



MINUTES

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Tuesday, 27 March 2018

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

COUNCIL:

Cr B Harwood (*Kardinia Ward*)
Mayor

Cr S Asher (*Bellarine Ward*)
Cr J Mason (*Bellarine Ward*)
Cr T Sullivan (*Bellarine Ward*)

Cr E Kontelj (*Brownbill Ward*)
Cr S Mansfield (*Brownbill Ward*)
Cr P Murrhly (*Brownbill Ward*)

Cr R Nelson (*Kardinia Ward*)
Cr P Murnane (*Kardinia Ward*)

Cr A Aitken (*Windermere Ward*)
Cr K Grzybek (*Windermere Ward*)

SECTION A - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Acknowledgements 1

Confirmation of Minutes 1

Declarations of Conflicts of Interest 1

Question Time 2-7

Petitions 7

SECTION B – REPORTS

1. Response to Petitions Received in Relation to the Proposed Intensive Goat Farming and Milk Processing Plant at 240 Forest Road South, Lara 8-21

2. State Government of Victoria – Country Football and Netball Program..... 22-25

3. Planning Authorisations – Council to Staff 26-27

4. Contractual Matter (*Confidential*) 28

5. Proposed Development (*Confidential*) 29

6. Employment Matter (*Confidential*)..... 30

7. Audit and Risk Committee Summary Report (*Confidential*)..... 31

8. Tender T1770865 – Provision of Painting Services (*Confidential*) 32

SECTION C - ASSEMBLY OF COUNCIL

SECTION D - PLANNING DELEGATIONS

SECTION E - 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, 27 MARCH 2018
COMMENCING AT 7.00 PM**

PRESENT: Cr B Harwood (Mayor), Crs A Aitken, S Asher, K Grzybek, E Kontelj,
J Mason, P Murnane, P Murrhiy, R Nelson, T Sullivan

Also present: K Spiller (Chief Executive Officer), K Walsh (Director Manager Planning
and Development), B Luxford (Director Investment & Attraction),
G Wilson-Browne (Director City Services), L Quinn (Director Community
Life), P Anderson (Director Finance & Strategy), A Keen (Executive
Manager, R Leonard (Executive Manager Legal Services & Governance)

OPENING: The Chair declared the meeting open at 7.00pm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Council acknowledged Wadawurrung Traditional Owners of this land and all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People who are part of the Greater Geelong community today.

APOLOGIES: Cr Mansfield (*Maternity Leave*)

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Cr Kontelj moved, Cr Asher seconded -

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 27 February 2018 be confirmed.

Carried.

Cr Mason moved, Cr Gryzbek seconded -

That the Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 27 February 2018 be confirmed.

Carried.

Cr Murrhiy moved, Cr Asher seconded -

That the Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 13 March 2018 be confirmed.

Carried.

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Nil.

QUESTION TIME:

Anne Preston submitted several questions in relation to the General Local Law 2005 – in particular the issuing of permits.

Ms Preston also asked if she could arrange a meeting with the Melbourne Drone Group in the next three weeks.

Kelvin Walsh responded he will have the twenty-eight questions responded to tomorrow and indicated he would be happy to meet with the Melbourne Drone Group.

Srechko Kontelj asked the following questions in relation to the State Government appointed Monitors:

1) Do Councillors believe that they need the Monitors?

The Mayor responded he was unable to answer except to say it is the position we now find ourselves in and we will respect that position.

2) Does Council intend to request the removal of the Monitors ahead of the State Election?

The Mayor responded there are no plans at the moment.

3) Since its election in October to date, what has been the cost to Council of having the Monitors in place.

The Mayor responded costs for Jude Munro November to March was \$25,800, and Peter Dorling November to March was \$7,645 – a combined total of \$33,445.

Darren Keiller asked why don't Council have a snake catcher on their books, as it stands the system fails the public to find one for the case that snake/s were on Council land. As some other Councils pay snake catchers to remove from houses. I have three bills now in your system that snakes were on public land and still fighting your system to get paid from 28 October 2017.

Cr Nelson left the meeting room at 7.10 pm.

Guy Wilson-Browne advised that he had spoken with Mr Keiller and that the City has agreed, on this occasion, to pay the invoices, and has outlined to Mr Keiller the City has a preferred supplier process in place and to be able to invoice the City for his services he needs to be contacted by an officer to instruct him to undertake works on the City's behalf. Mr Keiller is encouraged to apply to be one of the City's preferred suppliers.

Cr Nelson re-entered the meeting room at 7.12pm

Paul Russell asked the following:

- 1) Inadequate notice. Officers have reservations that VCAT would cancel the permit on the basis of material mis-statements in public notices because "the detail on the notice was adequately and sufficiently clear in regards to the use". "It is not the function of the notice to describe in detail the permit being applied for". The Council notice reads, "use and development of land for intensive animal husbandry (goat farming) milk processing plant and creation of an access to a road zone 1. "I suggest that any reasonable person (including executives of Australian Wool Handlers) would read this to simply mean a goat farm with 300-400 animals plus a milking plant similar to many dairy farms.

If we look at the supposed detail – Intensive Animal Husbandry (Goat Farming)” intended to describe a goat farming unit measuring 214 metres by 139 metres housing 4500 goats. This is as long as three Airbus 380 passenger jets parked nose to tail “Milk Processing Plant” intended to describe a plant as tall as an 11 storey building. The tallest and newest building in Geelong (Worksafe) is only three storeys higher. Officers state “not the function of the notice to describe in detail”. In fact the description is so lacking in any detail that it is worthless. It is vague and intentionally or unintentionally misleading. I suggest that there are sufficient grounds for an objection to be raised by Council in regards to this notice.

The Mayor responded the officer’s advice to Council is that there are insufficient grounds for an objection to be raised by Council in regards to this notice.

- 2) Observations regarding the Second Basis – inadequate notice Point 2) Officers believe that it could not be argued that notice was inadequate. 252 notices were issued to both owners and occupiers of neighbouring and nearby properties etc. The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning has put out a guide styled “A Guide to the planning system”, which in part states this guide is designed to help professional planners, local Council and referral authority officers, Councillors, students, people applying for a planning permit. I refer to Section 3 Planning Permits Page 26, third last para, which reads if a responsible authority considers that a proposal is likely to be of interest or concern to the broader community, it may itself give notice it considers appropriate. This would be in addition to any further notice given by an applicant or the responsible authority in accordance with section 52(2). It could include publicity in the media, public meetings, newspaper articles, letterbox drops or any other appropriate method. Why did Council officers not consider that there was sufficient cause to notify a broader community given the impact on the township of Lara?

Kelvin Walsh responded that the Planning and Environment Act sets out how community consultation is to be undertaken. It states that notice must be given to owners and occupiers of lots adjoining the land to which the application applies. As part of broader notification, notice were also placed in the City News section of the Geelong Independent and Saturday Geelong Advertiser. Local media coverage also raised awareness of the application.

Danielle Thompson asked the following:

- 1) I notice that Peter Dorling, one of the three Administrators who approved the Nuchev proposal, is currently a State appointed Monitor tasked with implementing recommendations from the Commissioner’s Enquiry. Can you confirm that he played no part in this review given his previous role?

The Mayor responded he can confirm that Peter Dorling played no role in the preparation of the advice to the Council Meeting of 27 March 2018 in relation to the Nuchev petitions.

- 2) As the State Government appointed Administrators made the decision to proceed with the Nuchev proposal if the Council do proceed with an objection could the Council seek recover costs from the State Government?

The Mayor responded that the advice from officers is no.

Judith Fraser asked the following:

Officers Report on Nuchev Petition - This report hides behind legalities and selective information, it's not the full picture. In the FAQ's, there is frequent reference to 'compliance with the Act' in response to questions about notification and consultation.

Yet, on page 4 of the Officers report it says "There is a legitimate public interest in the fair operation of the planning laws'. It is not 'fair' that Officers hide behind 'compliance' to the Act and then proclaim that fairness should apply to planning laws. I live within 1.5 km of the proposed site and have never received one copy of the Geelong Indy, nothing about it on social media until after the VCAT approval. How are the recommendations of this report fair to me, my neighbours, and the hundreds of people who purchased land or property after Council approved the permit in 2016? Councillors need to be fair to the hundreds if not thousands of people in the Lara and Corio community, and if that negatively impacts one business that, according to their planning permit, will only employ 12 full time equivalent employees, then so be it. However, if Councillors confidently accept the recommendation of the report, what will they do to help us get fair treatment and adequate protection from harm and an unpleasant environment?

Council Report on Nuchev Petition - FAQ 17 – The question is about who is monitoring QFever. The answer talks about the need for Nuchev to provide a plan, and that the plan must be used. Previous versions of the plan have stated there will be biannual reporting to Council by Nuchev, and any outbreak in the interim periods would be subject to notification. The EPA have already publicly stated that they are not involved in this matter as the heard will be under 5000 heads. This sounds like that there will be no independent authority validating the newly submitted plan or monitoring adherence to it. Is this correct – if not, who will Council be relying on to validate the plan, and who will be monitoring it?

Question 18 – You state that you have relied on specialist advice from DHHS. Yet in Q15 – you point out that DHHS are reliant on the plans supplied by Nuchev. In the VCAT ruling "DHHS is not a referral authority for this particular proposal or indeed to any planning application for intensive animal husbandry. So, whilst it provided comments on the planning application to Council in this case, it is not recognized in the planning scheme as a referral authority or even as a relevant authority. " So why does Council rely on DHHS advice about Nuchev, when the information relied on by DHHS is supplied from Nuchev?

The Mayor responded that some of the questions asked will be discussed during debate later this evening.

Kelvin Walsh took the questions on notice.

Bronwen Baker asked:

In relation to the planning permit granted for 240 Forest Road South, Lara, two objectors appealed to VCAT against the granting of the permit. Unfortunately one objector was forced to withdraw due to serious health problems. The other objector, Mr Rob Leonard, proceeded unrepresented to a compulsory conference held at VCAT where he was persuaded by Nuchev's lawyers to withdraw this appeal. I have had lengthy conversations with Mr Leonard, who does not feel as though he reached agreement, as is the aim of a compulsory conference. He felt inappropriately pressured when Nuchev's lawyer raised the possibility of City of Greater Geelong taking enforcement action against him for not having permits for some things on his land, naming a shed and an office as examples. Rob felt that this knowledge, which could only have come from CoGG sources, was raised as a threat designed to encourage him to consent to withdraw his objection, which, alone with no legal advisor present, and under tremendous pressure, he reluctantly did.

This highly inappropriate, if not downright unlawful, conduct by Nuchev's lawyer, took place while CoGG's lawyer sat silently and allowed it to happen. In allowing this threat to be made, does this Council believe that the behaviour of the City's lawyer in this case, was in line with CoGG's responsibility as a model litigant?

Mr Leonard has adamantly advised that if he had not felt threatened in this way, he would never have agreed to Nuchev's terms, and the matter would have proceeded to hearing at VCAT, as did the Moorabool appeal. Does this council therefore agree, that Mr Leonard along with other Lara residents who were not aware of the proposed development at the time, deserve the opportunity to have our case heard?

The Chief Executive Officer responded Council is not in a position to make comment about Mr Leonard.

The Mayor also indicated he was unable to respond to the questions and thanked Ms Baker for her comments.

Leanne Rupene asked:

- 1) With Lara residents being concerned about becoming guinea pigs to a unprecedented risk of Qfever in a high Qfever risk industry involving foetuses and placentas from 4,500 breeding dairy goats, can you tell us where else in Victoria is an intensive animal husbandry, of this nature, been permitted in such close proximity to urban areas? Is Geelong the only council to permit a development like this?

The Mayor responded Council, as Responsible Authority, must assess all planning applications in line with obligation set out in the Planning and Environment Act and against policy set out in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme. Each planning application is unique and must be dealt with on a case by case basis and assessed on its merits. No two sites nor proposed uses and developments are the same.

- 2) There are no protocols in Victoria for dealing with a Qfever outbreak. The planning report talks about the cost to COGG of mounting an appeal, but what cost do they put on the safety and health of Lara residents?

The Mayor outlined that responses provided in the FAQ attachment to the Council report provide further information regarding QFever. It is important to note that QFever is a notifiable disease. Any outbreak at the site would be reported to the DHHS and managed by the Principal Medical Adviser to the Chief Health Officer; and a DHHS Communicable Disease Officer would lead the investigation and Council would provide assistance where required.

Brian Young asked if the Chair will honestly answer the question as to whether Council members have been involved in discussions with the Planning Department and others, been given correct information re QFever etc., had open access to all the submitted emails from residents on which to base their decision and vote – and the burden of responsibility they will carry if there is a future outbreak – or are they just going to vote as they have been instructed to?

