



GLEN EIRA CITY COUNCIL

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2022

MINUTES

Meeting was held remotely and streamed live
via Council's website at 7.30pm

Present

The Mayor, Councillor Jim Magee
Councillor Tony Athanasopoulos
Councillor Anne-Marie Cade
Councillor Margaret Esakoff
Councillor Sam Parasol
Councillor Neil Pilling
Councillor Simone Zmood
Councillor David Zyngier

INDEX

1.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	4
2.	APOLOGIES NIL	4
3.	REMINDER TO DECLARE ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN ANY ITEMS ON THE AGENDA	4
4.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS	5
5.	RECEPTION AND READING OF PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS	5
	Nil	
6.	REPORTS BY DELEGATES APPOINTED BY COUNCIL TO VARIOUS ORGANISATIONS	5
	Nil	
7.	REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES AND RECORDS OF ASSEMBLY	6
	7.1 Advisory Committees	6
	7.1.1 Advisory Committee Minutes	6
	7.2 Records of Assembly	6
	7.2.1 Records of Assemblies of Councillors	6
8.	OFFICER REPORTS (AS LISTED).....	7
	8.1 87 Seymour Road, Elsternwick	7
	8.2 15-17 Station Avenue, McKinnon	8
	8.3 VCAT Watch	17
	8.4 Financial Management Report (31 January 2022)	17
	8.5 Draft Housing Strategy 2022	18
	8.6 Draft Caulfield Structure Plan for Consultation	19
	8.7 Woodfire Heating	20
	8.8 Inclusion of 5 Trees in the Classified Tree Register.....	20
	8.9 Advanced Waste Processing.....	21
	8.10 Glen Eira Philanthropic Partnership Policy	22
	8.11 Donations for the Provision of Park Benches Policy Update.....	23
	8.12 Policy Review Project.....	23
	8.13 Glen Eira Business and Economy Advisory Committee - Recommended Community Representatives	24
	8.14 Provision of Personal Protective Equipment and Supplies Panel.....	24

8.15	Quarterly Services Performance Report - December 2021.....	25
8.16	Submission : Review of the Rules of Association - Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV).....	25
9.	URGENT BUSINESS NIL	25
10.	ORDINARY BUSINESS	25
	10.1 Requests for reports from a member of Council staff - Nil	25
	10.2 Right of reply - Nil	25
	10.3 Notice of Motion - Nil	25
	10.4 Councillor questions.....	25
	10.5 Written public questions to Council	27
11.	CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS.....	42
	Nil	
12.	CLOSURE OF MEETING.....	42



The Mayor welcomed Councillors, Council officers, Glen Eira residents and other community members to the 22 February 2022 virtual Council Meeting. Cr Magee advised of the process that would be followed should Council encounter technical difficulties livestreaming the meeting.

The Mayor then confirmed that the Councillors could be recorded as present by ensuring they met the following three criteria:

- They can hear proceedings;
- They can see other members in attendance and can be seen by other members; and
- They can be heard (to speak).

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Mayor read the acknowledgement.

Glen Eira City Council Acknowledges the peoples of the Kulin Nation as Traditional Owners and Custodians, and pay our respect to their Elders past, present and emerging. We Acknowledge and uphold their continuing relationship to land and waterways. Council extends its respect to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

2. APOLOGIES NIL

3. REMINDER TO DECLARE ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN ANY ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Councillors were reminded of the requirement for disclosure of conflicts of interest in relation to items listed for consideration on the Agenda, or any item that was considered at this meeting, in accordance with Section 130(2) of the *Local Government Act 2020* and Rule 60(3) of the Glen Eira City Council Governance Rules. Councillors were then invited to indicate any such conflict of interest.

There were no conflicts of interest declared at the meeting.

