MINUTES of the ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF THE COLAC-OTWAY SHIRE COUNCIL held at the COPACC Meeting Rooms on 28 September 2011 at 3:00 pm.

1. **OPENING PRAYER**

Almighty God, we seek your blessing and guidance in our deliberations on behalf of the people of the Colac Otway Shire. Enable this Council's decisions to be those that contribute to the true welfare and betterment of our community. AMEN

2. PRESENT

Cr Brian Crook (Mayor) Cr Frank Buchanan Cr Lyn Russell Cr Stephen Hart Cr Stuart Hart Cr Geoff Higgins Cr Chris Smith

Rob Small. Chief Executive Officer Colin Hayman, General Manager, Corporate & Community Services Neil Allen, General Manager, Infrastructure & Services Jack Green, General Manager, Sustainable Planning & Development Rhonda Deigan, Executive Officer

APOLOGIES 3. Nil

4. MAYORAL STATEMENT

Colac Otway Shire acknowledges the original custodians and law makers of this land, their elders past and present and welcomes any descendents here today.

Colac Otway Shire encourages active community input and participation in Council decisions. Council meetings provide one of these opportunities as members of the community may ask questions to Council either verbally at the meeting or in writing.

Please note that some questions may not be able to be answered at the meeting, these questions will be taken on notice. Council meetings also enable Councillors to debate matters prior to decisions being taken.

I ask that we all show respect to each other and respect for the office of an elected representative.

An audio recording of this meeting is being made for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting. In some circumstances the recording may be disclosed, such as where Council is compelled to do so by court order, warrant, subpoena or by any other law, such as the Freedom of Information Act 1982.'

Thank you, now question time. 30 minutes is allowed for question time. I remind you that you must ask a question, if you do not have a question you will be asked to sit down and the next person will be invited to ask a question. This is not a forum for public debate or statements.

- 1. Questions received in writing prior to the meeting (subject to attendance and time)
- 2. Questions from the floor

5. QUESTION TIME

Questions Received in Writing Prior to the Meeting

James Judd – Colac

- 1. Why does Council not include all available facilities available to pay Council rates with its rates notices since it is claimed direct payment facilities have been in existence for more than 10 years and this gains no mention about how to pay rates?
- 2. When will council fix its financial management by refusing to send out detailed accounts each month when a number of transactions take place? Council refuses to allow payments to be made at regular intervals to manage financial obligations.
- 3. Please explain how council is able to give two opposite views on rates being made in four equal instalments of total rates and charges within a 9 month period by holders of the top office. In the first instant you refused to say why instalments could equal over 50% of the total in the first two payments and not only 50% of the gross total in your last claim it is that all payments are of equal size.

Response:

Details of available methods of payment ARE provided on the reverse side of the Valuation and Rates Notice (being page 2 of the four pages provided). This information is provided at the bottom of the page under the heading "METHODS OF PAYMENT".

Column 3 of the table detailing the methods of payment is labelled "BY DIRECT DEBIT". Information provided under this heading advises ratepayers wishing to utilise this option to contact Councils Customer Service staff who are able to provide the appropriate application form and any relevant information.

This information has been provided on Valuation and Rates Notices for at least the past 12 years.

With respect to the last two questions, Council has advised on a number of occasions that regular payments are welcome to be made at our Customer Service Centres from amounts as little as \$1 and every effort is made to ensure that the annual rate charge is spread evenly over the four quarters.

4. When it is able to make sure it knows when events are held? Why does Council refuse to keep a listing of regular events and only bother to advise of events when it receives written notifications of them? – re calendar of events notification.

Response:

The calendar of events is a free service provided by this Council to provide event organisers the chance to advertise upcoming activities at no cost. It is the responsibility of event organisers to provide Council with the details of their event to ensure that all information provided in the calendar is accurate. Notices are regularly placed in local newspapers calling for submissions to the events calendar.

Questions Received Verbally at the Meeting

Peter Fillmore – Otway Forum

 In light of the many contradictory figures, assumptions and close result quoted in the survey of ratepayers' views on the Apollo Bay Harbour resort redevelopment, will the Councillors delay a decision on starting the Planning Scheme Amendment until the next Council meeting in Apollo Bay? This will give the local community time to read the report and also the chance to see it democratically debated and at the same meeting as the Apollo Bay swimming pool report will be tabled.

Response:

The Mayor responded that this issue had been discussed over a long period of time and that Councillors would have the opportunity during today's meeting to consider the planning scheme amendment process.

2. What guarantees can the Mayor give that the Planning Scheme Amendment will not be overruled at some point in the future by either VCAT or the Planning Minister, as was the case at the Torquay Golf Club and the Spring Creek development also at Torquay?

Response:

The Mayor advised that given the Torquay projects were on private land it would be inappropriate to draw any comparisons with the Apollo Bay proposal. However no guarantees can be given on whether VCAT or the Planning Minister would support the proposal.

The CEO stated that no one can give guarantees but that the key issue is that protections will be put in place by a Planning Scheme Amendment making any overruling less likely to occur.

3. With no expression of interest, no business plan and no proven demand for a hypothetical resort (and with two health and wellbeing businesses, Clarwern Resort and the day spa already operating and in Apollo Bay), what guarantee is there that a resort will ever be built on the tiny footprint at the harbour and any State Government funding will become available for public facilities there?

