in a manner that minimises soil erosion. Exposed areas of soil must be stabilised to prevent soil erosion. The time for which soil remains exposed and unestablished must be minimised to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
15. Sediment control measures must be undertaken during construction to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority to ensure that the development subject land is adequately managed in such a way that no mud, dirt, sand, soil, clay or stones are washed into or allowed to enter the stormwater drainage system.
16. All filling of the land over 300mm in depth on the site must be carried out, completed and recorded in accordance with:
 - a) The provisions of any Construction Management Plan CEMP; and
 - b) Australian Standard AS 3798 2007 (Guidelines on earthworks for commercial and residential developments).

To the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

17. All roads used for the purpose of haulage of imported or exported materials for construction must be:
 - a. Approved in writing by the Responsible Authority for the submitted haulage strategy, at least seven days prior to the commencement of use,
 - b. Maintained in accordance with the Responsible Authority's maintenance intervention levels, or as requested by the Responsible Authority if the road deteriorates during the haulage period, and
 - c. Reinstated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
18. Any construction stockpiles, fill and machinery must be placed away from areas supporting native vegetation and drainage lines to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
19. A salvage and translocation plan must be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment and the approval of the responsible authority.
20. No polluted and/or sediment laden run-off is to be discharged directly or indirectly into drains or watercourses.
21. Pollution or litter traps must be provided on the land at appropriate points along the drainage system or drainage lines.
22. The exterior colour and cladding of the development must not result in any adverse visual impact on the environment of the area and all external cladding and trim of the building, including the roof, must be of a low reflective nature.
23. All pipes, fixtures, fittings and vents servicing any building on the subject land must be concealed in service ducts or otherwise hidden from view to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
24. The use and development must not detrimentally affect the amenity of the area, through the:
 - a. Transport of materials, goods or commodities to or from the land.

- b. Appearance of any building, works or materials.
 - c. Emission of noise, artificial light, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit or oil.
 - d. Presence of vermin.
25. The permit holder must implement all recommendations contained in the ground-water and salinity management plan required by Condition 26 of Planning Permit T120482 to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
26. The actions which identify the responsible agent as the “landowner” or “developer” in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) must be implemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment.
27. Any:
- Works carried out in respect of the approved subdivision;
 - Construction of buildings and associated works; and
 - Removal, lopping or destruction of native vegetation on the land.

Only native vegetation which is identified for removal in the incorporated NVPP applying to the land may be removed, lopped or destroyed without a permit.

Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation, native vegetation to be removed in accordance with this NVPP must be clearly marked on site to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority whilst works are being undertaken within the vicinity.

Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation within any property (identified by the Property Number Map 1 of the Officer NVPP), the owner of the land must provide offsets consistent with the incorporated NVPP by either:

- Providing an allocated credit extract issued by the Department of Sustainability and Environment; or
- Preparing and submitting an Offset Plan to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment and have the Offset Plan approved by Responsible Authority.

Where an Offset Plan is approved:

- Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation, the owner of the land from which the native vegetation is being removed must provide on-title security for the Offset Site to the satisfaction of Department of Sustainability and Environment that provides for the implementation of the Offset Plan and pay the reasonable costs of the preparation, execution and registration of any on-title agreement; and
 - Offsets must be initiated within 12 months of approval of the Offset Plan or before the removal of Very High Conservation Significance vegetation, whichever is earlier, and be implemented according to the schedule of works in the Officer Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
28. Before the development is occupied the landowner must enter into a legally binding agreement (or alternative agreement approved by DSE) for the payment to implement the Officer Precinct Structure Plan: Cardinia Creek Conservation Management Plan (8 September 2011) in accordance with Section 2.3.1 Management Responsibilities and Funding and Appendix 8 to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment. The landowner must pay the reasonable costs of the preparation, execution and registration of the agreement.

29. Before the development is occupied:
- a. The areas set aside on the approved plans for access and car parks must be constructed, sealed, drained and delineated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The area/s must be maintained in accordance with the requirements of Clause 52.06 of the Cardinia Planning Scheme;
 - b. A residential standard concrete vehicle crossing/s as shown on the approved plans must be constructed to the approval and satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
 - c. All landscaping shown on the approved plans must be completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
 - d. All required privacy screening devices and fencing shown on the endorsed plans must be installed and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
 - e. The development must be provided with an appropriate drainage connection point and connect to an underground drain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
 - f. The premises must be connected to a reticulated sewerage system of a sewerage authority;
 - g. Provision of power and telephone lines to all new dwellings must be placed underground from the main point of service supplied by the relevant authority outside the boundaries of the subject land;
 - h. A bin storage area must be provided for each dwelling and must be located so as not to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the neighbourhood to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
 - i. A mail box must be provided to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and Australia Post;
 - j. A clothesline must be provided for each dwelling and must be located so as not to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the neighbourhood to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; and
 - k. Lighting must be provided near the front entrance of each dwelling to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
30. Prior to the occupancy of any building approved, the Owner of the land must enter into an agreement with the Responsible Authority under section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to confirm waste collection arrangements for the Land as informed by the approved waste management plan.

