



CITY OF
PORT PHILLIP

**STRATEGY AND POLICY
REVIEW COMMITTEE**

AGENDA

2 APRIL 2002

PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

To Councillors

Notice is hereby given that a Meeting of the **Strategy and Policy Review Committee** of the **Port Phillip City Council** will be held in the **Council Chamber, St Kilda Town Hall** on **Tuesday, 2 April 2002, commencing at 6.00pm.**

AGENDA

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS**
- 3. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**
- 4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**
Nil.
- 5. QUESTION TIME (INCLUDING COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS)**
- 6. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS**
(See Report Index)
- 7. REPORTS BY DELEGATES (COUNCILLOR) APPOINTED TO OTHER BODIES**

David Spokes
Chief Executive Officer
28 MARCH 2002

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

REPORT INDEX

2. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS - FOR CONSIDERATION BY COUNCILLORS AND SENIOR OFFICERS

A10 Evaluation Of Tender 0585 – Cleaning Services – Public Toilets And BBQS

Responsible Manager: David Spokes – General Manager Corporate

(Note: This item is a Confidential Item in accordance with Section 89 (d) of the Local Government Act 1989).

6. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

A1 KRA Monthly Management Report From The Chief Executive Officer

6

Responsible Manager: David Spokes – Chief Executive Officer

Purpose: This Report Aims To Provide Councillors With A Summary Of The Major Areas Of Activity And Operational Performance As At 23 February 2002 And Compares Actual Performance Against Forecast.

Recommendation: That The Monthly Management Report From The CEO Detailing Council's Year To Date Financial And Operating Performance Be Received And Noted.

A2 2002/03 Appointments To Council Internal And External Committees

10

Responsible Manager: David Graham – General Manager Corporate

Purpose: To Appoint Councillor Representatives To Its Internal And External Committees For 2002/03.

Recommendation: That Council Appoint Councillor Representatives To Its Internal And External Committees For 2002/03 As Per The Attached Table.

6. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS (CONT)

- A3 Proposal To Make Community Amenity (Amendment) Local Law No. 2 Of 2002** **12**
- Responsible Manager:** Stephen Cooper - Manger Enforcement & Public Health
- Purpose:** To Consider Possible Amendments To The Provisions Of Community Amenity Local Law No. 1 - Clause 25 - Managing Amenity On Building Sites.
- Recommendation:** That Council Give Public Notice Pursuant To S.223 Of The Local Government Act That It Proposes To Make The Community Amenity (Amendment) Local Law No. 2 Of 2002.
- A4 City Of Port Phillip Neighbourhood Forums** **20**
- Responsible Manager:** Mandy Press – Manager Neighbourhood Amenity
- Purpose:** This Report Provides A Descriptive Overview Of The Neighbourhood Forum Program To Date And Provides A Clear Direction For The Next Round Of Forums.
- Recommendation:** That Council Adopts The Proposal For Conducting The Next Round Of Neighbourhood Forums As Outlined In Section 3 Of This Report.
- A5 Sustainable Review Panel Report Corporate Communications** **36**
- Responsible Manager:** Stephen O'Kane – Director Organisation Development
- Purpose:** To Provide Council With The Report Of The Sustainable Review Panel - Corporate Communications, Management's Response And The Proposed Communications Strategy
- Recommendation:** That Council Note The Report Of The Sustainable Value Evaluation Panel Review Of Corporate Communications And Adopt The Implementation Plan
- A6 Research Into Concrete Dwellings, Fishermens Bend, Port Melbourne** **39**
- Responsible Manager:** Bruce Phillips - Manager Planning And Building Services
- Purpose:** This Report Provides The Outcomes Of The Research Work Undertaken By Building Solutions Victoria Into The Various Amenity And Livability Matters In Relation To Concrete Dwellings In The Fishermen's Bend Area, Port Melbourne
- Recommendation:** That Council Note The Comments Received From Two Owners Of Concrete Dwellings In Fishermens Bend And Thank These Owners For Their Input.

6. PRESENTATION OF REPORTS (CONT)

A7 Amendment C30 - Shrine Vista Amendment 44

Responsible Manager: Bruce Phillips – Manager Planning And Building Services

Purpose: The Key Issues Associated With This Report Are For Council To Consider The Submissions Made In Respect Of Amendment C30 To The Port Phillip Planning Scheme And Form A Position On The Submissions Made In Respect Of Amendment C30 To The Port Phillip Planning Scheme

Recommendation: That Council, Having Complied With Part 3, Divisions 1 And 2 Of The Planning And Environment Act 1987, Resolves To Adopt Amendment C30 To The Port Phillip Planning Scheme With Changes.

A8 Port Phillip Planning Scheme Amendment C24 Part 2 49

Responsible Manager: Bruce Phillips - Manager Building And Planning

Purpose: For Council To Consider The Panel's Report And Adopt Amendment C24 Part 2.

Recommendation: That Council Adopt Amendment C24 Part 2 As Outlined In The Report And Forward It To The Minister For Planning For Approval.

A9 Service Agreements Review - Outcomes From Reallocation Of Family And Childrens Services Funding 66

Responsible Manager: Carol Mayell – Co-Ordinator Social Policy And Planning

Purpose: Following Decision A By Council 19th March 2001, Funding From Uniting Care Connections And Inner South Community Health Centre Was Marked For Reallocation. This Report, Forming Part Of The Stage 2 Review Process, Recommends Funding For Two Alternative Programs That Address Risk And Meet Primary Care Needs And Reduce Social Isolation.

Recommendation: That Council Fund The Inner South Community Health Service For An Extension Of Outreach Midwifery , \$19,720 And The Port Melbourne Neighborhood House & St Kilda Community Group For "Get Out Of Town Program" For Socially Isolated, Port Melbourne Families, \$18,280.

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
25 FEBRUARY 2002

A1	KRA MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
KEY RESULT AREA:	BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	N/A
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	DAVID SPOKES – CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
AUTHOR:	DAVID SPOKES
FILE NO.:	
ATTACHMENTS:	MONTHLY MANAGEMENT REPORT FROM THE CEO

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. This report aims to provide Councillors with a summary of the major areas of activity and operational performance as at 23 February 2002 and compares actual performance against forecast.
- 1.2. To inform Council on the progress against its Corporate Plan milestones, as reviewed at the end of February 2002, this review being the second of the proposed triennial corporate plan progress reviews.
- 1.3. To present Council with details of forecast changes made to the original budget as a result of the ongoing review by officers of their year to date financial performance.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Council has been receiving a comprehensive monthly management report from the CEO since August 2001.
- 2.2. Officers have reviewed the status of the Corporate Plan actions assigned to them and the summarised status report reflects the position at the end of February 2002.
- 2.3. The use of forecasts reflects an emphasis on ensuring that financial projections are updated regularly without altering the original budget.
- 2.4. Officers have reviewed their financial performance and budget forecast changes have been made where necessary, details of which are contained in the body of the report.
- 2.5. The next report will separate the Divisional operational and financial summaries from the service indicators to improve the readability of the report.

3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OVERVIEW

February Monthly Report

3.1. Financial Results Year to Date

Council's net operating surplus of \$3.603M after capital works is \$350K more than the year to date forecast of \$3.253M. A number of offsetting variances have contributed to this position, most notably:

- Capital works expenditure \$1.66M less than forecast due to timing delays against the phased budget, as set out in the body of the report.
- Capital grant funding is \$1.52M less than the forecast of \$1.92M due to delays in commencing and completing specific capital works projects.
- Capital expenditure \$562K less than budget due to a delay in building renovations, computer purchases and plant and equipment expenditure.
- Net parking revenue is \$173K more than the forecast of \$10.14M. No impact is expected on the full year parking income forecast.
- Waste management expenditure is \$158K less than forecast due to lower than expected growth in the volume of waste collected as well as the negotiation of a better tipping rate.

3.2. Budget Projections

- 3.2.1. Council's full year net surplus is now projected to be \$501K. This compares favourably with the balanced original budget and represents the position after full allowance for funding of the projected capital carry over of \$4.034M. This position is attributable to the forecast changes that were made and adopted by Council after the issue of the December 2001 report.
- 3.2.2. A detailed report will be provided to Council in the May cycle outlining the projected position for the Capital program.

3.3. Profit and Loss Statement

- 3.3.1. Council's income from grants is projected to be significantly less than budget due to a number of grants that were received before the end of the financial year. There will be no impact on Council's rate determination statement as \$1.6M (being grants received in advance) were transferred to reserves in 2000/2001 and these reserves will be used to fund the expenditure arising from the grant related programs.

3.4. Corporate Plan

- 3.4.1. Council officers have now carried out the second of their triennial reviews on the progress of the Corporate Plan and the results of this review are set out in section 7 of the report.
- 3.4.2. In preparation for the new Corporate Plan a series of KRA workshops have been conducted across the organisation with a view to identifying key issues for future consideration.

3.5. Council Elections

- 3.5.1. During the election campaign a number of complaints were received regarding the accuracy of the electoral roll. Such complaints inevitably arise as inaccuracies are almost guaranteed given the task of merging data from different sources. The status of individual property owners or indeed existence of potential voters is not necessarily known from rate records without active application by non residential ratepayers seeking to be on the roll. These issues are being investigated and will be reported to Council promptly. Discussions have commenced with the Office of Local Government on the administrative difficulties the current legislation poses

3.6. Review of Organisation Strategy

- 3.6.1. As previously discussed with Councillors an amended structure is being implemented effective 1 April. The changes are relatively minor, the major feature being a senior role focussed on strategic and corporate governance entitled "Community Governance." Several existing roles have been amended to better integrate service delivery.
- 3.6.2. The overall strategy underpinning the changes is to focus on future directions, streamline implementation of service reviews, and match commitment with capability. This will facilitate a service culture focussed on performance and service, and improved anticipation and scheduling of future physical and community infrastructure demands. It requires a management focus on emerging service directions with a much higher visibility of the aspirations contained in the current 10 year Community Plan.

4. POLICY CONTEXT

- 4.1. The Monthly Management Report is presented on a monthly basis and has no policy implications.

5. RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 That the monthly management report from the CEO detailing Council's year to date financial and operating performance be received and noted.

**STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002**

A2	2002/03 APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMITTEES
KEY RESULT AREA:	IMPROVING OUR SERVICE AND CAPABILITIES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	DAVID GRAHAM – GENERAL MANAGER CORPORATE
AUTHOR:	MURRAY CHICK
FILE NO.:	
ATTACHMENTS:	COUNCIL COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. To review and appoint Councillor representatives to council's internal and external committees.
- 1.2. To appoint Chairpersons to council's Strategy and Policy Review Committee and to the Statutory Planning Committee.
- 1.3. To appoint Leadership Councillors for each Key Result Area (KRA) within council's Corporate Plan.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Annually council reviews and appoints its representatives and chairpersons to its various committees, together with KRA Leadership Councillors.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1. A list of proposed appointments is included in this report for council's consideration.

4. OPTIONS

- 4.1. Council is required to determine its representative to its various committees. A list of recommended appointments is tabled for consideration.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1. The appointments to these committees cover all KRA's within council's Corporate Plan.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. N/A.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. N/A.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Designated council staff support these committees as required.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. N/A.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. N/A.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

11.1. These appointments will take effect from the date they are ratified at an ordinary meeting of council and relevant organisations will be notified accordingly.

12. CONCLUSION

12.1. The attached table of committee appointments is listed for council's consideration and determination.

13. COMMUNICATION

13.1. All relevant organisations will be notified of appointments to committees as ratified by council.

14. RECOMMENDATION

14.1. That council, for 2002/03, appoints the chairpersons and council representatives to its internal and external committees as per the attached table including Leadership Councillors for each Key Result Area within council's Corporate Plan.

**STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002**

A3	PROPOSAL TO MAKE COMMUNITY AMENITY (AMENDMENT) LOCAL LAW NO. 2 OF 2002
KEY RESULT AREA:	BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	N/A
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	STEPHEN COOPER - MANGER ENFORCEMENT & PUBLIC HEALTH
AUTHOR:	STEPHEN COOPER - MANAGER HEALTH & ENFORCEMENT
FILE NO.:	16/07/07
ATTACHMENTS:	1. EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 26 NOVEMBER 2001. 2. NOTES OF THE MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE BUILDING INDUSTRY 29 JANUARY, 2002 3. REPORT SUBMITTED BY PLANCOST PTY LTD 4. PROPOSED COMMUNITY AMENITY (AMENDMENT) LOCAL LAW NO. 2 OF 2002 5. AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS MANUAL NO.2 2001 6. SCHEDULE 8, LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1989 7. DRAFT PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROPOSAL TO MAKE THE COMMUNITY AMENITY (AMENDMENT) LOCAL LAW NO. 2 OF 2002

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. Council introduced Community Amenity Local Law No 1 in February 2000. The purposes of this Local Law are to provide for the peace, order and good government of Port Phillip City in a way that is complementary to the Council's Corporate Plan.
- 1.2. The Local Law was amended with effect from 15 October 2001.
- 1.3. Council is now asked to consider further amendments relating to building site noise at weekends.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The issue of noise generated at building sites during weekends has caused numerous complaints to Council from residents of the affected precincts. Typically building noise complaints are a transient problem, that is that there is a loss of amenity to residents during the construction period. It is believed that usually residents are able to tolerate short-term inconvenience, in the knowledge that the project will eventually be completed and some normality will return to the neighborhood.
- 2.2. However the intensity of redevelopment in the inner-city, particularly precincts around Port Melbourne and St Kilda Road, has led to a situation where construction activity will be continuous over several years to come. Affected residents have made representations to Councillors and Council staff regarding the impact of building noise.
- 2.3. In response, Council has asked the officers to consult with representatives of the building industry on the implications of restricting the start time for works on 'building sites (other than 'owner/builder' sites) to not before 9.00am on Saturdays. (Refer to Attachment 1 – Minutes of meeting held on 26 November 2001).
- 2.4. A meeting was convened with representatives of the building industry on 29 January 2002. Notes of the meeting are included as Attachment 2.
- 2.5. The key issues identified were:-
 - 2.5.1. The adverse impact to the cost of projects caused by the loss of productivity and inability to get sub-contractors to sites on Saturdays;
 - 2.5.2. The increased cost having the potential to curtail development in the City of Port Phillip; and
 - 2.5.3. The transition arrangements, if this amendment is adopted, for those projects that have been costed on the basis of the existing local law.
- 2.6. In response to the issues raised at the meeting, Mr Steve Grimes of Plancost Australia Pty Ltd was engaged to provide a commentary and opinion on those issues ("the Plancost report"). The Plancost report is attached (Refer Attachment 3).
- 2.7. In short, the report suggests that the proposal would not, of itself, be to the material detriment of the building industry or progress of development in Port Phillip. However there are significant issues to be addressed in the timing of implementation, particularly in regard to projects that are currently planned, where costs have been committed, but works are yet to commence.
- 2.8. On that basis, this report proposes amendment to the Local Law.
- 2.9. It should be noted in context that there are a range of controls over noise. In addition to the local law, the nuisance provisions of the Health Act 1970 may provide a remedy for chronic, 'unreasonable' noise issues.

- 2.10. The Environment Protection Act 1970 also provides some quite prescriptive guidelines in relation to noise generated from residential premises. Regulations under that Act specify the times at which certain types of equipment may be operated on residential premises. That includes the restriction on lawnmowers and electric power tools before 7am on weekdays and 9am at weekends.
- 2.11. The logic underlying that Regulation may be that these types of noise will cause a greater inconvenience at weekends than on weekdays. This report and the proposed amendment to the local law reflect that same philosophy.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1. This proposal seeks to manage the ongoing impact of building noise on residential amenity by amending the times during which building works may be conducted Saturdays.
- 3.2. The Community Amenity (Amendment) Local Law No. 2 of 2002 is proposed to make amendments to the Community Amenity Local Law No. 1 (the principal Local Law) to better meet the local amenity and safety objectives of the principal Local Law by managing, regulating and controlling uses and activities which may:
 - 3.2.1. be dangerous, cause a nuisance or be detrimental to the amenity of the area or the environment; and
 - 3.2.2. interfere with a healthy and safe environment in the municipal district for residents, workers and visitors.
- 3.3. The proposal is set out in Attachment 4.
- 3.4. Briefly, the proposal is:-
 - 3.4.1. That the amendment to the Local Law come into operation on 15 August 2002.
 - 3.4.2. To amend the Local Law in Clause 24 (5) (b) by replacing '7.00am to 1.00pm Saturday' with '9.00am to 3.00pm Saturday'; and

- 3.4.3. To make provision to enable existing committed building projects to be completed under the current local law provisions where:-
- (a) an application for a building permit has been made prior to the commencement of this Local Law; or
 - (b) a builder provides evidence to the satisfaction of Council that the builder has entered into contracts for the building works prior to the commencement of this Local Law on the basis of the Principal Local Law in its unamended form,

whether or not a building permit has been granted for the building works or the building works have not yet commenced."

and

1. To delegate to the Director City Development and Manager Building and Planning the power to form the view that a builder has provided sufficient evidence that the builder has entered into contracts for building works prior to the commencement of this Local Law.

3.4.4. The issue addressed in 3. and 4. above is of particular concern to representatives of the building industry, and the Plancost report addresses the validity of those concerns. The officer view is that it is reasonable to implement a transitional provision for those builders who have costed projects that are currently in process on the basis of the existing local law.

3.4.5. Therefore the proposed local law would recognise contracts entered into at the commencement date to ensure that the provisions are not applied retrospectively. There is an inherent assumption that this is a reasonable milestone at which it can be assumed that project costings are 'locked in'.

3.4.6. It may be contended that at the time of calling tenders for a building, final costings have been made. However it is considered that sufficient lead time is available in this statutory process for adoption of the local law that this timing question should not create an unreasonable burden on any affected party.

3.4.7. It should also be noted that the Council at its meeting in November 2001 resolved to amend the Procedures and Protocols Manual. Those amendments are attached in Attachment No.5.

3.4.8. All proposed amendments to Local Laws must comply with Schedule 8 of the Local Government Act 1989. It is considered that the proposal complies with Schedule 8 (Refer Attachment 6).

- 3.4.9. There is sufficient qualitative evidence (e.g. number and type of complaints received) to demonstrate that the benefits of the restriction, that is the promotion of amenity and safety for residents, workers and visitors, will outweigh the costs as identified above in terms of impact on the building industry and development. Further, continued complaints to Council's Community Amenity Enforcement staff suggests that the current approaches to these matters needs the back up of a local law amendment as proposed to obtain a satisfactory outcome for the Council. In other words, the proposal's objectives can only be achieved by the restriction.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. Adopt all provisions are currently drafted.

- 4.1.1. Council may adopt all of the proposed amendments as presented.

4.2. Further amend the provisions as currently drafted.

- 4.2.1. Council may amend the proposal. An obvious example would be to allow an 8am rather than a 9am starting time.
- 4.2.2. The City of Melbourne has settled on an 8.00am start on Saturdays which indicates a precedent for this option. An argument against 8am starts is that it would not clarify the inconsistency with s48A of the Environment Protection Act 1970 as referred to in 'Policy Context' below.
- 4.2.3. However this '8.00am' option would not be favoured if the Council considers that the proposed commencement time of 9.00am provides a fair balance between the needs of residents and builders.

4.3. Further amend the proposal to allow completion of 'finishing trades' between 7.00am and 9.00am on Saturdays.

- 4.3.1. This option acknowledges that some finishing type trades (eg painting) generate less noise. However the associated activities such as vehicle movement, radios and operation of machinery are likely to create a residual noise problem.
- 4.3.2. Given also that this option creates further ambiguity, and attendant enforcement difficulties, it is not recommended.

4.4. Do nothing.

- 4.4.1. The November 2001 resolution of Council indicates that the 'do nothing' option is not an acceptable means of addressing resident concerns.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1. Council is the permit issuing body for many activities in the public domain. Under the Local Government Act, Council is also responsible for the good management of the area, its assets and its public safety.
- 5.2. Council is empowered under s111 of the Local Government Act 1989 to make Local Laws for or with respect to any act, matter or thing in respect of which the Council has a function or power. The Act also requires that a local law must not be inconsistent with any Act or regulation. A local law is inoperative to the extent that it is inconsistent with any Act or regulation.
- 5.3. The proposal addresses a particular element of inconsistency between the existing local law and the provisions of s48A of the Environment Protection Act 1970. This Act restricts noise emitted from residential premises due to prescribed equipment, including power tools.
- 5.4. The test of non-compliance under the Environment Protection Act relates to whether the noise can be heard in a habitable room in any other residential premises, regardless of whether any door or window giving access to that room is open, outside prescribed times, including prior to 9.00am on Saturdays. The proposed local law amendment will, to that extent, bring greater consistency between the local law and the Environment Protection Act.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. This proposal supports Councils commitment to environmental initiatives.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

- 7.1. The proposed amendments support environmental objectives. The Plancost report makes comment on the financial implications. The direct social implications of implementation have not been quantified in the preparation of this report.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. There may be a resource implication associated with introduction of the proposed amendments. This needs to be addressed with the broader issue of construction site management.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. The following internal personnel have been consulted at various stages during the review.;
- 9.1.1. Geoff Oulton, Director City Development
- 9.1.2. Bruce Phillips, Manager Building, Strategic and Statutory Planning
- 9.1.3. Rod Burke, Team Leader Community Amenity Enforcement

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1. External consultation was conducted with:-
- 10.1.1. Representatives of the building industry at the meeting on 29 January, 2002
 - 10.1.2. Steve Grimes, Quantity Surveyor, Plancost Australia Pty Ltd
 - 10.1.3. Melanie Olynyk, Maddocks Lawyers
 - 10.1.4. City of Melbourne
- 10.2. Consultations with the City of Melbourne are ongoing, particularly in the documentation of good practices regarding assessments of reasonable noise and permit issue considerations.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

- 11.1. Timelines for introduction and implementation would be:-

<i>Date</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
22 April	Strategy and Policy Review Committee report to Council	Adopt Committee recommendation
Late April / early May	Public Notice of proposed amendment pursuant to s.223 of the Local Government Act 1989 Advise interested parties	Consultation Statutory requirement
late May	Meeting of committee	To consider submissions received pursuant to s.223.
1 July	Report to meeting of Strategy and Policy Review Committee	Report on the outcome of public consultation and submissions. Recommend adoption of amendments to Local Law
22 July	Committee report to Council	Adopt Committee recommendation
Late July / early August	Lodge advertisements to appear in Emerald Hill Times, Port Phillip Leader and Government Gazette.	Advise of adoption or variation by Council of amended Local Law Advise interested parties
Late July	Distribution of amendments to Local Law to Office of Local Government.	Requirement to send a copy of any new Local Law to the Minister.
15 August	Local Law commences	

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. The amendments to Community Amenity Local Law No 1 have been proposed as complaints received have demonstrated a particular impact on residential amenity caused by building works on Saturday mornings.
- 12.2. It is therefore proposed to amend the permitted times for building works on Saturdays from '7.00am to 1.00pm' to '9.00am to 3.00pm'.
- 12.3. It is proposed to provide a transitional provision to allow that the amendment will not apply to projects where the builder has entered into contracts for the

building works prior to 15 August 2002. An officer delegation is proposed to enable consideration of any applications so received.

