

MINUTES

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Tuesday, 28 May 2013

Held at the
Council Conference and Reception Centre
City Hall, Little Malop Street, Geelong
commencing at 7.00pm

COUNCIL:

Cr. K. Fagg
- Mayor

(G21 Geelong Regional Alliance, Governance Regional Cities,
Women in Community Life)

Cr. T. Ansett (<i>Windermere</i>)	(Heritage, Rural Communities)
Cr. L. Ellis (<i>Coryule</i>)	(Coastal Communities, Infrastructure, Parks and Gardens)
Cr. J. Farrell (<i>Beangala</i>)	(Community Safety, Education and Youth)
Cr. K. Fisher (<i>Corio</i>)	(Community Development)
Cr. B. Harwood (<i>Kardinia</i>)	(Enterprise Geelong)
Cr. M. Heagney (<i>Brownbill</i>)	(Arts and Culture, Central Geelong)
Cr. J. Irvine (<i>Austin</i>)	(Sport and Recreation)
Cr. E. Kontelj (<i>Cowie</i>)	(Aboriginal Affairs, Multicultural Affairs)
Cr. Dr. S. Kontelj (<i>Kildare</i>)	(Finance)
Cr. R. Macdonald (<i>Cheetham</i>)	(Major Projects, Planning, Knowledge Economy)
Cr. R. Nelson (<i>Deakin</i>)	(Major Events, Tourism)
Cr. A. Richards (<i>Buckley</i>)	(Environment & Sustainability, Transport, Primary Industries)

SECTION A - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Acknowledgements	1
Apologies	1
Confirmation of Minutes	1
Declarations of Conflicts of Interest.....	1
Question Time.....	4
Petitions	4

SECTION B – REPORTS

1. Election of Deputy Mayor.....	5
2. Review of Road Management Plan	6
3. Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy – Getting Full Value	7-12
4. Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy – Ministerial Advisory Committee	13-17
5. 2013-2014 Sport and Recreation Victoria Funding Program Submissions	18-30
6. Contractual Matter (<i>Confidential</i>)	31

SECTION C - NOTICES OF MOTION

SECTION D - COMMON SEAL REGISTER

SECTION E - ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS

SECTION F - CONFIDENTIAL

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING
OF THE GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL
HELD AT THE COUNCIL CONFERENCE AND RECEPTION CENTRE
CITY HALL, LITTLE MALOP STREET, GEELONG
TUESDAY, 28 MAY 2013
COMMENCING AT 7.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Cr K Fagg (Chair), Crs T Ansett, L Ellis, J Farrell, K Fisher,
B Harwood, M Heagney, J Irvine, R Macdonald, R Nelson,
A Richards*(7.15pm)

Also present: S Griffin (Chief Executive Officer), J Wall (General Manager Corporate Services), P Bettess (General Manager Economic Development, Planning and Tourism), G Van Driel (General Manager City Services), J McMahon (General Manager Community Services), D Frost (General Manager Projects, Recreation and Central Geelong), J Brown (Manager Administration and Governance), R Bourke (Governance Co ordinator), D Chiller (Co ordinator Communication and Marketing)

OPENING: The Mayor declared the meeting open at 7.00pm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The Mayor acknowledged that we are here today on the land of the Wathaurong People and we pay our respects to Aboriginal elders past and present.

APOLOGIES: Crs E Kontelj and S Kontelj

LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

Cr Ellis moved, Cr Irvine seconded -

That Leave of Absence be granted to Cr Ron Nelson from 2 June to 8 July 2013, inclusive.

Carried.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 14 May 2013 be confirmed and signed.

Carried.

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Nil.

QUESTION TIME:

Question Time is an opportunity for questions to be addressed to Council and while the minutes record the general content, they do not purport to be a transcript of what was said by individuals. Likewise Councillor or Officer verbal responses are in summary form only. Views expressed may not be the views of Council.

Council's practice is to provide a separate document on its website setting out questions and responses including any more detailed written responses which may be provided subsequent to the meeting.

The following questions were asked in relation to the Proposed Storage and Blending of Chemicals at 1-39 Roseneath Street, North Geelong – Planning Permit 147/2011:

Margaret Huber

- 1) Do the Councillors deem appropriate for a facility to store and blend toxic, corrosive and flammable substances in such close proximity to residential and service areas?
- 2) How is it acceptable for the proposed development to precede without the required buffer zone requirements?
- 3) If such an area already exists and meets with current legislative requirements, how is it appropriate to store chemicals in an area which is close to residential and service areas? Why are the Council not recommending this area to the applicant?

Peter Bettess, General Manager Economic Development, Planning and Tourism, responded that the site is located within an industrial zone. The applicant is quite entitled to apply for a permit and Council must consider any permit before it. The permit, as part of the planning process, is referred to the relevant agencies including EPA, WorkSafe and the CPA for their feedback.

Council did not make any recommendations regarding this area. The site is industrial and it comes down to the nature of the chemicals and chemicals that do require buffer distance. The permit process is designed to assess these issues.

Joan Clarke

- 1) My husband and I have recently retired into Slevin Street. What guarantee to the ratepayers for devaluation of our property if this 'mini refinery' should go ahead? Rumours are we have already lost 50% of value?
- 2) Has Council and the planning department forgotten their duty of care to the community of Geelong?
- 3) Has and will the planning department consider all the people of Geelong and its environment in regards to the effects of these substances, should there be a spill accident, fire or other incident?

Peter Bettess responded that the application will receive full and proper consideration, including that of the relevant authorities and a full planning process.

Mr Bettess added that advertising of the application concluded on 17 May and Council can consider any objections until it makes its decision.

QUESTION TIME (CONT'D)

Council has received 107 submissions and has tentatively booked a planning information session, where panels and other people meet with residents and explain the planning process which is set down for Friday 14 June at 4.00pm. Council is waiting reply from the EPA and other authorities at this stage. Cr Eddy Kontelj has called the application in to a planning committee. That planning committee is tentatively scheduled for 16 July. .

The Mayor responded that Council will take into account as part of consideration of the process.

** Cr Richards entered the meeting room at 7.15pm*

Jose Lopez

- 1) Why does this facility need to be opened again after all these years?
- 2) Why do we have to have chemical facilities so close to residential and businesses?

Peter Bettess responded that these issues will be discussed as part of the planning process, including whether this site is appropriate.

Stephen Juhasz

- 1) Is the Council aware of the leak and subsequent fire with toxic smoke of a similar facility last Friday in Brazil?

The Mayor noted the comment.

- 2) If so, how can Council even consider placing such a facility in a residential area regardless of the arbitrary light industrial zoning?

The Mayor responded that this question will form part of the full planning process in considering the application. The applicant has a right to make application for a permit.

- 3) If the Council do not give this a green light does the Council commit to representing the wishes of ratepayers if the applicant appeals this matter to VCAT?

Peter Bettess responded, certainly, if Council refuses the permit and the applicant appeals, Council would defend its position.

Colin Wallace asked the following question:

Mr Mayor, at the meeting my wife Mary and I had with you on 4th March 2013, at which you were accompanied by Cr Heagney, you said you would check whether anything had been given to Woolworths regarding the works paid for out of the \$100,000 mentioned in Condition 7 of the Ropeworks Planning Permit. At our next meeting with you on 4th April 2013, at which you were again accompanied by Cr Heagney, you told us that nothing had been given to Woolworths but that in the meantime, that is between 4th March 2013 and 4th April 2013, you had asked Peter Bettess to write to Woolworths about the matter and include with his letter the table contained in the letter to me dated 4th April 2011 signed by Kevin Battye, Co-ordinator Asset and Traffic Management. Seeing we have heard nothing about this since, I am asking you, Mr Mayor, has there been a reply from Woolworths?

QUESTION TIME (CONT'D)

Peter Bettess responded that Woolworths are no longer a party. The site was originally owned by Fabcot, but was subsequently purchased by an entity controlled by Charter Hall. Advice has been sought to confirm which entity we should be writing to and once this is ascertained a letter will be forwarded, but as yet we have not corresponded.

Mayor responded he is aware it has changed hands but didn't know the new owner.