Cr Grzybek responded that the correspondence you are referring to has been received and readily available to all Councillors who will make their own decision. They have not been told how to vote.

Michelle Macnaughtan asked:

- 1) The risk of Qfever is an issue relevant to both applications before us. Professor Wilks' Risk Management Plan identifies various matters that can impact upon the risk beyond the boundaries of this site. We do not support the proposal for detailed conditions to give effect to an Infection Control Management Plan, whether in a works approval or the planning permit, in this case.
The intention of this is to create a new regulatory regime to control the Qfever risk arising from this proposal through a 'Review Panel'. DHHS seeks this level of control. Given we do not support this control being established through planning permit conditions, the various agencies and Nuclech will need to consider alternatives to achieve the rigorous compliance regime."
- 2) What is the alternative plan that will ensure adequate regulatory monitoring, reaction and response to Nuclech's operations and the evident QFever risk?

Kelvin Walsh took the question on notice for a written response.

Andy Meddick addressed Council as follows:

- 1) Having read through the documentation released by Council under FOI, and also reviewing at length some of the technical parts of the application, a number of questions rear up relating to the original question before both Council and the Planning Department, that is, was the original approval process at some point corrupted, either by lack of relevant information, or the lack of probity on Council's part?
- 2) My first question relates to Council's assertion that residents were informed of the application by Council, by means of a mail out. Upon viewing the map supplied under FOI it is obvious that even a perfunctory view of the surrounding properties tagged in the Council supplied map as being those that were informed, reveals them all to be either land with no dwellings, that is farm land or paddocks, or properties dedicated to industrial use. Not one residential property. Are Councillors aware of this, as that clearly shows residents were denied consultation? And, did that therefore form part of the planning department's recommendation both recent and prior?
- 3) In relation to this fact, are Councillors aware that the planner is only under obligation to inform bordering properties, in this instance those that I have described above, and that informing any other property inhabitants is at the planner's discretion, therefore either deliberately or incompetently, excluding residents from the process?
- 4) Are Councillors aware that the applicants main odour and dust mitigation measure, the mechanical blind apparatus, were never inspected in a functioning operation, and in fact were deemed appropriate based upon the applicant submitting a brochure from the manufacturer that describes a product much smaller than intended for use in Lara, and as stated never observed in situ by any appropriately qualified scientist or person as to being appropriate for the use intended? Does Council not find this a serious flaw in the consideration of the approval process, given that the health of the residents is to rely on a completely theoretical mitigation proposal?
- 5) We have been informed throughout this process that the only avenue open to all residents, and to Council, was to prove that the planning approval process was somehow corrupted or incomplete. Does Council agree that the above questions quite obviously prove that that is the case?
- 6) This Council was elected on the promise that it was a new age for Council, a fresh beginning free of the bullying, corruption and ward favouritism that plagued its predecessor. During that time the residents of the northern ward of Windermere were disadvantaged in favour of those in the more economically upscale wards. This Council tonight, has a chance to prove that it stands behind all its residents, even if it believes that a court or appeals tribunal will not rule in its favour, because the residents have to believe that their elected representatives will stand with them because it is their moral responsibility, even if it costs the Council money.

Will this Council do the right thing by its northern constituents, or will we see a decision made because this proposal is not located in the land just to the west of the more economically advantaged suburbs?

The Chief Executive Officer responded that the process was in accordance with legal requirements and was not corrupted.

Vickii Darah asked regarding the Lara Goat Factory to be decided on this evening, how much confidence do Councillors have in the recommendations of Director of Planning, Kelvin Walsh, given that it will result in Lara residents being bitterly opposed to Councillors, perhaps for many years, yet Mr Walsh has resigned, leaving Councillors to bear responsibility for this planning mess?

The Chief Executive Officer responded he had full confidence in the Director of Planning and Development that he has handled the matter properly.

Dr Tamasin Ramsay asked what will Council do if/when the Lara community experience direct and/or indirect harms (QFever, QFever fatigue syndrome, etc). Are they sufficiently insured and/or willing to offer compensation?

International science repeatedly and unequivocally demonstrates that animal industries cause more harm to our land, air and waterways than any other harmful industry including mining, transport and fossil fuels. Environmental considerations may be sufficient for CoGG planning permit but are insufficient according to international science. How will you ameliorate the significant environmental harms caused by the goat factory that are not sufficiently addressed in the plan?

Nuchev's plan states that the risk of the goat factory bringing QFever to the Lara community is no greater than that posed to the general public outside of Lara. Yet serious outbreaks have occurred overseas as a direct result of goat industries.

The Chief Executive Officer responded that the Principal Medical Officer is the person who will be dealing with these issues.

PETITIONS: Nil.

1. **RESPONSE TO PETITIONS RECEIVED IN RELATION TO THE PROPOSED INTENSIVE GOAT FARMING AND MILK PROCESSING PLANT AT 240 FOREST ROAD SOUTH, LARA**

Source: Planning & Development
Director: Kelvin Walsh
Index Reference: Proposed Nuchev Development – 240 Forest Road South, Lara

Purpose

Following receipt of petitions received at its meeting on 27 February 2018, Council has requested Officers' advice addressing Council's ability to make an application under section 87 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987 (Act)* to cancel planning permit 1204-2015 granted in respect of a proposed intensive goat farm and milk processing plant at 240 Forest Road South, Lara. Having considered all relevant matters, this report recommends that Council not proceed with such an application, and the reasons why.

Background

There has been significant community interest in planning permit 1204-2015 and the City is aware of the strong objections of a number of Lara residents in particular to the continuance of this permit. At its meeting on 27 February 2018, more than 200 community members attended the Council meeting to voice their concerns about the operation of an intensive goat farm and milk processing plant pursuant to planning permit 1204-2015.

Over the past weeks, the City has received more than 250 items of correspondence from community members expressing concern about planning permit 1204-2015, and requesting the intervention of Council. The community has also raised a broader range of questions in relation to planning permit 1204-2015, the intensive goat farm and the milk processing plant. The questions have generally been recorded in **Attachment 2**, together with the City's response to those questions.

The Planning Permits and VCAT

1. Nuchev is an Australian-based company specialising in goat milk products, and more specifically sells a range of goat infant formula products globally. Nuchev intended to expand its Victorian operations across two separate sites in the City of Greater Geelong, with a breeding facility already in operation outside this municipality.
2. Nuchev applied for two planning permits as follows:
 - a. Planning permit application 32-2015 for the proposed use of the land at 715 Ballan Road, Moorabool for Intensive Animal Husbandry (Goat Farming), Associated Buildings and Works including Earthworks and Caretakers Dwelling (**Moorabool Operation**).
 - b. Planning permit application 1204-2015 for the proposed use and development of the land at 240 Forest Road South, Lara for the use and development of Land for Intensive Animal Husbandry (Goat Farming), Milk Processing Plant and Creation of an Access to a Road Zone 1 (**Lara Operation**).
3. Both planning permit applications were considered at a Planning Committee Meeting of Council on 25 July 2016.

4. With respect to the Lara Operation, notice of the application was undertaken as follows:
 - a. A public notice was sent by Council to 252 owners/occupiers of neighbouring and nearby properties to the Lara Operation site (**Attachment 3**). The application was described as:

USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR INTENSIVE ANIMAL
HUSBANDRY (GOAT FARMING), MILK PROCESSING PLANT AND
CREATION OF AN ACCESS TO ROAD ZONE 1
 - b. According to a Statutory Declaration made by the permit applicant on 19 October 2015, notices were erected at the proposed Lara Operation site on 1 October 2015 and maintained in good condition for 14 days from that date.
 - c. A notice of the application was inserted in the City News section of the Geelong Independent and the Geelong Advertiser headed "*Notice of an Application for Planning Permit*". The notice appeared in one edition of the newspapers (**Attachment 4**).
5. In response to the notices, 56 objections were received. An application was filed with the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (**VCAT**) by two objectors regarding the proposed planning permit for the Lara Operation. That application was the subject of a negotiated compulsory conference on 20 February 2017 following which a permit for the Lara Operation was issued at the direction of VCAT. Of important note, VCAT made the statement that: "*(b)ased on the information available to the Tribunal, (it) consider(ed) it (was) appropriate to make these orders.*"
6. An application was also filed with VCAT regarding the Moorabool Operation which was heard over 13 hearing days. On 10 January 2018, VCAT handed down its decision, denying both the planning permit and the EPA works approval for the Moorabool Operation. VCAT described the Moorabool Operation as being "*unique*" and as being at an intensity that "*does not currently exist in Victoria or elsewhere in Australia.*" and stated that the site in question was not incapable or unsuitable of being used for intensive goat farming. Specifically, it said:

"We are unable to approve this proposal in its current form and intensity. However, our decision to refuse both applications should not be taken to mean that this site is completely unsuitable for use as a goat dairy. It may be that our key concerns are matters of detail able to be addressed so that this site can be used for this purpose albeit in a modified lesser format and intensity."

The petitions and submissions to Council

7. At its meeting on Tuesday 27 February 2018, the following petitions were received by Council:
 - a. a petition of nearly 700 residents from around the Lara area: "*opposing (the) development at "240 Forest Road, Lara"* (sic) *for the risk of QFever, public health, the close proximity to suburban developments, traffic, smell and the confined cruel conditions provided for the goats.*"
 - b. a Change.org petition containing approximately 1770 names from the Geelong area, Australia and world-wide requesting to: "*stop the inhumane goat farm and spread of Q virus to our children*"

- c. a Change.org petition containing approximately 2112 names from the Geelong area, Australia and world-wide requesting to: *“(p)lease help and protect the residents of Geelong and surrounds as well as other communities in the state from inappropriate intensive factory farms and ensure that suitable buffer zones are included and owned by the proponents and that the lifestyles, amenity and health of people is protected.”*

These petitions were accompanied by a letter from Neil Longmore, Planning Lawyer, dated 20 February 2018 requesting Council make an application under section 87 of the Act to cancel the permit granted for the Lara Operation on three grounds. They are, as quoted:

- d. *“A material change of circumstances has arisen in that VCAT in Knol v. EPA & Greater Geelong City Council [2018] 33 extensively reviewed the identical QFever risk management measures for a similar intensive goat breeding proposal by Nuchev at Moorabool and found them inadequate (**the First Basis**);*
- e. *For a proposal with health implications for a large number of Lara residents, serious doubts exist as to whether the notice required under section 52 of the Act was adequate (**the Second Basis**); and*
- f. *There are continuing disturbing suggestions circulating that unlawful pressure may have been applied to the sole objector at the compulsory conference in Leonard v. Greater Geelong City Council [2017] VCAT 282 to induce that person to withdraw their objection, leading directly to the grant of the permit which foreclosed on all opportunities for a thorough independent VCAT examination of the risks of QFever. As the Tribunal was able to conduct a proper review of QFever risk management for the Moorabool facility leading to a refusal to grant a permit, the conduct that resulted in consent orders in Leonard may well, at its most charitable, constitute a material mistake in relation to the grant of the Lara permit under section 87(1)(c) of the Act, if not something more serious.” (**the Third Basis**)*

(the **Longmore Letter**).

8. Technically, the petitions themselves make no request of Council to make an application under section 87 of the Act. Only the Longmore letter specifically makes that request which Mr Longmore says is made *“on behalf of No To Nuchev”*, an unincorporated association. Despite the inconsistency between the Longmore Letter and the requests contained in the petitions submitted to Council, Officers have taken the requests made in the Longmore Letter as representing the wishes of all petitioners.
9. A further letter from AWH Tailored Logistics Solutions (**AWH**) dated 20 February 2018 was also handed to Council at its 27 February 2018 meeting requesting Council make an application to VCAT under section 87 of the Act in respect of the Lara Operation. AWH is located at 250 Forest Road South, Lara and is directly adjacent to, and shares a 600 metre boundary with, the proposed Lara Operation site. The grounds upon which AWH make their request to Council are identical to the grounds outlined in the Longmore Letter. Officers advise that AWH were notified of the application during the notice period. Council’s records show that AWH did not submit an objection at that time.

Key Issues

Principles

- The cancellation of a planning permit by VCAT is a serious step which should not be taken lightly. Previous decisions at VCAT uphold the certainty of permits and the persons acting in accordance with them and highlight the reluctance to use cancellation proceedings as a forum to reopen debate about the decision to grant the permit in the first place. The City understands that VCAT must strike a balance between the unfairness to a permit holder which would result from the cancellation of a permit and the public interest in the cancellation. In *Koutroubas & Ors v. Melton Shire Council [2002] VCAT 917*, VCAT stated:

“..it must be acknowledged that according fairness to the permit holders itself satisfies a public interest. There is a legitimate public interest in the fair operation of the planning laws. There is a legitimate public interest in the preservation of vested rights and the operation of planning provisions in a way which promotes consistency and the ability of persons in the position of the permit holder to know where they stand.”