Response:

The Mayor stated that the Planning Scheme Amendment process is a way of ensuring control over what footprint is placed on the harbour. The intent of the Planning Scheme Amendment is to introduce controls and to allow community input into those controls. What we are debating today is whether to proceed with the Planning Scheme Amendment process.

4. Can the Mayor guarantee that the cost of the Planning Scheme Amendment shall remain within the budget of \$250,000 when it was initially costed at \$500,000 and who shall pay if the cost overruns?

Response

The General Manager for Sustainable Planning and Development advised that some elements of the original Planning Scheme Amendment had been removed and that there is no expectation that there will be any cost overrun.

5. Why won't the Council support Otway Forum's alternative plan that has widespread community support, will cost substantially less and require no Planning Scheme Amendment? This plan has already been shown to Terry Mulder and National Park officials and received a positive response.

Response

The Mayor stated that Otway Forum's alternative plan was not the only one received by Council. As a result of the Planning Scheme Amendment process, these alternative plans may be taken into account. Council is only being asked to endorse the Planning Scheme Amendment process today.

Tabling of Documents

The Mayor tabled a letter to Cr Chris Smith addressing issues raised with respect to the budget at the August Council meeting.

MOTION - MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Frank Buchanan that the letter sent to Cr Chris Smith, as tabled by the Mayor, be included in the minutes of this meeting. CARRIED 7: 0

Our Ref. GEN00460 BC/RD

Your Ref: Contact:



7 September 2011

Cr Chris Smith Colac Otway Shire Council 1330 Bungador Road SWAN MARSH VIC 3249

Dear Councillor Smith,

Question to the Mayor at the August Ordinary Council Meeting

Your question at the August meeting and your statement at the June meeting both inferred that an extra \$23,548 was to be paid to the CEO. This inference is clearly incorrect.

For your information, in case you or anybody else is still in doubt, I supply the following facts.

The above amount was attributed as an increase to the CEO's office budget from the previous financial year, 2010/2011.

The break-up of the amount in the current 2011/12 budget is as follows:

- An additional \$16,748 for standard EBA increase (approximately 4% applied to all three staff within the CEO's office
- · An increase in contribution for the Great South Coast Municipality Group
- An extra amount for the Community Satisfaction Survey.

I trust that this matter has now been resolved.

Yours sincerely,

Brach

Cr Brian Crook Mayor

CC: All Councillors

Colac Otway Shire PO Box 283 Colac Victoria 3250 www.colacotway.vic.gov.au inq@colacotway.vic.gov.au **Colac Service Centre** 2-6 Rae Street Colac Victoria 3250 Ph: (03) 5232 9400 Fax: (03) 5232 1046 **Apollo Bay Service Centre** 69-71 Nelson Street Apollo Bay Victoria 3233 Ph: (03) 5237 6504 Fax: (03) 5237 6734

6. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Colin Hayman	OM11112809-17 End of Financial Year Management Report
Nature of Disclosure:	Indirect Interest
Neil Allen	OM11112809-17 End of Financial Year Management Report
Nature of Disclosure:	Indirect Interest

7. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

- Ordinary Council Meeting held on the 24/08/11
- Special Council Meeting held on the 14/09/11.

MOVED Cr Frank Buchanan seconded Cr Stephen Hart that Council confirm the above minutes.

CARRIED 7 : 0

OFFICERS' REPORTS

Chief Executive Officer

OM112809-1	CEO'S PROGRESS REPORT TO COUNCIL
OM112809-2	LOCAL LAWS REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE
OM112809-3	MEN'S SHED FORREST

Corporate and Community Services

OM112809-4 RENAMING OF PART OF EGAN ST, COLAC OM112809-5 REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT POLICY OM112809-6 S86 COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL RE-ELECTION - BIRREGURRA PUBLIC HALL OM112809-7 LEASE RENEWAL - WYE RIVER FIRE STATION 30 MCLELLAN CRT, WYE RIVER

Infrastructure and Services

OM112809-8COLAC-ELLIMINYT COMMUTER FOOTPATH STRATEGYOM112809-9LOCAL PORTS GOVERNANCE REVIEW DISCUSSION PAPEROM112809-10SPECIAL CHARGE SCHEME - MORLEY AVENUE DRAINAGE

Sustainable Planning and Development

OM112809-11	APOLLO BAY HARBOUR PRECINCT REDEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION OF MARKET RESEARCH RESULTS
OM112809-12	SUBMISSION TO STATE GOVERNMENT CAR PARKING PROVISIONS REVIEW
OM112809-13	SUBMISSION TO THE VICTORIAN PLANNING SYSTEM MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OM112809-14	DRAFT COLAC CBD AND ENTRANCES PROJECT REPORT
OM112809-15	LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA FUND

General Business

OM112809-16 ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS

Urgent Item of Business

OM112809-24 RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICES PROPERTY LEVY OPTION PAPER

