



Ordinary Meeting of Council Agenda

**to be held on Tuesday 10 April 2018 at 7.00pm
Richmond Town Hall**

Arrangements to ensure our meetings are accessible to the public

Council meetings are held at either the Richmond Town Hall or the Fitzroy Town Hall. The following arrangements are in place to ensure they are accessible to the public:

- Entrance ramps and lifts (off Moor Street at Fitzroy, entry foyer at Richmond).
- Interpreting assistance is available by arrangement (*tel. 9205 5110*).
- Auslan interpreting is available by arrangement (*tel. 9205 5110*).
- A hearing loop is available at Richmond only and the receiver accessory is available by arrangement (*tel. 9205 5110*).
- Proposed resolutions are displayed on large screen.
- An electronic sound system amplifies Councillors' debate.
- Disability accessible toilet facilities are available at each venue.

Recording and Publication of Meetings

An audio recording is made of all public Council Meetings and then published on Council's website. By participating in proceedings (including during Public Question Time or in making a submission regarding an item before Council), you agree to this publication. You should be aware that any private information volunteered by you during your participation in a meeting is subject to recording and publication.

www.yarracity.vic.gov.au

Order of business

- 1. Statement of recognition of Wurundjeri Land**
- 2. Attendance, apologies and requests for leave of absence**
- 3. Declarations of conflict of interest (Councillors and staff)**
- 4. Confidential business reports**
- 5. Confirmation of minutes**
- 6. Petitions and joint letters**
- 7. Public question time**
- 8. General business**
- 9. Delegates' reports**
- 10. Questions without notice**
- 11. Council business reports**
- 12. Notices of motion**
- 13. Urgent business**

1. Statement of Recognition of Wurundjeri Land

“Welcome to the City of Yarra.”

“Yarra City Council acknowledges the Wurundjeri as the Traditional Owners of this country, pays tribute to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Yarra and gives respect to the Elders past and present.”

2. Attendance, apologies and requests for leave of absence

Anticipated attendees:

Councillors

- Cr Daniel Nguyen (Mayor)
- Cr Misha Coleman (Deputy Mayor)
- Cr Danae Bosler
- Cr Mi-Lin Chen Yi Mei
- Cr Jackie Fristacky
- Cr Stephen Jolly
- Cr Mike McEvoy
- Cr James Searle
- Cr Amanda Stone

Council officers

- Vijaya Vaidyanath (Chief Executive Officer)
- Andrew Day (Director - Corporate, Business and Finance)
- Ivan Gilbert (Group Manager - CEO's Office)
- Lucas Gosling (Acting Director - Community Wellbeing)
- Chris Leivers (Director – City Works and Assets)
- Bruce Phillips (Director - Planning and Place Making)
- Jane Waldock (Assistant Director - Planning and Place making)
- Fred Warner (Group Manager – People, Culture and Community)
- Mel Nikou (Governance Officer)

3. Declarations of conflict of interest (Councillors and staff)

4. Confidential business reports

Item

- 4.1 Contractual matters
- 4.2 Matters relating to legal advice

Confidential business reports

The following items were deemed by the Chief Executive Officer to be suitable for consideration in closed session in accordance with section 89 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1989*. In accordance with that Act, Council may resolve to consider these issues in open or closed session.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the meeting be closed to members of the public, in accordance with section 89 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1989*, to allow consideration of:
 - (a) contractual matters; and
 - (b) matters relating to legal advice.
2. That all information contained within the Confidential Business Reports section of this agenda and reproduced as Council Minutes be treated as being and remaining strictly confidential in accordance with the provisions of sections 77 and 89 of the *Local Government Act 1989* until Council resolves otherwise.

5. Confirmation of minutes

RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Tuesday 20 March 2018 be confirmed.

That the minutes of the Special Confidential Council Meeting held on Monday 26 March 2018 be confirmed.

6. Petitions and joint letters

7. Public question time

Yarra City Council welcomes questions from members of the community.

Public question time procedure

Ideally, questions should be submitted to Council in writing by midday on the day of the meeting via the form available on our website. Submitting your question in advance helps us to provide a more comprehensive answer. Questions that have been submitted in advance will be answered first.

Public question time is an opportunity to ask questions about issues for which you have not been able to gain a satisfactory response on a matter. As such, public question time is not:

- a time to make statements or engage in debate with Councillors;
- a forum to be used in relation to planning application matters which are required to be submitted and considered as part of the formal planning submission;
- a forum for initially raising operational matters, which should be directed to the administration in the first instance;

If you wish to raise matters in relation to an item on this meeting agenda, Council will consider submissions on these items in conjunction with and prior to debate on that agenda item.

When you are invited by the meeting chairperson to ask your question, please come forward and take a seat at the microphone and:

- state your name clearly for the record;
- direct your questions to the chairperson;
- ask a maximum of two questions;
- speak for a maximum of five minutes;
- refrain from repeating questions that have been asked previously by yourself or others; and
- remain silent following your question unless called upon by the chairperson to make further comment or to clarify any aspects.

8. General business

9. Delegates' reports

10. Questions without notice

11. Council business reports

Item		Page	Rec. Page	Report Presenter
11.1	Amendment C219 (Trenerry Crescent) Consideration of Panel Report	8	18	David Walmsley – Manager City Strategy
11.2	Update on recent Wellington Street Copenhagen bike lane tender	19	22	Jane Waldock – Assistant Director Planning and Place Making
11.3	Accessibility of Yarra Railway Stations	23	27	Adrian Murphy – Manager Aged and Disability Services
11.4	Community Grants 2018/19 Initiation Report	28	35	Aldo Malavisi – Community Partnerships Unit Manager
11.5	Proposed Motions for MAV State Council 2018	36	37	Ivan Gilbert – Group Manager Chief Executive's Office
11.6	Councillor Attendance at ICLEI World Congress 2018 - Authorisation	38	39	Ivan Gilbert – Group Manager Chief Executive's Office
11.7	Councillor Attendance at ALGA 2018 National Conference - Authorisation	40	41	Ivan Gilbert – Group Manager Chief Executive's Office

The public submission period is an opportunity to provide information to Council, not to ask questions or engage in debate.

Public submissions procedure

When you are invited by the meeting chairperson to make your submission, please come forward and take a seat at the microphone and:

- state your name clearly for the record;
- direct your submission to the chairperson;
- speak for a maximum of five minutes;
- confine your remarks to the matter under consideration;
- refrain from repeating information already provided by previous submitters; and
- remain silent following your submission unless called upon by the chairperson to make further comment.

12. Notices of motion

Item		Page	Rec. Page	Report Presenter
12.1	Notice of Motion No.4 of 2018 - Walmer Street Bridge	42	42	Councillor Stone

13. Urgent business

Nil

11.1 Amendment C219 (Trenerry Crescent) Consideration of Panel Report

Trim Record Number: D18/39886

Responsible Officer: Director Planning and Place Making

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is:
 - (a) To provide Councillors with an overview of the key recommendations of the independent Planning Panel that considered Amendments C218 and C219 at a joint Planning Panel hearing that occurred in August 2017; and
 - (b) To recommend an alternate version of Amendment C219 for adoption for the reasons outlined in this report.
2. Council must decide whether to:
 - (a) adopt the amendment as recommended by the Panel Report and submit it to the Minister for Planning for final approval in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Planning and Environment Act 1987; or
 - (b) adopt the Amendment in the form recommended in this report which includes an alternate version of the amendment based for reasons outlined in the report, and submit it to the Minister; or
 - (c) adopt the Amendment as exhibited and submit it to the Minister; or
 - (d) abandon the Amendment and advise the Minister that Council has abandoned it.
3. In accordance with Section 27 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987 (the Act)*, a Planning Authority (Council) must consider the Panel's recommendations before adopting an amendment and must justify any variations to the Panel's recommendations.

Background

4. Amendment C219 proposes to rezone land at 112–124 and 126-142 Trenerry Crescent from Commercial 2 Zone to Mixed Use Zone and apply a Development Plan Overlay and an Environmental Audit Overlay.
5. The Amendment facilitates urban renewal of underutilised commercial land, and supports the achievement of Council's preferred vision for the subject sites, as articulated in the adopted Johnston Street Local Area Plan, 2015.
6. Conditional authorisation was received for the Amendment on 8 November 2016 which stated that:
 - (a) *"The Amendment must be consistent (with) the Yarra River controls currently being prepared by DELWP prior to submission for approval to the Minister for Planning under Section 35 of the P & E Act 1987."*
7. The Amendment was exhibited from 24 November to 24 December 2016 and received 16 submissions, of which 14 were by the same people or organisation. Most of the submissions covered similar issues.
8. On 4 July 2017 Council resolved to seek the appointment of a Planning Panel in accordance with Section 23 of the Act as there were a number of issues raised in submissions that could not be resolved through changes to the Amendment.
9. At that meeting, Council endorsed the Amendment with a number of changes in response to submissions (Attachment 1). Particular issues relating to traffic, heritage and building heights were addressed in the revised amendment submitted to the Panel.
10. A joint Panel hearing was conducted in August 2017, with appearances made by: proponents and their legal representatives; VicRoads; and a representative of the Collingwood Historical Society.

11. A number of issues were common to both amendments and these were outlined in the Panel report.
12. Council had legal representation, which called on expert witnesses for heritage and traffic.