The agreement will be informed by the findings of the waste management plan and may provide that:

- a) all waste generated by the use of the land will be managed in accordance with the waste management plan for the land approved by the Responsible Authority;
- b) the Owner agrees to indemnify Cardinia Shire Council and its officers with respect to any injury or damage caused to any person (including the Council's officers) or property as a result of Council or its officers entering the land for the purpose of collecting waste; and
- c) the Owner acknowledges and agrees that, despite the waste collection arrangements that apply to the land, the Owner remains liable to pay the relevant waste collection levy.

The form and content of the agreement must be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, and all costs relating to the preparation and registration of the agreement on title must be met by the permit holder. An application must be made to the Registrar of Titles to register the Section 173 agreement on the title to the land under Section 181 of the Act.

31. The landscaping shown on the endorsed plans must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and used for no other purpose. Any dead, diseased or damaged plants are to be replaced.

Expiry of permit:

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

- a) The development is not started **two (2) years** from the date of this permit;
- b) The development is not completed **four (4) years** from the date of this permit;

The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing in accordance with Section 69 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

Notes:

- 1. A 'Vehicle Crossing Permit' must be obtained from Council prior to the commencement of any works associated with the proposed vehicle crossing.
- 2. A Building Permit may be required for this development. To obtain a building permit you will need to contact a registered building surveyor.
- 3. This planning permit no force or effect until such time the Statement of Compliance is issued for Stage 2 of planning permit T120482 and a title has been issued for the subject site being Lot A PS738353A

1 DEVELOPMENT OF 19 DWELLINGS, 360 PRINCES HIGHWAY OFFICER

Moved Cr J Owen Seconded Cr C Ryan

That the without prejudice plans submitted to Council with respect to planning permit application T160600 and VCAT reference P1056/2017 be supported subject to the conditions listed below and a consent order provided to VCAT allowing Planning Permit T160600 be issued authorising the development of a nineteen (19) dwellings at 360 Princes Highway (proposed lot A PS738353A).

CONDITIONS

1. Before the development starts, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and one (1) copy must be provided. The plans must be generally in accordance with the without prejudice plans submitted to Council on 28th June 2017 (Titled: Multi unit development, Job Number: OFFI.PION.000A, dated 28 June 2017) but modified to show:
 - a. The contours of the site to accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor;
 - b. The finished floor levels of the dwellings, which must accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor;
 - c. The following information on the elevations plans:
 - i. The level of the main roof levels of the buildings; and
 - ii. The maximum wall and building heights of the buildings.Both must accord with a feature survey plan prepared by a licensed surveyor.
 - d. Balcony of dwellings 2, 3, 9 & 10 to indicate a minimum width of 1.6 metres and area of 8 square metres consistent with Clause 55.05-4 of the Cardinia Planning Scheme
 - e. Each three bedroom dwelling to include a notation of a tandem parking space with dimensions and clearances consistent with the design standards of Clause 52.06-9.
 - f. References of 'Lot' on elevation plans to be altered to 'Dwelling' or 'Unit'.
 - g. Dwelling 12 and 19 to provide a porch/pedestrian access to Heathcote Grove to provide a sense of address and appropriate interface to Heathcote Grove.
 - h. All rear wall garage windows which face the street to be appropriately tinted to avoid presenting as a garage to the streetscape.
2. The development as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered or modified except with the written consent of the Responsible Authority.
3. Once the development has commenced, it must be continued and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
4. The buildings and works approved under this permit must not be commenced until the title has been issued for the subject site being Lot A PS738353A. A copy of the title must be presented to the building surveyor as evidence.

5. At least 14 days before any works start, a site specific Construction Management Plan (CMP) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved the CMP will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. All works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved CMP.

The CMP must address all environmental risks and include:

- a. Temporary stormwater management including sedimentation control.
 - b. Provision of pollution and contamination controls including noise and dust.
 - c. Location of stockpiles and stockpile management.
 - d. Location of site office and facilities.
 - e. Equipment, materials and goods management.
 - f. Tree protection zones, trees to be retained and trees to be removed.
6. Before the development starts, a landscape plan prepared by a person suitably qualified or experienced in landscape design to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. When approved, the plan will be endorsed and will then form part of the permit. The plan must be drawn to scale with dimensions and three copies must be provided at an appropriate scale. The landscaping plan must be generally in accordance with the endorsed plans under condition 1, except that the plan must show:
 - a) A planting schedule of all proposed trees, shrubs and ground covers, including botanical names, common names, pot sizes, sizes at maturity, and quantities of each plant for the common property throughout the site to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
 - b) Details of surface finishes of pathways and driveways.
 - c) Details of fencing throughout the development and along common boundaries to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, which must include the height and materials of the proposed fencing. If no fencing is proposed this must be clearly labelled.
 - d) Planting adjacent to the access entrance driveway to create a sense of entry by using a common tree species selection.
 - e) A planted buffer along the footpaths on each street frontage.

All species selected must be drought tolerant and selected to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

7. A Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency, being Cardinia Shire Council, in accordance with the approved Cardinia Road Precinct Contributions Plan. The Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency within the time specified in the Cardinia Road Precinct Development Contributions Plan. If no time is specified in the Cardinia Road Precinct Development Contributions Plan, the Development Infrastructure Levy must be paid to the Collecting Agency, being Cardinia Shire Council before the development starts, as defined by the issue of a building permit under The Building Act, 1993 unless some other time has been agreed with the Collecting Agency.

Note: This condition will be deemed satisfied if a Development Infrastructure Levy has previously been paid.