VCAT may cancel or amend a planning permit under section 87 of the Act if it considers that there has been, of relevance –

- (i) A material misstatement or concealment of fact in relation to the application for the permit; or
- (ii) Any material mistake in relation to the grant of the permit; or
- (iii) Any material change of circumstances which has occurred since the grant of the permit or
- (iv) Any failure to give notice in accordance with the Act.

Observations regarding the First Basis - material change of circumstances

- The essence of the First Basis stated in the Longmore Letter was that the conclusion reached by VCAT in its decision regarding the Moorabool Operation should have also applied to the matter regarding the Lara Operation if that matter were properly heard and determined.
- The Officers advise that VCAT decisions subsequent to a granting of a permit may constitute a *‘material change of circumstances’* in the exceptional case and only where the decision concerned is a guideline decision, rather than a decision which largely turns on its specific facts.
- It is the Officers’ view that VCAT is unlikely to direct the cancellation of the planning permit for the Lara Operation site on this ground because:
 - As noted above, VCAT was clear in its reasons for decision that the refusal of the planning permit relating to the Moorabool Operation did not mean that the site was completely unsuitable for use as an intensive goat farm, stating that: *“It may be that our key concerns are matters of detail able to be addressed so that this site can be used for this purpose albeit in a modified lesser form and intensity.”*
 - VCAT’s decision in respect of the Moorabool Operation was not a decision that should generally apply to other cases and was decided upon the particular facts

of the Moorabool Operation (“*We are unable to approve **this** proposal in its **current form and intensity**”). Further, VCAT described the Moorabool Operation as “*unique*.” There is no comment made by VCAT as to the weight to be given to the decision in future cases.*

Observations regarding the Second Basis – inadequate notice

- The Officers have reservations that VCAT would cancel the permit on the basis of material misstatements in public notices because:
 - The detail on the notice was adequately and sufficiently clear in regards to the use and identification of the site. It is not the function of the notice to describe in detail the permit being applied for. Previous VCAT decisions have indicated that the function of a notice is to alert people to the fact that an application has been made and its general nature. The onus is on those given or seeing the notice to investigate and ascertain if they are affected by the application and whether they wish to lodge an objection.
 - Officers believe that it could not be argued that notice was inadequate. 252 notices were issued to both owners and occupiers of neighbouring and nearby properties. Two signs were placed on site and notices were placed in two newspapers. The Officers believe this exceeds the requirements for notice under section 52 of the Act. Apart from the formal notice, the issue was publicised through social media and newspaper articles.

Observations regarding the Third Basis – undue pressure

- The essence of the Third Basis outlined in the Longmore Letter is that Mr Leonard, the sole objector at the VCAT Compulsory Conference regarding the planning permit for the Lara Operation site, may have had undue pressure applied to him. The allegation does not point out who allegedly applied pressure to Mr Leonard nor how the pressure was applied. It is impossible for the City to provide any further comment.
- Be that as it may, the Officers do not believe that VCAT would cancel the planning permit for the Lara Operation site based on a material mistake in relation to the granting of that permit arising out of the way the compulsory conference was conducted based on the following facts:
 - Mr Leonard volunteered to participate in the compulsory conference;
 - The compulsory conference was overseen by a Tribunal appointed mediator;
 - Mr Leonard reached a compromise with Council and Nuchev; and
 - The Tribunal was satisfied that it was “*appropriate to make [the] orders*”.

Legal and other Costs

- The Officers have been informed that the cost to the City to run the section 87 application to hearing at VCAT would be no less than \$30,000. This does not include the cost of any expert witnesses that may be required. If the application fails and the City is ordered by VCAT to pay Nuchev’s legal costs, these are estimated at no less than \$30,000. The City has been informed that such an application would also tie up considerable City resources.
- If VCAT is persuaded to cancel the permit based on a material change of circumstances or misstatement or mistake, the City would be required to pay Nuchev

and any other “*person who has incurred expenditure or liability for expenditure*” compensation. This is impossible to quantify. Given that the Lara Operations permit was granted in February 2017, the costs that have been expended by others with “*vested rights*” in the planning permit could be considerable.

Conclusions

- Taking all matters into account and on balance, the Officers recommend that Council not proceed with an application under section 87 of the Act in respect of the planning permit for the Lara Operation site.
- If the petitioners include persons who objected to the grant of the permit, those persons are empowered by the Act to seek a cancellation of the planning permit at VCAT if they remain dissatisfied with Council’s decision provided they are able to satisfy the criteria set out in section 89 of the Act.

Cr Grzybek moved, Cr Aitken seconded -

That Council:

- 1) acknowledges and welcomes all investors who choose the City of Greater Geelong as a place to create employment opportunities and especially those with export potential and this applicant currently has a legally approved planning permit;**
- 2) acknowledges that although this planning process on the evidence currently presented before Council appears to have been legally issued and approved, the local community and those Lara residents in particular not formally notified during the original process wish some mechanism to allow their genuine concerns to be considered;**
- 3) proceed with an application under section 87 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* to cancel planning permit 1204-2015 at 240 Forest Road South, Lara; and**
- 4) write to N. Longmore, B. Baker and AWH Tailored Logistics Solutions advising them of the outcome of Council’s consideration of the petitions.**

Carried.

Division Requested:

For: Crs Aitken, Grzybek, Kontelj, Nelson, Sullivan, Asher

Against: Crs Murrihy, Mason, Murnane, Harwood

Attachment 1

Financial Implications

There are potentially significant financial implications to Council if it chooses to proceed with the section 87 application. Council would be liable for its own legal costs (which have been estimated conservatively at \$30,000) and also potentially the costs of all other parties that become involved in the application. In addition, the Tribunal may seek an undertaking from Council to pay compensation. Given that the planning permit was issued in February 2017, Officers cannot determine what losses the permit applicant has incurred since that time which may be claimable against the Council should VCAT cancel the permit.

Community Engagement

Council consulted with the community in accordance with the requirements of the Act by providing direct notice to 252 owners/occupiers of neighbouring and nearby properties to the Lara Operation as part of the planning permit application process. In addition, relevant notices were erected at the Lara Operation site for 14 days and notice of the application was inserted in the City News section of the Geelong Independent and the Geelong Advertiser. In response to that notification, Council received 56 objections to the proposal from the community.

Social Equity Considerations

Concerns regarding community health and amenity have been raised by the community with Council through questions, letters and emails, petitions and submissions. The matters raised by the community were also considered in the application process for the planning permit for 240 Forest Road South, Lara.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The legal implications of making an application under section 87 have been set out in this report. In addition, the Council is subject to the model litigant guidelines in relation to any legal proceedings it participates in.

Alignment to City Plan

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

There are no known conflicts of interest in the preparation of this report. This report has been authored by Council officers not involved in the original assessment and subsequent VCAT appeal process.

Risk Assessment

The risks of proceeding with an application under section 87 of the Act have been set out in this report. The risks associated with the planning permit were considered at the time of the permit application and subsequent VCAT compulsory conference.

Environmental Implications

There are no environmental implications arising from Council's decision to accept the recommendations that are the subject of this report.

ATTACHMENT 2

PROPOSED INTENSIVE GOAT FARMING AND MILK PROCESSING PLANT

240 FOREST ROAD SOUTH, LARA

ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

COUNCIL ADVICE

1. *Historically, how successful have section 87 proceedings been at VCAT?*

Section 87 applications are legal and technical in nature and each proceeding is based on its own merits according to known legal tests. Accordingly, the number of successful/unsuccessful applications brought before VCAT in the past will have no bearing on the outcome of any future section 87 applications.

In any event, on our research, since 2000, there are no known applications where VCAT has heard and determined to cancel a permit under section 87.

LOCATION

2. *Is the site properly zoned for an intensive goat farm and milk processing plant?*

The site is zoned for farming, which aims to provide for the use of land for agriculture and encourages the retention of employment and population to support rural communities.

A goat farm and a milk processing plant are permitted uses in the Farming Zone, provided there is a planning permit issued for those uses and the permit holder meets any conditions imposed through the permit.

Council as the responsible planning authority, is required to consider all applications for a planning permit that are made to it, and this includes an assessment of the application against the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

3. *The Lara Structure Plan clearly shows that the Industrial 2 Zone further to the south is for potentially polluting industries. The buffer zone between is intended to keep the township of Lara and its residents healthy. Is it reasonable to put a goat farm here?*

The Lara Structure Plan nominates 240 Forest Road South, Lara to be within an area to be used as a buffer of 'non-sensitive land uses' between the Geelong Ring Road Employment Precinct and the Lara township.

The buffer nominated in the Lara Structure Plan does not preclude applications being considered that are allowable in a Farming Zone.

The assessment of whether a goat farm is reasonable from a public health perspective was considered as part of the planning permit application, with advice sought from the Victorian Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). DHHS was satisfied, that as long as the proposed risk management plan was implemented, there would be no increased risk of Q Fever in the community from the use.

4. *If this development goes ahead, doesn't it set a precedent for industrial operations to be placed on any farming zoned land in the City of Greater Geelong?*

The Greater Geelong Planning Scheme sets out uses and activities that are allowed without a permit, that require a permit or that are prohibited on all land in Greater Geelong.

Any land use that requires a permit is assessed on a case by case basis, on its merits and consistent with the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme. Accordingly, this development would not set a precedent for this type of use in a farming zone.

Broadly speaking, residential uses go into residential zones, industrial uses go into industrial zones, commercial uses go into commercial zones and farming uses into farming zones.

All planning permit applications are assessed on their suitability for the zone.

The use of a goat farm is defined in the planning scheme as “intensive animal husbandry”, with the use being more broadly included under “rural industry”. This use is considered appropriate in a farming zone with a planning permit.

Similarly, the land use “milk processing plant”, is defined as “rural industry”, and is considered appropriate in a farming zone with a planning permit.

It’s not uncommon for rural industry uses to be located in a farming zone.

5. *How can an intensive farming and milk processing facility be approved for a location so close to the residential area of Lara?*

In considering the application for a planning permit, Council must take into account the zoning of the site and relevant planning policies.

A milk processing plant is required to be located at least 300 metres from land in a residential zone or education centre.

The location of a processing plant at 240 Forest Road South, Lara meets this required distance.

Council’s assessment of whether the land use was appropriate in terms of its location took into consideration matters such as odour, noise and traffic.

The conditions of the planning permit outline requirements in relation to Q Fever management, odour control, noise levels, delivery hours and hours of operation for management activities associated with the use.

6. *Why isn’t the goat farm located somewhere else, like the Golden Plains Food Production Precinct?*

Council must respond to, and assess, each application it receives on its merits in line with the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, on the site it is being proposed on. Planning permits attach to the land which is the subject of the permit.

Council cannot direct an applicant that a particular land use would be better located somewhere else as part of assessing the planning permit application.

It is not mandatory that all intensive agricultural land uses in the region be located in the Golden Plains Food Production Precinct.

THE PROPOSAL

7. *What is being proposed for the site?*

The planning permit allows for use of the site for milk processing and goat farming.

The planning scheme definition for this use is “intensive animal husbandry” and “rural industry”.

A purpose-built building to house goats is proposed, measuring 214 metres by 139 metres, with an open side and a height of 7.5 metres.

A milk processing plant is also proposed to be built which will have a maximum roof height of 27 metres. This building includes four 13 metre high refrigerated milk silos and a connected office building.

8. *Are the buildings too big and dominating for the site and the local area?*

The buildings have been assessed against the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, which includes design and siting issues under the Farming Zone.

The planning scheme does not have prescriptive guidelines on the size of buildings in the Farming Zone.

A planning assessment, which considered the surrounding area, the location of the buildings and proposed landscaping to provide a screen along the boundary, determined that the proposed buildings were reasonable for the site.

9. *When will the goat farm and milk processing plant operate?*

The conditions of the planning permit allow for:

- Management activities associated with the use to only occur between 4am and 11pm.
- Deliveries to and from the site to only occur between:
 - 6am and 10pm, Monday to Saturday
 - 7am and 6pm, Sunday

CONSULTATION

10. *Was the Lara community notified about the original planning permit application for 240 Forest Road South, Lara?*

Council wrote to 252 landowners and occupiers about the application, notices were placed in the City News section of the Geelong Independent and Saturday Geelong Advertiser (as well as being made public on Council’s website) and two signs were placed on the site, one on Forest Road South and one on Broderick Road.