Mary Wallace asked:

- 1) In light of the fact that there are two versions of a table purportedly detailing the works paid for out of the \$100,000 mentioned in Condition 7 of the Ropeworks Planning Permit, both in letters signed by Kevin Battye, Co-ordinator Asset and Traffic Management, I am asking what is Council's view on why there are these two versions in which there are significant differences from one to the other in the descriptions?

The Mayor responded that his understanding was one item had the GST incorrectly included. Although the item is described differently, it is consistent to the works carried out on each of the invoices.

- 2) In the letter to Peter Bettess dated 16th March 2011 signed by my husband Colin Wallace on behalf of both of us, we requested the dates during which works were undertaken that were paid for out of the \$100,000 mentioned in Condition 7 of the Ropeworks Planning Permit. In the table contained in the letter to my husband dated 4th April 2011 and signed by Kevin Battye, Co-ordinator Asset and Traffic Management, there is a column headed simply 'Date' and I am asking, does this mean dates the works described were undertaken or does it mean something else and, if so, what?

The Mayor responded he could not answer specifically but would take the question on notice.

- 3) The description in the invoice from Surbo Holdings that my husband and I were given as part of Council's response to our Freedom of Information request of 31st March 2011 says: 'Remove trees and make new footpath with fence First St as per quote', with the amount being \$30,000. Seeing we were given the invoice but were not given the quote, I am asking for a copy of the quote if it exists.

The Mayor took the question on notice.

A further question in relation to Planning Permit 147/2011, submitted by Robyn O'Dale, was tabled for a written response.

PETITIONS

Cr Richards presented a petition containing over 300 signatures requesting the provision of a pedestrian crossing in Torquay Road, Grovedale in the area between Peter and Perrett Streets.

1. ELECTION OF DEPUTY MAYOR

During the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 27 November 2012, Cr Stretch Kontelj was elected as Deputy Mayor until 27 May 2013. In accordance with 11C(2) of the City of Greater Geelong Act 1993, Council must elect a Deputy Mayor upon the office becoming vacant.

Cr Macdonald moved, Cr Nelson seconded –

That Council elect a Deputy Mayor for a six month period from 28 May 2013 to 28 November 2013.

Carried.

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Heagney seconded -

That Cr Bruce Harwood be nominated as Deputy Mayor for a six month period 28 November 2013 until 28 May 2013.

There being no further nominations, Cr Bruce Harwood was declared elected as Deputy Mayor of the City of Greater Geelong for a six month period from 28 November 2013 to 28 May 2013.

Carried.

Cr Macdonald left the meeting room at 7.29pm for the evening.

2. REVIEW OF ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN

Portfolio:	Infrastructure – Cr Ellis
Source:	City Services – Engineering Services
General Manager:	Gary Van Driel
Index Reference:	Subject: Roads, Footpath & Streets / Asset Management Roads Maintenance & Repair

Summary

The purpose of this report is to seek Council's approval of the review of the Road Management Plan (Version 5.0) under the provisions of the Road Management Act 2004 (RMA).

The Road Management Plan sets out the inspection frequencies, maintenance standards and response times that are applied to the road infrastructure for which Council is responsible.

The Road Management Plan (Version 4.0) was adopted by Council on 27 October 2009. The RMA regulations require that the plan be reviewed when a new Council is elected. The RMA also requires that the plan be made available for public comment if that review proposes a reduction to level of service

General changes have been made to the Plan, including updates to relevant documents and updating tables of asset quantities. The proposed changes are summarised as follow:

- The inclusion of proactive inspection of hazard, warning and regulatory road signs;
- The inclusion of 'beyond maintenance' works programs for sealed roads, footpaths and kerb and channel;
- Modification of trip hazard intervention level for Category 2 footpaths;
- The inclusion of road side drainage pit intervention level.

The proposed Road Management Plan (Version 5.0) was available for public comment for 28 days from the 23 February 2013. No comments were received.

This Road Management Plan (Version 5.0) is now in its final recommended format and Council may now proceed to adopt it so that it may be gazetted.

Cr Ellis moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That consideration of the report be deferred.

Carried.

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE

Portfolio:	Environment and Sustainability - Cr Richards
Source:	City Services
General Manager:	Gary Van Driel
Index Reference:	Waste Management

Summary

- In October last year the Victorian Minister for Environment and Climate Change released the draft Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy for consultation and comment.
- At its meeting on 11 December Council resolved to respond to the call for comment by:
 - indicating support for the draft Policy
 - requesting advice on the proposed timelines for the development of the proposed actions identified in the Policy
 - offering to be involved and assist in the development of a state wide integrated waste and resource recovery system, and
 - advised that the Policy should
 - address the role of community education and waste minimisation
 - include reference to the waste hierarchy as a guidance tool, and
 - Council expressed concern at the lack of transparency in the distribution of landfill levee funds and the provision of landfill levee funds for strategic waste management projects.
- On 15 April 2013 the Minister released the Getting Full Value - Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy.
- The Policy sets a 30 year vision *'to have an integrated state wide waste management and resource recovery system that provides an essential community service by protecting the environment and public health, maximising the productive value of resources and minimising long term costs to households, industry and government'* with policy principles and priorities for the next 10 years.
- It is part of the Victorian Government's economic and environmental strategies set out in the recently released Securing Victoria's Economy and Environmental Partnerships.
- The key objectives of the Policy are for the waste management and resource recovery system to:
 - support Victoria's economic prosperity
 - protect public health and preserve local amenity
 - contribute to environmental protection, and
 - all resource recovery and waste activities will function as one integrated statewide system.

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE (CONT'D)

- The Policy recognises that the previous Towards Zero Waste strategy achieved a reduction in waste to landfill by setting targets and assisting in projects, however, it proposes that what is now required is a more direct approach with commitment from the Victorian Government.
- This commitment across all identified waste management issues is the primary focus of the Policy and is what this Council has been advocating for some time.
- A full copy of the Policy may be viewed at www.dse.vic.gov.au/waste
- It is considered that the Policy addresses the concerns that Council has identified and raised and, through the commitments by the Victorian Government outlined in the Policy, will provide a sound planning basis for the long term provision of sustainable waste management services.
- The Policy, along with the Council's previously adopted waste management strategic position, will now form the framework for the preparation of the Council's waste management strategy.

Cr Richards moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That Council writes to the Minister welcoming the Policy direction and in particular the commitment by the State Government to address key waste management issues and offers to be involved and assist, to the extent that it is able, in the development of the statewide integrated waste and resource recovery system.

Carried.

Report

Background

In October last year the State Minister for Environment and Climate Change released the draft Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy for consultation and comment.

At its meeting on 11 December 2012 Council resolved to respond to the call for comment by:

- indicating support for the draft Policy,
- requesting advice on the proposed timelines for the development of the proposed actions identified in the Policy
- offering to be involved and assist in the development of a state wide integrated waste and resource recovery system, and

advised that the Policy should

- address the role of community education and waste minimisation,
- include reference to the waste hierarchy as a guidance tool, and
- Council expressed concern at the lack of transparency in the distribution of landfill levee funds and the provision of landfill levee funds for strategic waste management projects.

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE (CONT'D)

On 15 April 2013 the Minister released the Getting Full Value - Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy.

The Policy sets a 30 year vision 'to have an integrated state wide waste management and resource recovery system that provides an essential community service by protecting the environment and public health, maximising the productive value of resources and minimising long term costs to households, industry and government' with principles and policy priorities for the next 10 years.

It is part of the Victorian Government's economic and environmental strategies set out in the recently released Securing Victoria's Economy and Environmental Partnerships and assumes that if Victoria's waste is managed effectively it will provide economic development opportunities.