8. Prior to any works commencing within 100 metres of the edge of any waterbody which is to be retained, a highly visible fence is to be installed 20 metres from the edge of the water body.
9. Before the development starts, drainage plans must be submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The plans must show the provision of a stormwater detention system.

The stormwater detention system will become the responsibility of the property owner or body corporate to maintain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Note: As the development has an impervious ratio greater than 35%, the developer shall engage the services of a suitably experienced Engineer to design a stormwater detention system that will reduce the intensity of the storm water discharge entering Council's drainage system, i.e.: a detention system. The storm water detention system shall provide for the same five (5) year ARI peak discharge as that for a standard house lot with no storm water detention. A standard house lot is assumed to have a fraction impervious area of 35%. Calculations and a plan shall be submitted to Council for approval prior to construction. The storm water detention system must be constructed prior to the occupation of the proposed development.

10. Before the development starts, the Owner must prepare and submit a waste management plan to the Responsible Authority. The waste management plan must:
 - a) be prepared by a suitably qualified expert;
 - b) provide detail of the proposed arrangements for collection of waste from the land; and
 - c) be consistent with relevant guidelines prepared by Cardinia Shire Council with respect to waste management for new residential and mixed use developments

to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

11. Before the commencement of any buildings and works a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be prepared to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and submitted to and approved by the Responsible Authority. The CEMP must specifically address significant flora and fauna where the buildings or works within:
 - a) 50 metres of any native vegetation to be retained in the *Officer Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (September 2011)*;
 - b) 100 metres of any waterbody (including creeks, drains, dams and wetlands) under the provisions of the *Officer Precinct Structure Plan Conservation Management Plan (excluding Cardinia Creek) (15 September 2011)*.
The CEMP must address all requirements specified in the *Officer Precinct Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (September 2011)* and the relevant Conservation Management Plan.
12. Stormwater must not be discharged from the subject land other than by means of an underground pipe drain discharged to an outlet in the street or to an underground pipe drain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
13. Stormwater works must be provided on the subject land so as to prevent overflows onto adjacent properties.
14. Earthworks must be undertaken in a manner that minimises soil erosion. Exposed areas of soil must be stabilised to prevent soil erosion. The time for which soil remains exposed and unestablished must be minimised to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
15. Sediment control measures must be undertaken during construction to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority to ensure that the development subject land is adequately managed in such a way that no mud, dirt, sand, soil, clay or stones are washed into or allowed to enter the stormwater drainage system.
16. All filling of the land over 300mm in depth on the site must be carried out, completed and recorded in accordance with:

- a) The provisions of any Construction Management Plan CEMP; and
- b) Australian Standard AS 3798 2007 (Guidelines on earthworks for commercial and residential developments).

To the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

- 17. All roads used for the purpose of haulage of imported or exported materials for construction must be:
 - a. Approved in writing by the Responsible Authority for the submitted haulage strategy, at least seven days prior to the commencement of use,
 - b. Maintained in accordance with the Responsible Authority's maintenance intervention levels, or as requested by the Responsible Authority if the road deteriorates during the haulage period, and
 - c. Reinstated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- 18. Any construction stockpiles, fill and machinery must be placed away from areas supporting native vegetation and drainage lines to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- 19. A salvage and translocation plan must be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment and the approval of the responsible authority.
- 20. No polluted and/or sediment laden run-off is to be discharged directly or indirectly into drains or watercourses.
- 21. Pollution or litter traps must be provided on the land at appropriate points along the drainage system or drainage lines.
- 22. The exterior colour and cladding of the development must not result in any adverse visual impact on the environment of the area and all external cladding and trim of the building, including the roof, must be of a low reflective nature.
- 23. All pipes, fixtures, fittings and vents servicing any building on the subject land must be concealed in service ducts or otherwise hidden from view to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- 24. The use and development must not detrimentally affect the amenity of the area, through the:
 - a. Transport of materials, goods or commodities to or from the land.
 - b. Appearance of any building, works or materials.
 - c. Emission of noise, artificial light, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, waste water, waste products, grit or oil.
 - d. Presence of vermin.
- 25. The permit holder must implement all recommendations contained in the ground-water and salinity management plan required by Condition 26 of Planning Permit T120482 to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- 26. The actions which identify the responsible agent as the "landowner" or "developer" in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) must be implemented to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment.
- 27. Any:

- Works carried out in respect of the approved subdivision;
- Construction of buildings and associated works; and
- Removal, lopping or destruction of native vegetation on the land.

Only native vegetation which is identified for removal in the incorporated NVPP applying to the land may be removed, lopped or destroyed without a permit.

Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation, native vegetation to be removed in accordance with this NVPP must be clearly marked on site to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority whilst works are being undertaken within the vicinity.

Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation within any property (identified by the Property Number Map 1 of the Officer NVPP), the owner of the land must provide offsets consistent with the incorporated NVPP by either:

- Providing an allocated credit extract issued by the Department of Sustainability and Environment; or
- Preparing and submitting an Offset Plan to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment and have the Offset Plan approved by Responsible Authority.