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICERS' REPORT

D = Discussion

W = Withdrawal

	ITEM	D	W
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFF	FICER		
	<u>D'S PROGRESS REPORT TO JNCIL</u>	CR STUART HART CR LYN RUSSELL	
		ROOOLLE	
Recommendation(s)			
That Council notes the	CEO's Progress Report to Council.		
	CAL LAWS REVIEW STEERING MMITTEE		CR STUART HART
Department: Executive			
Recommendation(s)			
	<i>Crto the Colac Otway ws Review Steering Committee for vs 1, 2 and 3.</i>		
OM112809-3 MEN	N'S SHED FORREST	CR	
Department: Executive		STUART HART	
Department: Executive <u> Recommendation(s)</u>		CR LYN RUSSELL	
That Council:		CR BRIAN CROOK	
depot fronting located there fo group for a perio that use for a f	e use of the section of the Forrest Blundy Street and the two sheds or use by the Forrest Men's Shed od of one year with a right to extend further one year on the basis that ons for a permanent facility are	CROOK	
2. Enters into a lice	ence to occupy on this basis.		
	rest Men's Shed group in pursuing or a permanent facility.		

MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Geoff Higgins that recommendations to items listed in the Consent Calendar, with the exception of item OM112809-2 Local Laws Review Steering Committee, be adopted.

CARRIED 7:0

OM112809-2 LOCAL LAWS REVIEW STEERING COMMITTEE

MOVED Cr Stuart Hart seconded Cr Lyn Russell

That Council appoints Cr Stephen Hart to the Colac Otway Shire Council Local Laws Review Steering Committee for the review of Local Laws 1, 2 and 3.

CARRIED 7 : 0

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICERS' REPORT

D = Discussion

W = Withdrawal

ITEM	D	W
CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES		
OM112809-4 RENAMING OF PART OF EGAN ST. COLAC		
Department: Corporate and Community Services		
<u>Recommendation(s)</u>		
That Council:		
1. Resolves that the northern section of Egan Street, Colac, located between Pound Road and Hearn Street Colac be renamed "North Egan Street" in accordance with the provisions of section 206 and clause 5 of schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 1989.		
<i>2.</i> Publishes the Council's resolution in the Victorian Government Gazette.		
<i>3.</i> Advises the owners of properties abutting the section to be named North Egan Street of Council's resolution.		
OM112809-5 REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT POLICY		
Department: Corporate and Community Services		
<u>Recommendation(s)</u>		
<i>That Council adopts the Revised Procurement Policy No. 3.2.</i>		

<u>OM11</u>	2809-6	S86 COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL RE- ELECTION - BIRREGURRA PUBLIC HALL	CR LYN RUSSELL		
Depar	tment: Corpo	rate and Community Services			
<u>Reco</u>	mmendatio	<u>n(s)</u>			
That (Council:				
1.	Act 1989, nominated	o Section 86 of the Local Government resolves to appoint the following members to the Birregurra Public Hall of Management until 28 September			
	Margaret	ormack, Ian Mcdonald, Sue Bateson, McDonald, Bryan Sanders, Brian Greg McKay, Jane Dennis, Belinda			
2.	section(a) resolves t from being	nce with Section 81 sub-section(2) sub- of the Local Government Act 1989, o exempt members of the Committee required to submit a primary or ordinary interest return in accordance with this			
3.	meetings record afte	e Committee that a copy of minutes of held be forwarded to Council for its er each meeting and that a Treasurer's provided annually.			
<u>OM11</u>	2809-7	LEASE RENEWAL – WYE RIVER FIRE STATION - 30 MCLELLAN CRT, WYE RIVER		CR STEPHEN HART	
Depar	tment: Corpo	rate and Community Services			
<u>Reco</u>	Recommendation(s)				
That (Council:				
1.	the provis Governme Country F	es the statutory procedure pursuant to sions of section 190 of the Local nt Act 1989 to enter into a lease with the ire Authority for them to continue to e Council owned land at 20 McLellan e River.			

2.	Agrees with the terms and conditions of the proposed lease. A term of 10 years with two five year options at a rental of \$1 per year.	
3.	Determines that any submissions to the proposed lease be considered at the Council meeting to be held on 23 November 2011 following a 6 week period submission period.	

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Stuart Hart that recommendations to items listed in the Consent Calendar, with the exception of items OM112809-7 Lease Renewal – Wye River Fire Station - 30 McLellan Crt, Wye River, be adopted.

CARRIED 7:0

OM112809-7 LEASE RENEWAL – WYE RIVER FIRE STATION - 30 MCLELLAN CRT, WYE RIVER

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Stuart Hart that:

Council:

- 1. Supports the provision of a lease to the Country Fire Authority (CFA) for them to continue to occupy the Council land at 20 McLellan Street, Wye River.
- 2. Instructs the Chief Executive Officer to offer the CFA a choice of lease options as follows:
 - a) A term of 50 years at \$1 per year with the CFA being exempt from Council rates but liable to pay the waste management charge, if any, OR
 - b) A term of 10 years with two five year options at a rental of \$1 per year with the options being at the CFA's discretion rather than Councils.
- 3. Apart from any differences outlined in point 2, Council agrees with all other terms in the proposed lease.
- 4. Once the CFA has indicated their choice from the above options the Council is to commence the statutory procedure pursuant to the provisions of section 190 of the Local Government Act 1989 to enter into a lease with the CFA based on the CFA's preference from the two options.
- 5. Determines that any submissions to the proposed lease be considered at the first available Council meeting to be held after a 6 week submission period.
- 6. Calls on the Chief Executive Officer to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the advertising of the proposed lease commences no later than 31 October 2011.