The key objectives of the Policy are to provide:

- Economic prosperity by facilitating investment, improving productivity and increased employment and increase efficiency through economical use of resources.
- Integrated and efficient systems by providing cost effective waste and resource recovery services, integrating land use planning, transport and development and managing information better for improved decision making.
- Public health and well being by preserving local amenity, improving facility performance and minimising risk to people, and
- Environmental protection by minimising environmental harm and improving environmental performance of facilities

The Policy states that the Victorian Government will:

- Assist Victorians to reduce waste generation and achieve financial savings through efficient resource use by
 - supporting commercial, not-for-profit and Victorian public sector organisations to achieve financial savings through waste reduction
 - providing households with the information and support they need to reduce waste by using household goods more efficiently
 - continuing to work in partnership with the Commonwealth Government through the *National Waste Policy: Less Waste, More Resources*, and take a lead role in national strategies that harness Victoria's strengths and capabilities
- Facilitate strong markets for recovered resources by
 - working to develop the right conditions for resource recovery markets to grow and mature in Victoria
 - continuing to use the landfill levy as a market signal that provides incentives to resource recovery industries and provides certainty to Victorian industries and businesses
- Facilitate a Victorian waste and resource recovery system that maximises the economic value of waste by
 - undertaking planning that promotes a cost effective, statewide network of infrastructure capable of moving waste materials to where the highest economic value can be achieved

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE (CONT'D)

- fostering investment in a diversified portfolio of infrastructure that can manage the projected mix and volumes of waste materials
 - aligning waste and resource recovery planning and delivery with land use and transport requirements under the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and Transport Integration Act 2010
- Reduce the environmental and public health risks of waste by
 - minimising the environmental and public health impacts of waste and resource recovery facilities
 - prioritising actions that minimise the short and long term environmental impacts of organic waste
 - facilitating the long term purpose of landfills to be for receiving and treating residual waste, and ensure a range of support mechanisms for closed landfills
- Reduce illegal dumping and littering by
 - Curbing illegal dumping to protect environmental and human health
 - reducing litter to provide safer communities and healthier environments
- Reform and strengthen the way institutions work and are governed to effectively implement waste policy.

A full copy of the Policy may be viewed at www.dse.vic.gov.au/waste

As with the draft Policy, the Policy recognises the need for a review of the governance processes (ie: the roles and responsibilities of the state organisations, namely the Department of Environment and Primary Industry, Sustainability Victoria and the regional waste management groups) and supports the current Ministerial Advisory Committee process that was established under the draft Policy. A separate report has been prepared regarding a response to this review.

Discussion

The Policy is a comprehensive list of waste management issues and most importantly clearly outlines what the State Government plans to do about these issues. As such it includes government commitments and actions and provides a strong support base for local government generally and this Council's waste management direction.

The Policy also identifies that the previous Victorian policy, Toward Zero Waste, served its purpose by setting targets for waste reduction that has resulted in the diversion of the 'easy to do' waste types and on the back of this it is necessary to take a different approach, one of more direct Victorian Government action, commitment and practical support.

The most significant commitment is in the Vision 'to establish a state wide integrated waste management system' that incorporates all waste streams with land use planning and regulator support across all the varying community needs, both in the short and long term. This system will be developed through the preparation of a state wide infrastructure strategic plan that acknowledges current waste infrastructure, identifies the gaps and provides direction on infrastructure development. Of importance in this process is the prioritisation of organics as a waste stream requiring specific attention. The Policy proposes an organics strategy that seeks suitable organics processing technologies, regulator support and developer encouragement.

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE (CONT'D)

In terms of the particular issues raised by Council in its response to the draft Policy, the Policy:

- On a number of issues acknowledges the role of community education (eg: in waste reduction, materials recovery, illegal dumping) and commits to working with local government to co ordinate education programs to ensure maximum benefit is realised
- Addresses the issue of waste reduction by setting a goal to 'assist Victorians to reduce the waste they generate and save Victorian's money through efficient use of resources'.
- Recognises the role of the waste hierarchy and proposes that it now requires alignment with the principles of environmental protection to ensure best outcomes (eg: organics composting is rated highly in the waste hierarchy but this must be done to high standards to ensure that the environment and public health is protected)
- Confirms that the role of the landfill levee will continue as an incentive for resource recovery and to fund state organisations involved in waste management and projects with the possibility of it being increased for materials with greater potential to cause environmental damage (eg: organics). It is expected that greater transparency will result form the development of a strategic direction and allocation of funds to projects that align to this direction.

While the Policy is comprehensive it will not provide any quick fixes as it is a calculated policy that incorporates a 30 year vision with principles and priorities to be observed over the first ten years. It takes a responsible approach of gathering data to enable well informed decision making that will be embodied in various strategic directions. It is considered that this is exactly what the waste industry in Victoria needs at this time.

The potential failing in the Policy is the significant focus on waste management as an economic driver and the possible outcome that if this does not prove to be the case then the environmental benefits may be disregarded.

In terms of setting targets the Policy has taken the approach that these will be established in the form of performance measures once sufficient data is available to ensure that these are realistic and can be regularly measured. These performance measures will specifically address environmental impacts of landfills, illegal dumping and litter, waste generation reduction, waste and resource recovery processes and productivity, competitive markets for recovered materials and assessments of how planning and regulatory organisation are dealing with these aspects. These performance measures will be report on bi-annually.

It is recommended that the Policy be supported and that Council again offer to assist, to the extent that it is able, in the development of the various strategies proposed.

Environmental Implications

The underlying focus of the Policy is to reduce the environmental impact of the waste we produce.

3. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – GETTING FULL VALUE (CONT'D)

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications as a result of this report.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The Policy is the key strategic document for the management of waste in Victoria and establishes the foundation for waste management direction in the State. It will be translated into regional waste management plans and Council will be obliged to follow its direction, within the limitations of its own capabilities and community demands.

The Policy, along with Council's previously adopted waste management position paper, will form the basis for the preparation of Council's own waste management strategy.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No Council officers have any direct or indirect interest in this matter, in accordance with Section 80© of the Local Government Act.

Risk Assessment

There are no notable risks to Council as a result of the recommendation from this report.

Social Considerations

The Policy should provide direction for the provision of waste management services by the Council that may have social considerations, however, Council will be able to address these matters at a future time as part of the consideration of any aspect of its waste management service delivery.

Communication

Other than the response to the Minister there are no communication issues as a result of this report.

4. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY – MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Portfolio:	Environment and Sustainability –Cr Richards
Source:	City Services
General Manager:	Gary Van Driel
Index Reference:	Waste Management

Summary

- In October last year the Victorian Minister for Environment and Climate Change released the draft Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy for consultation and comment.
- The draft Policy committed to the appointment of a Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) to advise on institutional and governance arrangements to deliver on the objectives outlined in the draft Policy.
- The MAC has been established, comprising three members with expertise in local government, waste management and economic management with the task to investigate and carry out industry consultation during April and May and report to the Minister by the end of May.
- Local government consultation sessions have been conducted over the period 26 April to 9 May. A Council officer attended a consultation session on 1 May.
- The MAC has 'not encouraged' consultation submissions other than through the consultation sessions, relying on these and information gathered from previous reviews and investigations.
- The MAC is required to review only the Victorian government organisations involved in waste management, namely Department of Environment and Primary Industry, Sustainability Victoria and the regional waste management groups. The role of local government as the service provider for municipal waste is acknowledged.
- The consultation focussed on the key issues of:
 - Infrastructure Planning – Strategic and Implementation
 - Infrastructure Procurement Facilitation
 - Landfill Levee Funding and Financial Management
 - Market Development
 - Education, and
 - Data Management and Reporting

and raised a number of detailed questions around these issues, primarily to do with the relationships and roles and responsibilities of the Victorian government bodies and in particular those of the regional waste management groups and their configuration throughout Victoria.

- As input to the consultation session Council's attending officer emphasised the need to develop the statewide waste and resource recovery system strategic documents (ie: the waste and resource recovery infrastructure plan and the organics strategy) as a precursor to further consideration of these issues.

4. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY - MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONT'D)

- Once an indication of what is required under these strategies is identified then this will largely inform the preferred structure to deliver on these strategies. This approach is relevant to all the issues raised and particularly relevant to the future configuration of the waste management groups.
- This approach highlights the urgent need for the preparation of these strategies, a position that has been recommended in a previous report on the Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy, including an offer to the Minister for Council to assist in the preparation of the strategies.
- It is recommended that Council note the input provided by the Council officer to the MAC consultation session and advise the MAC that Council formally supports this position.

Cr Richards moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That Council writes directly to the Minister and to the Ministerial Advisory Committee recommending that the waste and resource recovery infrastructure plan and the organics strategy be developed prior to any further consideration of the issues before the Ministerial Advisory Committee and that these strategies be prepared as a matter of urgency.

Carried.

Report

Background

In October last year the Victorian Minister for Environment and Climate Change released the draft Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy for consultation and comment.