Where an Offset Plan is approved:

- Before the removal, destruction or lopping of any native vegetation, the owner of the land from which the native vegetation is being removed must provide on-title security for the Offset Site to the satisfaction of Department of Sustainability and Environment that provides for the implementation of the Offset Plan and pay the reasonable costs of the preparation, execution and registration of any on-title agreement; and
- Offsets must be initiated within 12 months of approval of the Offset Plan or before the removal of Very High Conservation Significance vegetation, whichever is earlier, and be implemented according to the schedule of works in the Officer Plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

28. Before the development is occupied the landowner must enter into a legally binding agreement (or alternative agreement approved by DSE) for the payment to implement the Officer Precinct Structure Plan: Cardinia Creek Conservation Management Plan (8 September 2011) in accordance with Section 2.3.1 Management Responsibilities and Funding and Appendix 8 to the satisfaction of the Department of Sustainability and Environment. The landowner must pay the reasonable costs of the preparation, execution and registration of the agreement.

29. Before the development is occupied:

- The areas set aside on the approved plans for access and car parks must be constructed, sealed, drained and delineated to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The area/s must be maintained in accordance with the requirements of Clause 52.06 of the Cardinia Planning Scheme;
- A residential standard concrete vehicle crossing/s as shown on the approved plans must be constructed to the approval and satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- All landscaping shown on the approved plans must be completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
- All required privacy screening devices and fencing shown on the endorsed plans must be installed and completed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
- The development must be provided with an appropriate drainage connection point and connect to an underground drain to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;

- f. The premises must be connected to a reticulated sewerage system of a sewerage authority;
 - g. Provision of power and telephone lines to all new dwellings must be placed underground from the main point of service supplied by the relevant authority outside the boundaries of the subject land;
 - h. A bin storage area must be provided for each dwelling and must be located so as not to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the neighbourhood to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority;
 - i. A mail box must be provided to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and Australia Post;
 - j. A clothesline must be provided for each dwelling and must be located so as not to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the neighbourhood to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; and
 - k. Lighting must be provided near the front entrance of each dwelling to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
30. Prior to the occupancy of any building approved, the Owner of the land must enter into an agreement with the Responsible Authority under section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 to confirm waste collection arrangements for the Land as informed by the approved waste management plan.

The agreement will be informed by the findings of the waste management plan and may provide that:

- a) all waste generated by the use of the land will be managed in accordance with the waste management plan for the land approved by the Responsible Authority;
- b) the Owner agrees to indemnify Cardinia Shire Council and its officers with respect to any injury or damage caused to any person (including the Council's officers) or property as a result of Council or its officers entering the land for the purpose of collecting waste; and
- c) the Owner acknowledges and agrees that, despite the waste collection arrangements that apply to the land, the Owner remains liable to pay the relevant waste collection levy.

The form and content of the agreement must be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority, and all costs relating to the preparation and registration of the agreement on title must be met by the permit holder. An application must be made to the Registrar of Titles to register the Section 173 agreement on the title to the land under Section 181 of the Act.

31. The landscaping shown on the endorsed plans must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and used for no other purpose. Any dead, diseased or damaged plants are to be replaced.

Expiry of permit:

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

- a) The development is not started **two (2) years** from the date of this permit;
- b) The development is not completed **four (4) years** from the date of this permit;

The Responsible Authority may extend the periods referred to if a request is made in writing in accordance with Section 69 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

Notes:

1. A 'Vehicle Crossing Permit' must be obtained from Council prior to the commencement of any works associated with the proposed vehicle crossing.
2. A Building Permit may be required for this development. To obtain a building permit you will need to contact a registered building surveyor.
3. This planning permit no force or effect until such time the Statement of Compliance is issued for Stage 2 of planning permit T120482 and a title has been issued for the subject site being Lot A PS738353A

Cd.

GENERAL REPORTS**2 CONTRACT 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11) - SEASONAL ROADSIDE AND FIRE PREVENTION SLASHING**

FILE REFERENCE INT1745481

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Michael Ellis

AUTHOR Kevin Alexander

RECOMMENDATION

Council exercise the option for the two year extension to the existing Seasonal Roadside and Fire Prevention Slashing Contract 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11) provided by Citywide Service Solutions.

Attachments*Nil.***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In September 2015 Council accepted the tender submitted by Citywide Service Solutions for Contract 15/11 the seasonal roadside slashing Contract 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11)

A review of the contract found that;

- When the contract price was benchmarked against competitor rates, the option to extend the contract provided the best financial outcome.
- All works were completed with acceptable timelines.

Council is obligated to undertake fire prevention works in accordance the Country Fire Authority Act 1958.

\$290,000 is allocated in the annual operational budget for roadside slashing works.

BACKGROUND

At the Council meeting on 21st September 2015 Council accepted the tender submitted by Citywide Service Solutions for Contract 15/11 the seasonal roadside slashing over the period 2015 to 2017.

During the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 financial years Council budgeted \$290,000 each year respectively towards contracted roadside grass slashing services for the peak grass growing period of November to January to reduce the risk of fire and improve visibility at rural intersections.

This contracted service was delivered via the Seasonal Roadside and Fire Prevention Slashing Contract 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11).

A review of the current contract was conducted and found that:

- The payment method changed from hourly rates to lump sum and per kilometre rate for potential variations providing better value for money within the allocated budget.
- Benchmarking of the costs associated with providing the service demonstrated that the original tender rates via Citywide are very competitive.