CARRIED 6:1

DIVISION called by Cr Stuart Hart

For the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Frank Buchanan, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart

Against the Motion: Cr Chris Smith

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICERS' REPORT

D = Discussion

W = Withdrawal

CR CHRIS SMITH

<u>OM</u> 1	12809-10 SPECIAL CHARGE SCHEME – MORLEY AVENUE DRAINAGE	CR LYN RUSSELL
Dep	artment: Infrastructure	
<u>Rec</u>	commendation(s)	
Tha	t Council:	
drai Mor Dec	olves with respect to the construction of a common nage line along the rear of properties 37, 41, 45, and 49 ley Avenue, Wye River, to give notice of its Intention to lare a Special Charge Scheme for the construction of se works such that:	
1.	The construction of a common underground drainage pipe and associated works will be of special benefit to properties described in paragraph (e) and shown on the attached plan by way of:	
	Controlled stormwater discharge, and	
	Improved site and land stability.	
2.	A special charge be declared for the period commencing on 28 September 2011 and concluding on 28 September 2016.	
3.	A special charge scheme be declared for defraying any expenses in relation to the installation of an underground stormwater pipe system comprising of a 375mm stormwater pipe along the rear of 37, 41, 45, and 49 Morley Avenue, Wye River.	
4.	The following be described as the area for which the special charge is declared: The properties that can directly connect to the underground drainage line located along the rear of 37, 41, 45, and 49 Morley Avenue, Wye River and applying to properties described in paragraph 5.	
5.	 The following be declared as the land in relation to which the special charge is so declared: 37 Morley Avenue, Wye River 39 Mor ey Avenue, Wye River 41 Morley Avenue, Wye River 43 Morley Avenue, Wye River 45 Morley Avenue, Qye River 47 Morley Avenue, Wye River 4 Morley Avenue, Wye River 4 Morley Avenue, Wye River 	
6.	 The following be specified as the criteria which forms the basis of the special charge so declared: Ownership of the land described in paragraph 5 of the recommendation. 	

7.	The following be specified as the manner in which the special charge so declared be assessed and levied:
	• The unit of assessment is one (1) benefit unit per property who can directly connect to the underground common drainage line. The unit benefit equates to an estimated \$3,677.
8.	Having regard to the proceeding parts of this Resolution but subject to Section 166(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1989:
	<i>i. it can be confirmed that the owner of each rateable land described in Column 1 of the Schedule will therefore be liable for the respective amounts set out in Column 2 of the Schedule; and</i>
	<i>ii. it be recorded that each owner may, subject to Section 167(4) of the Local Government Act 1989 and any further Resolution of Council pay the special charge in the following manner;</i>
	a) payment of quarterly instalments (commencing within one calendar month of the issue of the notice requesting payment) over 4 years with interest paid on the remaining principal at the Council overdraft rate and that a penalty interest rate be applied to late instalment repayments only; or
	 b) payment by lump sum to be paid within one calendar month of the issue of notice requesting payment.
9.	The Chief Executive Officer be authorized to give public notice of Council's intention to declare a special charge scheme in accordance with Section 163(1C) of the Local Government Act 1989.
10.	It be recorded that, subject to Section 163A and 168(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1989, Council proposes to use the money from the special charge so declared in the manner set out in the "Estimate" annexed to this resolution.
11.	Council appoints two (2) Councillors as a Special Committee to consider submissions pursuant to Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, and that this Special Committee hears such submissions at Council's Rae Street Offices at 5pm on Wednesday, 9 November 2011.
12.	If all parties enter into a Private Agreement, to the satisfaction of Council, within a reasonable time, that the Special Charge Scheme be abandoned.

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Lyn Russell that recommendations to item OM112809-9 Local Ports Governance Review Discussion Paper, as listed in the Consent Calendar, be adopted.

CARRIED 7:0

OM112809-8 COLAC-ELLIMINYT COMMUTER FOOTPATH STRATEGY

MOVED Cr Chris Smith that Council does not endorse the draft Colac-Elliminyt Commuter Footpath Strategy for public consultation and that it be sent back to the drawing board.

Due to the lack of a seconder, the motion lapsed.

MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Geoff Higgins that: Council:

- 1. Endorses the draft Colac-Elliminyt Commuter Footpath Strategy for public consultation; and
- 2. Places the Draft Colac-Elliminyt Commuter Footpath Strategy on exhibition until Friday 18 November 2011

CARRIED 6:1

DIVISION called by Cr Chris Smith

For the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Frank Buchanan, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart

Against the Motion: Cr Chris Smith

OM112809-10 SPECIAL CHARGE SCHEME – MORLEY AVENUE DRAINAGE

MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Stephen Hart

That Council:

Resolves with respect to the construction of a common drainage line along the rear of properties 37, 41, 45, and 49 Morley Avenue, Wye River, to give notice of its Intention to Declare a Special Charge Scheme for the construction of these works such that:

- 1. The construction of a common underground drainage pipe and associated works will be of special benefit to properties described in paragraph (e) and shown on the attached plan by way of:
 - Controlled stormwater discharge, and
 - Improved site and land stability.