The draft Policy committed to the appointment of a Ministerial Advisory Committee (MAC) to advise on institutional and governance arrangements to deliver on the objectives outlined in the draft Policy.

The MAC has been established, comprising three members with expertise in local government, waste management and economic management with the task to investigate and carry out industry consultation during April and May and report to the Minister by the end of May.

Local government consultation sessions have been conducted over the period 26 April to 9 May. A Council officer attended a consultation session on 1 May.

The MAC has 'not encouraged' consultation submissions other than through the consultation sessions, relying on these and information gathered from previous reviews and investigations.

The MAC is required to review only the Victorian government organisations involved in waste management, namely Department of Environment and Primary Industry, Sustainability Victoria and the regional waste management groups. The role of local government as the service provider for municipal waste is acknowledged.

4. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY - MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONT'D)

The consultation focussed on the key issues of:

- Infrastructure Planning – Strategic and Implementation
- Infrastructure Procurement Facilitation
- Landfill Levee Funding and Financial Management
- Market Development
- Education, and
- Data Management and Reporting

and raised a number of detailed questions around these issues, primarily to do with the relationships and roles and responsibilities of the Victorian government bodies and in particular those of the regional waste management groups and their configuration throughout Victoria.

Develop the statewide waste and resource recovery system strategic documents (ie: the Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan and the Organics Strategy) as a precursor to further consideration of these issues to first identify what is required under these strategies. This is in accordance with Council submission to the Policy consultants in December 2012.

Discussion

The Ministerial Advisory Committee review has been confirmed as an action under the now released Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy – Getting Full Value, as previously reported to Council.

The vision of this Policy is *'to have an integrated state wide waste management and resource recovery system that provides an essential community service by protecting the environment and public health, maximising the productive value of resources and minimising long term costs to households, industry and government'* with the preparation of a waste and resource recovery infrastructure strategic plan and organics strategy key actions to guide the implementation of this system. The previous report identifies these actions as crucial to the forward direction for waste management in Victoria, as at present there is no strategic direction other than waste reduction targets set under the previous State waste strategy. That is, there is a destination but no road map. The Policy provides this road map.

In addition to these strategic documents the Victorian Policy flags the likelihood of waste infrastructure being established on a 'hub and spoke' arrangement with the hub containing specific infrastructure items (eg: major landfill, waste treatment facility) with feedstock delivered by transport networks from the outer areas (ie; the spokes).

The infrastructure plan and organics strategy will provide guidance on the type of facilities required and the preferred locations and feedstock sources and as a consequence will help in determining the preferred procurement processes and provide for transparency in the expenditure of future landfill levee funding.

4. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY - MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONT'D)

If prepared through a collaborative process these strategic documents will assist in gaining buy in from all stakeholders. It should be noted that the Policy promotes the integration of waste which includes commercial and industrial waste and construction and demolition waste, all of which are controlled by the private sector. This will add a further level of complexity to the future direction and the future governance and institutional arrangements. Identifying how these wastes streams will be managed is critical prior to deciding on how those responsible for these waste are to be included in the planning processes.

It is the therefore the strong recommendation of this report that these strategic documents should be developed prior to any serious consideration of how the State authorities should be structured and roles and responsibilities determined in order that these aspects can be aligned to best deliver on the directions that are identified. To establish these processes in the current waste management strategic void is not likely to provide the best outcome.

This approach does highlight the urgency around the preparation of these strategic documents and, as with the previous report of the Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy, Council should offer its assistance to the extent that it is able for the preparation of these documents.

Environmental Implications

The underlying focus of the Victorian Waste and Resource Recovery Policy and consequently the Ministerial Advisory Committee considerations, is to reduce the environmental impact of the waste we produce.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications as a result of this report.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The Policy is the key strategic document for the management of waste in Victoria and establishes the foundation for waste management direction in the State. It will be translated into regional waste management plans and Council will be obliged to follow its direction, within the limitations of its own capabilities and community demands.

How the Policy is to be implemented will have a significant bearing on how Council delivers its waste services in the future therefore it is critical that the most effective structure to deliver on the Policy is established. The recommendations of this report are considered to provide the best opportunity of achieving the most effective future waste management system.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No Council officers have any direct or indirect interest in this matter, in accordance with Section 80c of the Local Government Act.

4. VICTORIAN WASTE AND RESOURCE RECOVERY POLICY - MINISTERIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONT'D)

Risk Assessment

There are no notable risks to Council as a result of the recommendation from this report.

Social Considerations

Other than ensuring that the Policy delivery occurs in the most effective and transparent manner there are no social considerations resulting from this report.

Communication

Other than the response to the Minister there are no communication issues as a result of this report.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS

Portfolio: Sport & Recreation - Cr Irvine
Source: Projects, Recreation & Central Geelong / Sport & Recreation
General Manager: Dean Frost
Index Reference: Subject: Grants & Subsidies / Sport & Recreation
Grants & Funding - incoming

Summary

- Sport and Recreation Victoria's (SRV) funding programs provide an important opportunity for Council to secure much needed funding for sport and recreation projects in the municipality.
- This report outlines a number of projects recommended by the Projects, Recreation & Central Geelong Division for submission to the Community Facility Funding Program (Major Facilities, Minor Facilities, Soccer Facilities and Planning categories) and Country Football & Netball Program.
- Council seeks expressions of interest from sporting clubs and community groups, as well as reviewing reserve master plans and strategic documents to identify eligible projects for submission to SRV.
- The process for the selection and endorsement of projects to be submitted to Sport & Recreation Victoria by Council is recommended to be revised to allow for submissions to be made to future funding rounds in a timely manner.

Cr Irvine moved, Cr Richards seconded -

That Council endorse the:

- 1) development of submissions for Sport and Recreation Victoria's funding programs for expenditure in the 2014/15 financial year as follows:**

Community Facilities Funding Program – Major Facilities Category

- **Geelong Criterium Circuit Pavilion**

Community Facilities Funding Program – Minor Facilities Category

- **Regional Paddle Sports Pavilion Redevelopment**
- **Barwon Heads Village Park Playground Upgrade**
- **Eastern Park Tan Track Development**

Community Facility Funding Program – Soccer Facilities

- **Barwon Heads Village Park Soccer Field Upgrade**

Community Facilities Funding Program – Planning Category

- **Greater Geelong Recreation & Leisure Needs Study**

Country Football & Netball Program

- **Herne Hill Reserve Netball Court Development**

- 2) revised process for the selection of projects for submission to Sport & Recreation Victoria, and that revision to include bringing the report back to Council for endorsement.**

Carried.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Report

Background

Each year, the State Government make funds available for sport & recreation projects through a number of Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV) grant programs.

Generally, these funding programs encourage:

- better planning of sport and recreation facilities;
- innovative sport and recreation facilities;
- accessible, inclusive, high-quality & sustainable sport and recreation facilities;
- increasing communities' access to leisure opportunities; *and*
- strengthening communities through sport and recreation participation.

There are two funding programs that are of particular relevance to this report – Community Facility Funding Program and Country Football Netball Program. Within the Community Facility Funding Program there are four categories that are of relevance to this report (as outlined below).

Grant Program/ Category	Who can apply	No. of Applications	Maximum Amount per Grant	Maximum Total Project Cost	Funding Ratio** (minimum)
Community Facility Funding Program – Major Facilities Category	Sporting clubs, community groups & Councils	One (1)	\$650,000	No limit	1 State : 2 Local
Community Facility Funding Program - Minor Facilities Category	Sporting clubs, community groups & Councils	Up to three (3) – seeking a maximum total of \$200,000	\$100,000*	\$500,000	1.5 State : 1 Local
Community Facility Funding Program – Soccer Facilities	Sporting clubs, community groups & Councils	Up to two (2) – seeking a maximum total of \$100,000	\$100,000	No limit	1.5 State : 1 Local
Community Facility Funding Program – Planning Category	Councils	One (1)	\$30,000	No limit	1.5 State : 1 Local
Country Football Netball Program	Sporting clubs, community groups & Councils	Up to three (3), seeking a maximum total of \$100,000	\$100,000	No limit	1.5 State : 1 Local

*Applications under the Minor Facilities category for the maximum grant amount need to involve an exceptional project or circumstance.