- 12.4. The amendments will be incorporated into Community Amenity Local Law No 1 and its associated Protocols, Procedures and fees.

13. COMMUNICATION

- 13.1. The proposal will be communicated by letter to those representatives of the building industry who attended, or with whom there has been communication, in relation to the meeting on 29 January.
- 13.2. Communication of the statutory process under s223 of the Local Government Act 1989 will also be undertaken. This will be supplemented by notification via press release, Divercity and / or the Council column.

14. RECOMMENDATION

- 14.1. That Council, in accordance with sections 119 and 223 of the *Local Government Act* 1989, give notice in the Government Gazette and public notice that it proposes to make the Community Amenity (Amendment) Local Law No. 2 of 2002.
- 14.2. That the notices referred to in paragraph 14.1 be generally in the form of the Notice attached (refer Attachment 7).
- 14.3. That any submissions made in response to the notices referred in to in Recommendation 1 be considered by a committee of the Council, such committee to comprise [### *specify the names of Councillors or Council staff to comprise the committee* ###].

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002

A4	CITY OF PORT PHILLIP NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS
KEY RESULT AREA:	ENHANCING OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD AND PLACES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	MANDY PRESS – MANAGER NEIGHBOURHOOD AMENITY
AUTHOR:	MANDY PRESS
FILE NO.:	
ATTACHMENTS:	SUMMARY OF NOTES – NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS SEPTEMBER 2001 TO FEBRUARY 2002

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. Review of round one neighbourhood forums
- 1.2. Proposal for the second round of neighbourhood forums

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Neighbourhood Forums are one of several methods Council uses to consult with the community. The primary aim of the forums is to listen and respond to community issues at a neighbourhood level., The forums are one of the tools in our growing democracy program. Unlike other forums on specific issues these forums encourage a free flow of information on issues defined by the community.
- 2.2. Six Neighbourhood Forums were conducted between October 2001 and February 2002.

2.3. The following table provides some data about attendance/presentation

Month	Neighbourhoods	No. People Attending	Comm. Group Presentation	Council Presentations
October	Elwood/Ripponlea	100	5	5
November	East St. Kilda (Russian)	90	6	5
November	St. Kilda	100	2	7
December	Port Melbourne	90	3	4
February	Middle Park / Albert park	150	4	5
February	South Melbourne	120	2	6
TOTAL		650	22	32

- 2.4. Attachment 1 provides summary notes for each forum.
- 2.5. Promotion of the forums included an invitation to each household in the City, and details were provided on the website, in local newspapers and DiverCity.
- 2.6. Traders in Sth Melbourne and Middle Park/Albert Park shopping centres were invited to the February forums. All community groups in each neighbourhood were directly invited to participate.
- 2.7. Several flaws were found in our household distribution procedures which have been substantially reviewed and improved. Neighbourhood minders will be utilised to invite traders in all neighbourhoods to future forums. We now have an up-to-date mailing list for all community groups within each neighbourhood.
- 2.8. The format for each 2 hour forum included Council and community group presentations with about half the time available for question from the floor.
- 2.9. Participants were also invited to note an concerns/issues for follow up by Council staff.
- 2.10. 101 requests were logged on to Council's requests handling system, with 90% resolved to date. Several participants provided unsolicited positive feedback on each of the forums through the feedback sheets.
- 2.11. Agenda setting for each forum was determined in consultation with the neighbourhood Councillor(s) and was based on what was perceived to be the critical issues and concerns for each neighbourhood. All departments were also requested to consider how they might contribute.
- 2.12. Each forum was 'hosted' by a member of the General Management Team, with systems support provided by staff from City Development,

neighbourhood development, communications and facilities teams. The CEO attended and participated in all forums.

2.13. Assist staff provided general information and managed RSVP's which rarely reflected the actual numbers who did attend! Eg:

2.14. 45 RSVP's for Middle Park/Albert Park, 150 attended.

3. PROPOSAL

3.1. It is proposed that the following forum program be adopted

May 20th	7:00 – 9:00pm	Elwood/Ripponlea Venue: TBA
June 17th	7:00 – 9:00pm	East St. Kilda - St. Kilda Town Hall
July 15th	7:00 – 9:00pm	St. Kilda – St Kilda Town Hall
August 19th	7:00 – 9:00pm	Port Melbourne- Port Melbourne Town Hall
September 16th	7:00 – 9:00pm	Middle Park/Albert Park Venue: TBA
October 21st	7:00 – 9:00pm	South Melbourne- Sth Melbourne Town Hall

3.2. The structure for the forums is to be further explored but it will be important to ensure that more time is available for the community to raise its concerns. Neighbourhood minders should be encouraged to attend the relevant forums, along with staff whose work is focused on the specific neighbourhood. The forums will also provide an opportunity to obtain community feedback on the Governance review, the Community and Corporate Plans and SCPI.

3.3. The CEO will continue to attend all forums and members of the GMT will continue to both host and provide a strong level of support for each forum.

4. OPTIONS

4.1. That Council adopts the proposal outlined in Section 3 of this report

4.2. That Council adopts this proposal with some modifications

4.3. That Council no longer proceeds with the project

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1. The fourth Key Result Area in this year's Corporate Plan (2001/2002) aims to "enhance our neighbourhoods and places" by implementing dozens of actions that promote a sense of place and community identity, coordinate community services and encourage local commerce industry and tourism. One of these actions is to conduct two forums in each neighbourhood in the year.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

6.1. This project will have no direct impact on the environment other than through community education messages on environmental sustainability which may emerge.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

7.1. This project will contribute to achieving cultural, and social sustainability through opportunities for residents and other stakeholders to contribute to Council's decision-making process.

7.2. It will also provide opportunities for neighbours to meet.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

8.1. The annual direct cost of conducting the neighbourhood forum program is \$30K. The break down is as follows:

Promotion	\$18,000*	(12 x \$1,500)
Catering	\$ 9,000	(12 x \$ 750)
Materials	<u>\$ 3,000</u>	
	\$30,000	

* The high cost here is associated with direct household invitations. These are regarded as the most effective means of encouraging attendance, but may not be necessary when the forum program is well established.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

9.1. The review of round one, and planning for round two has been discussed with GMT, City Development, Neighbourhood Development, Communication and Facilities staff.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

10.1. No external consultations has been undertaken, but it is intended to establish participant evaluations for the next round of forums.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

RELEVANT COUNCIL DEPARTMENT	REQUIREMENTS	TIMELINE
All areas	List of projects by neighbourhood occurring in the next 3 –6 months, as well as issues about which you will be organising consultations. Prepare information and / or presentation at forum.	End April
All areas	A couple of good facilitators and support staff/notetakers. A director or department to “mind” each forum This will involve agenda setting, attendance, facilitation, and ensuring the display of information- presentation of material is available as agreed, the department will also be responsible for note taking, preparing a summary and logging requests on Vitesse.	For each forum
Facilities	Set up meeting places / arrange catering.	For each forum
Communications	Publicity in council / local news Individual invitations to be issued to each household Letter to all neighbourhood groups / organisations Public notices Web-site	Strategy by mid March
ASSIST	To manage RSVP'S and generally promote forums	Prior to each forum
Councillors	To sign off on the detail for their neighbourhood forum	2 weeks before each forum

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. This report provides a descriptive overview of the neighbourhood forum program to date and provides a clear direction for the next round of forums

13. COMMUNICATION

- 13.1. Direct invitations to each forum will be made to residents community groups and shopping centre traders in each of the neighbourhoods.
- 13.2. DiverCity and local newspapers column will provide details of each forum.

14. RECOMMENDATION

- 14.1. That Council adopts the proposal for conducting the next round of neighbourhood forums as outlined in Section 3 of this report.

Attachment 1

SUMMARY NOTES

CITY OF PORT PHILLIP NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS



OCTOBER 2001 - FEBRUARY 2002

CITY OF PORT PHILLIP NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM PROGRAM

Neighbourhood Forums are an initiative of the Council to provide an opportunity for local groups and individuals to hear what services are currently being provided in their area and to present to the Council issues and concerns that are held locally. The Forum's are an important tool in our 'growing democracy' initiatives.

Six Forums have been held so far in the City of Port Phillip for the communities in Elwood, East St Kilda, St Kilda, Port Melbourne, Middle Park & Albert Park and South Melbourne & St Kilda Road. The Forums run over a two hour period, the first hour being given to presentations and the second to questions from the floor.

Further Forums will be held in 2002. Details will be advertised in the Divercity newsletter and on the Council website at www.portphillip.vic.gov.au

Following is a summary of the Forums held in 2001/2002 and the issues raised and responses provided.

ELWOOD

The Elwood Forum was held on 15th October 2001 at the St Columbas Hall, Elwood. Approximately 100 people attended. Presentations were made by Save Elwood Streets, Scott Street Child Care Centre, Elwood Play Group, the Gecco Trail and the Elwood RSL. Council services presented included Street Cleaning, Walk Safe Program, Arts Strategy, Phoenix Theatre project and Margins Memories & Markers initiative.

The following is a summary of the issues raised and the response

Issues Raised	Response
Syringes on beaches this summer – can Council guarantee a safe beach this year	Safety is a priority and regular cleaning takes place, including manual patrols in areas that machinery can't reach.
Beach cleaning routines – when is the beach cleaned and is it as often as other parts of the foreshore?	Elwood beach is cleaned as often as other beaches as part of the regular maintenance program.
Litter traps on outfall drains to the bay	Council has a priority list of outfalls that it is progressively seeking funding for to install litter catchment devices to reduce pollution in the bay
Extension of heritage control overlay to the Ripponlea area	Councillors spoke of the importance of heritage under the new Good Design Guide and the need for heritage overlays to protect character.
There were many concerns regarding the Elwood Canal and planned dredging, vegetation planting along the canal, and progress of the Master Plan	A briefing night for the community on the Elwood Canal Masterplan will be arranged

Issues Raised	Response
Complaint that lighting along the canal is intrusive into private property (too bright)	New diode low level lighting is being considered along the canal. The change to lower lighting needs to take into account public safety and budget.
Query regarding Micromet watering system and costs involved at the Clarke Street Reserve	The micromet system was introduced as a more efficient and cost effective means of ensuring an adequate water supply to the reserve

EAST ST KILDA

The East St Kilda Forum was held on the 19th November 2001 in the Council Chamber at the St Kilda Town Hall. The forum was a fully interpreted event and catered primarily for the Russian Speaking Community in East St Kilda. Approximately 90 people attended. The Association of Russian Medical Practitioners, the Association of World War 2 Veterans, Club Nadeshda, the Shalom Association, TV Sputnik and the Victoria Police made presentations. Information was provided on the following Council services and programs: Street Cleaning, the Community Festival, Drug Policy, East St Kilda Neighbourhood House and the Margins Memories and Markers program.

The following is a summary if the issues raised:

Issues Raised	Response
Provision of an Aged Care facility in the City to cater for Russian speaking residents	Recommended to the Director Social Development to advocate for assistance from other levels of government as it is not Council's responsibility to directly provide this kind of aged care facility.
Financial assistance from the Council to purchase equipment for community group activities	Funding has been received for a video projector at the Betty Day Care centre.
Upgraded timetabling for public transport stops in the City	Implementation as part of the review of transport stops in the city conducted by the Integrated Transport department
Improved public toilet facilities on the foreshore	Change & toilet facilities in Shakespeare Gve are due to be improved in the coming months. Other areas to be assessed as part of the ongoing review of council's toilet strategy
Desire for a purpose built central community group meeting place	Consideration will be given to this topic by the new council in 2002
Support for more services for the youth in the municipality	A skate park for the foreshore of St Kilda is the next step in providing youth orientated spaces in the city
Graffiti and vandalism of street furniture on the foreshore	Council has been trialling an 'immediate response' program of removing vandalism within 48hrs or reporting. Signs are good that this is effective in minimising recurrences

Issues Raised	Response
Desire for a higher profile for the East St Kilda Russian Speaking Community	A Russian community planning day is planned for the future. A member of the Russian community will also be invited to be part of the Older Persons Reference Group
Better access for pedestrians on footpaths in busy shopping centres	There is a review of disability access on a State wide level which will have lasting impact on the clearing of footpaths in shopping areas. Due to report mid 2002.