Submissions and Issues considered by the Panel

13. Across the 16 submissions received for the Amendment, the following key issues of concern were expressed at the Panel hearing:
 - (a) traffic impacts;
 - (b) building heights and setbacks (which was sometimes related to consistency with DDO1);
 - (c) protection of heritage buildings;
 - (d) increased population and infrastructure requirements;
 - (e) character and amenity;
 - (f) removal of third party notice and review rights; and
 - (g) visual impact of new development (on the Yarra River corridor).
14. Some of the issues raised in submissions could not be addressed through changes to the Amendment and often had broader implications. These included the following issues:
 - (a) traffic volumes throughout the local area; and
 - (b) a growing population resulting in pressure on existing infrastructure and amenity of the local area.

Panel Report and Recommendations

15. The Panel report was received by Council officers on 25 October 2017 and the Panel's recommended changes (the Panel preferred version of the Amendments) are in the Appendices of the Panel report (Attachment 2).

Officer Recommended Changes

16. The version of the Amendment (Schedule 14 to the DPO) being recommended for adoption is found as Attachment 3 to this report.

Issues Common to Both Amendments

17. In addressing Amendments C218 and C219 (as a combined Panel hearing) the Panel considered the following issues that were common to both Amendments:
 - (a) Duplication of provisions in the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 1(DDO1) Yarra (Birrarung) River Corridor Protection; and
 - (b) Traffic (conditions and impacts from new development).

Duplication of provisions in DDO1 (Amendment C219)
18. The Panel considered whether the Schedule 14 to the DPO should duplicate the provisions of DDO1. DDO1 was revised in February 2017 to introduce mandatory maximum height controls that were previously discretionary. The DDO1 control expires in January 2021 but is expected to become permanent at some stage.
19. Experts for the proponent presented evidence to the Panel that favoured including an additional discretionary building height control - expressed as a 'preferred maximum 25 metres' - on the Indicative Framework Plan within the DPO14 schedule. The Panel considered that it would be consistent with the building height limits envisioned in the JSLAP and the mandatory controls in DDO1, and would only apply if DDO1 is amended or expires in 2021 without being extended.
20. **The Panel made the recommendation to delete any duplication of the DDO1 provisions in the Development Plan Overlay Schedule but include a reference to applicable DDO1 requirements and retain specific provisions that add to DDO1.**

Officer Response

21. Officers agree with the changes recommended by the Panel to refine the content of the Schedule to the DPO. Council officers however, disagree with the Panel's view to include reference to a 'preferred' maximum height as the Minister's authorisation to prepare and exhibit the Amendment required it to be consistent with any future changes to the planning controls for the Yarra River. DDO1 was revised and gazetted on 24 February, 2017 and contained mandatory height and setback provisions.
22. The proponent emphasised that DDO1 is interim (or temporary) and could therefore change in the future. Officers, however, consider that it can be assumed - due to the ongoing work and collaboration with DELWP towards the protection of the state significant Yarra River corridor from inappropriate development - that DDO1 will become permanent in some form. The mandatory heights and setbacks provisions contained in DDO1 reflect the community's (and Council's) strong desire for certainty in planning controls.
23. Council agreed during the Panel that duplication of (the general) provisions of DDO1 in the Schedule to the DPO is not absolutely necessary and some elements of the schedule can be deleted provided that the 25 metre building height control is inserted, as exhibited.

Traffic

24. The issue considered by the Panel was whether the potential development outcomes under Amendment C219 would have a significant impact on traffic in the local area and whether the proponents should be required to conduct traffic impact assessments and make a proportional contribution to traffic mitigation works – in particular, a signalised intersection at Johnston Street.
25. The Panel considered the issue of traffic for Amendments C218 and C219 simultaneously.
26. For Amendments C218 and C219, the evidence provided by Council's expert (GTA Consultants) and the experts engaged by both sets of proponents, concluded that the impact of future development on the overall traffic volumes would be minimal and that it was unreasonable to impose the cost of a signalised intersection on either one or both sets of proponents.
27. Based on their traffic modelling, GTA Consultants estimated that the additional traffic added to the network by assumed development outcomes for Amendments C218 and C219 is approximately 3% for the two combined amendments.
28. The VicRoads representative acknowledged that in light of the traffic evidence it would not be equitable to require the proponents to fund installation of new traffic signals. VicRoads relinquished the requirement that the proponents pay for works to be carried out for a signalised intersection.
29. **The Panel made the following recommendation:**
 - (a) ***Retain the provision in Amendments C218 and C219 requiring the proponent to provide a traffic and car parking impact assessment but delete reference to it being to the satisfaction of VicRoads and the requirement for proponents to contribute to mitigation works.***

Officer Response

30. Council officers acknowledge the Panel's advice and commentary in response to the evidence presented on traffic. It is clear that there is an existing traffic issue which occurs mainly during peak periods and that a signalised intersection is, in the view of Council's expert, needed now. However, it was concluded that it is not the direct responsibility of either proponent.
31. The amendments may have some impact on the local road network and as such a future permit application should consider those impacts and whether any mitigation measures should be introduced as a result.

32. The changes to the Schedule to the DPO in Attachment 3, which are recommended for adoption by Council, include the following changes in response to the Panel recommendation:

Panel Recommendation	Officer Recommended Change for Adoption
<p>Retain the provision requiring the proponent to provide a traffic and car parking impact assessment but delete reference to it being to the satisfaction of VicRoads and the requirement for proponents to contribute to mitigation works.</p>	<p>The following wording has been inserted into the schedule (DPO14) which officers believe is acceptable in relation to varying the Panel's recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the impact of any additional traffic on the surrounding road network, and how any necessary mitigation measures should be addressed. (Change 1 – found in the schedule to the DPO)</i> <p>The following additional dot point has also been inserted in the Schedule to the DPO: (A Traffic Management Report identifying)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>other mitigation measures identified through a traffic and car parking report. (Change 1a)</i>

Traffic Further Actions/Council Projects

33. On January 17, 2018, VicRoads announced via their web site, funding for traffic lights at the Abbotsford Convent. This follows several years of advocacy to the State Government by Council.
34. These lights are in addition to lights already in operation at Paterson Street in Abbotsford, (85m to the east of Trenerry Crescent) and Nicholson Street (325m to the west). This means there will be 3 signalised intersections along Johnston Street within a length of around 400m.
35. The combination of lights would have the cumulative effect of calming traffic along Johnston Street, but not necessarily ease traffic conditions for Trenerry Crescent, where the key concern is pedestrian and cyclist safety.
36. A further traffic study to determine the broad network conditions relating to traffic originating from (or travelling through) Clifton Hill towards (and from) Johnston Street is recommended and this would take the form of a future or updated Local Area Place Management Plan (LAPM).

Issues Specific to Amendment C219

37. Issues specified to Amendment C219 are:
- (a) Heritage;
 - (b) Height;
 - (c) Form and content of Amendment C219 and DPO; and
 - (d) Requirement for public shared pathway.
38. The officer recommended changes that are discussed in this report are numbered (as changes) within the Schedule to the DPO and on the Panel recommended version of the Indicative Framework Plan (Attachment 3 and 6 respectively).

Heritage

39. The Panel has recommended that Council adopt the citation (Statement of Significance) for 112-124 Trenerry Crescent, as provided by GJM Heritage and submitted to the Panel by Council officers. In order to give the Statement of Significance effect, it needs to be referenced in in clauses 21.11 and 22.02 in the Planning Scheme, as set out in attachments 7 and 8.

40. The former Austral Silk and Cotton Mills (Austral) building at 112-124 Trenerry Crescent is graded as *Individually Significant* and is part of HO337.
41. The Panel, having regard to the expert evidence report submitted by the proponent, recommended the following change to the Indicative Framework Plan that affects the heritage elements of the site at 112-124 Trenerry Crescent:
 - (a) addition (or wrap-around) of a building envelope along the northern façade of the heritage building based on the proponent's heritage expert report; and
 - (b) removal of reference to an 8m height limit for any building envelopes surrounding the heritage building.
42. The Panel also recommended removing from the Schedule, the need for a Conservation Management Plan, as a Heritage Impact Statement is the standard report to produce for a permit application involving a heritage building.
43. It should be noted that an expert report was submitted to the Panel but the proponent's expert was not called to give evidence or allowed to be cross examined by Council's legal representative. Therefore the views contained within the report were not open to questioning during the planning Panel process, which was a point made to the Panel by Council.
44. The expert's view relates to the wrap-around building envelope. The expert report justified the additional building envelope by noting that there were (at some previous time) industrial/warehouse buildings to the north of the current heritage building and in fact, the two sites were almost completely occupied with warehouse buildings from varying periods.

Officer Response

45. Officers agree that a requirement for a Conservation Management Plan is unnecessary as a Heritage Impact Statement is more appropriate and agree to the changes to the Schedule to the DPO as proposed by the Panel.
46. Officers however, disagree with a number of graphic changes to the Indicative Framework Plan that relate to the heritage building. Further independent heritage advice was sought in relation to the recommendations. The independent advice supports Council officers proposed variations to the Panel's recommendations (found as Attachment 6).
47. The post-Panel advice received from GJM Heritage comments on the negative impacts of both the potential for built form at the northern side of the heritage building and the removal of the 8m height limit at the eastern interface:
 - (a) *it is our view that a development constructed to the north of the heritage building in accordance with the recommended Indicative Framework Plan is unacceptable in heritage terms; and*
 - (b) *a discretionary height control of 8m is necessary to ensure that the height of any new development east of the former Austral Silk and Cotton Mills Factory/Warehouse does not reduce its landmark qualities and visual prominence when viewed from key public vantage points along the Yarra River.*
48. The DPO Schedule recommended by officers for adoption by Council includes the following changes:

Panel Recommendation	Officer Recommended Change for Adoption
<p>Insert an additional key view-point on the Indicative Framework Plan at Freeway edge</p> <p>Identify a future building envelope (in addition to the one already at the rear) at the northern edge of the heritage building</p> <p>Remove reference to an 8m height limit on the pink building envelope in the legend</p>	<p>Delete added view point as it cannot be achieved if the site at 126-142 Trenerry is developed (of minor consequence to the plan) (Change 2)</p> <p>Remove added/extended building envelope as conflicts with the objective to retain a view corridor through the site as well as the heritage advice from GJM heritage. (Change 3)</p> <p>Expert evidence by the proponent noted that the southernmost part of the heritage building has a façade facing Trenerry Crescent. Views of this facade should be protected. Council’s expert agreed with this and as such the Schedule DPO has been amended to protect views to southernmost part of the heritage building (Change 4).</p> <p>Reinstate 8m height limit in legend (Change 5) in accordance with the advice received from GJM Heritage in relation to a suitable built form response at the eastern side of the heritage building.</p>

Maximum Heights

49. The Panel accepted a revised version of the Schedule to the DPO, submitted by the proponent that has significantly modified the Indicative Framework Plan, including a preferred 25m maximum height (not including the street wall height).