Local newspapers ran a number of articles about the application prior to any decision being made.

56 people submitted objections to the planning application.

11. *How could so many people be so unaware of the original planning application?*

Public notification of the application complied with the Act.

There were a number of articles published in the local media about the proposal prior to the Council making a decision.

The number of objections submitted indicates that there was knowledge of the applications within the surrounding community.

12. Was the community consultation of the original planning application inadequate?

Community consultation was adequate and complied with the requirements of the Act.

The Act sets out how community consultation is to be undertaken. It states that notice must be given to owners and occupiers of lots adjoining the land to which the application applies.

The City's consultation, including advertising and sending and displaying notices, was undertaken in line with the requirements of the Act.

On Saturday 20 May 2015, Nuchev undertook its own community consultation, which was prior to lodging the application with Council.

Two open house events were held by Nuchev at the Lara Community Centre and Anakie Community House to share proposed plans and hear from the locals.

Local media coverage also raised community awareness of the application.

PLANNING APPLICATION ASSESSMENT

13. Did Council and the Administrators have all the information and experience needed to make an informed decision on the Lara planning application?

The Administrators made a decision on the planning permit application for 240 Forest Road South, Lara on 25 July 2016.

A detailed planning report was prepared by the City's officers, with input from DHHS, the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and others. This was provided to the Administrators to inform their decision.

The report provided an assessment of the planning permit application in line with the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme. The Administrators had all of the relevant information required for them to make a fully informed decision.

Objectors' concerns, including the risk of Q Fever, were considered as part of the original application and on review through a subsequent VCAT appeal process.

At a VCAT compulsory conference on 20 February 2017 it was agreed between all parties, including objectors, that the planning permit be granted with some variations to the permit conditions.

These variations included a requirement that a risk management plan for Q Fever, to mitigate the risk and manage Q Fever if detected, must be approved by the EPA and DHHS prior to submission to Council.

Q FEVER RISK & MONITORING

14. Why don't VCAT's concerns about Q Fever risk management at Moorabool apply to Lara?

A Works Approval from the EPA was required for the Moorabool operation as it proposed to accommodate more than 5,000 goats.

Given the proposed intensity of the Moorabool operation, the DHHS required an Infection Control Management Plan to be incorporated within the Q fever risk management plan under the EPA Works Approval.

It was determined through the VCAT hearing that the Works Approval would not have ongoing obligations once the farm was established and that no licence was required under the EPA. The only approval which had ongoing obligations would be the planning permit.

In making its decision the tribunal noted that the Moorabool site may well be appropriate for the proposed use but not at the proposed scale of 14,000 goats. VCAT's decision regarding the Moorabool operation was made on facts specific to that operation.

VCAT's decision does not set a precedent for other similar cases.

15. Is the Lara community being exposed to an unacceptable risk of Q Fever if the Nuchev goat farm goes ahead?

The City relies on the expertise of the DHHS for management of disease such as Q Fever. The application was referred to the DHHS for its comment.

DHHS requested that the applicant prepare a revised Q Fever risk assessment for 240 Forest Road South, Lara.

A DHHS report concluded that if adopted "the risk management measures proposed are expected to ensure that the risk of operating on these sites presents, at worst, no higher risk of human infection in the surrounding area than the current background level within the state".

The DHHS was satisfied that there would be no increased risk of Q Fever in the community as long as the risk management plan was implemented.

16. How will the risk of Q Fever be managed on site?

A risk management plan is required to be submitted as a condition of the planning permit for the site at 240 Forest Road South, Lara.

The condition requires that the risk management plan must have been approved by the EPA and the DHHS before it's submitted to Council.

As a condition of the planning permit, the applicant will be required to meet a range of risk management measures in order to ensure ongoing management of Q fever.

The condition on the planning permit also requires biannual reporting to Council on the implementation of the risk management plan.

17. Who will be monitoring Q Fever at the Lara goat farm?

A Q Fever risk management plan is required to be submitted to Council for endorsement as a condition of the planning permit.

The plan must be approved by the EPA and the DHHS.

The planning permit condition requires that the use must at all times be conducted in accordance with the endorsed risk management plan to the satisfaction of Council.

The condition on the planning permit also requires biannual reporting to Council on the implementation of the risk Q Fever management plan.

18. It is reported that Q Fever can be fatal to immune-suppressed residents and vaccinations have high egg protein and are not recommended for children under 15. How can residents be confident they will be safe?

Council has relied on specialist advice from the DHHS in relation to the assessment of the Q fever risks associated with the planning permit.

The advice provided to Council from the DHHS, was that the department was satisfied that there would be no increased risk of Q Fever in the community as long as the risk management plan was implemented.

19. What happens if Q fever breaks out on the site?

Q Fever is a notifiable disease.

Any outbreak at the site would be reported to the DHHS and managed by the Principal Medical Adviser to the Chief Health Officer.

A DHHS Communicable Disease Officer would lead the investigation and Council would provide assistance where required.

20. VCAT rejected the Moorabool proposal on the grounds of undue risk of potential Q-fever transmission (and wastewater issues), why didn't it reject the Lara goat farm?

The Moorabool proposal was not rejected on the grounds of undue risk of potential Q fever.

An appeal was lodged at VCAT by objectors (a joint application which included six objectors) against Council's decision to support the proposal for 240 Forest Road South, Lara.

At the VCAT compulsory conference on 20 February 2017 it was agreed between all parties (applicant, objector, residents and Council) that the planning permit be granted with some variations to the permit conditions.

The variations to the permit conditions strengthened the conditions to require that the Q Fever risk management plan must be approved by the EPA and DHHS prior to submission to Council.

AMENITY IMPACTS

21. Won't the goat farm be smelly?

The planning permit requires that an odour model be submitted to and approved by Council prior to the operation commencing.

The odour model requires that odour does not impact on the residential area to the north.

Any odour must be contained within the surrounding land zoned Industrial, Special Use and Farming.

Council will investigate any alleged breaches and undertake enforcement of planning permit conditions as required.

22. Won't the goat farm create too much traffic for the local roads?

The traffic generated by the goat farm is expected to be absorbed within the existing road network.

VicRoads, as the roads authority for Forest Road South, has provided conditions which are included in the planning permit in relation to access to and from the site on Forest Road South, including the provision of turning lanes.



Notification of a Planning Application

Why am I receiving this notice?

On the reverse side of this letter is Notice of a Planning Permit Application relating to a development, use or subdivision that is proposed either near you, or near land that you have an interest in as an owner or an occupier.

You are receiving notice of this application because you may be affected by the proposal.

Do I need to do anything?

If you feel that you may be affected by the proposal, we recommend that you review the documentation that has been submitted with the application. Information on how to do this is explained below. Following this you may object to the application. The objection must be submitted in writing and explain how you would be affected by the proposal.

If you are not concerned about the application, you do not have to do anything.

How can I find out more information?

If you would like to review the documentation that has been submitted with the application, you can do so by visiting www.geelongaustralia.com.au/advertisedplanning or any of the customer service centres listed on the reverse side of this page.

For more information or to discuss this application with a Planning Officer please phone 03 5272 4456 or email statplanning@geelongcity.vic.gov.au You are also welcome to drop into our offices at 100 Brougham Street, Geelong.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Garrett".

MELISSA GARRETT
STATUTORY PLANNING CO-ORDINATOR

STATUTORY PLANNING
100 BROUGHAM STREET, GEELONG

NOTICE OF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMIT

The land affected by the application is located at :	240 FOREST ROAD SOUTH, LARA
The application is for a permit to :	USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND FOR INTENSIVE ANIMAL HUSBANDRY (GOAT FARMING), MILK PROCESSING PLANT AND CREATION OF AN ACCESS TO A ROAD ZONE 1
The applicant for the permit is :	SPIIRE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD - GEELONG OFFICE
The application reference number is :	1204/2015
You may look at the application and any documents that support the application at the office of the Responsible Authority or online at www.geelongaustralia.com.au/advertisedplanning Customer Service Centre will be open between the hours of 9.00am-5.00pm weekdays (with the exception of Geelong West & Waurin Ponds which is open between 10.00am and 2.00pm). Brougham Street will be open from 8.00am-5.00pm.	<p>City of Greater Geelong City Development Offices 100 Brougham Street GEELONG VIC 3220</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>CoGG - Corio Customer Service Centre Corio Village Centre Bacchus Marsh Road CORIO VIC 3214</p>

The application can be viewed during office hours and is free of charge.
Any person who may be affected by the granting of the permit may object or make other submissions to the Responsible Authority

An objection must

- be sent to the Responsible Authority in writing
- include the reasons for the objection
- state how the objector would be affected

The responsible authority must make a copy of every objection available at its office for any person to inspect during office hours free of charge until the end of the period during which an application may be made for review of a decision on the application.

The Responsible Authority will not decide on the application before :	18th October 2015
---	-------------------------------------

If you object, the Responsible Authority will advise you of its decision.

ANDREW LOVE CENTRE PINK RIBBON RIDE

Please be advised of the following changed traffic conditions:

Upper Hearne Parade car park Eastern Park Geelong will be closed between 6.00am and 5.00pm on Sunday 4 October 2015 for the safe departure and conclusion of the Andrew Love Centre Pink Ribbon Ride.

Emergency access will be maintained at all times.

For more information visit www.geelongaustralia.com.au.

TOMORROW WHEN THE WAR BEGAN FILMING

MONDAY 12 AND TUESDAY 13 OCTOBER 2015

To ensure the safe filming of Tomorrow When the War Began the Barwon Heads Bridge will have temporary changed traffic conditions. Pedestrians and vehicles may experience a maximum 15 minute delay between approximately 9.00am to 6.00pm on Monday 12 and Tuesday 13 October.

Please note the filming involves the location being transformed into a film set, including the use of weapon props.

For more information please contact the film locations manager John Greene on 0418 535 686.

PUBLIC NOTICE

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO GRANT A LEASE

The City of Greater Geelong hereby gives notice under Section 190 of the Local Government Act 1989 of its intention to grant a lease to the Ocean Grove Golf Club Incorporated for land at 9 Guthridge Street, Ocean Grove, Victoria 3226 on the following terms and conditions:

- the rent be set at \$973.44 plus GST for the first year
- the term of the lease shall be for 50 years;
- other terms and conditions contained in the lease document.

Written submissions about the proposed lease will be considered in accordance with Section 223 of the Act and must be received by the Property and Procurement Department, City of Greater Geelong, PO Box 104, Geelong, Vic 3220, by 5.00pm on **Monday 2 November 2015**.

Any person requesting to be heard in support of their written submission is entitled to appear in person or by a person acting on their behalf before a committee of Council, the day, time and place of which will be advised.

EASTERN BEACH DREDGING PROJECT

The Eastern Beach swimming enclosure will be closed to swimmers from Monday 5 October 2015 for three weeks, weather permitting for dredging. Dredging take place to maintain safe diving and swimming within the enclosure.

These maintenance works are restricted to the swimming enclosure only, and do not restrict the use of the children's pool and other facilities at Eastern Beach.

The works are undertaken under an approved Environmental Management Plan for the monitoring and reporting of the dredging operations.

For more information please call 5272 5272.

HAVE YOUR SAY

CHANGES TO PAYMENTS MADE AT CITY HALL

Customers are advised that from Monday 5 October, City Hall will no longer have a cash facility to process cash payments made to Council. If you need to make a payment by cash, you can still do so at any one of the following Customer Service Centres:

- 100 Brougham Street, Geelong. Weekdays 8.00am to 5.00pm
- Ocean Grove, The Grove Centre, 66-70 The Avenue. Weekdays 9.00am to 5.00pm
- Drysdale, 18-20 Hancock Street. Weekdays 9.00am to 5.00pm
- Belmont Library, 163 High Street. Weekdays 9.00am to 5.00pm
- Geelong West, 153A Pakington Street. Weekdays 10.00am – 2.00pm
- Corio Shopping Centre, Shop 4k 83a Purnell Road. Weekdays 9.00am to 5.00pm
- Waurn Ponds Library, 230 Pioneer Road. Weekdays 10.00am – 2.00pm

Payments can also be made online at www.geelongaustralia.com.au or by phoning 5272 5272.

EMPLOYER SKILL SHORTAGE SURVEY WE NEED YOUR FEEDBACK

Enterprise Geelong is undertaking its annual employer survey to better understand skills needed in the region. Information collected in the survey will be used by a range of local stakeholders to inform strategies, for workforce planning and initiatives to address skills in shortage.

We encourage employers across the region to participate by completing this five minute survey to inform this important work.