ST KILDA

The St Kilda Neighbourhood Forum was held on 19th November 2001 at the Cora Graves Community Centre, Blessington Street, St Kilda. Approximately 100 people attended. The Esplanade Alliance and Salvation Army provided presentations. Information was provided on the following Council services: Capital Works at St Kilda Botanical Gardens, Street Cleaning, proposed Skate park, St Kilda Urban Design Framework, Road Safety initiatives, the Eco Centre, and Sustainable Community Progress Indicators (SCPI).

The following is a summary if the issues raised and the response:

Issues Raised	Response
Acland Street toilets and their removal	Demolition and replacement of the toilets is planned but timeline not confirmed
Night Arch at St Kilda Junction	A community meeting was held 11 th December to discuss the proposal. The Night Arch planning application has since been withdrawn due to a lack of funding
St Kilda Festival There were concerns regarding the running of the festival and impact on residents	Concerns were noted and advice given that a majority of residents have responded positively to the festival in a recent survey.
Veg Out and the Urban Design Framework(UDF)	Veg Out will be retained and improved under the UDF
Attorney General report on Street Sex Workers Concerns regarding proposed zoning of areas for sex workers	No zones decided and a process will be advertised in selecting them. The final report of the advisory committee will be released in 2002 following a public consultation period
Overcrowding of footpaths in shopping centres	There are guidelines for disabled access that are to be implemented in 2002 which will address problems with footpath space and trading practices
Policing in the community	There was a feeling that policing levels were too low and safety compromised. There is a clear responsibility for the police and Council works cooperatively with them to achieve public safety

PORT MELBOURNE

The Port Melbourne Neighbourhood Forum was held on Thursday 13th December 2001, at the Port Melbourne Town Hall. Approximately 90 people attended.

Community and Council presentations included:

- Plans to upgrade the Port Melbourne Primary School – Peter Martin – Principal
- Plans for Murphy Reserve Pavilion/Graham Street underpass, skateboard ramp - Jane Kopacek (City of Port Phillip)
- Friends of the Foreshore – environmental initiatives – Janet Bolitho
- Council's Street Cleaning services in Port Melbourne, and proposals for improvement – Peter Onley
- Bay Street Traders Association role in Bay Street improvements – Tony Hill, President
- Progress on several traffic management initiatives in Port Melbourne – Paul Smith (City of Port Phillip)
- Beacon Cove Stage 2 – Bruce Phillips (City of Port Phillip)

The following is a summary of the issues raised and the response

Issues Raised	Response
Financial Management – expenditure on footpath and drainage	Capital Works Expenditure is now double that of the 3 cities prior to amalgamation.
<p>Beacon Cove Why are only 2 proposals being considered</p> <p>What is Council position on this proposal</p> <p>Parking restrictions</p>	<p>The process is being overseen by the State Government not Council. The State appointed an advisory panel who will consider all options.</p> <p>Council considers the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site, with unacceptable social and environmental consequences.</p> <p>Will remain following the construction period.</p>
<p>Murphy Reserve Project completion date</p> <p>Quality of ground maintenance</p>	<p>May 2002</p> <p>Standards now agreed and review of contract to seek improvements is being undertaken.</p>
Dog Beaches in Port Melbourne	Council is conducting a trial of 2 dog beaches (leash free areas), one in Garden City and the other near Lagoon Pier .

Issues Raised	Response
<p>Traffic Management Speed and traffic on Graham Street</p>	<p>Extra vehicles are not expected as a result of work on Williamstown Rd and Council is seeking to reduce the speed limits.</p>
<p>Pickles Street road resurfacing</p> <p>Will traffic be considered in the Boulevard Master Plan</p>	<p>Council officers have looked at low noise asphalt and will report to Council. Resurfacing currently not on Capital Works plan.</p> <p>Yes, and the planning process commenced in December.</p>
<p>Street Prostitution Where will "safe houses" be located</p>	<p>This question is still to be addressed but there is no intention to relocate activity to Port Melbourne.</p>
<p>Port Melbourne Library Inadequacy of consultations process</p>	<p>Extensive opportunities for community input to proposals. A reference group to be established and further input to more detailed plans will be sought.</p>
<p>Street Cleaning Grass cuttings left in gutters by the Council contractor</p>	<p>Will be followed up with the contractor.</p>
<p>Weed Control Concern about unsafe use of pesticides</p>	<p>The Council contractor is certified to meet Health and Safety standards and Council will monitor performance regularly.</p>

Middle Park & Albert Park

The Middle Park & Albert Park Forum took place at the Middle Park Community Centre, Cnr Nimmo & Richardson Streets, Middle Park from 6.00 – 8.00pm. The Forum was well attended, with 150 people addressed by a variety of community and council speakers. The format of the evening varied slightly in that speakers asked for questions from attendees immediately after each presentation. The following speakers addressed these topics:

<p>Bruce Ward The Anti-Cancer Relay</p>	<p>The charity marathon will be run at Albert Park Reserve on the weekend of the 27th/28th April. To raise a team or become involved in the day contact 1300 656 585.</p>
<p>Peter Penry-Williams South Port Nursing Home</p>	<p>Peter outlined the Nursing Homes services to the community and future plans to service the growing number of elderly people in the catchment area.</p>
<p>James McCaughey Gasworks Art Park</p>	<p>James outlined the resident artist programs and explained some of the plans to expand the gallery space at the Park by moving staff offices. There were questions from the floor regarding the cost of running the park and the artist program.</p>
<p>Ray Walton South Melbourne Market</p>	<p>Ray outlined the types of stalls run at the market. There have been substantial capital works undertaken (\$600k) over the last year. Questions about the types of stalls to the need for a better lift and signage at the market bus stop were raised.</p>
<p>Paul Smith Grand Prix</p>	<p>Paul outlined the traffic arrangements for the 2002 Grand Prix. Questions addressed the desire for minimising the impact of the St Kilda Festival parking influx each year and there were general queries regarding the parking arrangements for the coming Grand Prix.</p>
<p>Deirdre Pellizer Library Services</p>	<p>Deirdre outlined the services offered at the Albert Park Library and the renovations to the Community Meeting Room that will take place in May 2002. She also described minor works to be undertaken at the Middle Park Library.</p>
<p>Jane Kopececk & Daryl Gill Middle Park Surf Life Saving Club</p>	<p>Jane outlined the review undertaken of all six clubs along the Port Phillip foreshore. There were questions regarding the future of the Middle Park club house which is to be upgraded. A planning consultation meeting will be advertised in the near future for interested parties to view the plans.</p>

Issues Raised	1.1.1.1.Response
Tony Cadmore Garden of Eden Community Programs	Tony highlited the work for the dole program that the nursery is involved in.
Sue Wilkinson Planning & Heritage	Sue outlined the free pre planning application process, the Heritage Advisory Service and the Fast Track Planning Service offered by Council.

There was an opportunity for general questions for the last half an hour of the meeting and feedback form were available for people to raise issues after the Forum night. The following is a summary of some of the issues raised and subsequent action to date.

Issues Raised	Response
What is the process to change parking restriction is a residential street?	There needs to be broad support for any changes to existing conditions. A guide on how to change conditions is available from Paul Smith, Traffic Engineer, ph 9209 6445
Why are the Forum's occurring just before the Council elections on March 16?	The current Forum is being held at this date because it is the last Forum of a series that began in September last year. The Forums are not connected to the Election process.
Where can I get further information about the costs associated with the Middle Park Surf Life Saving Club upgrade?	The Council website www.portphillip.vic.gov.au has further information.
Why isn't West St Kilda used as a place name when advertising the Forums?	West St Kilda is a postcode defined area, as are many areas within the municipality. The council doesn't use postcodes as reference points as they often spill over into neighbouring areas.
Can the Council consult more often and more fully with the community, for example by asking key questions on rate notices?	The Council is changing its market research approach to key questions more often rather than lots of questions annually.
Can the Middle Park Beach be netted off for swimming?	This will be considered for next summer
How do I establish a neighbourhood watch committee in my local area?	Information and some support provided to encourage neighbourhood watch committees in local areas

South Melbourne

The South Melbourne Neighbourhood Forum was held on Monday, 18th February 2002, at the Sth Melbourne Senior Citizens Centre. The Forum was attended by 120 people. Approximately 30 questions were raised and issues discussed. Community and Council presentations included:

- Academy of Music
- Clarendon Street Traders
- South Melbourne Market
- Festivals & Events
- Home Support Services for Older Residents
- Grand Prix & Traffic
- Street Cleaning, Parks & Gardens
- Library and Heritage Centre

The following is a summary if the issues raised and the response provided to date:

Issues Raised	Response
<p>National Academy of Music Future of the Academy</p>	<p>The State Government was to provide a building. The Academy will be present at the South Melbourne Town Hall for some years to come.</p>
<p>South Melbourne Market A request for installation of pedestrian crossings around market, installation of fans and improving the toilets and lift.</p>	<p>Money had been spent on capital improvements. New works such as airflow, toilets and lifts will be considered in the coming year.</p>
<p>Festivals & Events Festivals in the past have been cancelled events due to high liability premiums. Where would festival be held and how much of budget is set aside for festivals?</p>	<p>The State and Federal Governments are looking at alternatives for community festival insurance. Future events would take place in the Town Hall precinct. A budget of approximately \$10,000 is set aside for Sth Melbourne festivities.</p>
<p>Home Support Services for Older Residents. Is there an odd job assistance program? What is Council's contribution?</p>	<p>Home support is now called Property Maintenance. Council contributes \$900,000 per annum towards Home Care for the elderly.</p>
<p>Grand Prix & Traffic What is the future Direction for Albert Park? Are there to be changes to Melbourne Sports & Aquatic Centre?</p>	<p>Parks Victoria is the responsible authority for Albert Park. Parks Victoria will decide the future of the Aquatic Centre and the management of the Albert Park area.</p>

Issues Raised	Response
<p>Street Cleaning & Parks & Gardens Nature strips, lawns and guttering need attention. There is litter on beaches.</p> <p>St. Kilda Road – would like to see the planting of native trees</p>	<p>Excell is the parks and garden contractor. They have been advised of additional works required.</p> <p>Work has commenced on Storm Water management plan. The City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip are working together. Both Council's are looking at planting natives keeping in mind Heritage laws.</p>
<p>Library and Heritage Centre Opening hours a concern. What is the impact of History Centre on Library Budget Process? Internet services at Albert Park</p>	<p>Looking at hours and co-location for Library and History Centre.</p> <p>There are PCs for Albert Park at this stage.</p>

For further information on Neighbourhood Forums Program contact the Assist Centre on 9209 6777 or visit the website at www.portphillip.vic.gov.au

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002

A5	SUSTAINABLE REVIEW PANEL REPORT CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS
KEY RESULT AREA:	IMPROVING OUR SERVICE AND CAPABILITIES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	STEPHEN O'KANE – DIRECTOR ORGANISATION DEVELOPMENT
AUTHOR:	ALLAN GATISS
FILE NO.:	16/08/11
ATTACHMENTS:	1. REPORT BY SUSTAINABLE REVIEW PANEL ON REVIEW OF CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS 2. RESPONSE TO PANEL REPORT – GMT ENDORSED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 3. COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY AND SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. To present a report by the Sustainable Evaluation Panel of the Sustainable Value Service Review of Corporate Communications
- 1.2. To consider the Management Response and Implementation Plan endorsed by GMT.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The Panel met and considered the submission of the Communications Unit between 16 and 23 November.
- 2.2. The Panel consisted of: Ms Helen Davison (Chair), Cr Julian Hill, Dr Michael Henry (Independent Expert) and Mr Geoff Oulton, Acting Director, Organisation Development.
- 2.3. The Panel's report was forwarded to the Communications Unit on 17 December 2001.
- 2.4. The Communication Unit's response was considered and endorsed by GMT in March 2002.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1. That Council notes the Panel's report and adopts the attached Implementation Plan.