Officer Response

50. The Panel’s version of the plan allows for 25m across the entire site, because it removes the setback lines that were previously on the Plan to illustrate the transition in maximum heights across the site. This is inconsistent with DDO1 which includes setbacks and transitional heights towards the river. The Panel’s version does not comply with the conditional authorisation as it is inconsistent with DDO1. Indeed the transition in building heights towards the Yarra River were part of the previous DDO 1.
51. The post-exhibition version of Amendment C219 expresses a maximum height of 25m for the two affected sites, which was drafted and amended in accordance with DDO1, as specified in the conditional authorisation letter to Council.
52. The change to the hatching across the site now confuses where it should apply and what it means for built form on the site. It is simpler to remove the hatching, reinstate the setback lines, and combine wording in the legend relating to the provisions of DDO1 and SLO1 with the general built form aspirations for the site (Change 8 – Attachment 6).
53. The heights, setbacks and other elements on the Indicative Framework Plan do not need to be expressed as either preferred or mandatory because of how the Development Plan Overlay operates.
54. The Schedule to the Development Plan Overlay states the following requirement:
- (a) *The development plan must be generally in accordance with the Indicative Framework Plan as shown in Figure 1 to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.*
55. In addition the parent clause (43.04) to the DPO states:
- (a) *A permit granted must:*
- (i) *be generally in accordance with the development plan; and*
- (ii) *include any conditions or requirements specified in a schedule to this overlay.*

- 56. Simply labelling the maximum heights on the plan is sufficient, and as stated previously, DDO1 applies already.
- 57. The Panel also included wording in the schedule that refers to the need to consider DDO1 – again, this removes the need to identify a preferred maximum height on the Indicative Framework Plan.
- 58. The DPO Schedule recommended by officers for adoption by Council includes the following changes:

Panel Recommendation	Officer Recommended Change for Adoption
Label maximum height as preferred 25m	Remove reference to “preferred” 25m height limit as it is inconsistent with DDO1 and non-compliant with conditional authorisation – label as 25m maximum. (Change 6)
Label street wall height as preferred (northern site)	Remove word “preferred” (Change 7)
Extend hatching south of property boundary (126-142 Trenerry Crescent)	Remove hatching which has been extended by panel and combine wording in legend with first entry in legend relating to site are (Site Area – DDO1 applies) (Change 8)

Requirement for Public Shared Pathway

- 59. The Panel concluded that there was not a strong justification for a public pathway:
 - (a) *The Panel accepts that the gap between the buildings at 112-124 and 126-142 Trenerry Crescent provides the best of few opportunities to view the river corridor from the street. However, the Panel does not accept the gap should be preserved forever as it is today.*
- 60. The Panel report also provided commentary that supports a view corridor to be retained:
 - (a) *The Panel accepts the merit of utilising the gap between buildings on the site(s) to allow view lines to the river corridor but does not support the pedestrian and cycling link on the property at 112-124 Trenerry Crescent as an essential element in achieving a better experience in accessing the river corridor; and*
 - (b) *The Panel has amended the Indicative Framework Plan to identify a view corridor but has deleted the requirement for the link.*

Panel Recommendation:

- (c) **Delete the requirement for the publicly accessible shared path shown on the Indicative Framework Plan and adopt the wording of the Panel preferred form of the Indicative Plan at Appendix E.**

Officer Response

- 61. Identifying opportunities to improve linkages to the Yarra River corridor is identified in State Planning Policy (Clause 12.05-2 Yarra River Protection):
 - (a) *Retain and enhance people’s enjoyment of the river and its environment by:*
 - (i) *ensuring linkages and public access to the river and its parklands are maintained, enhanced and new links created where appropriate.*
- 62. The opportunity for a shared public link is also identified in the *Johnston Street Local Area Plan* as an opportunity to strengthen the network of pedestrian and cycling links in close proximity to the Capital City Trail and to utilise existing opportunities to provide pedestrian/cycling links through larger sites, which is suitable in this location.
- 63. The current pedestrian path along Trenerry Crescent becomes difficult to navigate at the north-west corner of the site which is a sharp right turn along a narrow footpath at this location. If the shared public link is not achieved in the future, the improvement to the north-west corner of the site should be undertaken at a minimum.

64. The Panel’s recommended changes in relation to ‘form and content’ to the DPO Schedule are generally accepted with the exception, that the Vision section of the DPO, should include a reference to the publicly accessible link opportunity. This provides a consistency between the DPO and the Indicative Framework Plan.
65. The Panel’s recommended changes to the Indicative Framework Plan, in relation to the public link opportunity, are not supported by officers for the following reasons:
 - (a) The link is not legible, it should be more clearly illustrated; and
 - (b) The wording relating to the public link being “negotiated with the land owner” should be revised to achieve an improved planning control. When a Development Plan is submitted this matter would be “negotiated with the land owner”, prior to approval.
66. The DPO Schedule recommended by officers for adoption by Council includes the following changes:

Panel Recommendation	Officer Recommended Change for Adoption
<p>Remove all references to the requirement to provide a shared link from the Schedule to the DPO</p> <p>Modify references to the shared link on the Indicative Framework Plan</p>	<p>Officers agree with some of the changes but have re-inserted the following wording into the schedule under the Vision section to establish a relationship to the <i>potential</i> for a shared link within the Schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Explore the potential for a publicly accessible shared link as identified on the Indicative Framework Plan. (Change 9 – Vision section of Schedule to DPO)</i> <p>The symbol representing the shared link opportunity has been modified (Change 10) and the reference in the legend also modified (Change 11) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Public link opportunity”

Form and Content

Changes to the Indicative Framework Plan (IFP)

67. The Panel considered evidence from the proponent that reduced the amount of graphic details on the Indicative Framework Plan and some of the changes are supported by Council officers as the plan has gone through several iterations before the endorsed post-exhibition version submitted to the Panel.
68. Changes (suggested by the proponent) to the wording of various components within the legend were accepted by the Panel without any explanation in the Panel report or during the Panel hearing.
69. The Panel recommended the following change in order to remove repetition with DDO1:
 - (a) The removal of the setback lines along with the 18m and 11m maximum heights.
70. This suggests that in the absence of DDO1, the maximum (preferred) height across the entire site is 25m without any transition in height towards to river corridor. The Panel’s recommended change appears to have overlooked this possibility, keeping in mind that both sets of proponents repeatedly emphasised the interim nature of DDO1 during the Panel process. Again, there is a need to comply with the conditional authorisation for the amendments.
71. The Panel recommended version of the IFP also modifies the graphic relating to the view corridor through the site. However, the poorly modified graphic creates a conflict with another graphic element which was discussed previously (the heritage envelope identified in pink).
72. The view corridor was discussed previously in relation to the *Public Shared Pathway (or Shared Link Opportunity)* and the Panel provided support for the provision of spacing between buildings to enable the view corridor to be achieved.

Changes to the Schedule to the DPO

- 73. Within Section 2.0 – Conditions and Requirements for Permits – there is a requirement for a Landscape Plan but the Panel’s recommended version deletes all of the detail that the landscape plan would include. Officers consider that this change is unnecessary and unjustified as it is a reasonable requirement at the permit stage.
- 74. The DPO Schedule recommended by officers for adoption by Council includes the following changes:

Panel Recommendation	Officer Recommended Change for Adoption
Delete the setback reference lines that relate to DDO1 and identify the transition of height across the site	Retain the setback lines as they identify the desired transition of building height across the site. (Change 12)
Change graphic that relates to the retention of a view corridor through the site	Delete faint arrow and apply hatching across an area that indicates where view corridor is to be retained (Change 13)
Remove detail in schedule to DPO relating to the requirement for a landscape plan at the permit stage	Reinstate detail (at Clause 2.0) as is considered reasonable and a good outcome considering the context of the site which abuts the Yarra River corridor (Change 14)
Change wording that relates to improving the north-west corner for pedestrians and cyclists	Modify wording to make more certain and clarify that this is in negotiation with <u>Council</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Improve corner for pedestrians and cyclists through discussions with Council – (Change 15)</i>

External Consultation

- 75. The Amendment has been consulted upon in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Planning and Environment Act and submitters have been notified as the Amendment has progressed through to the Planning Panel stage.

Internal Consultation (One Yarra)

- 76. The Amendment has had input from statutory planning and the traffic (engineering and sustainable transport) department at Council.

Financial Implications

- 77. The Amendment costs are being covered by the proponent.

Economic Implications

- 78. The Amendment would have positive economic effects on the local area through employment opportunities created on the site.