**Funding ratio is specific for regional cities

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Discussion

This report relates to two matters for the consideration of Council: 1) endorsement of projects to be submitted to SRV for funding consideration, and 2) revision of the process for the selection and endorsement of projects to be submitted to Sport & Recreation Victoria by Council.

This report refers specifically to the recommended applications for possible funding by SRV under the Community Facility Funding Program (Major Facilities, Minor Facilities, Soccer Facilities and Planning categories) and Country Football & Netball Program. In determining recommended projects, the SRV funding guidelines/criteria and the likelihood of success have been considered.

Projects submitted to SRV for consideration will be eligible for funding in the 2014/15 financial year. Projects that will have commenced prior to the announcement of funding are not eligible and cannot be considered for submission to SRV.

Applications to SRV are due on the following dates:

- Community Facility Funding Program (all categories) – 5 June 2013
- Country Football Netball Program – 31 January 2014 (based on advice from SRV)

* Please note that the funding program guidelines (including funding criteria) were released by the State Government on 6 May 2013.

Community Facility Funding Program - Major Facilities Category

The Major Facilities category provides funding opportunities for projects with significant regional and/or multi-use benefit, as well as providing participation outcomes across wide geographic and demographic populations.

The assessment criteria for this category are as follows:

Why?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	Responds to identified community needs and issues and is strategically supported by local or regional plans and/or State Sporting Associations/peak bodies planning.
	Addresses a gap in local/regional provision of facilities.
How?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	Clearly identifies the project scope, methodology and how proposed outcomes can be completed within a prescribed timeframe (detailed in a Project Management Framework).
	Includes provision of appropriate project costing and confirmation of funding sources.
	Includes formally endorsed schematic plans that address safety, risk management, Universal Design principles, Environmentally Sustainable Design**.
	Demonstrates economic impact during construction and operation, including employment during and after construction.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Who?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
10%	Engages, consults and collaborates with a variety of stakeholders.
	Will be managed by an appropriately qualified team.
	Considers inter-municipal linkages and issues where appropriate.
What will the project achieve?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
50%	Increases (or in certain cases maintains) participation in sport and recreation. As a result of the project, what will be the additional participation and programming outcomes? Please provide support letters that clearly state how each partner will benefit.
	Encourages the broadest possible community participation in sport and recreation activities.
	Has significant regional/sub-regional and/or multi-purpose benefits.
	Improves the quality and range of sport and recreation opportunities.
	Demonstrates appropriate business planning, which addresses operational and financial sustainability.

A number of projects were considered for the Major Facilities category. The City of Greater Geelong can submit one (1) application for consideration by SRV under this category. In evaluating projects, consideration was given to projects that provide the greatest benefit to the community and meet the assessment criteria for the funding program. Availability of local funding sources was also taken into consideration.

Council staff have had discussions with the SRV regional office to gain feedback on potential projects. The project that is proposed to be submitted to SRV for funding consideration is outlined below:

Project: Geelong Criterium Circuit Pavilion

Project Description: Construction of a pavilion at the Geelong Criterium Circuit (Belmont). This project will provide much needed amenity, administrative and social facilities for cycling events, club competition & training, and programmed activities at the criterium circuit. The criterium circuit currently has no pavilion or amenity facilities.

Total project cost: \$1,400,000

Funding sources: \$466,000

Council contribution required: \$934,000

Community Facility Funding Program - Minor Facilities and Soccer Facilities Categories

The Minor Facilities and Soccer Facilities categories provide funding opportunities for locally significant projects that increase participation in sport & recreation and improve community access to facilities.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

While these two grant categories are separate, they share common assessment criteria. The Minor Facilities category is for all sport and recreation activities, whereas the Soccer Facilities category is for soccer facilities only.

The assessment criteria for these categories are as follows:

Why?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	Responds to identified community needs and issues, based on consultation and addresses a gap in the provision of local facilities.
	Is strategically supported by local or regional plans and/or State Sporting Associations/peak bodies plans.
How?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	Clearly identifies the project scope, methodology and that proposed outcomes can be completed within a prescribed timeframe.
	Includes the provision of quotations/internal cost estimates, and schematic plans (endorsed by the project partners) for the project.
	Includes confirmation of funding contributions (both financial and in-kind) with letters detailing level and type of in-kind contribution provided.
	Addresses issues around safety, risk management, Universal Design Principles and Environmentally Sustainable Design.
	Includes project costs provided by a certified quantity surveyor, tender price or independent qualified expert for projects with a total project cost of more than \$500,000 (excluding GST). (For Soccer Facilities only).
Who?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
10%	Consults and collaborates with a variety of stakeholders.
What will the project achieve?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
50%	Increases (or in certain cases maintains) participation in sport and recreation. As a result of the project, what will be the additional participation and programming outcomes? Please provide support letters that clearly state how each partner will benefit.
	Encourages the broadest possible community participation in sport and recreation activities.
	Considers multi-use and improves the quality and range of sport and recreation opportunities.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Minor Facilities Category

A number of project registrations were submitted to Council by sporting clubs and community groups that are eligible for the Minor Facilities category. The City of Greater Geelong can submit up to three (3) applications for consideration by SRV under this category. In evaluating project registrations, consideration was given to projects that provide the greatest benefit to the community and meet the assessment criteria for the funding program. Availability of funding contributions from local sources was also taken into consideration.

Council staff have had discussions with the SRV regional office to gain feedback on the proposed projects. The projects that are proposed to be submitted to SRV for funding consideration are outlined below:

Project 1: Regional Paddle Sports Pavilion Redevelopment

Project Description: Redevelopment of the existing pavilion/storage facility on the Barwon River at Balyang Sanctuary. This project will provide increased capacity for multiple user groups to use the facility as a base for activities. The pavilion is the central facility for paddle sports within the municipality, providing regional benefit to the community.

Total project cost: \$300,000

Funding sources: Grant \$80,000, Club \$80,000 In-kind (Club) \$25,000

Council contribution required: \$115,000

Project 2: Barwon Heads Village Park Playground Upgrade

Project Description: Upgrade of the playground at Barwon Heads Village Park on Sheepwash Rd. This was identified as a sub-regional playground in the Geelong Play Strategy. The playground is due for upgrade works to provide greater opportunities for informal recreation. Sub-regional playgrounds within the Geelong are designed to provide unique play experiences throughout the municipality.

Total project cost: \$250,000

Funding sources: Grant \$70,000

Council contribution required: \$180,000

Project 3: Eastern Park Tan Track Development

Project Description: Upgrade of the Tan Track at Eastern Park to provide a central facility for informal walking and running activities. The project will include the installation of timing equipment, distance markers, signage, crossing points and path upgrades.

Total project cost: \$150,000

Funding sources: Grant \$50,000

Council contribution required: \$100,000

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Soccer Facilities Category

A number of project registrations were received by Council that are eligible for the Soccer Facilities category. The City of Greater Geelong can submit up to two (2) applications for a total of \$100,000 for consideration by SRV under this category. In evaluating project registrations, consideration was given to applications that provide the greatest benefit to the community and addressed the assessment criteria.

Council staff have had discussions with the SRV regional office to gain feedback on the proposed project. The project that is proposed to be submitted to SRV for funding consideration is outlined below:

Project 1: Barwon Heads Village Park Soccer Field Upgrade

Project Description: Upgrade of the playing field at Barwon Heads Village Park to include irrigation and drought tolerant turf. This project will allow increased use of the playing field for soccer. This project is supported by the Barwon Heads Village Park Master Plan.

Total project cost: \$200,000

Funding sources: Grant \$100,000

Council contribution required: \$100,000

Community Facility Funding Program - Planning Category

Council has an opportunity to apply for funding through the Planning Category to undertake a recreation planning or facility feasibility project. Planning projects are generally required to address a Council/region-wide project and/or provide solutions to complex sport and recreation issue.

The assessment criteria for this category are as follows:

Why?	Demonstrate how the planning process:
20%	Responds to identified community needs and issues and is supported by local organisations and/or Sporting Associations/peak bodies planning.
How?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	Clearly identifies the project scope, methodology and proposed outcomes in a draft project brief.
	Encourages innovative approaches to address issues such as risk management, Universal Design, multi-use and environmental sustainability.
Who?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
10%	Will consult and collaborate with a variety of project partners and stakeholders.
	Considers inter-municipal linkages and issues (where appropriate).