4. OPTIONS

- 4.1. Council receives the Report and recommendations of the Sustainable Review Panel and notes the GMT endorsed response to the Panel's recommendations
- 4.2. Council seeks further information regarding the Implementation Plan and then adopts it

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1. The outcome of the Service Review and the Implementation Plan are consistent with KRA 5, Objective 3 Improve effectiveness of Communications

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. There are no environmental impacts related to this Report

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

- 7.1. The proposal will have no negative social, economic or environmental impacts

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. The proposal will have no negative impacts on current approved budget

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. GMT has endorsed the Implementation Plan

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1. Not applicable

11. IMPLEMENTATION

- 11.1. Upon adoption by Council the Implementation plan will be rolled out along the timelines indicated

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. The Service review for Corporate Communications has been timely and has provided a framework by which Council's policy as outlined in KRA 5 , Objective 3 of the Corporate Plan can be delivered.

13. COMMUNICATION

- 13.1. The strategy does not need to be communicated to the community but will be introduced to the organisation via a series of presentations through the Divisions

14. RECOMMENDATION

- 14.1. That Council note the report of the Sustainable Value Evaluation Panel on the review of Corporate Communications and adopt the Implementation Plan

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002

A6	RESEARCH INTO CONCRETE DWELLINGS, FISHERMENS BEND, PORT MELBOURNE
KEY RESULT AREA:	BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	FISHERMENS BEND AREA, PORT MELBOURNE
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	BRUCE PHILLIPS - MANAGER PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES
AUTHOR:	SUE WOOD - STRATEGIC PLANNER
FILE NO.:	66/04/53
ATTACHMENTS:	REPORT TITLED 'INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS AMENITY MATTERS IN RELATION TO CONCRETE DWELLINGS, FISHERMENS BEND, PORT MELBOURNE, DECEMBER 2001', PREPARED BY BUILDING SOLUTIONS VICTORIA

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. To identify and respond to amenity and livability issues in relation to concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend, Port Melbourne.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. There are 60 concrete dwellings in the Fishermens Bend area, of which 14 dwellings are publicly owned and the remainder are privately owned.
- 2.2. Council resolved (September 2001) to, in part:
- 2.2.1. Adopt Design and Development Guidelines for Fishermens Bend.
- 2.2.2. Request a further report regarding the outcomes of research on the particular amenity and livability issues in relation to the concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend. Also, that owners are informed and given an opportunity to comment on the scope and outcomes of the research.
- 2.3. Building Solutions Victoria were commissioned to undertake the research.

- 2.4. In November 2001, a letter was sent to all owners of concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend that:
- 2.4.1. Summarised issues in relation to the concrete dwellings that were raised by several submitters to the Design and Development Guidelines for Fishermens Bend.
 - 2.4.2. Outlined the objectives of the research.
 - 2.4.3. Invited owners to raise any additional amenity and livability issues associated with the concrete dwellings and details on how to do this.
 - 2.4.4. Indicated that a future report on the research outcomes would be considered by Council.
- 2.5. Comments were received from two owners that raise the following issues:
- 2.5.1. Leaks in the concrete roof covering a bathroom/laundry annex; preferable to demolish annex and relocate facilities inside the dwelling.
 - 2.5.2. Potential difficulty and expense in making additions to a concrete dwelling, particularly if there is a requirement to keep the front facade. A more viable approach may be to demolish the dwelling and rebuild the front facade so that the overall appearance is unchanged. Council may require the owner to demonstrate that the current structure is unsound and this would add to the beauracracy and expense of altering a dwelling. This disadvantages the owners of concrete dwellings.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1. The report by Building Solutions Victoria is included as attachment 1. It outlines the objectives of the research, the methodology, consultation, findings and solutions. Some of the key findings of the report are:
- 3.1.1. The main issue is the poor thermal properties of the concrete dwellings that results in condensation forming within dwellings, (particularly during winter) and the increased energy consumption associated with the heating and cooling the dwellings. The orientation, location and exposure of the dwelling (in particular, walls) to the weather play a major role as to whether the dwelling is affected by this problem and the extent to which it is affected. The problem varies from dwelling to dwelling with some residents not experiencing the problem at all and others experiencing severe condensation.
 - 3.1.2. The thermal resistivity of the concrete walls does not meet the relevant clause of the Building Code of Australia.
 - 3.1.3. In terms of the structural soundness of the dwellings (which is a "test" in Council's heritage policy for the demolition of a significant heritage building), the method and materials used will ensure that the structural stability of the structure is maintained for the life of the building.

- 3.1.4. 16 solutions (and their associated costings) are provided to rectify condensation within the concrete dwellings, noting that most of the solutions are cost effective and each case needs to be investigated separately to determine the most appropriate course of action to improve thermal resistivity.
- 3.1.5. A second storey addition and alterations to a concrete dwelling would be equivalent to or more cost effective for a concrete dwelling compared to a brick dwelling in the context of any such addition/alteration being in accordance with the recently adopted Design and Development Guidelines.
- 3.2. The report does not provide information on tradespeople with appropriate skills to work on concrete dwellings as this would be contrary to Government policy and legislation regarding competition and restriction of trade. Council's Building Unit can, however, provide interested people with the details of various organisations (eg Master Builders Association) that may be able to provide advice.

4. OPTIONS

- 4.1. Options for Council in relation to the report by Building Solutions Victoria include:
 - 4.1.1. Note the report and take no further action.
 - 4.1.2. Use the report to assist owners of concrete dwellings to improve the amenity and livability of their dwellings, wherever possible and feasible to do so.
- 4.2. Option 4.1.2 is the preferred option because it is supportive of Council's heritage policy (refer section 5.2).

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1. All of the buildings (including the concrete dwellings) in Fishermens Bend are identified as significant on the City of Port Phillip Heritage Policy Map.
- 5.2. The Council's heritage policy (Clause 22.04, Port Phillip Planning Scheme) in relation to the demolition of a significant heritage building states (in part) that it is policy to:

“Not support the demolition of a significant building unless and only to the extent that:

The building is unsound or cannot be feasibly reused.”
- 5.3. The report by Building Solutions Victoria addresses the feasible reuse of a concrete dwelling.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. The report by Building Solutions Victoria provides some technical solutions that could be used to improve the amenity and livability of a concrete dwelling.

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

- 7.1. The solutions outlined in the report by Building Solutions Victoria are a proactive step by the Council towards assisting owners to improve the amenity and livability of a concrete dwelling. This integrates social, environmental and economic objectives and, more specifically, supports Council's planning objectives for the area.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. Consultant fees are included in the current Strategic Planning Unit budget.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. Council's strategic planners and heritage adviser have provided input.

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1. External consultation included:
- 10.1.1. Notification to owners of concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend of the research (and also providing an opportunity for input) and the meetings at which the research outcomes are to be considered by Council.
 - 10.1.2. Inspection by Building Solutions Victoria of various concrete dwellings and discussions with their owners.
 - 10.1.3. Discussions with the Office of Housing, Heritage Victoria, people in the concrete construction and research industries and quantity surveyors.

11. IMPLEMENTATION

- 11.1. The report by Building Solutions Victoria should be used as an information resource by Council, owners of concrete dwellings and other interested people.

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. The research undertaken by Building Solutions Victoria responds to Council's request to further investigate the amenity and livability issues associated with the concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend, in consultation with owners. It also provides a variety of solutions to address the main issue of internal condensation.

13. COMMUNICATION

- 13.1. A copy of the report should be provided to all owners of concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend.
- 13.2. Council's Planning and Building staff should be informed of the report.
- 13.3. Copies of the report should be made available at the planning and building counters.

14. RECOMMENDATION

- 14.1. That Council:
 - 14.1.1. Note the comments received from two owners of concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend and thank these owners for their input.
 - 14.1.2. Note and receive the report 'Investigation of Various Amenity Matters in Relation to Concrete Dwellings, Fishermens Bend, Port Melbourne, December 2001', prepared by Building Solutions Victoria.
 - 14.1.3. Provide a copy of the report to all owners of concrete dwellings in Fishermens Bend, Port Melbourne Library and on Council's web site.
 - 14.1.4. Endorse the report being used as an information resource for Council, owners of concrete dwellings and other interested people.

**STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002**

A7	AMENDMENT C30 - SHRINE VISTA AMENDMENT
KEY RESULT AREA:	IMPROVING OUR BUILT ENVIRONMENT
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	LAND BOUND BY HIGH STREET TO THE NORTH, PUNT ROAD TO THE EAST, RALEIGH STREET TO THE SOUTH AND THE EXISTING BOUNDARY OF SCHEDULE 4-4 OF THE DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY TO THE WEST LAND BOUND BY QUEENS WAY TO THE NORTH, UPTON ROAD TO THE EAST, WELLINGTON STREET TO THE SOUTH AND ST KILDA ROAD TO THE WEST.
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	BRUCE PHILLIPS – MANAGER PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES
AUTHOR:	ROB BALL - STRATEGIC PLANNER
FILE NO.:	66/02/113
ATTACHMENTS:	1. EXPLANATORY REPORT 2. PUBLIC NOTICE 3. SUBMISSIONS 4. SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. The key issues associated with this report are for Council to:
 - 1.1.1. Consider the submissions made in respect of Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme; and
 - 1.1.2. Form a position on the submissions made in respect of Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. A report to Council's Neighbourhood and Environment Committee on 4 June 2001 and a further report on 1 October 2001 outlined the need for an amendment to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme in relation to the introduction of Design and Development Overlay 13 to protect the Shrine Vista (Amendment C30). As outlined by the reports, Amendment C30 is required to:
- Correct an error that occurred in translation to the new format Port Phillip Planning Scheme.
 - Ensure that the subject land cannot be developed in a manner that would adversely impact on the Shrine Vista.
- 2.2. Council resolved to exhibit Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme once all documentation was finalised.
- 2.3. The Explanatory Report for Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme is provided as **Attachment 1** and outlines in greater detail places affected by the amendment and the strategic justification for the amendment.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1. It is Port Phillip's vision that the boulevard character of St Kilda Road is retained and important views and vistas to the Shrine of Remembrance in particular are protected.
- 3.2. To achieve this, the City of Port Phillip's Municipal Strategic Statement and Local Policies outline a number of objectives, strategies, implementation methods and policies that are relevant to the protection of the Shrine of Remembrance vista. These include:
- Clause 21.05-4:
- Retain and enhance key landmarks that terminate important vistas, accentuate corner sites and provide points of interest and orientation for the community.
- Clause 22.06:
- Encourage new developments to maintain and enhance important vistas in the municipality such as (but not limited to):
 - Along St Kilda Road, particularly towards the Shrine of Remembrance,
 - Shrine Vista.
- 3.3. Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme is considered consistent with the objectives and strategies outlined in both the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme and furthers Council's objectives in relation to the protection of important vistas within the municipality.