- Programs were completed on time and achieved an acceptable standard.
- There was an increased number of customer request due to extended growing season and all were met within accepted time lines.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Council is obligated to undertake fire prevention works in accordance with its Municipal Fire Prevention Plan and the requirements of the Country Fire Authority Act 1958. Additional contracted resources as proposed under these contracts should enable Council to meet those obligations.

RELEVANCE TO COUNCIL PLAN

- 1.7.2. Implement effective plans and procedures that minimise the impact of emergencies in the Shire.
- 1.7.3. Protect against risk through effective bushfire and flood preparation.

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

The contract extension was considered and endorsed by the Senior Leadership Team.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

\$290,000 is allocated in the annual operational budget for roadside slashing works. The extent of slashing undertaken is managed to meet the need to achieve fire prevention and roadside safety objectives within the available budget

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that Council approve the 2-year contract extension (Contract 2015-2017 - RFT 15/11) for Citywide to provide Seasonal Roadside and Fire Prevention Slashing. The contract extension expiry date will align with the renewal of the Open Space Contract in 2019.

2 CONTRACT 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11) - SEASONAL ROADSIDE AND FIRE PREVENTION SLASHING

Moved Cr M Schilling Seconded Cr L Wilmot

That Council exercise the option for the two year extension to the existing Seasonal Roadside and Fire Prevention Slashing Contract 2015-2017 (RFT 15/11) provided by Citywide Service Solutions.

Cd.

3 COCKATOO-GEMBROOK MULTI USE TRAIL

FILE REFERENCE INT1745541

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Michael Ellis

AUTHOR Kurt Pitts

RECOMMENDATION

That the:

1. Tender submitted by Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd to undertake the works associated with Contract 17/16 - Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail Construction be accepted for the contract sum of \$2,469,394.76 (Excl. GST);
2. Remaining Tenderers be advised accordingly; and
3. Common Seal of the Council be affixed to the contract documents.

Attachments

- 1 Confidential memorandum circulated to councillors only 4 Pages

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Emerald-Gembrook Trail has received funding through both state and national level funding programs and is considered a high priority trail in Cardinia Shire's Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategy.

This report provides consideration for the appointment of a contractor to undertake works to construct the 6.5km length of trail between Cockatoo and Gembrook. The proposed works involve concrete and gravel path construction, fencing, retaining walls, indigenous planting, drainage improvements and associated works.

The tender for the Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail submitted by Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd is the most advantageous for Council, providing the best value for money and excellent service through their experience in vegetation and environmental management.

It is therefore recommended that Contract 17/16 for the construction of the Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail be awarded accordingly.

BACKGROUND

The Emerald-Gembrook Trail is a high value regional trail linking the Hill's towns of Emerald, Cockatoo and Gembrook, and ultimately to Belgrave via other path networks.

The trail is expected to hold significant tourist value and attract a high number of users to the region, increasing the tourism value associated with these small hill's communities, Puffing Billy and other attractions in the area.

The first part of the Emerald-Gembrook Trail was completely some time ago with the construction of the Emerald-Cockatoo component through Emerald Lake Park and Wrights State Forest providing a link between the two towns.

The construction of the final segment of this trail has received widespread community support through extensive community consultation held throughout the design stage.

Tenders were advertised on 13 May 2017 and closed on 6 June 2017. A total of three (3) tenders were received from the following tenderers:

Tymon Constructions
Contek Constructions
Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management

Tenders were evaluated against the criteria of Capability and capacity, Relevant experience and past performance of the tenderer, Quality system and project plan, Prequalified contractor on the VicRoads Qualification Register R1, Compliance with the specifications, financial viability, risk and insurance, compliance to conditions of contract, conflict of interest, OHS, Pricing and value for money.

To provide best value for money, it is recommended that the Cockatoo-Gembrook Trail construction be awarded to Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd for a sum of \$2,469,394.76 (Excl. GST).

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The works have been developed in accordance with Council's Asset Management Plans and Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategy.

RELEVANCE TO COUNCIL PLAN

These projects are consistent with efforts to " Provide active and passive recreation facilities to meet the needs of residents", " Increase opportunities for residents to participate in a range of sport, recreation and leisure activities", " Provide accessible facilities to meet identified community needs", and " Prioritise multi-use pathways, where practicable, to create networks that connect destinations".

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Extensive community consultation was undertaken prior to the detailed design stage commencing. The consultation process assisted in settling on the final route alignment of the trail which was adopted by Council at the beginning of 2015. Extensive consultation has taken place with property owners affected by land acquisition, as well as Puffing Billy and the Emerald Tourist Railway Board.

Consultation with the community, affected property owners and commuters to notify them of disruptions throughout the construction works will form part of the project planning and delivery after the award of this Contract.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

The recommended tender submitted by Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management is for the lump sum price of \$2,469,394.76 (Excl. GST).

Council has received funding for this project of \$1,000,000 through a federal government election commitment through the Department of Infrastructure, and \$545,000 through the State

Government's Growing Suburbs Fund. The remaining funds will be provided through Councils capital works program.

CONCLUSION

The tender submitted by Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd for the construction of the Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail is considered to be the most beneficial to Council and it is recommended that Contract 17/16 - Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail Construction be awarded to Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd for \$2,469,394.76 (Excl. GST).