- 2. A special charge be declared for the period commencing on 28 September 2011 and concluding on 28 September 2016.
- 3. A special charge scheme be declared for defraying any expenses in relation to the installation of an underground stormwater pipe system comprising of a 375mm stormwater pipe along the rear of 37, 41, 45, and 49 Morley Avenue, Wye River.
- 4. The following be described as the area for which the special charge is declared:

The properties that can directly connect to the underground drainage line located along the rear of 37, 41, 45, and 49 Morley Avenue, Wye River and applying to properties described in paragraph 5.

5. The following be declared as the land in relation to which the special charge is so declared:

•	37 Morley Avenue, Wye River	Lot 2 LP 82721
•	39 Morley Avenue, Wye River	Lot 3 LP 82721
•	41 Morley Avenue, Wye River	Lot 4 LP 82721
•	43 Morley Avenue, Wye River	Lot 5 LP 82721
•	45 Morley Avenue,□ Wye River	Lot 6 LP 82721
•	47 Morley Avenue, Wye R□ver	Lot 7 LP 82721
•	49 Morley Avenue, Wye River	Lot 8 LP 82721

- 6. The following be specified as the criteria which forms the basis of the special charge so declared:
 - Ownership of the land described in paragraph 5 of the recommendation.
- 7. The following be specified as the manner in which the special charge so declared be assessed and levied;
 - The unit of assessment is one (1) benefit unit per property who can directly connect to the underground common drainage line. The unit benefit equates to an estimated \$3,677.
- 8. Having regard to the proceeding parts of this Resolution but subject to Section 166(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1989:
 - *i. it can be confirmed that the owner of each rateable land described in Column 1 of the Schedule will therefore be liable for the respective amounts set out in Column 2 of the Schedule; and*
 - *ii. it be recorded that each owner may, subject to Section 167(4) of the Local Government Act 1989 and any further Resolution of Council pay the special charge in the following manner;*
 - a) payment of quarterly instalments (commencing within one calendar month of the issue of the notice requesting payment) over 4 years with interest paid on the remaining principal at the Council overdraft rate and that a penalty interest rate be applied to late instalment repayments only; or
 - b) payment by lump sum to be paid within one calendar month of the issue of notice requesting payment.
- 9. The Chief Executive Officer be authorized to give public notice of Council's intention to declare a special charge scheme in accordance with Section 163(1C) of the Local Government Act 1989.
- 10. It be recorded that, subject to Section 163A and 168(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 1989, Council proposes to use the money from the special charge so declared in the manner set out in the "Estimate" annexed to this resolution.

- 11. Appoints Cr Frank Buchanan and Cr Stuart Hart as a Special Committee to consider submissions pursuant to Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989, and that this Special Committee hears such submissions at Council's Rae Street Offices at 5pm on Wednesday, 9 November 2011.
- 12. If all parties enter into a Private Agreement, to the satisfaction of Council, within a reasonable time, that the Special Charge Scheme be abandoned.

CARRIED 7 : 0

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICERS' REPORT

D = Discussion

W = Withdrawal

ITEM	D	W
SUSTAINABLE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT		
OM112809-11 APOLLO BAY HARBOUR PRECINCT REDEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION OF MARKET RESEARCH RESULTS		CR STEPHEN HART
Department: Sustainable Planning and Development		
<u>Recommendation(s)</u>		
That Council:		
1. Notes the results of the August 2011 Apollo Bay Harbour Precinct Redevelopment telephone research report prepared by Vawser and Associates.		
2. Endorses commencement of a Planning Scheme Amendment process to incorporate the Apollo Bay Harbour Precinct Master Plan into the Colac Otway Shire Planning Scheme.		
OM112809-12 SUBMISSION TO STATE GOVERNMENT CAR PARKING PROVISIONS REVIEW		
Department: Sustainable Planning and Development		
<u>Recommendation(s)</u>		
That Council lodges a submission to the State Government Car Parking Advisory Committee for consideration in its current review of parking provisions that supports the proposed changes.		

		[
<u>OM112809-13</u>	SUBMISSION TO THE VICTORIAN PLANNING SYSTEM MINISTERIAL		CR CHRIS SMITH		
	ADVISORY COMMITTEE				
Department: Susta					
<u>Recommendation</u>	Recommendation(s)				
Submission to th	dorses the Colac Otway Shire Council ne Victorian Planning System Ministerial ttee that was lodged prior to 31 August I to this report.				
<u>OM112809-14</u>	DRAFT COLAC CBD AND ENTRANCES PROJECT REPORT		CR LYN RUSSELL		
Department: Susta	inable Planning and Development				
<u>Recommendation</u>	on(s)				
That Council:					
1. Notes the report.	draft Colac CBD and Entrances Project				
	e draft report on public exhibition for a six weeks prior to its finalisation.				
<u>OM112809-15</u>	LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA FUND		CR STEPHEN HART		
Department: Sustainable Planning and Development					
Recommendation(s)					
That Council:					
to the D Developm Governme	he attached list of Capital Works projects epartment of Planning & Community ent by 30 September 2011 to meet Local nt Infrastructure Program (LGIP) and State Government requirements.				
LGIP alloc bank to d	50,000 from each of the first two years tation of funds to accumulate a \$500,000 contribute to a Regional Development Fund application.				
Gymnasiu	\$237,000 of the first year's LGIP to the m component of the Blue Water Fitness development, to meet the shortfall in				

- 4. Saves the remaining first year funds of \$74,243 to add to the year two bank to fund projects in excess of \$150,000.
- 5. Endorses an application for \$4.9m for the Central Reserve / Beechy Centre Project to be prepared for submission to the RDAF Round 2 with the LGIP banked funds over two years of \$500,000 in total to be used as a contribution to the project.