4. FORMAL EXHIBITION OF AMENDMENT C24

- 4.1. Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme was formally exhibited from 15 November 2001 to 20 December 2001 pursuant to Sections 17, 18 and 19 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987 by:
- Public Notice in the Emerald Hill Times;
 - Public Notice in the Port Phillip Leader;
 - Public Notice in the Victorian Government Gazette; and
 - Direct mail to prescribed Ministers and affected owners and occupiers of affected and adjacent properties pursuant to Section 19(1) of the Planning & Environment Act 1987.
- 4.2. A copy of the Notice of Amendment C30 is provided as **Attachment 2**.

5. SUBMISSIONS TO AMENDMENT C30

- 5.1. Council received three (3) submissions in relation to Amendment C30. Of the submissions received:
- One (1) raised no objection to Amendment C30;
 - One (1) submission was in support of Amendment C30;
 - One (1) submission requested that Amendment C30 be abandoned but subsequently this submission has been withdrawn.

6. CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS TO AMENDMENT C30

- 6.1. In accordance with Section 22 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987, Council must consider all submissions made on or before the closing date set out in the notice, and may consider late submissions.
- 6.2. Copies of all submissions received by Council to date are provided as **Attachment 3**.
- 6.3. The table at **Attachment 4** summarises the issues raised by each of the submitters, provides matters for Council's consideration in relation to each of these submissions, and provides officer recommendations in relation to each of the submissions.

7. OPTIONS

- 7.1. In accordance with Section 23 of the Planning & Environment Act 1987, after consideration of all submissions, Council must either:
- change the amendment in the manner requested; or
 - refer the submission to a panel appointed under Part 8; or
 - abandon the amendment or part of the amendment.

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. A fee will be payable to the Minister for Planning for considering a request to approve part of an amendment.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. Team Leader, Strategic Planning
- 9.2. Manager, Building and Planning

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1. Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme was formally exhibited for a period of one month from 15 November 2001 to 20 December 2001, during which time persons affected by the amendment could make written submissions.
- 10.2. Notices advising of the amendment were posted directly to affected and adjacent owners and occupiers as well as being placed in the local papers.
- 10.3. A full copy of all the amendment documentation was made available for inspection free of charge during office hours at the South Melbourne Town Hall, and the Department of Infrastructure's Planning Information Centre at 80 Collins Street, Melbourne.
- 10.4. In addition to this, consultation has taken place between Council officers and:
 - Department of Infrastructure
- 10.5. A public information meeting was held on the 29 November 2001 at the St Kilda Town Hall.
- 10.6. Subsequent to the receipt of the submission from ERM Pty Ltd Council officers have been engaged in discussions with the submitter which has resulted in the withdrawal of the submission

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. Three submissions have been received in regards to amendment C30. Two raise no objection to the proposed amendment and one objected to the amendment but has subsequently been withdrawn.
- 11.2. Due to the withdrawal of the submission opposing the amendment there are no longer any submissions requesting changes to the amendment. Subsequently a panel does need to be requested to consider the submissions.
- 11.3. Amendment C30 should be adopted by Council in its current form and forwarded to the Minister for her approval.

12. COMMUNICATION

- 12.1. Communication of this matter to the community is not considered necessary at this stage because notification of any approval of an amendment or part of an amendment would occur in the Government Gazette and by direct mail to all affected property owners and occupiers following approval.

13. RECOMMENDATION

- 13.1. That Council, having complied with Part 3, Divisions 1 and 2 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, resolves to adopt Amendment C30 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme with changes.
- 13.2. That Council resolves to submit the amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval pursuant to Section 31(1) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

**STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL 2002**

A8	PORT PHILLIP PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT C24 PART 2
KEY RESULT AREA:	IMPROVING OUR BUILT ENVIRONMENT
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	VARIOUS
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	BRUCE PHILLIPS - MANAGER BUILDING AND PLANNING
AUTHOR:	DENISE THORSON - STRATEGIC PLANNER
FILE NO.:	66/02/109
ATTACHMENTS:	ATTACHMENT 1 - AMENDED CITATION FOR 49A BLANCHE STREET, ST KILDA ATTACHMENT 2 - AMENDED CITATION FOR 22 WELLINGTON STREET, ST KILDA

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. The key issues associated with this report are for Council:
 - 1.1.1. To consider the report of the Panel appointed to hear and consider submissions in relation to Port Phillip Planning Scheme Amendment C24 Part 2; and
 - 1.1.2. To consider and adopt Amendment C24 Part 2 and referring it to the Minister for Planning for approval.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. Amendment C24 (Parts 1 & 2) propose new heritage controls for significant heritage places that were not proposed via Amendment C5, as well as a number of policy map updates.
- 2.2. At its meeting of 24 September 2001, Council considered submissions lodged in respect of Amendment C24 and resolved to request the Minister for Planning to appoint a panel to consider submissions.
- 2.3. At its meeting of 26 November 2001, Council resolved to split Amendment C24 into 2 parts to enable:
 - 2.3.1. Part 1, being those places affected by the amendment where Council had received no submissions, to be adopted by Council; and
 - 2.3.2. Part 2, being those places affected by the amendment where Council had received and considered submissions, to be referred to an independent panel appointed by the Minister for Planning for consideration.

- 2.4. Amendment C24 Part 2 affects the following properties:
- 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda
 - 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne
 - 63 Farrell Street, Port Melbourne
 - 2 Marine Parade, St Kilda
 - 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda
 - 32 Mitford Street, Elwood
 - 2A Spray Street, Elwood
 - 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda
 - 105 Wellington Street, St Kilda
 - 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne
- 2.5. Ms Kathryn Mitchell (Chair) and Ms Isabelle Johnstone were appointed as a Panel under delegation from the Minister for Planning on 12 November 2001 to hear and consider submissions in respect of Amendment C24 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme. The Panel held a hearing in the offices of Planning Panels Victoria for two days on Tuesday and Wednesday, 5 and 6 February 2002, and subsequently submitted its report to Council on 1 March 2002.
- 2.6. Council is now required to consider the report of the Panel and decide whether or not to adopt the amendment.

3. CONSIDERATION OF PANEL REPORT

- 3.1. The following section of this report:
- 3.1.1. outlines the proposed changes as exhibited for Amendment C24 Part 2;
 - 3.1.2. outlines the Panel responses and recommendations; and
 - 3.1.3. recommends a Council position.

3.2. 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.2.1. To be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO357
- 3.2.2. A new citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.2.3. Council's Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.2.4. Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.2.5. The submission questioned the heritage issues documented within the citation for the property.
- 3.2.6. The submitters for 49A Blanche Street generally support the application of the Heritage Overlay to their property.
- 3.2.7. In its inspections, the Panel observed that while the property had a degree of historical association and significance, (which is not in question), its condition was generally fair to poor.
- 3.2.8. Council agreed at the hearing that the statement of significance was based on a viewing of the property from the street only, and that the property should be examined in more detail by their heritage consultant to ensure accuracy.
- 3.2.9. At the request of the Panel, a further inspection was carried out by a council officer and Council's heritage consultant, and a revised citation was prepared for consideration. The Statement of Significance, Description and History as well as the condition and integrity sections were revised.
- 3.2.10. The Panel is satisfied that the revised citation (**Attachment 1**), which incorporates much of the information presented to the Panel by the submitters/owners of the property, properly and more accurately reflects the significance of the property.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda, subject to the amended Citation.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 subject to the amended citation.

3.3. 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.3.1. Place to be mapped within HO1
- 3.3.2. New citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.3.3. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.3.4. Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.3.5. The submission objected to property being identified as a significant heritage place and included within a Heritage Overlay as part of the amendment on the basis of an adjacent planning permit application that was before Council at the time (Application No. 50/2001 - 54 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne).
- 3.3.6. The property has inherent qualities that ought to be protected.
- 3.3.7. The Panel considers that a recently approved adjacent development is sympathetic to 58 Crockford Street and is of a scale which helps to include it within the streetscape.
- 3.3.8. The citation describes the context of this building as “*one of three Victorian-era row houses isolated in a multi-storey office environment*”. This context was raised at the hearing and the Panel agrees that is not an accurate description. The Panel recommends that the citation be reviewed and modified in this regard by Council prior to the adoption of the amendment.
- 3.3.9. The Panel considers this property represents an excellent example of its time and is worthy of inclusion in the Heritage Overlay.

Panel’s Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne and recommends that the citation be amended to delete reference to its location in a “multi-storey office environment”.

Council’s recommended position

Having considered the Panel’s response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne in Amendment C24 Part 2 subject to the citation being amended to delete reference to its location in a “multi-storey office environment”.

3.4. 63 Farrell Street, Port Melbourne
Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.4.1. New citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.4.2. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show place as a significant heritage place

Panel Discussion

- 3.4.3. The submission objected to the property being identified as a significant heritage place because the property had been altered and is in no way original, and the alterations have contributed to the loss of heritage value on this property.
- 3.4.4. In the written submission presented to the Panel, the alterations to the building were noted to reduce the significance of the property, including French windows to the front room where bay windows would have once been.
- 3.4.5. Although the structural integrity remains, the Panel was of the opinion that the property had been compromised. In addition, the Panel does not believe that the property is in any way unique and is located in a cul-de-sac where it will not be seen often by passers-by.
- 3.4.6. The Panel was not convinced by the submission of Council that this property be included in the Heritage Overlay
- 3.4.7. The Panel does not support its inclusion as a Significant Heritage Place in the Heritage Overlay.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel does not support the identification of the property at 63 Farrell Street, Port Melbourne as a Significant Heritage Place, and recommends that it be deleted.

Council's recommended position

The property is currently located within a heritage overlay, and therefore any alterations, additions or proposal for demolition would require a planning permit. Taking into account the alterations outlined, the property would be better described as a Contributory Heritage Place. This would require further notification and should happen as part of a future amendment.

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to delete 63 Farrell Street, Port Melbourne from Amendment C24 Part 2 and agree to identify it as a contributory heritage place as part of a future amendment.

3.5. 2 Marine Parade, St Kilda

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.5.1. HO298 to be extended to cover building
- 3.5.2. Updated citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.5.3. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show property as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.5.4. Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.5.5. The submission objected to the property being included within a Heritage Overlay because it argued that the citation for the property had been inadequately researched, and that the need and strategic basis for the existing heritage overlay on the adjacent property was flawed.
- 3.5.6. The submission objected to the amendment on the basis that the building is not of interest to warrant inclusion in the proposed controls.
- 3.5.7. The other terrace of the pair at 1 Marine Parade is already included in a Heritage Overlay although the submitter argues that this is also unjust.
- 3.5.8. The property is already listed within the Schedule to Heritage Overlay.
- 3.5.9. The submission does not provide any substantive reasons why it should not be included.
- 3.5.10. Upon viewing the property, though, it is clear to the Panel why the property should be included on Planning Scheme Map 6HO and Council's heritage policy map.
- 3.5.11. It is a property, which has significant presence at the start of Marine Parade, with a style so inherent to the history of St Kilda.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 2 Marine Parade, St Kilda.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 2 Marine Parade, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2.

3.6. 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.6.1. HO7 to be applied property (Property to be covered by both HO7 and HO193)
- 3.6.2. Citations in the Port Phillip Heritage Review to be updated to show place as being within HO7 & HO193
- At Council's meeting of 24 September 2001 it was agreed with the owner that Council would change Amendment C24 by:
- 3.6.3. removing the property from HO7; and
- 3.6.4. listing it separately within the Schedule at Clause 43.01 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme with a new HO number (368) that clearly describes the extent of the control as being the 1920's dwelling.