Please complete the survey by 9 October 2015 at www.enterprisegeelong.com.au

A report of the collated survey results will be available from November 2015 at www.enterprisegeelong.com.au



Retiring Geelong Botanic Gardens horticulturalist Jeff Hecker with some of the colourful blooms now catching public attention at the GBG

PLANNING PERMIT

NOTICE OF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMIT

The land affected by the application is located at 3 Cricklewood Lane, Wallington.

The application is for a permit to: Variation of Restrictive Covenant X668195D, and Buildings and Works for an Outbuilding.

The applicant for the permit is: H STIRLING.

The application reference number is: 1087/2015.

You may review the application and any documents that support the application free of charge at the office of the Responsible Authority at the following City of Greater Geelong Customer Service Centres:

- Ocean Grove, The Grove Centre, 66-70 The Avenue between 9.00am and 5.00pm weekdays
- 100 Brougham Street between 8.00am and 5.00pm weekdays
- or online at: www.geelongaustralia.com.au/residents/planning/advertising.aspx

If after viewing the file you wish to discuss the application further please contact the Statutory Planning Department on 5272 4456.

Any person who may be affected by the granting of the permit may object in writing including the reasons for the objection or how the objector would be affected by sending submissions to:

The Responsible Authority, City of Greater Geelong, PO Box 104, Geelong 3220.

The Responsible Authority will not decide on the application before: **18 October 2015**.

If you object, the Responsible Authority will advise you of its decision. Please be aware that copies of objections/submissions received may be made available to any person for the purpose of consideration as part of the planning process in accordance with the Planning and Environment Act, 1987. Personal information will be used solely by the City in accordance with the Planning and Environment Act, 1987.

NOTICE OF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMIT

The land affected by the application is located at 240 Forest Road South, Lara.

The application is for a permit to: Use and Development of Land for Intensive Animal Husbandry (Goat Farming), Milk Processing Plant and Creation of an Access to a Road Zone 1.

The applicant for the permit is: SPIIRE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD - GEELONG OFFICE.

The application reference number is: 1204/2015.

You may review the application and any documents that support the application free of charge at the office of the Responsible Authority at the following City of Greater Geelong Customer Service Centres:

- Corio Village Centre, Bacchus Marsh Road between 9.00am and 5.00pm weekdays
- 100 Brougham Street between 8.00am and 5.00pm weekdays
- or online at: www.geelongaustralia.com.au/residents/planning/advertising.aspx

If after viewing the file you wish to discuss the application further please contact the Statutory Planning Department on 5272 4456

Any person who may be affected by the granting of the permit may object in writing including the reasons for the objection or how the objector would be affected by sending submissions to:

The Responsible Authority, City of Greater Geelong, PO Box 104, Geelong 3220.

The Responsible Authority will not decide on the application before: **18 October 2015**.

If you object, the Responsible Authority will advise you of its decision. Please be aware that copies of objections/submissions received may be made available to any person for the purpose of consideration as part of the planning process in accordance with the Planning and Environment Act, 1987. Personal information will be used solely by the City in accordance with the Planning and Environment Act, 1987.

CITY NEWS

PHONE: 5272 5272
WWW.GEELONGAUSTRALIA.COM.AU

JOIN THE CITY

WE'RE NOW HIRING!

Are you interested in working for the City? We currently have the following positions available:

- Property Officer

To find out more, to apply, or to subscribe to our weekly job alerts, visit www.geelongaustralia.com.au

PUBLIC MEETINGS

CENTRAL GEELONG TASK FORCE SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETING

The next meeting of the Central Geelong Task Force Special Committee will be held at 9.30am on Friday 9 October at City Hall Chamber. Enter through the Little Malop Street entrance. This meeting is open to the public.

COUNCIL MEETING

The next meeting of Council will be held at 7.00pm on Tuesday 20 October 2015 at the Council Conference and Reception Centre, City Hall, Geelong. Enter through the Little Malop Street entrance. This meeting is open to the public.

TENDER

TENDER T1600010- BUILDING WORKS GROVEDALE TENNIS PAVILION RENOVATION

The City invites tenders closing 2.00pm on Wednesday 28 October 2015.

For tender assistance contact Graeme Kemp on 5272 5033

Tender documents are available in the first instance from the City's website www.geelongaustralia.com.au. For tender website assistance please contact Tenderlink on 1800 233 533.

EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST

STATE GOVERNMENT OF VICTORIA – COUNTRY FOOTBALL AND NETBALL FUNDING PROGRAM

The City is seeking expressions of interest for the following State Government funding opportunities:

Grant Program/Category	Maximum Amount per Grant	Funding Ratio (minimum)
Country Football and Netball Program	\$100,000	1.5 State 1 Local

Expressions of interest are invited from football and netball clubs that are seeking funding for sport and recreation facility development projects.

Submit your expressions of interests online at www.geelong.smartgrants.com.au/countryfootballnetball2015_2016

Expressions of interest close at midnight on **Sunday 18 October 2015**

Applicants are encouraged to discuss projects with Council officers prior to commencing an expression of interest.

For more information please email sport@geelongcity.vic.gov.au or call 5272 5272.

2. STATE GOVERNMENT OF VICTORIA - COUNTRY FOOTBALL AND NETBALL PROGRAM

Source: Community Life - Social Planning & Investment
Director: Linda Quinn
Index Reference: Sport & Recreation Grants & Funding - Incoming

Purpose

To seek Council endorsement to develop an application to the state government's Country Football and Netball Program (CFNP).

Background

Each year, the state government allocates funding for sport and recreation projects through a number of grant programs.

The Country Football and Netball Funding Program (CFNP) aims to improve football and netball facilities in rural, regional and outer metropolitan areas through funding for infrastructure developments.

Applications opened on 24 January 2018 and must be submitted to Sport & Recreation Victoria (SRV) by 12 April 2018.

Key Issues

- Sport & Recreation Victoria has presented Councils with a second opportunity for funding support which reflects the tight deadlines for submission.
- Following an assessment of the five (5) Expressions of Interests received, the upgrade to the Grovedale Football Netball Club change rooms, located at Burdoo Reserve Grovedale, is the recommended project for submission to SRV. This project has the greatest alignment to Council priorities and the CFNP funding criteria.
- As the recommended project is requesting a contribution of \$100,000 from the funding program, only one application will be submitted by Council.
- The total project cost is \$390,000 and the project will require a Council contribution of \$260,000, with the Grovedale Football Club contributing \$30,000.
- This project has been given priority as it was able to demonstrate the need for the facility upgrade in order to support female participation in football. The club has recently expanded to include four female teams in season 2018, and at present the facility does not provide suitable change facilities to support continued growth in women's participation.
- An assessment of the projects submitted identified this project as being most aligned with the G21 and AFL Barwon Regional Strategy. Both strategies have been endorsed by Council.

Cr Murnane moved, Cr Nelson seconded -

That Council:

- 1) endorses the development of a submission to Sport & Recreation Victoria's Country Football and Netball Program for the upgrade to the Grovedale Football Netball Club change rooms;**
- 2) refers the proposed Council contribution of \$260,000 to the 2018/19 Budget for consideration. Noting that should this application be unsuccessful, Council contribution will not be required.**

Carried.

Attachment 1

Discussion

The Country Football and Netball Funding Program (CFNP)

The Country Football and Netball Funding Program (CFNP) opened on 24 January, 2018 and closes on 12 April, 2018.

Only rural, regional and outer metropolitan councils can apply for the funding, so clubs and associations must submit an Expression of Interest on their projects to Council. The maximum grant amount available is \$100,000 per Council. Council is eligible to submit up to three (3) applications that total the maximum funding amount.

Information on the Country Football and Netball Program can be found at: <http://sport.vic.gov.au/grants-and-funding/our-grants/country-football-and-netball-program>. The CFNP guidelines are included at attachment 2.

Over the years, Council has submitted a number of applications to this fund for consideration. In the past five years, four out of five applications have been successful. The details of the last four successful applications are;

2014/15

Leopold Memorial Reserve – netball change rooms

CFN - \$100,000, External contributions - \$600,000, Council - \$455,000

2016/17

Anakie Reserve – unisex umpire change rooms

CFN - \$100,000, Council - \$1.077M

2017/18

Winter Reserve – unisex change rooms

CFN - \$100,000, External contributions - \$702,000, Council - \$348,000

2018/19 (Round 1)

Richmond Crescent Reserve – unisex umpire change rooms

CFN - \$100,000, Council - \$331,000

Grovedale Football Netball Club Stage 1 Change Room Upgrade

The project that has been identified as the preferred application with greatest community benefit and chance of success is the Grovedale Football Netball Club Stage 1 change room upgrade

This project will deliver Stage 1 of the change room upgrade at Burdoo Reserve. The project will provide modern, welcoming and gender neutral change facilities. This facility upgrade will support 500+ participants currently engaged at the Club along with their growing female football membership base. Female football at the Club has grown to include four teams in season 2018, and at present the facility does not provide suitable change facilities that can support this growth. This development will assist in delivering a facility that aligns with the AFL facility guidelines for unisex use and is supported by the G21 and AFL Barwon Regional Strategy which rates the current condition of the change facility as 3/10 (poor to very poor) .

Financial Implications

Should the funding submission to SRV be successful, Council will be expected to make a commitment to the project in the 2018-19 financial year. The minimum funding ratio for this program is \$1.5 State: \$1 Local.

2018-19 Budget – total Council contribution required \$260,000.

Proposed income:

Funding Source	Confirmed	Amount
Country Football Netball Program	N	\$100,000
Council contribution 2018/19	N	\$260,000
Grovedale Football Netball Club	Y	\$30,000
Total income/total project cost		\$390,000

Community Engagement

Following the state government opening the grant applications on 24 January, 2018 Council advertised and opened an Expression of Interest (EOI) which called on submissions from all football and netball clubs within the municipality. Football and netball clubs were contacted directly advising them of the new funding round. The EOI process ran from Friday 9 February, 2018 to Wednesday 21 February, 2018. Five (5) Expressions of Interest were received and evaluated.

During the evaluation process, EOIs were assessed against the CFNP Guidelines (Attachment 2) along with Council's budget drivers and the Our Future Community Indicators. Alignment to supporting strategies such as the G21 AFL Barwon Strategy were also considered. Discussions were held with local SRV and AFL Barwon representatives to ensure both had a level of comfort with the proposal. The assessment of applications can be found at attachment 3.

Social Equity Considerations

The proposed project will support growth in female football across the municipality and within the Grovedale Football Netball Club. The current facility cannot accommodate female participation due to being outdated and not aligning with modern standards and expectations. This project will provide a gender neutral facility that is compliant and appropriate for females.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

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

Alignment to City Plan

The recommended project aligns to the City Plan's priority of *Community Wellbeing* along with the City's Clever and Creative vision through the *Inclusive, Diverse, Healthy and Socially Connected Communities*. This project will encourage healthy lifestyles and connected communities through active recreation and participation in sport.

Conflict of Interest

No officer has any known indirect or direct conflict of interest in the preparation of this report.

Risk Assessment

There are no immediate risks associated with this report. A component of the project will entail relevant risk management and Occupational Health & Safety assessments.

Environmental Implications

There are no foreseeable environmental implications associated with this report. Environmentally sustainable design initiatives will be incorporated into the design where practicable.

Country Football and Netball Program

2016-2020

Guidelines



Authorised and published by the Victorian Government, 1 Treasury Place, Melbourne.

© State of Victoria, January 2018

Accessibility

To receive this publication in an accessible format, please contact the Grants Information Line on 1300 366 356, using the National Relay Service 13 36 77 if required.

Available at www.sport.vic.gov.au/grants

(1607027)

Country Football and Netball Program –2016-2020

Message from the Minister for Sport, John Eren

The Victorian Government is proud to continue our partnership with funding partners the AFL, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria through the *Country Football and Netball Program*.

The program is aimed at helping country football and netball clubs, and clubs on the metropolitan fringe, who may be struggling with outdated, overused or non-compliant facilities.

Grants of up to \$100,000 are available for projects that improve facilities, including new or redeveloped change rooms, installation of improved turf, drainage and irrigation, new or upgraded netball courts or installation of sports lighting for courts or ovals.

Better sport and recreation facilities go a long way to encouraging future football and netball players, coaches, officials and supporters of all abilities to participate in their local club and make it easier for the rest of the community to join in the fun and benefit from healthy and active lifestyles.

Better sport and recreation facilities allow clubs to draw bigger crowds, bringing them vital revenue. Having modern facilities also helps clubs attract new players from near and afar.

For many years, country football and netball clubs have been bringing people together to share their love of sport and community.