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Frank Buchanan that recommendations to item OM112809-12 Submission To State Government Car Parking Provisions Review as listed in the Consent Calendar be adopted.

CARRIED 7:0

OM112809-11 APOLLO BAY HARBOUR PRECINCT REDEVELOPMENT PRESENTATION OF MARKET RESEARCH RESULTS

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Stuart Hart

That Council:

- 1. Notes the results of the August 2011 Apollo Bay Harbour Precinct Redevelopment telephone research report prepared by Vawser and Associates.
- 2. Endorses, in principle, the commencement of a Planning Scheme Amendment process to incorporate the Apollo Bay Harbour Precinct Master Plan into the Colac Otway Shire Planning Scheme subject to the following points.
- 3. Acknowledges the contentious aspect of the proposed hotel and calls for a Councillor workshop to discuss that aspect of the proposed Master Plan.
- 4. Notes the claim that funding will only be available if there is private investment in the Harbour and calls on the Chief Executive Officer to obtain written clarification as to whether that private investment must be in the form of a hotel.
- 5. Calls for a Council report after the matters in point 3 and 4 have occurred so that the Council can determine what part, if any, the hotel should have in the planning scheme amendment.

CARRIED 5:2

DIVISION called by Cr Frank Buchanan

For the Motion: Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Chris Smith, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart

Against the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Frank Buchanan

OM112809-13 SUBMISSION TO THE VICTORIAN PLANNING SYSTEM MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Geoff Higgins

That Council endorses the Colac Otway Shire Council Submission to the Victorian Planning System Ministerial Advisory Committee that was lodged prior to 31 August 2011, as attached to this report.

CARRIED 6 : 1

OM112809-14 DRAFT COLAC CBD AND ENTRANCES PROJECT REPORT

MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Geoff Higgins

That Council:

- *1.* Notes the draft Colac CBD and Entrances Project report.
- 2. Places the draft report on public exhibition for a period of at least six weeks prior to its finalisation.

CARRIED 7 : 0

OM112809-15 LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA FUND

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Geoff Higgins

That Council:

- 1. Provides the attached list of Capital Works projects to the Department of Planning & Community Development, and ensures that the list of bridges needing works are included, by 30 September 2011 to meet Local Government Infrastructure Program (LGIP) guidelines and State Government requirements.
- 2. Saves \$200,000 from each of the first two years LGIP allocation of funds to accumulate a \$400,000 bank towards a Regional Development Australia Fund application.
- 3. Allocates all of the remaining funds of approximately \$361,000 in the first year, to repair or replace a bridge or bridges, in addition to any works funded via the usual Council budget process, using the Infrastructure's priority list as a guide.
- 4. Rejects the minimum cost limit of \$150,000 per project in the report as this will unfairly disadvantage those areas, particularly rural areas, with projects costing less than \$150,000 and will also place unreasonable limits on the Infrastructure Department as some priority bridges will cost less than \$150,000 to repair or upgrade.

CARRIED 5:2

DIVISION called by Cr Geoff Higgins

For the Motion: Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Chris Smith, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart Against the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Frank Buchanan

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Lyn Russell

That Council endorses an application for up to \$4.9m for the Central Reserve / Beechy Centre Project to be prepared for submission to the Regional Development Australia Fund Round 2.

CARRIED 7 : 0

CONSENT CALENDAR

OFFICERS' REPORT

D = Discussion

W = Withdrawal

ITEM	D	W
<u>GENERAL BUSINESS</u>		
OM112809-16 ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS	CR	
Department: General Business	STEPHEN HART	
Recommendation(s)		
That Council notes the Assembly of Councillors reports for:		
Central Reserve Advisory Committee - 3 August 2011 Municipal Emory and Management		
Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee - 18 August 2011		
Councillor Briefing Session - 24 August 2011		
Councillor Workshop - 14 September 2011		

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Stuart Hart that recommendations to item OM112809-16 Assembly Of Councillors as listed in the Consent Calendar be adopted.

CARRIED 7:0

URGENT ITEM OF BUSINESS – RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICES PROPERTY LEVY OPTIONS PAPER

MATTER OF URGENCY - MOVED Cr Lyn Russell seconded Cr Stephen Hart that Council consider the Response to Fire Services Property Levy Options Paper as an urgent item of business in order to meet the State Government's deadline of 30 September 2011 for submissions.

CARRIED 7:0

AUTHOR:	Brett Exelby	ENDORSED:	Colin Hayman
DEPARTMENT:	Corporate & Community Services	FILE REF:	D11/4701

OM112809 – 24 RESPONSE TO FIRE SERVICES PROPERTY LEVY OPTION PAPER

Purpose

The State Government recently circulated the Fire Services Property Levy Options Paper for consideration and comment. This report proposes the key responses that are to be provided to the State Government by the Colac Otway Shire

Declaration of Interests

No officer declared an interest under the *Local Government Act 1989* in the preparation of this report.