3 COCKATOO-GEMBROOK MULTI USE TRAIL

Moved Cr L Wilmot Seconded Cr J Owen

That the:

1. Tender submitted by Kent Environmental & Vegetation Management Pty Ltd to undertake the works associated with Contract 17/16 - Cockatoo-Gembrook Multi Use Trail Construction be accepted for the contract sum of \$2,469,394.76 (Excl. GST);
2. Remaining Tenderers be advised accordingly; and
3. Common Seal of the Council be affixed to the contract documents.

Cd.

4 APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE EMERALD VILLAGE COMMITTEE

FILE REFERENCE INT1745537

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Jenny Scicluna

AUTHOR Allison Howard

RECOMMENDATION

That the following amendments and appointments be made to the following Committee of Management formed under Sections 86 and 88 of the Local Government Act (1989).

Emerald Village Committee:

Richard (Dick) Bartley	President
Bruce Ratcliff	Vice President
Howard Winter	Secretary
Judith Davies	Treasurer
Ron Harmer	Committee member
Michelle Jackson	Committee member
Jeffery Slater	Committee member
Dale Allen	Committee member
David Greenaway	Committee member
Tina McInerney	Committee member
Patricia Buoncristiani	Committee member
Kelly McAllister	Committee member

All previous members are removed from this committee.

Attachments

Nil

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report advises Council of the membership of the Committee of Management that has been appointed as the result of public meeting that has been conducted by Councillors or Council Officers.

BACKGROUND

Members of Special Committees require appointment by Council resolution pursuant to Section 86 of the Local Government Act. The election of Special Committees of Management is organised by Council and takes place annually or at other specified times.

The Act requires that Council approves the membership of Special Committees. It also notes those who are no longer members.

At a meeting held on Tuesday 27 June, 2017 the members detailed above were elected to be appointed by Council to the Emerald Village Committee for the current term as specified in the Deed of Delegation.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

RELEVANCE TO COUNCIL PLAN

Establishing and maintaining Committees of Management is directly relevant to the Council Plan goals of actively engaging with communities and increasing levels of community participation.

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

An advertisement of the upcoming annual general meeting was placed in the Ranges Trader on Tuesday 30 May, 2017.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

CONCLUSION

It is appropriate for the Council to confirm the appointment of these new members to the Emerald Village Committee.

4 APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE EMERALD VILLAGE COMMITTEE

Moved Cr L Wilmot Seconded Cr J Springfield

That the following amendments and appointments be made to the following Committee of Management formed under Sections 86 and 88 of the Local Government Act (1989).

Emerald Village Committee:

Richard (Dick) Bartley	President
Bruce Ratcliff	Vice President
Howard Winter	Secretary
Judith Davies	Treasurer
Ron Harmer	Committee member
Michelle Jackson	Committee member
Jeffery Slater	Committee member
Dale Allen	Committee member
David Greenaway	Committee member
Tina McInerney	Committee member
Patricia Buoncristiani	Committee member
Kelly McAllister	Committee member

All previous members are removed from this committee.

Cd.

5 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO NOBELIUS HERITAGE PARK AND EMERALD MUSEUM COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

FILE REFERENCE INT1746207

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Michael Ellis

AUTHOR Desiree Lovell

RECOMMENDATION

That the following appointments be made to the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management for the term August 2017 to July 2019:

Pauline Murphy (President)

June Styling (Secretary)

Jill Sales (Treasurer)

Elaine Morris

Wendy Smith

Roy Kendall

Chris Scarlett

Leon Michalski

Carey Williams

Kerry Champness

Attachments

Nil.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report advises Council of the members elected to the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management following the Biennial General Meeting held on 4 July 2017.

BACKGROUND

The Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management operate as a Section 86 Committee of Cardinia Shire Council. The Committee manages the daily operations of the Emerald Museum and surrounding Nobelius Heritage Park.

A total of 10 committee members were elected onto the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee at the Biennial General Meeting (BGM) held on the 4 July 2017. The BGM was held at the Nobelius Museum, Emerald.

The current Instrument of Delegation (2016) for the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management requires the committee of management to be made up of between five and ten members. The elected committee meets this requirement.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

RELEVANCE TO COUNCIL PLAN

Maintaining members of special Committees to Council, directly relates to Council Plan area 2 - Our Community - Increased levels of community participation.

CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION

Council officers developed an extensive communications plan in the lead up to the BGM, aiming to increase awareness within the community of the museum, and seek nominations to the committee of management. Cr Brett Owen chaired the nomination process, and welcomed the new committee.

FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

CONCLUSION

The BGM of the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management was held on the 4 July 2017. 10 members were nominated to the committee.

5 APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO NOBELIUS HERITAGE PARK AND EMERALD MUSEUM COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

Moved Cr L Wilmot Seconded Cr J Springfield

That the following appointments be made to the Nobelius Heritage Park and Emerald Museum Committee of Management for the term August 2017 to July 2019:

Pauline Murphy (President)
June Styling (Secretary)
Jill Sales (Treasurer)
Elaine Morris
Wendy Smith
Roy Kendall
Chris Scarlett
Leon Michalski
Carey Williams
Kerry Champness

Cd.

6 DOCUMENTS FOR SEALING

FILE REFERENCE INT1745517

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Derek Madden

AUTHOR Sharon Voltan

RECOMMENDATION

That Council note the fixing of the Common Seal to the documents listed below and the Seal be affixed to the other documents listed.