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

What will the project achieve?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
50%	Proposes outcomes that would increase (or in certain cases maintain) participation in sport and recreation.
	Plans for projects that encourage the broadest possible community participation in sport and recreation activities.
	Considers multi-use and improves the quality and range of sport and recreation facilities and programming outcomes.

The following project is considered the highest priority amongst potential planning projects.

Project: Greater Geelong Recreation & Leisure Needs Study

Project Description: The Greater Geelong Recreation & Leisure Needs Study will investigate and quantify the recreation and leisure needs of current and future communities within the municipality. The focus of this study will be to provide broad strategic direction on future resource allocation to meet current and anticipated leisure needs. A key focus for the project will be the development of service plans to be delivered under Council's asset management framework. The project will include analysis of capital contributions, service provision and economic development opportunities.

Total project cost: \$100,000

Funding sources: Grant \$30,000

Council Contribution required: \$70,000

Country Football & Netball Program

The Country Football & Netball Program provides funding opportunities for football and/or netball facility projects that increase participation in football and netball and improve community access to facilities.

The assessment criteria for this category are as follows:

Why?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	– Responds to identified community needs and issues and is supported strategically by other local or regional plans and/or State Sporting Associations/peak bodies planning.
	– Aligns with Victorian Government priorities, for example, the project is in a location of rapid population growth, a Community Renewal, Community Building Initiative or Neighbour hood Renewal area.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

How?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
20%	– Clearly identifies the project scope, methodology and proposed outcomes that can be completed within a prescribed timeframe.
	– Includes the provision of quotations/internal cost estimates, concept/schematic plans for the project and confirmation of funding contributions (both financial and in-kind).
	– Encourages innovative approaches to address items such as risk management, universal design principles, multi-use and environmental sustainability.
Who?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
10%	– Consults and collaborates with a variety of stakeholders including relevant peak bodies.
What will it achieve?	Demonstrate the extent to which the project:
50%	– Increases, or in certain cases maintains participation and addresses the demand for facilities.
	– Considers multi-use and improves the quality and range of sport and recreation opportunities.
	– Improves access to those groups traditionally disadvantaged, for example, people with a disability, women, young people, older adults, people from non-English speaking backgrounds, Indigenous people and those rurally isolated.

A number of project registrations were received by Council that are eligible for the Country Football & Netball Program. The City of Greater Geelong can submit up to three (3) applications for a total of \$100,000 for consideration by SRV under this category. In evaluating project registrations, consideration was given to applications that provide the greatest benefit to the community and addressed the assessment criteria.

Council staff have had discussions with the SRV regional office to gain feedback on the proposed project. The project that is proposed to be submitted to SRV for funding consideration is outlined below:

Project 1: Netball Court Upgrade – Herne Hill Reserve

Project Description: Upgrade of netball facilities at Herne Hill Reserve from one netball court to two plexipave netball courts with lighting. Herne Hill Reserve is one of the few remaining reserves to have only one court available for competition and training. The upgrade of facilities to include an additional court will allow St Josephs Football Netball Club to host all competition and training at the reserve. The club currently runs training and competition outside of regular fixture times due to the limitations of having a single court. This project will necessitate the relocation of turf cricket nets at the reserve.

Total project cost: \$200,000

Funding sources: \$60,000 Grant, \$80,000 Club, In-kind (Club) - \$5,000

Council contribution required: \$55,000

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Preferred Applications

A summary of the projects, costs and funding contributions is provided below:

COMMUNITY FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM: MAJOR FACILITIES CATEGORY				
PROJECT / GRANT NAME	PROJECT COST	GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED	PROJECTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION	PROJECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION
Geelong Criterium Circuit Pavilion	\$1,400,000	\$466,000	\$934,000	NIL

COMMUNITY FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM: MINOR FACILITIES CATEGORY				
PROJECT / GRANT NAME	PROJECT COST	GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED	PROJECTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION	PROJECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION
Regional Paddle Sports Pavilion Redevelopment	\$300,000	\$80,000	\$115,000	\$105,000
Barwon Heads Village Park Playground Upgrade	\$250,000	\$70,000	\$180,000	NIL
Eastern Park Tan Track Development	\$150,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	NIL

COMMUNITY FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM: SOCCER FACILITIES CATEGORY				
PROJECT / GRANT NAME	PROJECT COST	GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED	PROJECTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION	PROJECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION
Barwon Heads Village Park Soccer Field Upgrade	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	NIL

COMMUNITY FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM: PLANNING CATEGORY				
PROJECT / GRANT NAME	PROJECT COST	GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED	PROJECTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION	PROJECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION
Greater Geelong Recreation & Leisure Needs Study	\$100,000	\$30,000	\$70,000	NIL

COUNTRY FOOTBALL & NETBALL PROGRAM				
PROJECT / GRANT NAME	PROJECT COST	GRANT AMOUNT REQUESTED	PROJECTED COUNCIL CONTRIBUTION	PROJECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION
Herne Hill Reserve Netball Court Upgrade	\$200,000	\$60,000	\$55,000	\$85,000

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Revision of Project Selection and Endorsement Process

SRV provides Councils with a number of opportunities to apply for funding for facility projects each year. SRV requires Councils to seek expressions of interest (EOI) from sporting clubs and community groups, evaluate projects and submit applications to SRV for funding consideration. Council officers also review reserve master plans and strategic documents to identify eligible projects. The general timeframe to run this process is 12 weeks, allowing for the following steps:

- Weeks 1-4 – community EOI process run by Council
- Weeks 5-6 – evaluation of EOIs, discussion of projects with SRV and Councillors, and development of the associated Council Report
- Weeks 7-10 – Council Report process – allows for revision by General Manager, revision by Executive Management Team, Council briefing and endorsement of projects at a Council meeting
- Weeks 11-12 – Development of final funding applications for submission to SRV

In recent funding rounds, Council has been given considerably less than 12 weeks by SRV to submit projects. This has led to Council running shortened expression of interest and evaluation processes, as well as requiring the development of applications during the Council report process. This has negatively affected the community's ability to submit sufficiently developed projects and has impacted on Councils ability to give due consideration to potential funding submissions.

In an effort to address this, Council has run its expression of interest process prior to the official release of the funding program guidelines from SRV. While this assists in allowing the time necessary to complete the expression of interest and application processes, it 1) is reliant on early advice from the funding agency regarding timeframes for applications, and 2) exposes Council to changes in funding program guidelines.

The requirement to submit a Council report seeking endorsement for projects prior to making submissions to SRV (and other funding agencies) impacts on Councils ability to respond to funding opportunities in a timely manner as they arise.

The recommendation of this report is to allow Council's Sport & Recreation Department to run the following process for external funding opportunities without the requirement to submit a report to Council seeking formal endorsement:

- 1) Seek EOIs from sporting clubs/community on an ongoing basis
- 2) Community and Council informed of the deadline for EOIs based on SRV funding program due dates
- 3) Evaluation of EOIs against funding program criteria and Council requirements
- 4) Discussion with funding agency regarding potential funding submissions
- 5) List of EOIs submitted in each ward sent to each Ward Councillor
- 6) Recommendations for preferred projects established
- 7) Recommended projects discussed with Sport & Recreation Portfolio Councillor (including discussion on Council funding contributions)
- 8) Recommended projects discussed with Ward Councillors where relevant (including discussion on Council funding contributions)

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

- 9) Confirm projects to be developed
- 10) Development of applications for formal submission to the funding agency
- 11) Projects contribution requirements submitted for Council budgetary consideration

The revised process will allow greater flexibility in responding to funding program timeframes and an increased ability to engage the community in Council's expression of interest processes. The revised process will keep Councillors informed of EOI timeframes and potential projects in their respective wards.

Environmental Implications

There are no foreseeable environmental implications associated with this report, however during the assessment process, projects that included environmentally sustainable design initiatives were highly regarded.

Financial Implications

There are no immediate financial implications associated with adopting the recommendations of this report.

If funding submissions to SRV are successful, Council shall have to make a commitment to relevant projects for the 2014/15 financial year which would be determined via the budgetary process.