Panel Discussion

- 3.6.5. The owners of 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda wrote to Council requesting an opportunity to have on-going input into changes proposed to the listing of their property in light of on-going discussions with Heritage Victoria. They also requested that no changes be put in place until they had adequate opportunity to express their opinions.
- 3.6.6. An air raid shelter and land are already listed on the Victorian Heritage Register, however the residence, which the Council and the submitter also recognise as significant, is not.
- 3.6.7. Heritage Overlays are typically given to the full extent of the property. However since parts of the site, generally the land and air raid shelter, are already protected it would be inappropriate to have these areas covered also under an overlay.
- 3.6.8. The Panel understands that the submitters do not wish the property to be included on the Victorian Heritage Register, and agree with Council's recommendation that the dwelling can be individually listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the dwelling at 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2, subject to the dwelling being listed individually in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay as previously agreed between Council and the owner.

3.7. 32 Mitford Street, Elwood

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.7.1. New citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.7.2. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show place as a significant heritage place

Panel Discussion

3.7.3. The submission objected to the property being identified as a significant heritage place on the basis that the amendment does not adequately demonstrate that the property has qualities which make it a significant heritage place in the local municipality.

3.7.4. A permit has recently been issued for alterations and additions to the existing building (Planning Permit No 1588/2000). The Panel requested that Council's heritage consultant review the recently approved development plans and advise whether the stated significance of the place will be generally unaffected. In respect of the further inspection, Council's heritage consultant advised that:

The stated significance of the place will be generally unaffected by the proposed development although its rear context will be changed and the existing grounds removed. The house design addresses Mitford Street and its corner with Dickens Street so that the added development will be secondary to this expression. Similarly the relationship with the adjoining houses in Mitford Street will remain, as will most of its external architectural integrity.

3.7.5. The Panel do believe that the Council originally had justification for including the property as part of the amendment, however it now believes that the approved redevelopment significantly compromises the house's architecture and hence heritage integrity. The Panel therefore does not support the application of the Heritage Overlay on this property.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel does not support the identification of the property at 32 Mitford Street, Elwood as a Significant Heritage Place and recommends that it be deleted.

Council's recommended position

The property has recently been offered for sale and there is no certainty that a future owner will complete the approved development. Until such time as the approved redevelopment of the site is complete, it is considered appropriate that the property continue to be identified as a significant heritage place.

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 32 Mitford Street, Elwood in Amendment C24 Part 2 as a significant heritage place.

3.8. 2A Spray Street, Elwood

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.8.1. To be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO352
- 3.8.2. New citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.8.3. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.8.4. Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.8.5. The submission objected to property being included within a Heritage Overlay on the grounds that parts of the dwelling need major repair and there was concern that emergency repairs and renovations may not be able to be undertaken as they arise, therefore endangering the lives of the occupants, especially if parts became structurally unsound.
- 3.8.6. The written submission did not argue specifically against inclusion in a heritage overlay but voiced concerns regarding possible restrictions relating to repair works if required if the property is included within the overlay. However the application of a Heritage Overlay does not provide limitations on internal works, nor does it restrict normal maintenance. It does however require a permit for most other building works, including demolition. Demolition would only be considered if the building became unsound.
- 3.8.7. The property is clearly in need of ongoing maintenance but void of a full structural investigation the condition of the property can not be discussed. The Panel questions the description of the condition of the property as "good" and considers that a more likely description would be "fair". It recommends that this be changed in the citation.
- 3.8.8. Upon viewing the property, it is clear to the Panel why the property has been included. It is a property with considerable heritage significance, providing character to an otherwise characterless end of Spray Street.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 2A Spray Street, Elwood, subject to the Condition in the Citation being changed from "good" to "fair".

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 2A Spray Street, Elwood in Amendment C24 Part 2 subject to the citation being amended to describe the condition as "fair".

3.9. 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.9.1. To be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO363
- 3.9.2. Citation in the Port Phillip Heritage Review to be updated to show place as being within HO363 and being a significant heritage place
- 3.9.3. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.9.4. Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.9.5. The submission objected to the property being identified as a significant heritage place and included within a Heritage Overlay on the grounds that the property is not currently indicated as being a significant nor contributory building, the retention is not justified, it is by no means the only example of its type in the St Kilda area, and the submitters are unaware of any historical association.
- 3.9.6. A revised citation better describing and outlining the place's significance was prepared and forwarded to the owners for further comment. A subsequent submission was lodged with Council continuing to oppose inclusion of the property as part of the amendment
- 3.9.7. The submitter requested that if their submission for deletion was not successful, that the citation be amended to more specifically indicate the elements of most important to facilitate alterations to the non-contributory elements.
- 3.9.8. Council advised the Panel that the Statement of Significance could be amended and also suggested that the description within the citation be amended (**Attachment 2**).
- 3.9.9. The Panel, upon viewing the property, believes that the property has considerable heritage significance and supports its inclusion in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay, especially regarding the feature circular corner bay window and gabled roof front.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda, subject to the amended Citation.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 subject to the amended citation.

3.10. 105 Wellington Street, St Kilda

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.10.1. To be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO360
- 3.10.2. New citation to be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
- 3.10.3. Heritage Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 3.10.4. Neighbourhood Character Policy Map to be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

Panel Discussion

- 3.10.5. The submission objected to the property being identified as a significant heritage place and included within a Heritage Overlay because there would be an economic impact on property and it would result in restrictions on the possible future expansion and/or development of site.
- 3.10.6. The submitter for 105 Wellington Street indicated that the proposed amendment would have economic impact on its commercial tenants and possible expansions in the future.
- 3.10.7. Future development would be subject to a planning permit but there is no prohibition in painting the building in its current colours or leaving signs in place.
- 3.10.8. The Panel does not accept this as substantive reasons why it should not be included. Upon an inspection of the property, the Panel considers that it is clearly of heritage significance and the Panel supports its inclusion within the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the Heritage Overlay on the property at 105 Wellington Street, St Kilda.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 105 Wellington Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2.

3.11. 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne

Proposed Changes as Exhibited

- 3.11.1. Citation in the Port Phillip Heritage Review to be updated to show correct area on the map and to include additional information within the Statement of Significance

Panel Discussion

- 3.11.2. This submission requested a change to the amendment that would apply the Heritage Overlay to only part of the site, and change the citation within the Port Phillip Heritage Review to state that:

The fire station and the residence facing Williamstown Road are significant elements. The rear single storey section of the fire station and the recent rear structures (detached from the significant buildings) are non contributory.

- 3.11.3. At the hearing it was agreed by the submitters and Council that the extent of the overlay could effectively be described, instead, in dimensions. Urban Edge, acting on behalf of the owners provided Council with suggested changes to the Statement of Significance as follows:

The fire station and the residence facing Williamstown Road are significant elements. The rear single storey section of the fire station commencing at the north chimney, 20.5 metres from the Williamstown Road property boundary and running parallel to the Williamstown Road boundary, are non-contributory. The recent rear structures (detached from the significant buildings) are also non contributory.

- 3.11.4. The Council did not have any objection to this wording and the Panel is satisfied with the amended Statement of Significance and recommends its inclusion in the Citation.

Panel's Recommendation

The Panel supports the application of the heritage controls on the property at 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, subject to the amended Statement of Significance.

Council's recommended position

Having considered the Panel's response, it is considered appropriate that Council decides to retain 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne in Amendment C24 Part 2 subject to the amended citation.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL

- 4.1. The Panel considers that Council has shown an ongoing commitment to protecting the City's heritage places and has undertaken considerable strategic work to establish a sound framework for identification and protection of places of heritage value.
- 4.2. The Panel considered that the outcomes of the amendment have been made clear and are consistent with the existing heritage provisions of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme.
- 4.3. The Panel has recommended that Amendment C24 Part 2 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme BE ADOPTED subject to the following modifications:
- 4.3.1. Amend the Citations and Statements of Significance in accordance with the Panel discussion and recommendations contained in Section 6 of the report for the properties located at:
- 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda;
 - 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne;
 - 2A Spray Street, Elwood;
 - 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda; and
 - 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne.
- 4.3.2. Delete the properties located at 63 Farrell Place, Port Melbourne and 32 Mitford Street, Elwood from being identified as Significant Heritage Places in the Heritage Overlay.
- 4.3.3. Apply the Heritage Overlay to the dwelling (not whole of property) at 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda.

5. OPTIONS

- 5.1. Having considered the Panel's Report, Council must decide whether or not to adopt the amendment. Council has the following options available:
- 5.1.1. Council may adopt the amendment subject to the modifications recommended by the Panel in its report; or
- 5.1.2. Council may adopt the amendment subject to the changes outlined by this report; or
- 5.1.3. Council may abandon the amendment.
- 5.2. It is considered appropriate that Council adopts the amendment in accordance with the recommendations outlined by this report.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

- 6.1. Amendment C24 Part 2 is considered to be consistent with both the State Planning Policy Framework and Council's Local Planning Policy Framework in relation to the identification and protection of heritage places.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. A fee of \$700.00 is payable to the Minister for Planning to consider approval of an adopted amendment. This has been allocated for in the current budget.

8. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 8.1. Council's Manager Building & Planning circulated a copy of the Panel's report to all Councillors in February 2002 before its release to the public.

9. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. All submitters have been provided with a copy of the Panel's report.

10. IMPLEMENTATION

- 10.1. Based on the Panel's general support for Amendment C24 Part 2, it is considered appropriate that Council communicate its adoption of the amendment by:

- 10.1.1. Direct mail to all submitters
- 10.1.2. A media release for inclusion in the local papers
- 10.1.3. An update in Council's Divercity column
- 10.1.4. An update on Port Phillip Online

11. CONCLUSION

- 11.1. It is considered appropriate that Council adopts Amendment C24 Part 2 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme subject to the changes outlined in this report and once all documentation is finalised, forward it to the Minister for Planning for approval.

12. RECOMMENDATION

- 12.1. That Council, having considered the report of the Panel, decides to:
- 12.1.1. Retain 49A Blanche Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
 - it be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO357
 - a new citation, amended in accordance with Attachment 1 of this report, be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - 12.1.2. Retain 58 Crockford Street, Port Melbourne in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
 - it be mapped within HO1
 - a new citation, amended to delete reference to its location in a "multi-storey office environment", be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - 12.1.3. Delete 63 Farrell Street, Port Melbourne from Amendment C24 Part 2 and agree to identify it as a contributory heritage place as part of a future amendment.
 - 12.1.4. Retain 2 Marine Parade, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
 - HO298 to be extended to cover the property
 - an updated citation be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review in accordance with the revised citation prepared by Andrew Ward and circulated to the owner/submitter on 4 September 2001
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

- 12.1.5. Retain 23 Mitford Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- the 1920's dwelling be listed individually within the Schedule at Clause 43.01 of the Port Phillip Planning Scheme as HO368 and that the land be mapped within both HO368 and HO193
 - existing citations in the Port Phillip Heritage Review be updated to show place as being located within HO368 & HO193
- 12.1.6. Retain 32 Mitford Street, Elwood in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- a new citation be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place
- 12.1.7. Retain 2A Spray Street, Elwood in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- it be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO352
 - a new citation, amended to describe the condition as "fair", be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 12.1.8. Retain 22 Wellington Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- it be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO363
 - the citation in the Port Phillip Heritage Review to be amended in accordance with Attachment 2 of this report
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to show place as a significant heritage place and to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay

- 12.1.9. Retain 105 Wellington Street, St Kilda in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- it be listed in the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and Mapped as HO360
 - a new citation be included in the Port Phillip Heritage Review
 - Council's Heritage Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
 - Council's Neighbourhood Character Policy Map be updated to reflect changes to Heritage Overlay
- 12.1.10. Retain 425 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne in Amendment C24 Part 2 and that:
- the Statement of Significance in the citation included within the Port Phillip Heritage Review be amended to include the following wording:
The fire station and the residence facing Williamstown Road are significant elements. The rear single storey section of the fire station commencing at the north chimney, 20.5 metres from the Williamstown Road property boundary and running parallel to the Williamstown Road boundary, are non-contributory. The recent rear structures (detached from the significant buildings) are also non contributory.
- 12.2. That Council, having complied with Part 3, Divisions 1 and 2 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, adopts Amendment C24 Part 2 to the Port Phillip Planning Scheme subject to the changes outlined.
- 12.3. That Council authorises the Manger Building and Planning to finalise all documentation for Amendment C24 Part 2.
- 12.4. That Council submits Amendment C24 Part 2 to the Minister for Planning for approval pursuant to Section 31(1) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 once all documentation is finalised.