Sustainability Implications

- 79. The Amendment encourages the use of sustainable transport initiatives to reduce the impacts of traffic on the local area.

Social Implications

- 80. There are no direct social implications.

Human Rights Implications

- 81. There are no known human rights implications.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

82. The Amendment has been consulted upon through a variety of media options that Council offers including accessible web pages and translation services outlined on fact sheets and letters distributed as part of the amendment process.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

83. The Amendment implements the following Council Plan objective:
- (a) *Manage change in Yarra's built form and activity centres through community engagement, land use planning and appropriate structure planning processes.*

Legal Implications

84. The Amendment has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.

Options

85. There are four main options for Councillors to consider in relation to adopting the Amendment:
- (a) adopt the Amendment with the changes recommended by the Planning Panel; or
 - (b) adopt the Amendment with the officer recommended changes which take into account the Panel's recommendations with some variations; or
 - (c) adopt the Amendment as exhibited; or
 - (d) abandon the amendment.

Conclusion

86. The Panel has considered the Amendment (C219) at a Planning Panel that occurred in August 2017 and has made a number of recommendations for changes as outlined in this report.
87. In accordance with Section 27 of the Planning and Environment Act, Council must have regard to and consider the recommendations of the Planning Panel report before deciding to adopt an amendment with or without changes.
88. Council officers have reviewed the recommendations, sought further advice heritage and legal advice, and made subsequent changes to the Amendment in order to:
- (a) maintain the integrity of the Amendment and the purpose for introducing the Development Plan Overlay to the site (Schedule 14);
 - (b) comply with the conditional authorisation which was specifically aimed at ensuring that heights and setbacks were consistent with DDO1, which is mandatory in nature;
 - (c) comply with the Minister's Direction on the Form and Content of Planning Schemes – some of the Panel's recommended changes were put forward on this basis and are generally accepted by Council officers;
 - (d) improve the graphic content of the Indicative Framework Plan; and
 - (e) respond to expert advice that Council had received in relation to heritage matters for the two sites, and to submissions from community members expressing concerns about the heritage building on the site and how it is responded to through the creation of a Development Plan for the site.
89. Officers have concluded that many of the recommended changes by the Panel result in a poor planning control which does not comply with the conditional authorisation for the Amendment.
90. The use of the DPO as a planning tool was agreed to through discussion between Council officers and the proponent to provide a level of certainty in terms of the potential outcomes on the site(s), particularly as the DPO removes third party notification and review rights during the planning permit stage.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council notes the report of officers in relation to the Panel's findings in relation to Amendment C219; and the findings and recommendations of the Panel regarding Amendment C219.
2. That Council:
 - (a) having considered the report of the Planning Panel, adopts Amendment C219 in accordance with the officer recommended changes to the Amendment (found as Attachment 3);
 - (b) adopts the Statement of Significance (citation) for 112-124 Trenerry Crescent and the changes to Clause 21.11 and Clause 22.02 (Attachments 7 and 8 respectively) of the Yarra Planning Scheme to include the citation as a reference document; and
 - (c) submits the adopted amendment to the Minister for Planning for approval, in accordance with Section 31 of the Act.
3. That Council note the reasons for varying from the Panel report as outlined in the report.
4. That Officers notify submitters to Amendment C219 of Council's decision.

CONTACT OFFICER: Evan Burman
TITLE: Strategic Planner
TEL: 9205 5075

Attachments

- 1 Revised DPO Schedule C219 Endorsed Post-Exhibition
- 2 Yarra C218 and C219 Panel Report
- 3 Amendment C219 Final Version for Adoption
- 4 GJM C218 C219 Post Panel Advice 25 Jan 2018
- 5 GJM Heritage citation - 112-124 Trenerry Crescent C219
- 6 Yarra C219 Panel Recommended Plan (Officer Changes)
- 7 Municipal Strategic Statement Clause 21.11 - Amendment C219
- 8 Development Guidelines for sites subject to the Heritage Overlay

11.2 Update on recent Wellington Street Copenhagen bike lane tender

Trim Record Number: D18/56418

Responsible Officer: Assistant Director Planning and Place Making

Purpose

1. To brief Councillors on the outcome of the recent tender process to construct a Copenhagen bicycle lane on Wellington Street between Gipps Street and Johnston Street, Collingwood.

Background

2. In late 2009, Council endorsed the City of Yarra Bicycle Strategy 2010-2015 which focused on increasing cyclist numbers, broadening the rider demographic and improving safety.
3. The Wellington Street route is part of a major North-South route linking the City of Melbourne's Copenhagen lanes in LaTrobe Street and Albert Street in the city to Queens Parade and Clifton Hill. The Yarra Bicycle Strategy includes an action item to improve the bike facilities along the Wellington Street corridor and describes a separated treatment from Johnston Street to Victoria Parade which has a distance of 1.1km. It should be noted that a full Copenhagen style bike route to Queens Parade from Victoria Parade is not possible as there is insufficient space for a separated facility north of Johnston Street.
4. The 2009 Bicycle Strategy gave the Wellington Street project 5 stars out of 5 for its rider recruitment, retention, transport, connectivity and safety characteristics.
5. Between 17 April 2012 and 5th August 2014 seven council reports were produced regarding the Copenhagen bike lane proposal. These reports covered a number of matters including:
 - (a) an options assessment;
 - (b) consultation approaches;
 - (c) feedback from consultation phases;
 - (d) implications of not proceeding with the project;
 - (e) nominations for a Wellington Street south Traffic, Parking and Advisory group; and
 - (f) recommendations from the advisory group about how to proceed with the project.
6. On the 5 August 2014 Council resolved to deliver the permanent Copenhagen style option in two discreet phases. The first phase would be the southern section of Wellington Street between Victoria Parade and Gipps Street. That decision considered a number of factors including cost, budgetary impacts, synergies with the Victoria Parade bus lane project (being delivered by VicRoads), lack of prior experience in delivering Copenhagen lanes and significant stakeholder interest in the project.
7. The Copenhagen lane on the southern section of Wellington Street between Victoria Parade and Gipps Street was completed for \$650k in 2015.
8. On 6 October 2015, Council resolved the following:

That Council:

 - (a) *notes that in 2013 Council had instructed Officers to prepare the detailed design for permanent Copenhagen bicycle lanes in Wellington Street between Victoria Parade and Johnston Street;*
 - (b) *notes the completion of the Wellington St Copenhagen Bicycle Lanes between Victoria Parade and Gipps Street;*
 - (c) *refers the construction of the Copenhagen Bicycle Lanes between Gipps and Johnston Streets to the 2016/17 Budget for consideration;*

(d) *instructs Officers that, subject to the project being included in the adopted 2016/2017 Council Budget:*

(i) *to immediately proceed with finalising design plans;*

(ii) *to then commence the planning application process for the construction of Copenhagen Bicycle Lanes between Gipps Street and Johnston Street, and report to Council for planning permit approval (if this is required); and*

(iii) *to upon obtaining a planning permit (if required) OR if a planning permit is not required, to immediately call tenders for the project for construction in the 2016/17 budget period and report to Council for awarding of the contract; and*

(e) *explores scope for external funding for the project.*

9. In 2016 the Bike Strategy Refresh was endorsed by Council. This was an addendum to the original strategy and identified projects and programs for delivery from 2016 to 2021. The 'completion' of the Wellington Street Copenhagen lane was given a priority rating of 5 stars out of 5 following consultation with the Bicycle Advisory Committee.
10. In January 2018 an advertisement was placed calling for tender submissions to potentially construct the remaining section of the Copenhagen bicycle on Wellington Street pending a Council resolution to proceed with the project.
11. Two submissions to construct the project were received and both exceeded \$1m which triggers the requirement for a planning permit. Details of the relevant planning provisions are provided at Appendix A. In summary:
 - (a) an application for a planning permit will be lodged to carry out Roadworks within a Heritage Overlay;
 - (b) VicRoads consent to the project will be sought and included in the planning permit application;
 - (c) Council is the Responsible Authority and will determine the application;
 - (d) Clause 43.01-4 exempts the application from the Notice and Review provisions of the Act; that is, there is no opportunity for third party objections, nor for an objector appeal;
 - (e) as the application does not require notice, Officers can determine the application under delegation or, Councillors may choose to call up the application and have it decided at an IDAC or Full Council meeting; and
 - (f) any third party comments received are not able to have Council's determination reviewed at the Victorian Civil & Administrative Tribunal (VCAT).
12. Based on internal discussions with Council's Planning Department, it is expected that the permit process would take between 3-6 months. It is expected that it would be necessary to retender the project to obtain current prices at that time. If the current approach (to extend the current Copenhagen style infrastructure) remains Council's direction, and a planning permit is issued, it is anticipated that a report could come before Council seeking award of a contract in November/December 2018. If approval is given; construction could commence subsequent to this and funded across the 18/19 and 19/20 financial years (i.e. constructed in mid-2019).

External Consultation

13. No external consultation was required or undertaken regarding this for information only update on the Wellington Street bike lane project.

Internal Consultation (One Yarra)

14. The Statutory Planning team has been consulted to confirm the planning provisions.

Financial Implications

15. There are no significant financial implications associated specifically with obtaining a planning permit for the Copenhagen bike lane. The significant cost of such a project is at construction stage.

Economic Implications

16. There are no economic implications associated with obtaining a planning permit for the Copenhagen bike lane.

Sustainability Implications

17. There are no sustainability implications associated with obtaining a planning permit for the Copenhagen bike lane.

Social Implications

18. It is noted that this project has attracted both strong support and strong opposition from different sectors of the community. The cycling community largely supports the project; but some local businesses and enterprises oppose the project.