Support for projects within the Community Facility Funding Program (Minor Facilities & Soccer categories) and Country Football Netball Program have been expressed by the relevant the Ward Councillors.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

There are no legislative or legal ramifications associated with adoption of this report.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No Council staff or persons engaged in the evaluation of project registrations, development of recommendations or development of this report have a direct or indirect interest in the matters considered within the report.

Risk Assessment

There are no immediate risks associated with this report. A component of some projects may entail relevant risk management matters pertaining to the projects.

Social Considerations

The recommended projects will encourage the development of innovative community sport and leisure facilities. The expected population growth within the municipality necessitates the increased and improved provision of community sport facilities that provide a social outlet for the local community.

Participation in sport and recreational activities has long been recognised as an important contributor to community health and well being.

5. 2013/14 SPORT & RECREATION VICTORIA FUNDING PROGRAM SUBMISSIONS (CONT'D)

Benefits of physical exercise and recreation are well documented and include improved health and fitness, development of social skills, increased community connectedness and enhanced self-esteem. Thus an application for SRV funding for community recreation projects has significant social benefits.

Communication

Council's project registration process for the various funding opportunities discussed in this report was open to sporting clubs and community groups between 3 April 2013 and 24 April 2013. Council has used a range of communication methods to inform clubs and community groups of the process for projects to be registered and the associated timeframe (as outlined below).

- Email correspondence was sent to all club contacts on 3 April 2013 and 19 April 2013. A link to the online registration form was included in the email.
- A webpage was established on Council's webpage, with information on relevant grant programs and a link to the online application process.
- Council advertised the project registration process in the Geelong Advertiser "City News" on 13 April 2013 and 20 April 2013.
- An email was sent on 4 April 2013 to all clubs that submitted projects in 2012 inviting them to resubmit their previous project.
- Reminder emails were sent to club representatives that had begun (but not completed) online applications on 22 April 2013 and 24 April 2013.

In addition to the project registration process, staff from the Sport and Recreation Department of Council have investigated, and are aware of potential projects that fit within the funding programs discussed in this report through liaison with sporting clubs and community groups.

Council staff also discussed projects with a range of sporting clubs and community groups during the project registration period to provide advice on developing projects.

The guidelines for SRV's Community Facility Funding Program were released on 6 May 2013.

6. CONTRACTUAL MATTER

Portfolio:	Major Events - Cr Nelson
Source:	Projects, Recreation & Central Geelong / Events
General Manager:	Dean Frost
Index Reference:	Subject: Events

Cr Heagney moved, Cr Ansett seconded -

That in accordance with Section 89 (2) (d) of the Local Government Act 1989, this contractual matter be considered at the conclusion of all other business at which time the meeting be closed to members of the public.

Carried.

NOTICE OF MOTION – Cr R Nelson

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION 2012/2013

Council established the Geelong Major Events (GME) Committee in August 1998 pursuant to Section 86 of the Local Government Act.

The constituency of the Committee shall be constituted by:

- The Mayor and up to three other Councillors appointed by Council;
- The Chief Executive Officer;
- The Executive Director of Geelong Otway Tourism; and
- Four External Representatives of the business/arts/media or events community.

A quorum of the Committee shall constitute a number equating to one more than 50% of the appointed members of the Committee.

To ensure that a quorum is achieved at all ordinary meetings of the GME Committee, it is recommended that Council appoint a substitute Councillor member to the Committee who will be called upon to attend Committee meetings and participate with full voting rights, in the circumstance that one of the other Councillor committee members is not available to attend a formal meeting of the Committee.

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That Council support the nomination of Cr John Irvine, Portfolio for Sport and Recreation as Substitute Committee Member for Geelong Major Events.

Carried.

NOTICE OF MOTION – Cr A Richards

WAURN PONDS/ ARMSTRONG CREEK TRAIN STATION

Southern Geelong has experienced significant population growth which will continue for some time. This has changed the transport needs for all forms of transport including, walking, cycling, public transport including trains and buses and private vehicles use.

The Victorian State Government announced in the 2013/14 budget, that they would fund the development of a new train station at Waurnd Ponds/ Armstrong Creek, approximately where the rail line meets Rossack Drive in Waurnd Ponds. When all stages of the train station are built, there will be ample parking on the southern Armstrong Creek side, and close to 400 car parks on the northern Waurnd Ponds side. However, in stage 1 of the Victorian State government's plan for the new station, the only parking included will be 200 spaces on the northern side of the station.

This initial parking provision is completely inadequate, and will result in Waurnd Ponds streets becoming clogged with traffic. Residents will have trouble getting out of their driveway and down their streets. Currently, at Marshall station there are almost 400 car parks and these are now full each morning, well before the peak travel time finishes. Train passengers are now parking on the grassed area and outside the marked bays in order to get a park, and streets around the station are starting to fill up. Given the wide nature of Marshalltown Road, and the narrow nature of the suburban streets around the new Waurnd Ponds station, the problem of parking in suburban streets will be far worse at the new station.

There are at least two possible solutions to fix this problem. One is to build 400 car parks on the northern Waurnd Ponds side of the new station in stage 1 of the project. The second is to build car parks on the southern Armstrong Creek side of the new station, and provide the necessary infrastructure to cross to the train platform. It should also be made clear that provision of bus services from day one of the station opening, would assist greatly in keeping traffic levels down.

Cr Richards moved, Cr Harwood seconded -

That Council write to the Victorian State Government and Opposition, Member for South Barwon, and all Members of the Legislative Council for Western Victoria, thanking them for the funding for the new station, and seeking to address the inadequate provision of parking planned for stage one of the new Waurnd Ponds/ Armstrong Creek train station, and advocate for an increased level of parking to 400 spaces as a minimum, and the provision of bus services from day one of stage one of the project.

Further, that the Mayor, Buckley ward councillor, and council officers meet with the Victorian State Government, Member for South Barwon, and Members of the Legislative Council for Western Victoria to discuss a way forward on the issue that provides more parking at the new train station and bus services from day one of stage one of the project.

Carried.

COMMON SEAL REGISTER

Cr Fisher moved, Cr Heagney seconded -

That the following documents be signed and sealed by Council.

Carried.

1. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND JULIE ANN LATTA AND NIKOLETA FAZEKAS FOR 52 DONNELLY AVENUE NORLANE

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	52 Donnelly Avenue, Norlane
Application No:	794/2012

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 11 of Planning Permit No. 794/2012 issued on 25 October 2012 which allowed the construction of a second dwelling and a two lot subdivision.

The purpose of the Agreement is to link the subdivision with the approved development.

This Agreement has been prepared by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 794/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil

2. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND JOHN CHARLES WOOD AND GLENDA EILEEN WOOD FOR 18 CALVERT STREET, HAMLYN HEIGHTS

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	18 Calvert Street, Hamlyn Heights
Application No:	867/2012

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 12 of Planning Permit No. 867/2012 issued on 13 November 2012 which allowed the construction of a second dwelling and two lot subdivision.

The purpose of the Agreement is to ensure that the land is developed in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 867/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

This Agreement has been prepared by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 867/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil

3. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND LA MAISTRE BUILDERS PTY LTD FOR 140 DARE STREET, OCEAN GROVE

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	140 Dare Street, Ocean Grove
Application No:	1031/2012

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 11 of Planning Permit No. 1031/2012 issued on 2 April 2013 which allowed the construction of two dwellings and a two lot subdivision.

The purpose of the Agreement is to ensure that the land is only developed in accordance with plans approved by PP 1031/2012.

This Agreement has been prepared by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 1031/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil

4. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND VERA GAZZARD FOR 3 EDITH COURT, ST LEONARDS

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	3 Edith Court, St Leonards
Application No:	995/2011

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 14 (b) of Planning Permit No. 995/2011 issued on 18 January 2012 which allowed the Construction of Two (2) Double Storey Dwellings and Three (3) Lot Subdivision.

The purpose of the Agreement is to link the subdivision with the approved development.

This Agreement has been peer reviewed by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 995/2011 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil

5. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND WENDY MAREE EVERETT AND LEIGH EVERETT FOR 13 MARLBOROUGH STREET, HERNE HILL.

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	13 Marlborough Street, HERNE HILL
Application No:	CCE-2012-1148

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Council for consent to construct a verandah over a drainage easement.

The purpose of the Agreement is to protect the interests of the beneficiary (Council) of the easement.