STRATEGY AND POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 APRIL MARCH 2002

A9	SERVICE AGREEMENTS REVIEW - OUTCOMES FROM REALLOCATION OF FAMILY AND CHILDRENS SERVICES FUNDING
KEY RESULT AREA:	BUILDING STRONGER COMMUNITIES
LOCATION/ADDRESS:	N/A
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER:	CAROL MAYELL – CO-ORIDINATOR SOCIAL POLICY AND PLANNING
AUTHOR:	CARMEL BOYCE
FILE NO.:	40/03/20-03
ATTACHMENTS:	FOUR

1. KEY ISSUES

- 1.1. Review of Council funded service agreements managed by the Social Development Department was commenced in 2000 as determined by Council in June 2000.
- 1.2. Stage 1 was completed in March 2001
- 1.3. Stage 2 was completed in September 2001
- 1.4. There are three remaining residual issues, all of which will come to Council as reports or for decision making by the June cycle:
 - 1.4.1. Neighbourhoods Project Review, St Kilda Community Group
 - 1.4.2. Funding of SPAUMAY on a Service Agreement, and
 - 1.4.3. Re-allocation of funding withdrawn from children's and family service areas, as endorsed by Council in August 2001 as part of Stage 2 of the Review.
- 1.5. This report makes recommendations only in relation to the reallocation of funding withdrawn in Stage 2 from children's and family service areas
- 1.6. Three year service agreements in the Social Development department represent a partnership that Council has initiated and entered into to contract community agencies to deliver services meeting its priorities, on Council's behalf.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. In March and August 2001, Council was advised on, and made decisions in relation to the Review of Council funded Service Agreements.
- 2.2. It was decided that funding to two services, Uniting Care Connections and Inner South Community Health Service, cease and that funding of \$38,000 be reallocated to family and children's projects that;
 - 2.2.1. increase preventative service options,
 - 2.2.2. improve pathways and access to specialist services, and
 - 2.2.3. reduce pressure and demand on specialist services.
- 2.3. Council consulted, called for Expressions of Interest and received three responses. A panel comprising the Coordinators of Maternal and Child Health and Family and Youth Support Services, and the Social Planning and Policy Officer assessed the expressions of interest.

3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1. This report recommends the reallocation of \$38,000 in total to Two programs;
- 3.2. Inner South Community Health Service, Assertive Outreach Midwife Program - \$19,720
 - 3.2.1. for an extension of the ante- natal care program, to provide assertive outreach to at risk pregnant women who are otherwise unconnected with the service system, and to some measure locked out of main stream services, for the purposes of;
 - 3.2.1.1. ensuring improved linkages to Councils Maternal and Child Health Services, Enhanced Home Visiting Service and Family Support Service,
 - 3.2.1.2. improving linkages with other services including the Royal Women's Hospital, and in particular the drug dependency unit, and Uniting Care Connections, and
 - 3.2.1.3. decreasing potential child protection involvement, enhancing capacity of families and increasing the potential for family reunification where child protection has been involved in the past.
- 3.3. St Kilda Community Group and the Port Melbourne Neighborhood House, \$18,280 for the funding of a Port Melbourne based family strengthening program "Get out of Town" to;
 - 3.3.1.1. Address and reduce risk factors for primary and early secondary school aged children by, reducing social isolation, improving community connectedness, increasing family capacity and enhancing peer support,
 - 3.3.1.2. improve pathways to City of Port Phillip school holiday program and other local recreational and social support services to at risk families as identified in particular by Port Melbourne Primary and the Uniting Church Kindergarten

3.3.1.3. provide the capacity for early intervention where risk factors are identified.

4. OPTIONS

- 4.1. Fund One proposal at a significantly greater amount;
 - 4.1.1. This is an option open to Council
 - 4.1.2. The Expression of Interest from St Kilda Community Group and the Port Melbourne Neighborhood House was originally submitted on the basis that its costs would be significantly greater and it could reach significantly more families.
 - 4.1.3. It was determined early in the consultations that a stand alone model, as initially proposed, provided less long term benefit than a model that was complementary to Council's school holiday program. The new model developed will share expertise, and in sharing will provide better and more valuable links to families.
 - 4.1.4. No other proposals were submitted on the basis of requiring the full amount allocated.

- 4.2. Fund all three Proposals;
 - 4.2.1. This is an option open to Council.
 - 4.2.2. However the panel was of a view that although each proposal was unique and had intrinsic value, that two of the recommended Expressions of Interest would result in far greater benefit to the community.
 - 4.2.3. Further that the two recommended options resulted in a significantly different level of opportunity for residents to be provided with early intervention and pathways to other specialist services, which is directly consistent with Council's human service policy directions.

- 4.3. Funding two proposals as recommended;
 - 4.3.1. This option is the Officer preferred model.
 - 4.3.2. It is proposed that the Inner South Community Health Centre Proposal and the St Kilda Community Group and Port Melbourne Neighborhood House Proposal could both successfully operate within the constraints of the available funding.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1. The Review of Service Agreements is in keeping with the Human Services Plan 1988-2001. The plan identified priorities and a rationale for Councils involvement in agreements with local providers of welfare and support.
- 5.2. The Plan identified Council's most effective funding role as one of adding value through the provision of pathways to improve access to specialist services funded by other tiers of government. The Plan also identified as a priority, local service solutions that have a community strengthening focus
- 5.3. Services which duplicated programs funded by other levels of government were identified as no longer being an effective use of Council resources.
- 5.4. The aims of the Review are:
 - 5.4.1. To provide the opportunity to assess whether Council funds are aligned with Council priorities
 - 5.4.2. To enable organisations to determine whether there are more appropriate service models which they would wish to apply Council funds to; and
 - 5.4.3. To determine whether there are alternative organisations interested in and suitable to deliver services utilising Council funding within the priorities Council has set for its resource allocation
- 5.5. This report follows a decision of Council in August 2001, in relation to the Review, to cease some funding and reallocate it according to priorities listed above, and recommends reallocation of funding in accordance with that decision.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 6.1. These proposals have no environmental impacts

7. TRIPLE BOTTOM LINE ASSESSMENT

- 7.1. Known social impacts have been discussed above.
- 7.2. There are no known economic impacts
- 7.3. There are no known environmental impacts

8. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1. These programs require no additional resource allocation outside the Review budget. Funding of \$38,000 is to be re-allocated to the two new service agreements.
- 8.2. In previous decisions Council set aside funding otherwise withdrawn from Uniting Care Connections and Inner South Community Health Service for reallocating to programs addressing family and children's services identified needs. This amounted to \$45,550.
- 8.3. The review recommended that \$7,550 of the \$45,550 be re-allocated to extending the Taxation Service for low income earners, to the South Port Legal Service and the remainder of \$38,000 be allocated to family and children's services.

9. INTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 9.1. Council Officers consulted in this process include;
 - 9.1.1. Youth Support Services
 - 9.1.2. Coordinator Maternal and Child Health Services
 - 9.1.3. Coordinator Children's Services
 - 9.1.4. Coordinator of Family and Youth Support Services
 - 9.1.5. Manager Social Development
 - 9.1.6. Director Social and Cultural Development

10. EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

- 10.1. A public meeting was held in November 2001 to discuss the goals and criteria, local needs and to facilitate agency collaboration in the process. 12 agencies participated in the consultation.
- 10.2. Groups were also invited through public advertisement to apply for funds
- 10.3. Groups who expressed any interest in the funding round were actively encouraged to apply
- 10.4. All groups that lodged expressions of interest were invited to address and present to the assessment panel

11. IMPLEMENTATION

- 11.1. Following Councils decision it is proposed that In relation to the Assertive Outreach Midwife proposal by Inner South Community Health Service;
- 11.1.1. The Social Planner and the Coordinator of Maternal and Child Health Services work with Inner South Community Health Service to develop a service agreement including a range of Key Performance Indicators.
- 11.1.2. This service agreement should replicate all others following the funding of services review and run from May 2002 to 30th June 2004 a period of 26 months and require annual funding for this period over the funding cycle, and include any potential award rises and CPI increases as they arise.
- 11.1.3. This agreement would then be placed with the Coordinator Maternal Family and Youth Services for implementation, monitoring and reviewing.
- 11.1.4. Statistics of outcomes from this funding will be reported to Social Planning in order to provide a consolidated report to Council every six months in this period
- 11.2. Following Councils decision it is proposed that In relation to the "Get out of Town" Project as proposed by the St Kilda Community Group and the Port Melbourne Neighborhood House;
- 11.2.1. The Social Planner and the Coordinator of Family and Youth Support work with the above groups to rework the proposal to ensure that expectations of linkages and support through Council school holiday programs are clear, that the framework for the proposal is clear and is able to deliver on expected outcomes, that clear pathways between the Program and other services are defined
- 11.2.2. Further that the Social Planner and the Coordinator of Family and Youth Support develop a service agreement including a range of Key Performance Indicators.
- 11.2.3. This service agreement should replicate all others following the funding of services review and run from May 2002 to 30th June 2004 a period of 26 months and require annual funding for this period over the funding cycle, and include any potential award rises and CPI increases as they arise.
- 11.2.4. This agreement would then be placed with the Coordinator Maternal Family and Youth Services for implementation, monitoring and reviewing.
- 11.3. Statistics of outcomes from this funding will be reported to Social Planning in order to provide a consolidated report to Council every six months in this period.

12. CONCLUSION

- 12.1. It is proposed that Council fund Inner South Community Health Centre via a service agreement for the Assertive Outreach Midwife Program to \$19,720 per annum until June 30th 2004 for a period of 26 months.
- 12.2. It is proposed that Council fund the St Kilda Community Group and Port Melbourne Neighborhood House via a service agreement for the "Get out of Town" project to \$18,280 per annum from May 2002 until June 30th 2004 for a period of 26 months.
- 12.3. Council decision making in relation these grant proposals will complete one of three outstanding issues from the Service Agreement Review.

13. COMMUNICATION

- 13.1. Council advise in writing the service agreement partners immediately following the decision.
- 13.2. A media release in collaboration with the agencies, be prepared to announce the two new programs.

14. RECOMMENDATION

- 14.1. That Council enters a service agreement arrangement with the Inner South Community Health service to contract them to deliver an extension to the Assertive Outreach Midwife project for \$19,720 per annum until 30 June 2004.
- 14.2. That Council enters a service agreement arrangement with St. Kilda Community Group and the Port Melbourne Neighbourhood House to contract them to deliver the "Get Out of Town" program for socially isolated Port Melbourne families to an amount of \$18,280 per annum.
- 14.3. That a media release, in collaboration with the agencies, be prepared to announce the two new programs.
- 14.4. That a progress report on these two new service agreements be presented to Council in the December 2002 meeting cycle.