Attachments

Nil.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Under Council's Meeting Procedure Local Law, the Common Seal may be affixed to a document for the purpose of giving effect to a decision:

- a) Made by Council resolution;
- b) Made by resolution of a Special Council meeting under delegation; or
- c) Made by the Chief Executive Officer under delegation.

Accordingly, the Council Seal was affixed to the following documents:

Description	Authorisation	Seal Date
<i>Design and construct agreement 15/35 Manestar Road Bridge replacement, Upper Beaconsfield</i>	Council resolution 20 February 2017	23 March 2017
<i>Transfer of land 270 Cardinia Road, Officer to CSC – Acquisition of land Kaduna Park</i>	CEO under delegation	29 March 2017
<i>Contract 16/06 Engineering technical services between CSC & Morphum Environmental Ltd</i>	Council resolution 16 January 2017	29 March 2017
<i>Lease at premises 6e Henry Street, Pakenham between CSC and Cardinia U3A</i>	Council resolution 20 March 2017	30 March 2017
<i>Contract 17/10 – Deep Creek Reserve bulk earthworks - Goldsmith Civil & Environmental Pty Ltd & CSC</i>	Council resolution 20 March 2017	19 April 2017
<i>CSC & Patterson Cheney Investments P/L – purchase of reserve 1 on PS74955Y (Plan), part 195 Rix Road, Officer (Land)</i>	CEO under delegation	19 April 2017
<i>Contract 16/06A CSC & Engineering Technical Services</i>	Council resolution 16 January 2017	24 April 2017
<i>Contract 16/06H CSC & Engineering Technical Services – Pitt and Sherry & CSC</i>	Council resolution 16 January 2017	24 April 2017
<i>Contract 17/04 – Lang Lang Recreation Reserve Civil works package – CSC & Lasergrade P/L</i>	Council resolution 20 February 2017	24 April 2017
<i>Lot 2 on plan of subdivision PS 740739N being part of the land contained in certificates of title volume 10797 folio 683 and volume 10799 folio 634. Part closed government road abutting 14 Hamilton Road, Emerald</i>	Council resolution 18 March 2013	1 May 2017

<i>Description</i>	<i>Authorisation</i>	<i>Seal Date</i>
<i>CT16/06 – Engineering technical services – letter of acceptance</i>		1 May 2017
<i>Transfer of land – Brunt Road, Officer from Estate of Bell to CSC</i>	CEO under delegation	16 May 2017
<i>Transfer of discontinued road John Williams Drive, Upper Beaconsfield from CSC to S Beck and A Vandemeer</i>	Council resolution 17 November 2014	26 May 2017

The following document require the affixing of the Common Seal:

Lease from Council to Telstra Corporation Ltd – Cnr Princes Highway and Starling Road, Officer – renewal of lease – three options of renewal each for a further five years.

CONCLUSION

It is appropriate for the Council to note the fixing of the Common Seal to the documents listed above and resolve to seal the other documents listed.

6 DOCUMENTS FOR SEALING

Moved Cr J Owen Seconded Cr C Ryan

That Council note the fixing of the Common Seal to the documents listed below and the Seal be affixed to the other documents listed.

Cd.

ACTIVITY REPORTS**7 MAJOR PROJECT AND STRATEGIES ACTIVITY REPORT**

FILE REFERENCE INT1745480

RESPONSIBLE GENERAL MANAGER Michael Ellis

AUTHOR Andrew Barr; Desiree Lovell; Walter Carmignani; Ben Wood

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted.

Attachments*Nil.***EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As part of the reporting process to Council, this monthly report provides an update of the current status of major projects and strategies in progress. It includes an update on major projects, capital works, special charge schemes, asset management and strategies current at the time of this report.

CONCLUSION

This regular activity report is provided for Councillor's information.

CAPITAL WORKS**Recreation reserves***IYU Recreation Reserve pavilion*

The certificate of occupancy has been received for the pavilion, which will enable the user groups to gain access to the pavilion by August 2017. As previously reported, the playing surfaces are completed and available for usage.

Deep Creek Reserve

Earlier in the year, Council officers advertised a combined tender package for the Deep Creek building works and civil package, which also included services. At the time there was very little interest associated with the combined package. As such, the combined package for the whole works has been split into 2 separate packages, with package 1 being for Building & Services and package 2 being for the Civil Works. Package 1 will be re-tendered in July 2017, with Package 2 in September 2017.

There was a sod turning event at the site on 30 June 2017, associated with the Growing Suburbs Funding received for this project, with attendance by the Minister for Local Government, Daniel Mulino MP and Deputy Mayor Cr Jodie Owen.

Pepi's Land

Building and Civil Works packages are complete and ready now to go to tender. The Civil Works package will go out first and to market in September 2017 to coincide with the timing associated with the SRV funding application. The Building Works package will be timed to follow the completion of the civil works.

Gum Scrub Creek

The Integrated Childrens Centre and the Primary School facility are under construction with the first stage expected to be completed around the end of the year with an opening likely for early 2018.

Lang Lang Recreation Reserve

Works on site have progressed despite inclement weather and the contractor is confident of completing the works in accordance with the approved construction program.

The majority of the earthworks associated with the sedimentation basin, wetlands and water reuse pond are complete. The installation of electrical and telecommunication conduits is complete. The oval earthworks and associated drainage works continue.