I'm confident by working together we can bring new life to country football and netball, the heart and soul of regional Victoria.

I look forward to seeing new and exciting projects benefitting even more Victorians as part of the *Country Football and Netball Program*.

Hon John Eren MP
Minister for Sport

Contents

Message from the Minister for Sport, John Eren	3
1. About the Country Football and Netball Program.....	5
1.1 What is the Country Football and Netball Program?	5
1.2 Why is the Victorian Government, the AFL, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria funding these grants?	5
2. Who can apply?	5
3. What types of activities might be funded?	6
3.1 What will not be funded?	7
3.2 Past Performance	8
4. Partnership approach	9
5. What are the funding details?	9
6. What is the application process?	10
6.1. Process for clubs	10
6.2. Process for councils	10
7. How will applications be assessed?	11
7.1 Assessment Criteria	12
7.2 Information you will need to provide as part of your application	13
8. Conditions that apply to applications and funding.....	14
8.1 Acknowledging the government's support and promoting success	15
8.2 Payments	16
9. Resources and additional information.....	16

1. About the Country Football and Netball Program

1.1 What is the Country Football and Netball Program?

The *Country Football and Netball Program* provides funding to assist grassroots country football and netball clubs, associations and umpiring organisations to develop facilities in rural, regional and outer metropolitan locations.

1.2 Why is the Victorian Government, the AFL, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria funding these grants?

The *Country Football and Netball Program* is a response to the Parliamentary Rural and Regional Services and Development Committee's Inquiry into Country Football Report, tabled in State Parliament in December 2004.

Improving football and netball facilities in rural, regional and outer metropolitan areas will support the regional and rural way of life and ensure the sustainability of country football and netball into the future.

2. Who can apply?

Only rural, regional and outer metropolitan councils can apply directly to Sport and Recreation Victoria.

Country football and netball clubs, associations and umpiring organisations can register their interest in applying for funding by submitting an Expression of Interest to their local council. Clubs and associations are advised to contact their local council about timelines for Expressions of Interest.

Councils then review and select the Expressions of Interest they wish to endorse, and submit full applications to Sport and Recreation Victoria for consideration.

Applications for the 2018-2019 funding round open on 24 January 2018. Applications close on 12 April 2018.

Clubs and associations are encouraged to contact their council regarding local arrangements in accepting Expression of Interest.

3. What types of activities might be funded?

Improving participation outcomes is a key objective of the program. Applications must clearly demonstrate how the project will improve participation outcomes. Specifically proposals should demonstrate how the project:

- will increase or maintain participation
- encourages participation by females, juniors, people living in growth areas and communities experiencing disadvantage
- improves the health and wellbeing of the community
- caters for non-traditional participants
- collaborates with AFL Victoria, Netball Victoria or relevant peak bodies
- encourages development of multi-use, shared and co-located facilities
- improves or implements Environmentally Sustainable Design
- applies or demonstrates principles of Universal Design.

Examples of potential projects include:

- modifying existing football and netball facilities to improve usage and access such as:
 - unisex change room facilities and amenities for players and umpires
 - multi-purpose meeting spaces catering for community and education programs.
- development or upgrading football and netball playing surfaces
- development or upgrading of football or netball lighting.

Smaller scale local level projects are encouraged and will be looked at favourably as part of this program.

All project applications will be assessed against the *Country Football and Netball Program* eligibility and assessment criteria.

Councils must discuss their project proposals with a Sport and Recreation Victoria representative before submitting applications.

Other considerations:

- councils must make timely contact with AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria representatives to discuss project ideas, seek their input into the planning and design of facilities and participation/programming initiatives
- projects must meet the relevant standards (for example, lighting projects should comply with Australian standards for the respective sport and playing surface dimensions)
- councils should incorporate Universal Design principles and environmentally sustainable design into projects

- councils are encouraged to explore funding models that demonstrate stakeholder commitment to the project
- facilities planned in functional, self-contained stages are eligible
- projects on private land are eligible, but will be subject to the establishment of a legally binding agreement between the organisation and local council to ensure ongoing public access. Such proposals should demonstrate evidence of a legally binding agreement
- projects on school land are eligible subject to a completed *Community Joint Use Proposal* (to the Department of Education and Training) which is completed by the applicant and the school. (Schools can access this document from the Department of Education and Training website.) Applicants must allow sufficient time to complete this document and obtain the necessary endorsement from the Department of Education and Training at both the regional office and central office
- proposals may include project management fees of up to 5 per cent of the total project cost
- councils wanting to undertake detailed Design and Construct projects are eligible. Councils will need to demonstrate appropriate levels of planning and are still required to submit schematic designs and costings with full applications.

3.1 What will not be funded?

The *Country Football and Netball Program* will not fund the following activities:

- projects where contributions from funding partners are not confirmed
- facilities where tenants are not adhering to the [Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport](#)
- requests for retrospective funding, where projects have commenced or are completed prior to receiving funding approval (includes, but is not limited to, construction, site clearing, earthworks and building works)
- projects that do not strongly meet the assessment and eligibility criteria
- projects that do not meet the objectives of the program
- projects that do not meet the relevant Australian standards (for example, lighting projects)
- applications from organisations other than councils
- the purchase of land

- projects that require ongoing funding or support other than the initial grant
- routine or cyclical maintenance works to existing facilities
- facilities where little or no public access is available
- facilities designated for electronic gaming machine operations. In addition, applications where the recipient organisation/s receive revenue from electronic gaming machines will generally be given a lower priority
- repair of facilities damaged by vandalism, fire or other natural disasters where the damage should be covered by insurance
- requests for ongoing operational costs such as, but not limited to, salaries, electricity, water and other utilities
- requests for the purchase of recreation, entertainment, sporting, maintenance or any other equipment, community transport or any other type of vehicle
- upgrading or redeveloping kitchen facilities and/or toilet facilities, except as part of a larger project that meets the objectives of the funding program
- projects previously funded by Sport and Recreation Victoria, unless applicants can demonstrate additional or new uses resulting in increased or innovative participation/programming outcomes
- the replacement of like-for-like surfaces (for example, netball hard-court replaced with a similar hard-court surface) will not be considered a priority to receive funding unless it can be demonstrated that additional uses are proposed and/or a multi-purpose element is included. Exceptional circumstances may be considered where a safety and/or standard/compliance issue is evident
- projects that do not support the principles of Universal Design and Environmentally Sustainable Design.

3.2 Past Performance

In finalising decisions on the allocation of funding for the *Country Football and Netball Program*, Sport and Recreation Victoria will review an applicant's past performance and assess whether this is likely to have an impact on the successful delivery of a future project. Poor past performance will be taken into account when assessing applications and may be reason for projects not being supported.

This assessment will include consideration of whether:

- organisations have taken the appropriate steps to implement any previous projects funded by Sport and Recreation Victoria (within appropriate timeframes)

- organisations have overdue projects funded by Sport and Recreation Victoria and whether they have requested a variation
- organisations have completed projects funded by Sport and Recreation Victoria and whether they have submitted acquittal documentation.

4. Partnership approach

To strengthen the potential outcomes from the *Country Football and Netball Program* for communities, councils are required to engage Sport and Recreation Victoria, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria as early as possible to develop proposals that strongly align with the fund.

This includes engaging with Sport and Recreation Victoria, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria in the development of a project, rather than just in the development of an application. Sport and Recreation Victoria will provide guidance on how project ideas or proposals align with the fund prior to developing an application.

Once funded, projects are required to fulfil specific obligations to maintain funding commitments to projects. These obligations are outlined in the Funding Agreements. Project Managers are required to be familiar with these obligations.

5. What are the funding details?

Councils may be successful in receiving up to \$100,000 per financial year. This can comprise of one large project seeking \$100,000 or up to three smaller projects across different sites.

Sport and Recreation Victoria funding towards total project costs (excluding GST) will be based on the following ratios:

Funding available	Local government authority	Funding Ratios
Up to \$100,000*** Councils may be successful in receiving the total maximum funding of \$100,000 consisting of up to three applications per financial year.	Greater Dandenong, Kingston, Frankston*	SRV \$1:\$1 local
	Mornington Peninsula, Nillumbik, Yarra Ranges, Ballarat, Bendigo and Geelong	SRV \$1.5:\$1 local
	Cardinia, Casey, Hume, Melton, Mitchell, Whittlesea, Wyndham	SRV \$2:\$1 local
	Rural	SRV \$2:\$1 local

Smaller projects that achieve the objectives of this program are encouraged and will be highly regarded.

****Consideration will be given to claiming in-kind expenses to a maximum of 50 per cent of the total project cost.*

**Clubs competing in leagues affiliated with AFL Victoria Country are eligible to apply.*

6. What is the application process?

There are some important steps to consider before submitting an application to the *Country Football and Netball Program*.

6.1. Process for clubs

Only local councils are able to submit applications directly to Sport and Recreation Victoria. Clubs and organisations can seek to access this funding by completing an Expression of Interest for Community Organisations form and forward it to their respective council.

Any clubs wishing to discuss a project should contact their local council who will provide further advice.

6.2. Process for councils

Step 1: Check your eligibility

Only councils can apply directly to Sport and Recreation Victoria for funding.

Step 2: Councils should discuss their activity idea with Sport and Recreation Victoria, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria representatives

Step 3: Apply using Grants Online

To apply, go to www.sport.vic.gov.au/grants

Make sure you have the information you need to apply on hand, including required documents, and click on 'Apply online' to submit your application through Grants Online. You will receive an Application Number when you submit an application online. Please quote your Application Number in all correspondence relating to your application.

Submitting your application online through Grants Online ensures it is received by Sport and Recreation Victoria immediately and can be processed in the most efficient way. If you need assistance with applying online, please call the Grants Information Line on 1300 366 356 or email grantsinfo@sport.vic.gov.au between 8.30am – 5pm weekdays.

All supporting documentation can be emailed to cfnp@sport.vic.gov.au copying in your Sport and Recreation Victoria representative.

When you submit your application online using the grants online system you will receive an application number. Please quote your Application Number in the subject line of your email. Attach all documents to one email, zipping the files if required.

You can also send attachments on a CD or USB, quoting your application number, to:

Community Facilities Group
Sport and Recreation Victoria
Department of Health and Human Services
GPO Box 4057
Melbourne, Victoria 3001.

7. How will applications be assessed?

A *Country Football and Netball Program* Steering Committee has been formed to oversee this program including the assessment of applications. The committee comprises representatives from Sport and Recreation Victoria, Regional Development Victoria, Australian Football League (AFL), AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria.

There are a number of common features in successful applications. Good applications are well planned, involve relevant stakeholder consultation and are clear about what they are aiming to achieve. Answering each of the Assessment Criteria questions will help applicants develop a more thorough project proposal.

Grant applications will be assessed against the *Country Football and Netball Program* Assessment Criteria and the required documents set out in this section.

Applications must also provide all the relevant supporting documentation to secure grant funding. The application form asks for a description of the project, response to the assessment criteria and an explanation of the outcomes.

For example, questions about project development, strategic justification, stakeholder engagement and participation outcomes are incorporated under the Assessment Criteria section. The percentage weightings allocated to each criterion represent the importance of the different weighting Sport and Recreation Victoria will use to assess project applications.

7.1 Assessment Criteria

	Project Development
30%	Clearly identify the project scope, methodology and how proposed outcomes will be completed within a prescribed timeframe.
	Include site specific schematic plans (developed with stakeholder input including Sport and Recreation Victoria, Netball Victoria and AFL Victoria) and describe how safety, risk management, Universal Design Principles and Environmentally Sustainable Design has been incorporated into the proposed project.
	Include evidence of project costing, quotations/internal cost estimates
	Include confirmation of funding sources and contributions (both financial and in-kind) with evidence detailing level and type of in-kind contribution provided.
	Include 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).
	Strategic Justification
20%	Why is this project required? Describe how it responds to identified community needs, issues and addresses a gap in local facilities.
	Provide evidence of how the project is strategically supported by local or regional planning and/or AFL Victoria or Netball Victoria planning.
	Stakeholder Engagement
10%	What are the outcomes of the consultation undertaken with project stakeholders including Sport and Recreation Victoria, AFL Victoria, Netball Victoria, clubs/leagues, associations, Regional Sports Assemblies and community groups.
	Will the project be managed by an appropriately qualified team?
	Participation Outcomes
40%	Describe how the project improves (or in certain cases maintains) participation in country football and netball. 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 from the project.
	Describe any additional programming opportunities identified and planned

	to increase (or in certain cases maintain) participation.
	How does the project encourage the broadest possible community participation in football and netball activities, social connection and health and wellbeing.
	Considers multi-use and improves the quality and range of football and netball opportunities.
	Demonstrate how this project or the broader facility promotes gender equity through Council policies and facility management plans.