Human Rights Implications

19. There are no human rights implications.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

20. No external communications with CALD communities are required or undertaken regarding this for information only update on the Wellington Street bike lane project.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

21. The Wellington Street bicycle lane project (from Victoria Parade to Johnston Street) has been identified in the 2010/15 Bicycle Strategy and 2016 Bicycle Strategy Refresh.

Legal Implications

22. There are no known legal implications associated with this report.

Other Issues

23. There are no other issues.

Options

24. No options are presented as this report is for information only.

Conclusion

25. This report details the outcome of the recent tender process to construct a Copenhagen bicycle lane on Wellington Street between Gipps Street and Johnston Street. In January 2018 an advertisement was placed calling for tender submissions to potentially construct the remaining section of the Copenhagen bicycle lane pending a Council resolution to proceed with the project.
26. Two tender submissions to construct the project were received and both exceeded \$1m which triggers the requirement of a planning permit.
27. It is expected the planning permit process would take between 3- 6 months to a determination stage.
28. If the current approach (to extend the current Copenhagen style infrastructure) remains Council's direction, and a planning permit is issued, it is anticipated that a report could come before Council seeking award of a contract in November/December 2018. If approval is given; construction would commence on a date in 2019 and occur across the two financial years of 18/19 and 19/20.
29. It is noted that this project has attracted both support and opposition from different sectors of the community.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council:
 - (a) note the update report on the recent tender for the second stage of a Copenhagen separated bike lane from Gipps Street to Johnston Street, Collingwood;
 - (b) note that due to the tender prices that a planning permit would be required for the construction of that stage of works; and
 - (c) note that a planning permit application will now be lodged for the proposal.

CONTACT OFFICER: Simon Exon
TITLE: Strategic Transport Coordinator
TEL: 9205 5781

Attachments

- 1 Planning Permit Consideration Wellington Street

11.3 Accessibility of Yarra Railway Stations

Executive Summary

Purpose

To present the report *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* (Appraisal Report) and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data* for Council's endorsement, and to undertake advocacy for recommended upgrades at the railway stations.

Key Issues

Council resolved to receive a Council Report together with the *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data*, following the Delegates Report from the Disability Advisory Committee tabled by Cr Daniel Nguyen at Council meeting on 6 March 2018.

Council's Disability Advisory Committee (DAC) has been advocating for the rights of equitable access to public transport that meets the needs of the whole community, including people with disability, and instigated a project to conduct community access appraisal of Yarra's railway stations.

The appraisal was based on eight accessibility categories that demonstrate what is compliant, what needs improvement, hazards, and priorities for upgrades.

The Appraisal Report provides evidence that none of the nine railway stations in the City of Yarra meet all disability compliance requirements. People with mobility issues and who use wheelchairs, scooters or walking frames have difficulty in accessing Yarra's railway stations and their safety is compromised. The purpose of this evidence was to advocate for accessibility upgrades at railway stations in the City of Yarra.

Council's Strategic foresight in the *Council Plan 2017-2021* supports improvement to 'accessibility to public transport for people with mobility needs and older people (p. 59); and expresses commitment to 'Advocate to the state government for improved accessibility to public transport services' (p.59).

Following consideration of the report, DAC is recommending that Council endorse this report; forward it to PTV, Metro Trains and other relevant organisations; and engage in consultations with the relevant authorities advocating for upgrades to Yarra's railway stations as outlined in the report.

Financial Implications

Financial implications refer to approximately 100 hours of in-kind cost in terms of Officers' time when pursuing advocacy on endorsement of the report.

PROPOSAL

That Council endorses the *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data*; and undertake advocacy for upgrades at the railway stations in the municipality as recommended in the Appraisal Report.

11.3 Accessibility of Yarra Railway Stations

Trim Record Number: D18/44627

Responsible Officer: Acting Director Community Wellbeing

Purpose

1. To present the report titled *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* (Appraisal Report); and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data*, developed by Public Transport Sub-committee of the Disability Advisory Committee (DAC), for Council's consideration and endorsement.
2. To gain Council support to advocate with the relevant authorities for upgrades recommended in the above report towards achieving improved accessibility at railway stations in Yarra's municipality.

Background

3. At the Council Meeting on 6 March 2018 Cr Daniel Nguyen tabled a Delegates Report from the Disability Advisory Committee, delivered by the committee member, David Brant. The purpose of this Delegates Report was to inform Council about a project instigated by DAC's Public Transport Sub-committee. It involved appraisal of accessibility of all railway stations in the municipality due to DAC's perception that people with disability are limiting their use of public transport in Yarra. The project aimed at collecting and analysing data to compile a report with evidence on the issues of compromised safety experienced by commuters with disability. In response to the above Delegates Report, Council resolved to receive a Council Report together with the *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* (Attachment 1) and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data* (Attachment 2).

Appraisal Report

4. The purpose, methodology, data analysis, findings and recommendations for accessibility improvements are outlined in the Attachment 1 - *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* and the Attachment 2 - *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data*. These were endorsed by the Disability Advisory Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2017.
5. The railway stations were appraised against eight disability access categories including:
 - (a) TGSIs (Tactile Ground Surface Indicators – raised dots on ground at top and bottom of ramps, entrance points & direction of path for people who are blind);
 - (b) wheelchair access point (which is located at the front end on a platform);
 - (c) shelter (over the wheelchair access point);
 - (d) ramp gradient, width and handrails;
 - (e) signage; and
 - (f) accessible parking bays (i.e. 'disabled parking').
6. In addition to these categories, potential hazards have been identified in areas of:
 - (a) narrowness of platforms at wheelchair access points;
 - (b) steepness of ramps;
 - (c) obstructions on pathways;
 - (d) visibility issues; and
 - (e) absence of TGSI; and trip hazards.
7. Consideration was also given to the level of complexity of these improvements, and priorities for short, medium and long term upgrades were identified.

8. Several new stations in Melbourne including Tarneit, Williams Landing and Wyndham Vale, were also assessed as they represent improved accessibility standards and are best practice examples for all Victorian stations.
9. The significance of this report rests on the fact that all data and evidence is based on direct experiences of people with physical and sensory disabilities who conducted the appraisals at each station. Their particular access requirements were used as an experiential approach to data collection. For example, entry and egress from trains on platforms was conducted by members with walking frames and wheelchairs.
10. The findings were that none of the nine railway stations in the City of Yarra meet all disability compliance requirements. Areas of concerns are listed on page 10 in Attachment 1.
11. Commuters with mobility issues and who use wheelchairs, scooters or walking frames have difficulty in accessing Yarra's railway stations. An example of their safety issues is demonstrated in the photo below.



North Richmond Railway Station, Platform 1

12. DAC calls on Council to engage in consultations with authorities involved in the delivery of public transport services and infrastructure to do more than meet standards, but deliver best practice solutions to ensure safety and accessibility for all community members.

External Consultation

13. Two DAC members, Mary Rispoli and David Brant, were leading the site visits and organising other DAC volunteers with different disability access requirements (i.e. people using electric wheelchair, or walking frame) to join site visits. The Team reported their findings through DAC and this broadened input to twelve other community members.
14. The Appraisal Report includes a case study (p.26 in Attachment 1) from an Ambassador at the Summer Foundation, who is a Yarra resident and his advocate represented him at a DAC meeting.

Internal Consultation (One Yarra)

15. The DAC Public Transport Sub-committee engaged with Council staff to provide support and advice on the project planning, technical expertise, data analysis, and compiling of the final report. This support was provided by Council's officers from Strategic Transport, Parking Management and Aged and Disability Services.

Financial Implications

16. The Team dedicated voluntary hours for approximately 40 site visits and 30 meetings over the three year period.

17. After endorsement of the Appraisal Report further financial implications would involve Officers' workload to instigate systemic advocacy for implementation of recommended improvements. This may amount to in-kind of approximately 100 hours dedicated for drafting correspondence, attending meetings and providing advice on implementation.

Economic Implications

18. Improved accessibility at railway stations would increase community access to activity centres and thus contribute to greater business activities.

Sustainability Implications

19. More people would use public transport in place of the current option available to people with disability of point to point car or taxi travels.

Social Implications

20. The recommend access improvements would improve disability access, community participation and independence for people with disability, our aging population, parents with prams, shopping buggy users and those with temporary injuries or other conditions. Safe public transport travel encourages freedom of movement for all commuters and adds to cohesion of the community.

Human Rights Implications

21. Two principles under the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities* (Vic. 2006) directly support the right of people with disability to equal access to public transport. They include:
 - (a) recognition and equality before the law ('Measures taken to assist people who are disadvantaged because of discrimination ... '(p.3); and
 - (b) freedom of movement – 'people have the right to ... move freely ...' (p.3).

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

22. Disability is prevalent across all community groups, gender and age. Recommended improvements include improved signage, shelter protection, etc. These will have positive impact on commuters from CALD communities.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

23. The Recommendations in the appraisal report are consistent with the Objective Six in the *Council Plan 2017 – 2021*, which reads: *A connected Yarra – City of Yarra, a place where connectivity and travel options are environmentally sustainable, integrated and well-designed* (p.56). Under this Objective Council's commitment to improved accessibility is demonstrated in:
 - (a) Strategy 6.4 – Improve accessibility to public transport for people with mobility needs and older people (p. 59); and
 - (b) Initiative 6.4 – Advocate to the state government for improved accessibility to public transport services (p.59).

Legal Implications

24. Non-discrimination in access to public transport is supported by the provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cmth) and Disability Act 2006 (Vic).
25. The Victorian government has placed expectations on local governments "*to improve the autonomy, independence, and social inclusion of Victorians with a disability*" (*State Disability Plan 2017 – 2020*, p.14).
26. There are no foreseen legal implications to Council for endorsing the Appraisal Report and advocating to State government authorities for improved accessibility to railway stations in Yarra.