This Agreement has been prepared by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The requirement of the land owner to ensure that access to the easement is unfettered and the interests of the beneficiaries of the easement are thereby protected, and to achieve and advance the objectives of planning in Victoria.

Council Obligations

That no form of compensation is payable by Council (beneficiary) to the land owner should it be required to remove the relevant building / structure (over easement) to allow access, or should any damage to the land / structure occur as a result of accessing the easement.

6. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND LONSDALE GOLF CLUB PTY LTD

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning and Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
File number:	Application: C67
Property:	Fellows Road Point Lonsdale

Officers' Comments

- On 09 April 2013 Council resolved to adopt Planning Scheme Amendment C67 to rezone land at Fellows Road Point Lonsdale
- At the same meeting Council resolved to sign and seal an agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

The purpose of the S173 Agreement is to provide for developer contributions associated with the residential development of part of the Golf Course Land.

Owner's obligations

The agreement contains detailed obligations for the owner (developer), including:

- Transfer and develop designated public open space free of charge.
- Upgrade the Fellows/Kirk Road Intersection.
- Upgrade Gill Road.
- Construct a footpath along Fellows Road.
- Provide for stormwater collection and management in accordance with the Stormwater Drainage Masterplan.
- Pay \$900 per lot community infrastructure contribution.
- Protect vegetation in accordance with the Landscape Masterplan.
- Retain or relocate existing bus stops and shelters in Fellows Road.

Council's obligations

The agreement contains obligations for Council, including:

- No further Community Infrastructure payments are required.
- The Amendment is processed expeditiously.
- The Agreement is registered on title.
- The Community Infrastructure Contribution will be applied by Council within the Point Lonsdale township.

7. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND ROBERT ANDREW BAIRD AND SALLY ANNE BAIRD FOR 13 AND 15 JUNE STREET, HAMLYN HEIGHTS

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	13 & 15 June Avenue, Hamlyn Heights
Application No:	44/2012

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 12 of Planning Permit No. 44/2012 issued on 5 July 2012 which allowed the construction of two additional double storey dwellings and a four lot subdivision generally in accordance with the endorsed plans.

The purpose of the Agreement is to ensure the lots are developed in accordance with plan endorsed under Planning Permit No. 44/2012.

This Agreement has been prepared by Council's solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owner covenants, agrees and acknowledges with the Council that all development on the Subject Land must be in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of the Planning Permit, or any subsequent planning permit issued by the Council relating to the Subject Land.

Council Obligations

Nil.

8. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND BARWON REGION WATER AUTHORITY AND DUANE JEFFREY FARRELL AND SHAWN JEROME FARRELL FOR 7 FINCHAVEN STREET, HERNE HILL

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	7 Finchaven Street, Herne Hill
Application No:	1217/2009

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by the Barwon Region Water Corporation. There are no conditions of Planning Permit No. 1217/2009 issued on 5 August 2010 which allowed the Alteration to the Existing Dwelling, Construction of Two (2) Double Storey Dwellings and Three (3) Lot Subdivision

The purpose of the Agreement is to ensure that a reticulated gravity sewer main will be installed to service the Lot 1 Land at the request of and to the satisfaction of the Referral Authority in the event of further development of the Lot 1 Land.

This Agreement has been peer reviewed by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that a reticulated gravity sewer main will be installed to service the Lot 1 Land at the request of and to the satisfaction of the Referral Authority in the event of further development of the Lot 1 Land.

Council Obligations

Nil.

9. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND ANN ABRAHMSSEN FOR 45 NEIL STREET, BELL POST HILL

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	45 Neil Street, Bell Post Hill
Application No:	78/2013

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 8 of Planning Permit 78/2013 issued on 15 February 2013 which allowed subdivision of the land into two (2) lots.

The purpose of the Agreement is to link the subdivision with the approved development.

This Agreement has been peer reviewed by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 1307/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil.

10. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND JASON MARTIN O'NEILL FOR 22 ST CLOUD STREET HIGHTON

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	22 St Cloud Court, Highton
Application No:	1387/2012

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 9 of Planning Permit No. 1387/2012 issued on 25 March 2013 which allowed the construction of two double storey dwellings and a two lot subdivision.

The purpose of the Agreement is to link the subdivision with the approved development.

This Agreement has been prepared by one of Council's panel solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owners obligation is to ensure that all development on the land is in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of Planning Permit 1387/2012 (or any amendment to that permit) or any subsequent Planning Permit.

Council Obligations

Nil

11. SECTION 173 AGREEMENT BETWEEN GREATER GEELONG CITY COUNCIL AND AARON MARK BAILEY AND NICOLE MARIE JANOSEVIC FOR 118 ANAKIE ROAD, BELL PARK

Portfolio:	Planning – Cr Macdonald
Source:	Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager:	Peter Bettess
Property:	118 Anakie Road, Bell Park
Application No:	1407/2011

Officers' Comments

This Agreement pursuant to Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 was required by Condition 13 of Planning Permit No. 1407/2011 issued on 24 May 2012 which allowed additions to the existing dwelling, construction of second dwelling, create access to a Category 1 Road Zone and a two (2) lot subdivision generally in accordance with the endorsed plans.

The purpose of the Agreement is to ensure the lots are developed in accordance with plan endorsed under Planning Permit No. 1407/2011.

This Agreement has been prepared by Council's solicitors.

Owner's Obligations

The Owner covenants, agrees and acknowledges with the Council that all development on the Subject Land must be in accordance with the endorsed plans forming part of the Planning Permit, or any subsequent planning permit issued by the Council relating to the Subject Land.

Council Obligations

Nil.

ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD

Portfolio: Governance – Cr Fagg (Mayor)
Source: Corporate Services
General Manager: Jeff Wall

Summary

- Section 80A (2) of the Local Government Act 1989 requires the record of an Assembly of Councillors be reported to the next practicable Ordinary Meeting of Council.
- A record of Assembly of Councillors meeting(s) is attached as an Appendix to this report.

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Harwood seconded -
That the information be received.

Carried.

RECORD OF ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS
(Council Meeting 28 May 2013)

Assembly Details	Councillor Attendees	Officer Attendees	Matters Discussed	Conflict of Interest Disclosures
Disability Advisory Committee 13 May 2013	Cr Fisher	K Pritchard (MGR) F Hemingway(MGR) S Muratti (OFF) C Carlyon (OFF)	- DisabilityCare Australia - Council Health and Wellbeing Plan - Disability Standards for Accessible Public Transport 2012 - Environment Unit on the DAC - Street Access - NDIS	Nil.
Property Strategy Advisory Committee 14 May 2013	Crs Macdonald, Fagg, Farrell, Fisher, Irvine, Ellis, S Kontelj, Ansett	J Wall (GM) A Grant (PROPERTY ADVISOR)	- Sales List for Council Properties - Sale of the Old Geelong Gaol - Sale of Land – 400 Melbourne Road - Sale of Land – Draper & Asbury Streets, Ocean Grove	Nil.
Councillor Briefing 21 May 2013	Crs Fagg, Ansett, Ellis, Farrell, Fisher, Harwood, Heagney, Irvine, E Kontelj, Macdonald, Nelson, Richards	S Griffin (CEO) J Wall (GM) D Frost (GM) J McMahon (GM) P Bettess (GM) G Van Driel (GM) T Demeo (MGR) R Grant (MGR)	- Central Geelong Task Force - Osborne House – Alternative Use Options - Recreational Vehicle – Issues and Opportunities - Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption of Amendment C242 – Barrabool Hills Neighbourhood Shopping Centre, Highton - Contractual Matter (Confidential) 2013-2014 Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRC) Funding Program Submissions - Review of Road Management Plan - Victoria Waste and Resource Recovery – Ministerial Advisory Committee - Victoria Waste and Resource Recovery – Getting Full Value	Nil.

Cr Fisher moved, Cr Ellis seconded –

That the meeting be closed to the public.

Cr Irvine left the meeting room at 7.55pm

Carried.

The Meeting was closed to the public at 7.55pm

A record of the proceedings of this section of the meeting is contained in a Confidential Minute Book.

The Meeting was opened to the public at 8.00pm

CLOSE OF MEETING

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 8.00pm. Tuesday, 28 May 2013.

Signed: _____
Chairperson

Date of Confirmation: _____