7.2 Information you will need to provide as part of your application

Please submit the following mandatory documentation with your application.

All applications

- Site specific plan/aerial map showing location of proposed project
- Schematic Plans (site specific) developed with AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria, Sport and Recreation Victoria and stakeholder input (generic plans or plans from previous projects will not be accepted)
- Lighting Plans including lux charts that are site specific (for projects incorporating lighting)
- Quotes, internal cost estimates
-
- Quantity survey, tender price or independent qualified expert report for projects only over \$500,000 (excluding GST)
- Evidence of confirmation of funding sources (e.g. council report confirming contribution, letter from council CEO or club bank statements)
- Completed in-kind and voluntary labour support form (if applicable)
- Letters of support from organisations that clearly indicate how the group will either support or benefit from the project (as described in the 'What' section of the assessment criteria)
- Detailed Schedule of Use
- Project Management Framework
- Letters of support from organisations that clearly indicate how the group will either support or benefit from the project (as described in the 'What' section of the Assessment Criteria).
- Project Management Framework.
- Relevant sections of council reports/plans/strategies/community consultation to support the project (please do not attach entire documents).
- Technical and/or Access Audits (where available).
- Completed *Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport Form for Tenants* from all clubs that are tenants of the facility.
- A legally binding land-use agreement for projects located on private land.
- For those projects located on school land, a completed Joint Use Agreement, or a completed Community Joint Use Proposal to enter into a Community Joint Use

Agreement, plus a letter from the Department of Education and Training that indicates endorsement of the project at both the regional office and central office level

- Where applicable attach evidence that the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 2006*, Aboriginal Heritage Planning Tool has been completed to determine if a Cultural Heritage Management Plan is required for the project. The Aboriginal Heritage Planning Tool can be accessed at www.dpc.vic.gov.au/index.php/aboriginal-affairs/aboriginal-affairs-overview
-

8. Conditions that apply to applications and funding

Successful applicants must enter into a Funding Agreement with Department of Health and Human Services. Funding Agreements establish the parties and outline their commitments and obligations to each other, as well as setting out the general funding terms and conditions. It is recommended that applications review the Department of Health and Human Services standard terms and conditions before applying. It is recommended that you view the terms and conditions available at www.sport.vic.gov.au

- A Schedule is required to be executed (signed) by both parties. The Schedule sets out the:
 - activity details
 - funding amounts
 - agreed actions and payments
 - reporting requirements
 - acknowledgement and publicity requirements
 - other activity specific requirements
 - notices.
- Funds must be spent on the project as described in the application and outlined in the Schedule, unless changes are agreed to in writing.
- Successful applicants will have 18 months to complete the project.
- The facility tenant club(s) or association(s) are expected to adhere to the *Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport*. The *Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport – Forms for Tenants* must be completed and signed by each facility tenant club and submitted with the Full Application to Sport and Recreation Victoria. Applications without this form will not be considered for funding. More information about the *Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport* can be obtained from www.sport.vic.gov.au/
- A request to vary the timing or scope of an approved project must be discussed with your Sport and Recreation Victoria representative before submitting your request or commencing new works. Variation approval is at Sport and Recreation Victoria's discretion and may lead to a reduction or cancellation of the grant depending on the change in scope.
- Councils must inform the participating organisation(s), where applicable, of all funding arrangements and obligations in relation to the grant allocation. This includes ensuring the funded project does not commence prior to the endorsement of the Schedule.

- Councils are obliged to liaise with Sport and Recreation Victoria on the progress of funded projects, as requested throughout the life of projects as outlined in the Schedule.
- A local government officer must be designated to manage the project and provide information to the department according to the following key reporting requirements:
 - a Project Management Framework** must be completed and submitted with the application for all projects
 - through a process of appropriate engagement in the governance of a project, councils must secure Sport and Recreation Victoria’s endorsement of key documents such as schematic plans and architectural/planning briefs prior to work commencing. Projects must not commence or be tendered until endorsement is provided. Sport and Recreation Victoria may not make milestone payments if endorsement is not secured in a timely manner
 - councils must provide project acquittal documentation as required
 - councils are expected to guarantee the cash flow payments towards works where a community organisation is providing funding contributions for a project.
- Successful applicants will be required to contribute information on activity outcomes for use in outcomes reporting, program evaluation reviews or Department of Health and Human Services publications, 12 months after project acquittal.

**A Project Management Framework is a statement/spreadsheet that includes the name of the local government officer responsible for the project, project activities and project timelines. The Project Management Framework Fact Sheet, along with a basic Project Management Framework template, can be obtained from www.sport.vic.gov.au/grants

8.1 Acknowledging the Victorian Government’s support and promoting success

Successful applicants need to acknowledge the Victorian Government, the AFL, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria’s support through the provision of a grant from the *Country Football and Netball Program*.

Acknowledgement and publicity guidelines form part of the Funding Agreement and include the requirement that all activities acknowledge Victorian Government, the AFL, AFL Victoria and Netball Victoria’s support through logo presentation on any activity-related publications, media releases, promotional material and placement of a permanent Victorian Government endorsed sign/plaque at the site during construction and upon completed of infrastructure activities.

The Minister for Sport is to be given the opportunity to participate in any formal activity associated with the progress or completion of a facility or to officially open or launch the project. Openings and launches of *Country Football and Netball Program* projects are to be coordinated through the Office of the Minister for Sport. Councils considering staging an opening or launch must give adequate notice.

These guidelines have recently been updated to reflect current expectations of Victorian Government recognition. Acknowledgement and Publicity Guidelines can be found at www.sport.vic.gov.au.

8.2 Payments

Upfront payments for funded projects may be made if/when:

- a Funding Agreement has been signed by both parties and any special conditions have been met
- grant recipients provide reports as required, or otherwise demonstrate that the activity is progressing as expected
- other terms and conditions of funding continue to be met.

For all grants at least 10 per cent of the total funding is paid in arrears on evidence of satisfactory completion of the activity.

9. Resources and additional information

Further information in relation to each of the following items can be found at www.sport.vic.gov.au/grants and select *Country Football and Netball Program*.

Environmentally Sustainable Design

Proposals are encouraged to incorporate Environmentally Sustainable Design initiatives in project designs.

Competitive Neutrality Policy

Under the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) Competition Principles Agreement, Victoria is obliged to apply the COAG Competitive Neutrality Policy.

Capital Replacement Planning

A Capital Replacement Plan is a tool that can help you plan for the maintenance and eventual replacement of facilities. The development of a capital replacement plan is now a standard condition for many Sport and Recreation Victoria grants where facilities need to be periodically replaced or renewed.

Voluntary Labour and In-kind Support

Consideration will be given to claiming in-kind expenses to a maximum of 50 per cent of the total project cost.

Schedule of Use

A Schedule of Use is a list of all the sport and recreation activities, highlighting the extent to which the proposed facility development will be used. The schedule summarises the type and duration of the activity over a period of time and is a valuable tool to measure participation outcomes. Councils can use the Schedule of Use as provided or adapt and/or provide their own.

Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport

The facility tenant club(s) are expected to adhere to the Victorian Code of Conduct for Community Sport or related state sporting association code of conduct. Further information can be obtained from www.sport.vic.gov.au/integrity-in-sport/victorian-code-of-conduct-for-community-sport

SunSmart Online Shade Audit Tool

This online tool helps determine whether existing shade at a site is adequate and provides practical recommendations to improve both built and natural shade. For more information www.sunsmart.com.au/shade-audit/

Healthy Choices: policy guidelines for sport and recreation centres.

Guidelines to help sport and recreation centres establish policies that promote health and wellbeing.

Planning Guides

Sport and Recreation Victoria (in collaboration with industry stakeholders) has developed a series of planning guides for sport and recreation facility development which include:

- Female Sports Infrastructure Guidelines
- Community Sporting Facility Lighting Guide
- Artificial Grass for Sport Guide
- Design for Everyone Guide

Copies of these planning guides can be found at www.sport.vic.gov.au/grants

The AFL has developed a Preferred Facilities Requirement document to provide guidance in the development of football facilities. The AFL Preferred Facilities Requirements can be found at www.aflvic.com.au/facility-resources/

Netball Victoria has developed a range of documents to provide guidance on compliance and standards. These documents can be found at vic.netball.com.au/support/facility-development/

Design for Everyone Guide

The guide is a resource that uses the principles of Universal Design to provide users with an understanding of how to apply the philosophy of Universal Design during the design and construction phases of a new building or the redevelopment of a current facility.

The concept of Universal Design is to simplify life for everyone by making the built environment more usable to as many users as possible.

This document can be found at sport.vic.gov.au/design-for-everyone-guide

Assessment - Grant Submissions CFN 2018/19

Scale: 0 = No justification, 5 = limited justification provided 10 = Clear justification provided

Applicant	Project description	Total project cost	Total request from program	Total request from Council	Total contribution from application	SRV criteria										Total Score	Alignment to CoGG Budget Drivers							Alignment to Our Future Community indicators					Comments	Recommendation
						Does applicant meet pre-eligibility criteria	Has the project scope been clearly outlined	Has the budget been clearly outlined	Are plans provided with application	Is a QS provided with the project	Does the project address issues of safety and universal design	Have stakeholders been engaged	Is the project strategically supported	Does the project result in participation outcomes	Affordability		Asset Management	Business Improvement & Innovation	Business Urgency	Economic Development	Environment & Sustainability	Social Benefit	Strategy	Prosperous	Connected	Creative	Designed for People	Sustainable and Resilient		
Geelong Amateur Football Netball Club	Upgrade to floodlighting on second oval to 100lux	\$210,000	\$100,000	\$80,000	\$30,000	Yes	Yes	5	10	2	4	4	8	7	40	Cost estimates are only indicative - not completed by independent QS. Club contribution of \$30k	Addition to Council's existing asset base	No impact	None	Unknown	No impact	Increased provision of infrastructure at recreational facilities. Potential increases in participation	Yes - G21 AFL Barwon Strategy	Somewhat	Somewhat	No	Somewhat	No	This project is to upgrade lights on second oval. Club already has adequate lighting on no.1 oval for games etc. Standard Allocation would indicate that clubs need to fund this type of project	Not recommended for submission
Anakie Football Netball Club	Upgrade to floodlighting on main oval	\$45,793	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	Yes	Yes	6	4	6	9	5	8	7	45	Basic cost estimate provided only	Addition to Council's existing asset base	No impact	None	Unknown	No impact	Maintain participation in junior football	Yes - G21 AFL Barwon	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Somewhat	Fair Play Strategy and Standard Allocation will recommend that local level floodlighting needs to be funded by tenanting clubs	Not recommended for submission
Ocean Grove Collendina Cobras Junior Football Club	Floodlight upgrade	\$147,000	\$100,000	\$47,000	\$0	Yes	Yes	9	10	10	2	8	5	5	49	QS provided however no contribution from applicant	Addition to Council's existing asset base	No impact	No impact	Unknown	No impact	Maintain participation in junior football	Yes - G21 AFL Barwon	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Somewhat	Fair Play Strategy and Standard Allocation will recommend that local level floodlighting needs to be funded by tenanting clubs	Not recommended for submission
Bell Park Football Club re Sport and Recreation Club BELREC	Floodlight upgrade	\$284,000	\$100,000	\$184,000	\$0	Yes	Yes	9	10	10	4	8	7	7	55	QS provided however no contribution from applicant	Addition to Council's existing asset base	No impact	No impact	Unknown	No impact	Potential increases in participation, upgrade of outdated asset, connections with the development of an all abilities team	Yes - G21 AFL Barwon. Rates poorly	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	Somewhat	Fair Play Strategy and Standard Allocation will recommend that local level floodlighting needs to be funded by tenanting clubs	Not recommended for submission
Leopold Football Netball Club	AFL Goal posts	\$8,200				No	No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		Does not meet eligibility criteria - equipment grant													Ineligible	
Grovedale Football Netball Club	Development of away change room	\$390,000	\$100,000	\$260,000	\$30,000	Yes	Yes	9	10	9	9	9	10	10	66	Stage 1 change facility upgrade	Addition to Council's existing asset base	Participation outcomes, better access to facilities enhance Council's reputation	Urgency relates to non-compliant change rooms for females	If successful, job opportunities available through construction process	No impact	Upgrade os outdated asset which is not welcoming or compliant with female use	Yes - G21 AFL Barwon. Rates poorly 3 out of 10 in strategy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Somewhat	This project aligns strategically and to Council priorities. It has the highest assessment score and greatest chance of success through SRV	Recommended for submission

3. PLANNING AUTHORISATIONS – COUNCIL TO STAFF

Source: Governance & Legal Services
Executive Manager: Rebecca Leonard
Index Reference: Delegations

Purpose

To appoint Council officers as authorised officers under the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* (the P&EA).