Other Issues

27. Poor disability access to public transport is one of the key barrier limiting options, choices and opportunities to social participation of people with disability. This in turn leads to segregation, isolation and poor health outcomes.
28. The scope of this appraisal did not include the public toilets located at railway stations. The DAC has identified this as a separate project. Current knowledge is that toilets are open where there is a station attendant (i.e. Clifton and Richmond) and closed at other stations. The provision of accessible toilets is an important access aspect to the public transport system and warrants specific review.

Options

29. Council endorses the Appraisal Report and its Appendix undertaken by community members of the DAC, and that Council is not assuming responsibility for unforeseen consequences in relation to the content of the report.

Conclusion

30. It is consistent with the strategic planning of Council to advocate for the rights of equitable access to public transport that meets the needs of the whole community, including people with disability.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council:
 - (a) acknowledges outstanding effort of the Disability Advisory Committee's Public Transport Sub-committee;
 - (b) endorses the *Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra* and the *Appendix 3 Appraisal Data*;
 - (c) forwards the above report to PTV, Metro Trams and other relevant organisations on behalf of DAC; and
 - (d) undertake advocacy with PTV and Metro Trams for upgrades recommended in the above report.

CONTACT OFFICER: Adrian Murphy
TITLE: Manager Aged and Disability Services
TEL: 9205 5450

Attachments

- 1 Community Appraisal of Disability Access at Railway Stations in the City of Yarra
- 2 Appendix 3 Appraisal Data

11.4 Community Grants 2018/19 Initiation Report

Executive Summary

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview and seek endorsement of the process, objectives, priority areas and assessment procedures for the Annual Grants 2019, Small Project Grants 2018/19 and Room To Create Responsive Grants 2018/19; and outline and seek endorsement of the budget for the Annual Grants 2019, Small Project Grants 2018/19 and Room To Create Responsive Grants 2018/19, pending 2018/19 budget approval.

Key Issues

The Community Grants aim to support community initiatives and projects that address local issues, increase community resilience, build social capital and enhance the wellbeing of City of Yarra residents. Social outcomes such as knowledge and skills development, increased levels of resilience and celebration of cultural diversity are also aims of the grants program. The grants program is one of the key strategies in which Council addresses social cohesion and supports projects which aim to strengthen the community.

Financial Implications

An amount of \$878,650 for the Annual Grants 2019, \$75,000 for the Small Project Grants 2018/19 and \$25,000 for the Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19 are included for endorsement pending 2018/19 budget approval.

PROPOSAL

That Council endorses the funding allocation to the Annual Grants 2019, Small Project Grants 2018/19 and Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19 and the guidelines, assessment, monitoring and evaluation processes for each of the programs.

11.4 Community Grants 2018/19 Initiation Report

Trim Record Number: D18/46626

Responsible Officer: Community Partnerships Unit Manager

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to:
 - (a) provide an overview and seek endorsement of the process, objectives, priority areas and assessment procedures for the Annual Grants 2019, Small Project Grants 2018/19, and Room To Create Responsive Grants 2018/19; and
 - (b) outline and seek endorsement of the budget for the Annual Grants 2019, Small Project Grants 2018/19 and Room To Create Responsive Grants 2018/19, pending 2018/19 budget approval.

Background

2. Yarra City Council's Community Grants Program (the Grants Program) is a significant investment in the community. It is one of Victoria's leading local government grant programs, through which Yarra has established a reputation for its strong support for the community. The Community Grants Program aims are to:
 - (a) develop partnerships between Council and community groups to achieve Council's strategic directions;
 - (b) direct resources to both the emerging and specific needs of disadvantaged groups;
 - (c) develop a positive approach to the resolution of local social issues;
 - (d) support local groups, activities and community connectedness; and
 - (e) support community organisations to develop skills and increase community participation.
3. The Grants Program complies with the Victorian Auditor General's Office guidance and Council's audit requirements.
4. The Grants Program is subject to ongoing evaluation for continuous improvement, making the program more responsive, accessible and innovative.
5. The Grants Program currently includes the following grant rounds:
 - (a) Annual Grants (AG), providing funding annually;
 - (b) Investing in Community Grants (ICG), 2018-2020, providing funding over three years;
 - (c) Community Partnership Grants (CPG), 2017-2021, providing funding over four years;
 - (d) Small Project Grants (SPG), open throughout the year;
 - (e) Creative Yarra Arts Program 2017-2019 providing funding over three years;
 - (f) Celebrate Yarra Festival Program 2017-2019 providing funding over three years;
 - (g) Richmond and Collingwood Youth Program Grants, 2017-2020, providing funding over three years; and
 - (h) Room to Create Responsive Grants, open throughout the year.
6. This report seeks endorsement by Council for the opening in 2018 of the following three grant rounds:
 - (a) Annual Grants 2019;
 - (b) Small Project Grants 2018/19; and
 - (c) Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19.

7. The Annual Grants 2019 includes the following streams:
- (a) Community Development;
 - (b) Arts and Culture;
 - (c) Sustainability;
 - (d) Sport and Recreation;
 - (e) Family, Children & Youth; and
 - (f) Community Housing.

Advertising the Grants

8. A variety of methods are used to advertise the grants rounds to ensure as wide an audience as possible. These include email newsletters and networks, posting on the website, Yarra News, information sessions at Town Halls, and posters at: public housing estates, Senior Citizens' Centres, Connie Benn, Yarra Community Youth Centre, Libraries, Recreation Centres, Maternal Child and Health Centres, Neighbourhood Houses and Learning Centres, the Neighbourhood Justice Centre and Yarra's three Community Health Centres.

Proposed Annual Grants 2018

9. The Annual Grants priorities, streams and objectives are similar to those of last year with minor updates. One of the changes is to split the Community Development grants into three different streams: Community Strengthening, Community Support and Community Celebrations. The revised Annual Grants Guidelines are provided in **Attachment One**. Annual Grants Guidelines 2019 are for projects delivered in the calendar year of 2019.
10. The following table shows the proposed time-frame for Annual Grants 2019:

Grants Information Session	11am-12pm, Tuesday 5 June, 2018
Collingwood Town Hall, Wurundjeri Room	
Grants Information Session	2pm-3pm, Wednesday 6 June, 2018
Fitzroy Library, Meeting Room One	
Grants Information Session	6pm-7pm, Thursday 7 June, 2018
Richmond Town Hall, Meeting Room ne	
Grants Information Session	1pm-2pm, Friday 8 June 2018
Bargoonga Nganjin, Seminar Room One	
Youth-Led Grant Information Session	5pm-7pm, Wednesday 6 June 2018
Yarra Youth Services	
Youth-Led Grant Information Session	5pm-7pm, Wednesday 13 June 2018
Yarra Youth Services	
Grant round opens	9am Monday 11 June 2018
Applications close	11:59pm Monday 23 July 2018
Announcement of grant outcomes	November 2018
Funding agreements to be returned by successful applicants	From December 2018
Grants paid by Electronic Funds Transfer	From end of December 2018
Projects commence	From 1 January 2019

Community Panels – Annual Grants

11. The Community Panels comprise a majority of external community representatives and can also include Council Officers who were not involved in the internal assessment. The Community Panel comprises at least three people, two of whom are not Council staff.

Panellists should have expertise in the stream and preferably a familiarity with grants programs.

12. Community Panels will conduct an assessment process based on the Annual Grants guidelines, objectives, criteria and knowledge of stream priorities and community needs. The panel members each receive the full application and a summary of the internal assessor's comments. The Panels then develop and agree on recommendations for approval by Council.
13. Council has established the following selection criteria for community representatives to serve on the Panels:
 - (a) a strong working knowledge of the Yarra community;
 - (b) expertise in, and representative of, a program area relevant to the Annual Grants; and
 - (c) a commitment to complying with the ethical requirements of the process e.g. confidentiality and declaration of any conflict of interest.
14. Membership of the Community Panels will be sought from members of the community that demonstrate the appropriate expertise. Individual members will be identified in the confidential recommendations report to Council. The Yarra Arts Advisory Committee Councillors will make up the Arts and Culture Community Panel. The Yarra Environment Advisory Committee excluding Councillors will make up the Sustainability Community Panel.

Small Project Grants 2018/19

15. The Small Project Grants (SPG) continue to be popular with 120 grant applications in the nine months from July 2017 to March 2018. Seventy-six grants totalling \$74,000 were awarded in this period.
16. The SPGs allow organisations and individual artists to gain access to small amounts of funding quickly (up to \$1,000 within four weeks). The funding pool is split \$30,000 for Arts and Culture and \$45,000 for all other projects covering, community development, sustainability, sports, family, children and youth. The grants will open in July 2018 and close in May 2019 or when the funding pool is exhausted. The Small Project Grants 2018/19 guidelines are provided in **Attachment 2**.

Room To Create Responsive Grants 2018/19

17. The Room to Create Grants were launched in 2015, initially as a Council response to issues related to noise and patron behaviour complaints experienced by venues. The program was very successful in its first year with \$20,500 allocated to eight recipients. The program has been extended to help creative spaces as well as live music venues stay in Yarra.
18. \$25,000 has been allocated to the program for 2018/19, subject to budget approval. The Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19 Guidelines are provided in **Attachment 3**.

External Consultation

19. We sought feedback at both the application stage and through the acquittal process from grant applicants and recipients. This feedback was collated, and where practical, incorporated into the guidelines and application process for 2018.