Background

The Royal Commission held in the aftermath of the 2009 bushfires across Victoria made a recommendation that the model used to fund the provision of fire services throughout Victoria be changed. The current model provides for a Fire Services Levy (FSL) to be added to insurance premiums charged by insurance companies.

The Royal Commission found a number of houses destroyed by fire were not insured, with the reason for this thought to be the cost of insurance premiums (which included the FSL). Thus, the Royal Commission concluded insurance would be more affordable if the FSL was removed from insurance premiums, which would result in more property owners insuring their properties.

Consequently, a new funding model would be required to raise the money required to fund fire services with the Commission determining a property based funding model should be applied. The underlying premise for this was that all properties derive a benefit from the provision of fire services and therefore property owners should pay for that service.

The State Government's Department of Treasury and Finance has then developed a property based funding model as outlined in the Fire Services Property Levy Options Paper.

The Options Paper proposes that:

- a property levy be imposed on real property, including non-rateable property, property owned by local councils and potentially the State Government.
- the property levy be set annually to ensure fire services are adequately funded.
- the fire services property levy include a fixed component and an ad valorem charge assessed on the capital improved value (CIV) of the property.
- Concessions should given to holders of Health Care cards, Pensioner Concession cards and Department of Veterans Affairs Gold cards for their principal place of residence.
- the fire services property levy be collected by local councils, with support for implementation and administration.
- a tapering approach be adopted to phase out the insurance contributions prior to the introduction of the property levy.
- the Essential Services Commission be appointed to independently monitor the fire services property levy transition process. A public report on whether or not insurance companies have passed on savings to policy holders is to be produced as part of the monitoring role.

The principles guiding the design of the property based funding model are:

- efficiency
- equity
- sustainability and stability of the revenue base
- simplicity and transparency, and
- minimising administration and compliance costs.

The options paper discusses a number of funding models and funding collection models however they fundamentally focus on generating revenue to fund the Metropolitan Fire and Emergency Services Board and the Country Fire Authority from a property based levy to be collected by local government.

Council Plan / Other Strategies / Policy

Council will fulfil its leadership, statutory and legal obligations to its community and staff in a way that is: fair, ethical, inclusive, sustainable, financially responsible and meets the needs and practical aspirations of current and future generations.

Issues / Options

Overwhelmingly, the reaction of local government has been to oppose the proposal that it be the collector of revenue for the State Government. More fundamentally, the State government has direct responsibility for the provision of emergency services for all Victorians. Given the direct responsibility for the provision of the service, the responsibility for the funding of the service must also be with the State Government. The general view is that the State Government already has an organisation (called the State Revenue Office) for the purpose of collecting state revenue from Land tax and various duties. Collection of the fire services property levy is not a core responsibility of local government.

The State Revenue Office already has Council's valuations and assessments records and therefore has all the data required to produce the fire services property levy. It is acknowledged the proposal to raise the levy on non-rateable properties would require significant work to set up for the State Revenue Office, but no more so than local government.

Other concerns of local government are:

- There will be significant cost and resources implications in creating and maintaining assessments/parcels for properties not yet included within existing Council property records (for example: Crown land, Council roads).
- There is uncertainty how assessments will be determined (for example, by title or contiguous ownership?).
- The inclusion of the fire services property levy the rates notice will lead to non-payment of rates (due to cost) particularly given cost of utilities is rising rapidly.
- The use of the capital improved value as a basis for the levy may lead to additional valuation objections which will lead to greater cost for Council.
- That ratepayers will not recognise the fire service property levy as a State Government imposed levy and blame local government for increasing rates even further.
- That the fire services property levy may be required to forwarded to the State Government prior to the collection of any levy, so affecting local government cash flow.
- That the priority of the fire services property levy may leave local government to recover the unpaid levy as rates (as occurred with State Deficit Levy). Councils would therefore "finance" the State Government at their own expense.
- There will be confusion regarding concessions as Health Care Card (HCC) holders are not eligible for rates concession but will be eligible for the fire services property levy concession (this must be consistent with the rates concession).

 Whether HCC holders should be eligible for concession given the transient nature of eligibility and the cost and time required to be spent verifying eligibility for concession applicants.

Overall, the State Government is seeking to shift the cost of implementing and administering this change onto local government.

In addition, it is considered the proposal fails to meet some its own guiding principles as follows:

- A system that requires 79 Councils to remit payments to the State Government instead of requiring a single agency (for example the State Revenue Office) to collect and remit payment is not being "efficient".
- It is inequitable that only property owners contribute to the cost of fire services when the entire community benefits (thereby failing to meet the "equity" principle).
- A levy based on a fixed component and an ad valorem amount will be complicated for contributors and customer service staff alike when dealing with enquiries (again it fails to meet the "simplicity and transparency" principle).
- The proposal is complicated for local government as issues such as how assessments will be determined, what type of land (such as roads) should be levied, will Crown land be levied, how much financial assistance will local government receive are all unknown at this stage (again it fails to meet the "simplicity and transparency" principle).
- The inclusion of the levy on Council rates notices will not be transparent and is likely to have a negative impact on how the community views local government (again it fails to meet the "simplicity and transparency" principle).
- Fundamentally any organisation that raises a levy should be accountable for that levy and be responsible for invoicing and collection. This means that the State Government should implement and administer its own levy (again it fails to meet the "simplicity and transparency" principle).
- The proposal will have significant implementation and ongoing administrative resourcing implications for local government *(it fails to meet the "minimisation of administration and compliance costs" principle).*
- Whilst minimising costs for the State Government, the proposal adds significant costs to local government (again it fails to meet the "minimisation of administration and compliance costs" principle in broader terms).