Background

Council officers are appointed as authorised officers to exercise statutory powers under various Acts and Regulations. Appointments as authorised officers are to individual staff members.

The P&EA regulates enforcement and is reliant on authorised officers acting on behalf of the Responsible Authority (Council).

Key Issues

- Where there is a specific power within an Act, Council should appoint authorised officers pursuant to that Act. This is the case for the P&EA.
- Planning staff members have recently been employed by Council and are required to be authorised under the P&EA.
- **Attachment 2** sets out the Instrument of Appointment and Authorisation under the P&EA and lists the staff members to whom this authorisation applies (the instrument).

Cr Asher moved, Cr Kontelj seconded -

In the exercise of the powers conferred by section 224 of the *Local Government Act 1989* and the other legislation referred to in the attached instrument, Greater Geelong City Council (Council) RESOLVES THAT THE -

- 1) members of Council staff referred to in the instrument be appointed and authorised as set out in the instrument;**
- 2) instrument comes into force immediately upon the common seal of Council being affixed to the instrument, and remains in force until Council determines to vary or revoke it;**
- 3) instrument be sealed.**

Carried.

Attachment 1

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from the subject of this report.

Community Engagement

Relevant Council managers have been consulted regarding this recommended appointment and authorisation.

Social Equity Considerations

There are no social equity implications arising from the subject of this report.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The recommended appointment and authorisation of these staff members complies with the relevant provisions of the P&EA and the *Local Government Act 1989*.

Alignment to City Plan

The recommended appointments and authorisations of these staff members supports the delivery of Council planning services.

Conflict of Interest

No Council officers or contractors who have provided advice in relation to this report have declared a conflict of interest regarding the matter under consideration.

Risk Assessment

There are no significant or high risks associated with the subject of this report.

Environmental Implications

There are no environmental implications arising from the subject of this report.

4. CONTRACTUAL MATTER

Source: Finance & Strategy
Director: Peter Anderson

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Kontelj 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.

5. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Source: Finance and Strategy
Director: Peter Anderson

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Kontelj seconded -

That in accordance with Section 89 (2)(h) of the Local Government Act 1989, this matter which the Council considers may prejudice the Council or any person, be considered at the conclusion of all other business at which time the meeting be closed to members of the public.

Carried.

6. EMPLOYMENT MATTER

Source: People and Organisation Development
Executive Manager: Andrew Keen

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Kontelj seconded -

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

Carried.

7. AUDIT AND RISK COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT

Source: Governance and Legal Services
Executive Manager: Rebecca Leonard
Index Reference: Audit - CG - Internal

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Kontelj seconded -

That in accordance with Section 89 (2) (h) of the Local Government Act 1989, this matter which the Council considers would prejudice the Council or any person, be considered at the conclusion of all other business at which time the meeting be closed to members of the public.

Carried.

8. T1770865 - PROVISION OF PAINTING SERVICES

Source: Finance and Strategy
Director: Peter Anderson
Index Reference: Tender T1770865

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Kontelj 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.

ASSEMBLY OF COUNCIL RECORD

Chief Executive Officer: Kelvin Spiller
Source: Governance and Legal Services

Summary

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

Cr Sullivan moved, Cr Mason seconded -
That the information be received.

**RECORD OF ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCIL
(Council Meeting 27 March 2018)**

Assembly Details	Councillors	Officer Attendees	Agenda Items	Conflict of Interest Disclosures
<p>Council Briefing 6 March 2018</p>	<p>Cr Harwood (Mayor), Crs Aitken, Asher, Grzybek, Kontelj, Mason, Murrihy, Nelson, Sullivan</p>	<p>K Spiller (CEO) L Quinn (DIR) B Luxford (DIR) G Wilson-Browne (DIR) K Walsh (DIR) P Anderson (DIR) A Keen (EXEC MGR) R Leonard (EXEC MGR) G Russell (MGR) V Shelton (MGR) J Brown (CO ORD) J Thomas (SNR ADV TO MAYOR & CEO) L Raimondo (OFF) M Macgugan (OFF) T Raven (CO ORD) L Sherwell (OFF) J Malone (CO ORD) T Ellis (MGR) R Stevens (MGR) J Van Slageren (MGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the Domestic Animal Management Plan 2018-2021 • Revocation of Flood Prone Area Designation of New Lots at Armstrong Estate – Stages 22, 24, 25 & 39 • Revocation of Flood Prone Area Designation of New Lots at Warralily, Stage 70 • Ghazeepore Road, Waurm Ponds – Proposed Road Widening and Footpath Construction SRC353 – Intention to Declare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil.
<p>Budget Briefing No 2 7 March 2018</p>	<p>Cr Harwood (Mayor), Crs Aitken, Asher, Grzybek, Mason, Murrihy, Nelson, Sullivan</p>	<p>K Spiller (CEO) B Luxford (DIR) G Wilson-Browne (DIR) K Walsh (DIR) L Quinn (DIR) P Anderson (DIR) A Keen (EXEC MGR) R Leonard (EXEC MGR) M Kelly (MGR) K Fulton (CO ORD) F Reidy (MGR) R Stevens (MGR) K Paton (MGR) G Russell (MGR) M Kuhn (MGR) S Parker (CO ORD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018-2019 Budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cr Grzybek declared a Conflict in relation to the Lara Soccer Club and left the meeting prior to discussion. • Cr Nelson declared a Conflict in relation to the Geelong Gallery Archibald Prize and left the meeting prior to discussion.

		<p>V Shelton (MGR) S Boer (MGR) S Broadbent (MGR) T Hellsten (MGR) M Szymczak (A/MGR) T Kirwood (MGR) S Sodomaco (MGR)</p>		
<p>Council Briefing 20 March 2018</p>	<p>Cr Harwood (Mayor), Crs Aitken, Asher, Grzybek, Kontelj, Mason, Murrhiy, Murnane, Nelson, Sullivan</p>	<p>K Spiller (CEO) L Quinn (DIR) B Luxford (DIR) G Wilson-Browne (DIR) K Walsh (DIR) P Anderson (DIR) A Keen (EXEC MGR) R Leonard (EXEC MGR) G Russell (MGR) J Van Slageren (MGR) I Hicks (MGR) J Giacchi (General Counsel) V Shelton (MGR) K Paton (MGR) J Brown (CO ORD) K Ivens (Snr Advisor to Mayor & CEO) B Szymczak (Snr Communications Adv) T Raven (CO ORD) L Sherwell (OFF) J Van Slageren (MGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Government of Victoria – Country Football and Netball Program • Sale of Former Geelong Post Office • Planning Authorisations – Council to Staff • Contractual Matter (<i>Confidential</i>) • Proposed Development (<i>Confidential</i>) • Audit and Risk Committee Summary Report (<i>Confidential</i>) • Tender T1770865 – Provision of Paining Services (<i>Confidential</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
<p>Budget Briefing No 3 21 March 2018</p>	<p>Crs Harwood, Aitken, Asher, Mason, Murrhiy, Nelson, Sullivan, Kontelj, Murnane</p>	<p>K Spiller (CEO) L Quinn (DIR) B Luxford (DIR) G Wilson-Browne (DIR) K Walsh (DIR) P Anderson (DIR) A Keen (EXEC MGR) R Leonard (EXEC MGR) M Kelly (MGR) K Fulton (CO ORD) F Reidy (MGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018-2019 Budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cr Murrhiy declared a Conflict in the Geelong Racing Club and left the meeting room prior to discussion. • Cr Nelson declared a Conflict in the Geelong Art Gallery and left the meeting room prior to discussion.

		R Stevens (MGR) G Russell (MGR) M Kuhn (MGR) R Pedretti (MGR) R Smith (MGR) I Hicks (MGR) J Brown (CO ORD) P Dorling (MONITOR)		
--	--	---	--	--

PLANNING DELEGATIONS

Source: Planning & Development - City Development
Director: Kelvin Walsh
Index Reference: Delegation

Summary

- Section 98 of the Local Government Act 1989 and section 188 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 empower Council to delegate its powers, duties and functions under relevant legislation to members of Council staff.
- Council may also delegate to committees comprising Councillors and staff or a combination of both, pursuant to sections 86 and 87 of the Local Government Act and section 188 of the Planning and Environment Act.
- At its meeting on 13 March 2007 Council established a Planning Committee and a Development Hearings Panel with delegated powers to determine upon any development applications which have been the subject of an objection or in circumstances where officers have recommended refusal of the application.
- At its meeting on 23 September 2008 Council adopted a recommendation to allow Officers (restricted to Manager, Coordinator and Team Leader level) the ability to consider and approve applications with five or less objections.
- The appendix to this report contains a schedule of all applications determined under these delegations.

Cr Mason moved, Cr Asher seconded -

That the information be received.

Carried.

Planning Decisions Report - February 2018

App Number	Location	Application Type	Decision Date	Description	Authority Description
PP-695-2017	209 Melaluka Road, LEOPOLD VIC 3224	Development and Use of a Childcare Centre and a Medical Centre	16/2/2018	Refusal to Grant a Planning Permit	Development Hearings Panel
PP-867-2017	89A Skene Street, NEWTOWN VIC 3220	Use of the land for Medical Centre (Skin Clinic), Partial Demolition, Building and Works to Alter and Extend an Existing Building, Business Identification Signage and a Reduction in the Standard Car Parking Requirements	16/2/2018	NOD - DHP - Planning Permit	Development Hearings Panel
PP-1031-2017	114 South Valley Road, HIGHTON VIC 3216	Buildings and Works Associated with the Construction of Ten (10) Dwellings, a Ten (10) Lot Subdivision, Reduction of Visitor Car Parking and Creation of Access to a Road Zone Category 1	19-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 3
PP-1080-2017	42 Francis Street, BELMONT VIC 3216	Buildings and Works for the Construction of Three (3) Dwellings and Three (3) Lot Subdivision	8-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 1
PP-1149-2017	1 Emmy Court, GROVEDALE VIC 3216	Construction of a Second Dwelling and Two (2) Lot Subdivision	1-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 2
PP-1190-2017	149 Whitehorse Road, MOOLAP VIC 3224	Buildings and Works Associated with a Telecommunications Facility	22-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 5
PP-306-2017	28 Ivy Street, NEWCOMB VIC 3219	Development of the Land for Two Dwellings and Two (2) Lot Subdivision	27-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 2
PP-534-2017	9 Scarlett Street, GEELONG WEST VIC 3218	Buildings and Works Associated with the Construction of Three Dwellings and a Four Lot Subdivision	5-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 4
PP-646-2017	13 Acacia Court, OCEAN GROVE VIC 3226	Construction of a Second Dwelling and a Two (2) Lot Subdivision	1-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 2
PP-847-2017	18 Ballater Avenue, NEWTOWN VIC 3220	Buildings and Works for the Construction of Two (2) Dwellings and a Two (2) Lot Subdivision	19-Feb-2018	NOD - Delegate	Objectors - 1

CLOSE OF MEETING:

Cr Sullivan moved, Cr Asher seconded -

That the meeting be closed to the public.

Carried.

The Meeting was closed to the public at 9.16pm

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

Cr Kontelj moved, Cr Aitken seconded -

That the Meeting be opened to the public.

Carried.

SECTION E - CONFIDENTIAL

By resolution of Council it was determined that the decision made "In Committee" in relation to:

- Agenda Item 6 – Employment Matter***
- Agenda Item 8 – T1770865 – Provision of Painting Services***

.... be made public.

6. EMPLOYMENT MATTER

Source: People and Organisation Development
Executive Manager: Andrew Keen
Index Reference: Subject: CEO Recruitment

Resolution

That Council notes in the minutes of this meeting that Mr Brett Luxford has been appointed as Acting Chief Executive Officer.

8. T1770865 - PROVISION OF PAINTING SERVICES

Source: Finance and Strategy
Director: Peter Anderson
Index Reference: Tender T1770865

Resolution

That Council notes in the minutes of this meeting that:

- **Contract C1770865A has been awarded to Greater City Painting Services;**
- **Contract C1770865B has been awarded to Higgins Coatings Pty Ltd, and**
- **Contract C1770865C has been awarded to Programmed Property Services Pty. Ltd**

CLOSE OF MEETING

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 9.25pm. Tuesday, 27 March 2018.

Signed: _____
Cr Bruce Harwood (Mayor)

Date of Confirmation: _____.