Internal Consultation (One Yarra)

20. We surveyed internal (council officers) and external assessors on their views on the grants process. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive about how the grants program is run. The guidelines and application form are subject to annual review and minor changes are made to improve useability and make the grants process as clear as possible for applicants and assessors alike. The grants team works throughout the year to improve the governance, accountability and transparency of the grants program.

21. The Community Grants are a cross-organisational program. The grants team regularly engages and consults with stream managers and internal assessors who are integral to the effective running of the grants program. Stream managers and internal assessors come from the following branches and units: Community Partnerships Branch; Family, Youth and Children Services; Arts, Culture and Venues; Sustainability and Strategic Transport; and Recreation.

Financial Implications

22. The proposed budget for the Annual Grants 2019, pending 2018/19 budget approval is shown in this table alongside the budgets in 2017 and 2018:

Funding Streams	2017 Allocation	2018 Allocation	Proposed 2019 Allocation
Community Development	\$319,000	\$324,000	\$330,150
Family, Children and Youth	\$157,000	\$157,000	\$160,000
Sustainability	\$53,000	\$53,000	\$54,000
Arts and Culture	\$210,000	\$210,000	\$214,000
Sports	\$56,000	\$56,000	\$56,000
Yarra Housing Grant	\$50,000	\$52,500	\$52,500
Youth-Led Grants	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$12,000
Total	\$851,000	\$864,500	\$878,650

23. The following financial commitments have been referred to the annual budget process for consideration and approval:
- (a) \$878,650 for Annual Grants 2019;
 - (b) \$75,000 in 2018/19 for Small Project Grants; and
 - (c) \$25,000 in 2018/19 for Room to Create Responsive Grants.

Economic Implications

24. Community Grants strengthen the community sector through providing a flexible and responsive source of funds to community based Not-for-Profit organisations. Funding is used to support projects that deliver the outcomes outlined within the Council Plan, target the areas of highest need within the community, and ultimately aim to improve the long term economic outlook for local individuals, families and businesses through strengthening the capacity of local organisations.
25. Grants redistribute funds to those less advantaged in the community. The festivals and events bring economic benefits and assist with branding Yarra as a destination city. Projects that are funded to support new arrivals, young people and families through skills development or projects that support service coordination also have an indirect economic benefit.

Sustainability Implications

26. All grant applicants are encouraged to consider the environmental impact of their projects and ways in which to minimise their footprint. All applicants, regardless of which grant round they are applying for, are asked to consider ways of reducing and/or re-using resources. The direct environmental outcomes primarily come from the grants recommended through the Sustainability Stream of Annual Grants.
27. All applicants are encouraged to submit their applications online, reducing the need for printed forms. The Guidelines will also be available online. The assessments (both internal and external) will also take place online.

Social Implications

28. The Annual Grants Program aims to address social needs across various areas: arts and culture, environment, community development, sport and recreation, family, children and youth. Social objectives addressed within the grants program are:

- (a) building a sense of community through:
 - (i) cultural activities (community celebrations, observance of traditional celebration days, cultural festivals and events);
 - (ii) recognition of diversity (projects that strengthen Yarra's diverse community or celebrate and recognise diversity); and
 - (iii) social cohesion (projects which seek to bring people together and support the development of communities with shared aims and aspirations); and
- (b) promoting and improving community health and wellbeing through:
 - (i) recreation opportunities (sports, social recreation, walking and improving access to recreational activities);
 - (ii) improving health and wellbeing (food security, nutrition, skills development, health information, social engagement and support); and
 - (iii) promoting the participation of people with a disability in cultural, social and civic activities (encouraging organisers to increase the accessibility of their events and programs).

Human Rights Implications

29. The Community Grants Guidelines are in alignment with the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 and actively support people to participate in and contribute to their community.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

30. The grants are one of the most visible ways in which the Council interacts with local CALD community organisations. These organisations are encouraged and supported to apply. The grants are promoted through ethnic print media and radio and interpreters are available upon request at information sessions and meetings with the grants team. More than 25 CALD organisations were supported through the application process in the 2018 Annual Grants.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

31. The 2017 - 2021 Council Plan closely guides the Community Grants objectives. Community Grants are intended to support the delivery of the Council Plan and are a key way in which those objectives can be achieved in partnership with the community.
32. Six of the seven key objectives of the Council Plan relate to the Grants Program:
- (a) *Community health, safety and wellbeing are a focus in everything we do:* The Community Grants Program provides a flexible and responsive source of funds to support projects and initiatives within the not for profit community sector. The program supports Council's commitment to social justice and social inclusion principles, and provides support to communities living in Yarra's public housing estates. The program also supports community organisations within the recreational and sporting sector, to encourage greater participation and strengthen their capacity to deliver additional activities for the whole of the Yarra community. Many of the grants address social issues which improve community health and safety by seeking to resolve some of the urban problems of poverty, drug addiction and family violence;
 - (b) *Inclusion, diversity and uniqueness are welcomed, respected and celebrated:* The program provides support for community groups to offer inclusive and diverse activities, services, information and cultural celebrations, particularly in the arts and cultural and community development stream;
 - (c) *Council leads on sustainability and protects and enhances its natural environment:* The provision of a Sustainability Stream which provides support to local community groups through community education and engagement in environmental sustainability. All applicants are asked to consider the environmental impact of their project;

- (d) *Local businesses prosper and creative and knowledge industries thrive:* The Social Enterprise Grants have helped numerous local small businesses over the years to provide support to the community;
- (e) *Connectivity and travel options are environmentally sustainable, integrated and well-designed:* Bicycle projects have been prioritised through the Sustainability grants which incorporates the City of Yarra Bike Strategy; and
- (f) *Transparency, performance and community participation drive the way we operate:* Yarra City Council's Community Grants Program is a recognised leader among Local Government in Victoria. As well as having a diverse grants program, Yarra's grants have been an innovative means of connecting with and supporting local communities and involving them in the decision making process. Our transparent administrative processes are highly regarded by other councils.

Legal Implications

33. The grants program enables Council to achieve some of the basic tenets of the *Local Government Act 1989*:
- (a) Section 3C to promote the social, economic and environmental viability and sustainability of the municipal district;
 - (b) Section 3D fostering community cohesion and encouraging active participation in civic life; and
 - (c) Section 3E planning for and providing services and facilities for the local community.
34. Council has not sought legal advice in relation to the grants program this year.

Other Issues

35. No other issues.

Options

36. No other options.

Conclusion

37. The Community Grants remains a key way for Council to invest in community through a responsive community-focused program. A significant investment of resources is allocated for this purpose with strong outcomes in the community.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council:
 - (a) endorse the allocation of \$878,650 to the Annual Grants Program 2019 pending 2018/19 budget approval;
 - (b) endorse the allocation of \$75,000 to Small Project Grants 2018/19 pending 2018/19 budget approval;
 - (c) endorse the allocation of \$25,000 to Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19 pending 2018/19 budget approval;
 - (d) endorse the guidelines for Annual Grants 2019;
 - (e) endorse the guidelines for Small Project Grants 2018/19;
 - (f) endorse the guidelines for Room to Create Responsive Grants 2018/19;
 - (g) appoint the Yarra Arts Advisory Committee (excluding Councillors on the committee) as the community panel for the Arts and Culture grants stream;
 - (h) appoint the Yarra Environment Advisory Committee (excluding Councillors on the committee) as the community panel for the Sustainability grants stream; and
 - (i) endorse the proposal to appoint community representatives to serve on each of the community grants assessment panels.

CONTACT OFFICER: Michael Van Vliet
TITLE: Community Grants Team Leader
TEL: 9205 5146

Attachments

- 1 Annual Grant Guidelines 2019
- 2 Small Project Grant Guidelines 2018/19
- 3 Room To Create Responsive Grant Guidelines 2018/19

11.5 Proposed Motions for MAV State Council 2018

Trim Record Number: D18/54962

Responsible Officer: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office

Purpose

1. To adopt and approve motions for submission to the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) State Council to be held on 18 May 2018.

Background

2. Council has in recent years successfully submitted a number of motions to MAV State Councils.
3. Council has generally been represented at MAV State Councils by the nominated Council delegate (currently Cr Searle) or the substitute delegate (currently Cr Fristacky), in order to present the Council's motions. The State Council also provides an opportunity to meet with Councillors from across Victoria and exchange information, learn of issues being addressed by other local governments and identify opportunities to learn from others to improve Council's responses.

Consultation

4. Invitations have been extended to all Councillors to propose suggested motions for consideration by Council for submission to the peak state body.

Financial Implications

5. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Economic Implications

6. There are no economic implications associated with this report.

Sustainability Implications

7. There are no sustainability implications associated with this report.

Social Implications

8. Attendance at the MAV State Council provides an excellent opportunity for Yarra Councillor/s to meet with other Councillors from around the state and to become acquainted with the range of local government programs, projects and processes.

Human Rights Implications

9. There are no Human Rights implications associated with this report.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

10. There are no CALD Community implications associated with this report.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

11. The proposed motions are consistent with Council's established policy position on the relevant subjects.

Legal Implications

12. There are no legal issues concerned with attendance by Councillors at the State Council.

Other Issues

13. None applicable.

Options

14. None applicable.

Conclusion

15. It is recommended that Council endorse the attached motions for submission to the MAV State Council on 18 May 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council:
 - (a) endorse the following motions (*Attachments 1 -6*) for submission to the Municipal Association of Victoria State Council, 18 May 2018:
 - (i) Cyclist Safety;
 - (ii) Container Deposit Scheme;
 - (iii) Recycling Industries in Victoria;
 - (iv) Electric Buses;
 - (v) Infrastructure Funding; and
 - (vi) Victorian Cabinet.