Cockatoo-Gembrook Trail

The tender for the construction of the Cockatoo-Gembrook Trail closed on the 13 June with a report to be presented to Council separately for the consideration of the appointment of a tenderer.

This package of works includes construction of the 6.5km trail from McBride Street in Cockatoo to Gembrook Station. The trail follows existing road reserves and the Puffing Billy train line between the towns to create a unique and scenic trail.

Decorative Street Lighting Upgrade

Over the past two years 770 decorative street light globes in Lakeside, Cardinia Lakes and Blue Horizon estates have been upgraded. The globes have been changed from 80-watt mercury vapour globes to 32-watt compact fluorescent globes that are energy efficient and cost saving.

The retrofit will save Council approximately \$30,000 per year in energy and maintenance charges and reduce emissions by over 150 tonnes of CO₂e per annum. The changeover of streetlights to energy efficient globes is a key action from the Aspirational Energy Transition Plan.

This extensive retrofit program will be completed by the end of July.

Roads, paths, drains and bridges

2016 17 Bridge renewal program

The replacement of the Manestar Road Bridge has now been reopened to the public following some minor delays due to site conditions. The works involved the replacement of the existing timber structure with a new concrete structure.

Peet Street (Construction) Special Charge Scheme

Following the declaration of the scheme at the May 2017 Council meeting, land owners had the opportunity to provide a submission to the Victorian Civil and Administration Tribunal (VCAT) against the scheme from proceeding. It has been confirmed that VCAT received no submissions relating to the scheme. Programming of the preparatory works are underway which also includes timing associated with a construction tender.

2017 18 Road renewal program

Tender documentation relating to the 2017 18 road rehabilitation and reseal program are being finalised for advertisement in the coming months. Road resealing preparation works are currently being scheduled in preparation.

Strategies

Draft Waste and resource recovery strategy

The consultation for the draft strategy closed on Friday 14 July. The feedback will be collated and analysed with updates to the strategy made where necessary.

7 MAJOR PROJECT AND STRATEGIES ACTIVITY REPORT

Moved Cr G Moore Seconded Cr C Ross

That the report be noted.

Cd.

REPORTS OR MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

The Mayor advised that minutes of meetings of various Committees and Briefing Sessions had been received and were available for perusal for any interested persons.

REPORTS BY DELEGATES

Vale Mick Moreland

Cr Moore noted the recent passing of Mick Moreland OAM and spoke of his achievements and noting that he will be sorely missed.

Vale Roly Hughson

Cr Moore spoke of the recent passing of long term resident and Rotarian Mr

Vale Norm Joseph

Cr Ross noted the recent passing of local resident Norm Joseph and spoke of his achievements.

Deep Creek

Cr Jodie Owen advised that she had attended on behalf of the Mayor at the recent sod turning ceremony at Deep Creek Reserve

Leadership Program

Cr Jodie Owen reported on her attendance at the volunteer leadership program on 1 July

Tourism Advisory Committee

Cr Wilmot reported on her attendance at the Tourism Advisory Committee held on 21 July noting that it was Nadine Hutchins last meeting as Chair and that the Committee had moved to the appointment of an independent chair

Audit Committee

Cr Wilmot advised of her attendance at the Audit Committee Meeting held in June noting that the Minutes of the Committee had been circulated to all Councillors.

Emerald RSL documentary

Cr Wilmot reported on her attendance at the launch of the Emerald RSL documentary on Anzac Walk

Sporting Group

Cr Wilmot advised that in company with Cr Schilling she had participated in a basketball game as a fund raising event for the Pink Ribbon Foundation.

Windana

Cr Moore advised that in company with the Mayor and Cr Brown he had attended the Windana Drug Rehabilitation Centre in Maryknoll on 10 July and had discussed activities and developments At the Centre.

Special Olympics

Cr Moore advised that he had attended the opening of the Special Olympics at Cardinia Life That were officially opened by the Mayor

Waste Facility Tour

Cr Moore advised that he had participated in the Local Government Waste Facility tour organised by the Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group and that they visited four facilities

REPORT BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor reported on recent activities as follows:

- attended earlier this morning at the official announcement by Minister for Education, James Merlino of funding of \$2M for the Pakenham Hills Primary School parents zone as well as \$530,000 for the Gum Scrub Creek Primary School and \$1.6M for upgrades of the Koo Wee Rup Secondary College oval and hockey pitch and to build a new pavilion. These announcements are great news for our residents and thanked council staff involved in the applications
- earlier in the month Cr Jodie Owen ably deputised at the sod turning by Daniel Mulino MP of the Deep Creek development works.
- on 1 July proud to attend the official opening of the ANZAC Walk and presentation of the promotional video
- met with the Mayor and new CEO of Baw Baw Shire in company with the CEO with the intention of improving relationships with neighbouring councils
- officiated at the official opening of the Special Olympics at Cardinia Life

Staff members have met with representatives from the Department of Educations and Early Childhood Development, Department of Environment Land Water and Planning and Sport and Recreation Victoria

For the financial year just concluded Council lodged 57 grant applications for a total of \$38,255,091 of which 27 applications have been successful for a total amount of \$16,814,787 which is a great outcome

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

The Mayor advised that a petition had been received regarding the expression of interest process relating to early years management and advised that in accordance with the Meeting Procedure Local Law the petition will lay on the table for consideration at the next Council Meeting.

Meeting closed at 10.45pm

Minutes Confirmed
Chairman