This proposal appears to adopt a property based funding model simply because invoicing infrastructure already exists (that being local government) and it represents a cheaper and more politically expedient ongoing option for the State Government. The impact to local government as tier of government appears to have been given scant regard.

Significantly, the proposal is not based on any empirical analysis or consideration of other potential funding models. Other funding models should be investigated to ensure the cost of provision of fire services is more equitably apportioned across the community.

More significantly, the proposal to fund fire services only is a short-sighted patch-job when the State Government should be considering the management and funding of all emergency services on a holistic basis rather than the ad hoc service by service approach taken.

Proposal

It is proposed that Council provide a response to the Fire Services Property Levy Options Paper detailing Council's concerns.

Financial and Other Resource Implications

There are no immediate financial or resource implications. Should the Fire Services Property Levy be implemented in its current form, the resource implications will require review.

Risk Management & Compliance Issues

No risk management or compliances issues have been identified.

Environmental and Climate Change Considerations

No considerations are deemed relevant.

Community Engagement

The community engagement strategy will follow the recommendations of the Colac Otway Shire Council Community Engagement Policy of January 2010, which details five levels of engagement – inform, consult, involve, collaborate and empower.

The method selected would be to inform the community as more information is made available.

Implementation

The response to the Fire Services Property Levy Option Paper will be prepared to provided to Department of Treasury and Finance by 30 September 2011.

Conclusion

The fire services property levy proposal appears to adopt a property based funding model simply because invoicing infrastructure already exists (that being local government) and it represents a cheaper and more politically expedient option for the State Government. The impact to local government as tier of government appears to have been given scant regard.

Significantly, the proposal is not based on any empirical analysis or consideration of other potential funding models. Other funding models should be investigated to ensure the cost of provision of fire services is more equitably apportioned across the community.

More significantly, the proposal to fund fire services only is a short-sighted patch-job when the State Government should be considering the management and funding of all emergency services on a holistic basis rather than the ad hoc service by service approach taken.

Attachments

Nil

Recommendation(s)

That Council:

- 1. Provide a response to the Fire Services Property Levy Options Paper that includes the following:
 - a. That a property based funding model for the provision of fire services is not necessarily the most equitable model for the community and the State Government is strongly urged to investigate other funding models and options, which should include investigating an Emergency Services Levy which provides funding for all emergency services.
 - b. That the assumption that removing the fire services levy from insurance premiums will result in greater incidence of insured properties is simplistic and lacks validity as a basis for changing the current fire services funding model.
 - c. That local government should not be the fire services property levy collection agency.
 - d. That the provision of fire and emergency services is a core responsibility of the State government and it should therefore implement and administer the funding of these services.
 - e. The State Revenue Office is the most appropriate agency to levy and collect the fire services property levy for the State Government.
 - f. That the proposal is seen as the State Government undertaking a cost shifting activity on to local government.

CARRIED 6:1

DIVISION called by Cr Geoff Higgins

For the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Frank Buchanan, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart

Against the Motion: Cr Chris Smith

IN COMMITTEE

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Lyn Russell that pursuant to the provisions of Section 89(2) of the Local Government Act, the meeting be closed to the public and Council move "In-Committee" in order to deal with:

SUBJECT	REASON	SECTION OF ACT
End of Financial Year Management Report 2010/2011	this matter may prejudice the Council or any person	Section 89 (2) (h)
Real Estate Services Evaluation	this matter deals with contractual matters; AND this matter may prejudice the Council or any person	Section 89 (2) (d) (h)
Report from Delegate to other bodies - Audit Committee Minutes	this matter deals with personnel matters; AND this matter deals with contractual matters; AND this matter deals with legal advice; AND this matter may prejudice the Council or any person	Section 89 (2) (a) (d) (f) (h)
Contract Approval Contract 1102 – Cleaning Of Rural Toilets & Public Use Facilities	this matter deals with contractual matters	Section 89 (2) (d)
Contract Approval Contract 1117 – Office Redevelopment	this matter deals with contractual matters	Section 89 (2) (d)
Loan Services Tender Resolution	this matter may prejudice the Council or any person; AND this matter includes a resolution to close the meeting to members of the public	Section 89 (2) (h) (i)
Update on Bruce Street landfill environmental monitoring outcome	this matter deals with a proposed development; AND this matter deals with legal advice	Section 89 (2) (e) (f)

CARRIED 6:1

DIVISION called by Cr Chris Smith

For the Motion: Cr Brian Crook, Cr Geoff Higgins, Cr Frank Buchanan, Cr Stuart Hart, Cr Lyn Russell, Cr Stephen Hart

Against the Motion: Cr Chris Smith

OUT OF COMMITTEE

MOVED Cr Stephen Hart seconded Cr Lyn Russell that the meeting move out of committee.

CARRIED 7:0

The Meeting Was Declared Closed at 6.08 pm

CONFIRMED AND SIGNED at the meeting held on 26 OCTOBER 2011

.....MAYOR