CONTACT OFFICER: Rhys Thomas
TITLE: Senior Governance Advisor
TEL: 9205 5302

Attachments

- 1 State Council Motion - Cyclist Safety
- 2 State Council Motion - Container Deposit
- 3 State Council Motion - Recycling Industries in Victoria
- 4 State Council Motion - Electric Buses
- 5 State Council Motion - Infrastructure Funding
- 6 State Council Motion - Victorian Cabinet

11.6 Councillor Attendance at ICLEI World Congress 2018 - Authorisation

Trim Record Number: D18/59110

Responsible Officer: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office

Purpose

1. Pursuant to Council's Expense Entitlement Policy, to approve the attendance of Councillor Amanda Stone, at the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) World Congress 2018, to be held in Montreal, Canada, from 19 – 22 June 2018.

Background

2. The ICLEI, World Congress 2018 Committee has written, extending a formal invitation to Councillor Amanda Stone to be a guest speaker at the Congress, which is held every three years. The particular session topic is titled "**Participatory governance and inclusive decision making for sustainability**" based on a theme '*Yarra's multicultural partnerships to build a city for all*'.
3. The 2018 Congress will spotlight local governments and their most successful initiatives, innovative policies and remarkable results in achieving urban sustainability.
4. In 2018, more than 1200 local and regional governments, international agencies, national governments, representatives of the private and other partners from around the world will attend the ICLEI World Congress in Montréal. Together they will build partnerships and design bold and innovative ideas to steer the global urban agenda and strengthen collective action on sustainability worldwide and in particular, urban sustainability.
5. As the host, Montréal will show how the City is making sustainability a reality. From electrifying transport to promoting urban agriculture, Montréal is enacting policies and initiatives that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and help create a safe, resilient, inclusive and sustainable City.
6. Some of the key discussions will be (*detailed program in Attachment 1*):
 - (a) local governments as pivotal forces for sustainable change;
 - (b) achieving the global goals through local action;
 - (c) the impact of cities and regions on sustainable development in North America and globally; and
 - (d) going forward in collective partnerships.
7. Council's Expense Entitlement Policy provides:
 - (a) "Councillors' attendance at interstate and overseas conferences and Council's payment of airfares is subject to the approval of the Council;" and
 - (b) "Subject to the availability of funds, Council shall pay for the cost of registration fees, accommodation and travelling expenses, meals and other incidental expenses associated with authorised attendance at conferences and seminars."

Consultation

8. Not relevant to this report.

Financial Implications

9. The costs associated with attendance at the Conference are estimated as follows:
 - (a) economy airfares - subject to time of booking – currently (*Aust \$1,760.00*);
 - (b) conference registration is \$CAD 729.75 (early bird rate); (*=Aust \$789.84*);
 - (c) accommodation for 5 nights is estimated at \$CAD 169.00 (*=Aust \$183.10*) **per night**; and

(d) other costs including meals, taxis and incidentals.

10. Provision is made in the Council budget for Councillors to attend approved Conferences/Assemblies.

Economic Implications

11. There are no economic implications.

Sustainability Implications

12. Attendance at this Conference is focussed on identifying and formulating innovative processes to improve sustainability across all areas potentially impacted by climate change.

Social Implications

13. The status of this Conference and the opportunity to connect with representatives from a global perspective also provides the potential to focus on avenues to address social implications which are adversely impacted by sustainability constraints and climate change.

Human Rights Implications

14. There are no Human Rights implications associated with this report.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

15. There are no CALD communities implications associated with this report.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

16. The attendance at this Conference will enable networking with presenters, other delegates and Councillors to compare issues and innovations.

Legal Implications

17. There are no legal issues concerned with attendance by Councillors at the Conference; save that details of interstate travel (dates, attendees and costs) must be recorded in the interstate travel register, in accordance with the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2004*.

Other Issues

18. None applicable.

Options

19. None applicable.

Conclusion

20. That Council determine and authorise the attendance of Councillor Amanda Stone at the ICLEI World Congress 2018 in Montreal, Canada from 19 – 22 June 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council pursuant to Council's Expense Entitlement Policy approve the attendance of Councillor Amanda Stone at the ICLEI World Congress 2018 in Montreal, Canada from 19 – 22 June 2018.

CONTACT OFFICER: Ivan Gilbert
TITLE: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office
TEL: 9205 5110

Attachments

- 1 2018 ICLEI World Congress Program

11.7 Councillor Attendance at ALGA 2018 National Conference - Authorisation

Trim Record Number: D18/59118

Responsible Officer: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office

Purpose

1. To pursuant to Council's Expense Entitlement Policy, approve attendance by Councillors, at the principle national local government convention, the National General Assembly of the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA), to be held from 17 – 20 June 2018 at the National Convention Centre, Canberra.

Background

2. Council has in recent years successfully submitted a number of motions to the ALGA National General Assembly.
3. Council has generally been represented at both the National General Assembly and the State Council by one or two Councillors, in order to present the Council's motions and also meet other Councillors from around the nation/state and learn of issues being addressed by local governments and importantly, methods of dealing with same.
4. Council's Expense Entitlement Policy provides:
 - (a) "Councillors' attendance at interstate and overseas conferences and Council's payment of airfares is subject to the approval of the Council;" and
 - (b) "Subject to the availability of funds, Council shall pay for the cost of registration fees, accommodation and travelling expenses, meals and other incidental expenses associated with authorised attendance at conferences and seminars."

Consultation

5. Not relevant to this report.

Financial Implications

6. The costs per person, associated with attendance at the Assembly are estimated as follows:
 - (a) conference registration, including accommodation and economy airfares is **estimated at \$2,410**; and
 - (b) other costs including meals, taxis and incidentals.
7. Provision is made in the Council budget for Councillors to attend approved Conferences/Assemblies.

Economic Implications

8. There are no economic implications.

Sustainability Implications

9. There are no sustainability implications.

Social Implications

10. Not applicable to this report.

Human Rights Implications

11. There are no Human Rights implications associated with this report.

Communications with CALD Communities Implications

12. There are no communications with CALD communities implications associated with this report.

Council Plan, Strategy and Policy Implications

- 13. The attendance at peak body conferences enables discussion with Councillors across the nation to compare issues, processes, services standards which assist Council in formulating its own plans, strategies and work procedures.

Legal Implications

- 14. There are no legal issues concerned with attendance by Councillors at the National General Assembly or the State Council, save that details of interstate travel (dates, attendees and costs) must be recorded in the interstate travel register, in accordance with the *Local Government (General) Regulations 2004*, in respect of the National General Assembly.

Other Issues

- 15. None applicable.

Options

- 16. None applicable.

Conclusion

- 17. That Council authorise the attendance of Councillor/s at the National General Assembly 2018.

RECOMMENDATION

- 1. That Council pursuant to Council's Expense Entitlement Policy, approve attendance by Councillor/s.....at the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA) National General Assembly in Canberra from 17 – 20 June 2018.

CONTACT OFFICER: Ivan Gilbert
TITLE: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office
TEL: 9205 5110

Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

12.1 Notice of Motion No.4 of 2018 - Walmer Street Bridge

Trim Record Number: D18/59166

Responsible Officer: Group Manager Chief Executive's Office

I, Councillor Amanda Stone, hereby give notice that it is my intention to move the following motion at the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 10 April 2018:

“That the Mayor write to the Member for Richmond, Richard Wynne MP, seeking his commitment to funding an urgently needed fit-for-purpose pedestrian/cyclist bridge across the Yarra River at Walmer Street.”

Background

The current bridge at Walmer Street was constructed in 1892 as primarily a footbridge to connect the suburbs of Kew and Richmond, allowing access to Studley Park and surrounds.

Apart from general repairs and replacement of the sewer pipe under the river below the bridge, which forced its closure for 6 months in 2011, the bridge remains the same structure more than 100 years later.

It is now used by more than 500 cyclists in the morning peak 7- 9 am and many more pedestrians. Weekends see high usage of the bridge by both pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrian and cyclist numbers have doubled over the last seven years and the intense development of the Victoria Street East precinct, which is only partly complete, will add several thousand new residents to the immediate vicinity of the bridge, who will use the bridge to access the parklands in Boroondara. The Victoria Gardens Shopping Centre has generated further bridge traffic from Kew residents seeking to access the shops and the Victoria Street tram route.

Located on the Capital City Trail, the Main Yarra Trail and as part of the regional bike infrastructure connecting cyclists and walkers from Eltham to the city, Walmer Street Bridge is one of few Yarra River crossings and will come under increasing pressure in coming years.

The bridge is currently not fit for purpose and will become increasingly so. Apart from its age, its width does not meet Australian standards, and it is difficult for cyclists or pedestrians to pass each other whilst on the bridge. There is a need to replace this bridge now. As regional infrastructure, the responsibility for its replacement lies with the State Government.

The access to the bridge from Walmer Street Kew has been identified by Boroondara Council as needing immediate repair. Boroondara Council has detailed plans prepared to replace the land bridge approach on its side and has been actively seeking funding for this.

On the Yarra end of the bridge, the proposed development at 607-627 Victoria St, approved by the Minister for Planning in January 2017, involves a new access to the existing bridge. Construction on this development has commenced.

While both new approaches to the bridge are designed to increased user numbers, arguably, upgrading access at either end of an outdated bridge which is not fit-for-purpose is both of limited value and a waste of resources.

A new bridge is therefore urgently needed.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Mayor write to the Member for Richmond, Richard Wynne MP, seeking his commitment to funding an urgently needed fit-for-purpose pedestrian/cyclist bridge across the Yarra River at Walmer Street.