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Zmood****Seconded: Cr Esakoff**

That Council:

1. considers the meeting to be adjourned for 10 minutes from the commencement of any technical problem which prevents Council from livestreaming the meeting;
2. adjourns the meeting in the event livestreaming cannot be resumed within 30 minutes from the commencement of the technical problem which prevents livestreaming on Council's website with the meeting to be reconvened on Wednesday 23 February 2022 at 7.30pm via livestreaming; and
3. notes, if the Mayor is unable for any reason to attend the Council meeting or part of the Council meeting, the meeting will be chaired in accordance with Rule 13 of the Governance Rules. The Mayor will resume as Chair of the meeting upon return. If a vote is being taken at the time, the Mayor will resume as Chair after the result of the vote has been declared.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

It is recorded that Cr Zhang entered the virtual meeting at 7.35pm.

4. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS**Moved: Cr Esakoff****Seconded: Cr Pilling**

That the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 1 February 2022 be confirmed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**5. RECEPTION AND READING OF PETITIONS AND JOINT LETTERS**

Nil

6. REPORTS BY DELEGATES APPOINTED BY COUNCIL TO VARIOUS ORGANISATIONS

Nil

7. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES AND RECORDS OF ASSEMBLY

7.1 Advisory Committees

7.1.1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES**Moved: Cr Parasol****Seconded: Cr Athanasopoulos**

That the minutes of the Advisory Committee meeting as shown below be received and noted and that the recommendations of this Committees be adopted.

1. CEO Employment Matters Advisory Committee Meeting – 31 January 2022
2. Community Grants Advisory Committee – 8 February 2022

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7.2 Records of Assembly

7.2.1 RECORDS OF ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS**Moved: Cr Esakoff****Seconded: Cr Parasol**

That the Records of the Assemblies as shown below be received and noted.

1. 24 January 2022 Assembly; and
2. 1 February 2022 Pre-meeting

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. OFFICER REPORTS (AS LISTED)

8.1 87 SEYMOUR ROAD, ELSTERNWICK

Moved: Cr Zmood**Seconded: Cr Pilling**

It is recorded that Cr Esakoff vacated the virtual meeting at 7:39pm and re-entered at 7:40pm.

That Council resolves that had it been in a position to determine Application No. GE/DP-34556/2021 that it would have issued a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit for the construction of 19 dwellings on a lot and reduction of visitor car parking at 87 Seymour Road Elsternwick for the following reasons:

1. The setbacks of buildings from the street fails to respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character, contrary to Clause 55.03-1 (Street setback objective) of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme.
2. The orientation of the development, particularly the centrally located dwellings fails to integrate with the street, contrary to Clause 55.02-5 (Integration with the street objective) of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme.
3. The proposed site coverage of the development is excessive and fails to respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character or respond to the features of the site, contrary to Clause 55.03-3 (Site coverage objective) of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme.
4. The proximity of dwellings to the side boundary fails to respect the existing or preferred neighbourhood character or limits the impact on the amenity of existing dwellings, contrary to Clause 55.04-1 (Side and rear setbacks objective) of the Glen Eira Planning Scheme.
5. The proposed development, as a result of the presentation to Seymour Road and the lack of significant visual breaks, would result in an unsympathetic relationship with the established character of the area and fail to take into consideration its interface with existing residential development, contrary to Clause 22.08 (Minimal Change Area Policy), the requirements of Clause 55.02-1 (Neighbourhood Character Objective), and the purpose and decision guidelines of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone.
6. The orientation of the residential properties will result in overshadowing of some proposed secluded private open space areas, which will unduly compromise the amenity of future residents.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.2 15-17 STATION AVENUE, MCKINNON

Moved: Cr Cade**Seconded: Cr Pilling**

That Council resolves to issues a Notice of Decision to Grant an Amended Planning Permit for Application No. GE/PP-31180/2017/A to allow modifications to the approved three-story building comprising 16 dwellings at 15-17 Station Avenue, McKinnon, in accordance with the following amendments to the permit:

1. Amend permit preamble from “Construction of a three storey building comprising 16 dwellings above a basement level, reduction of visitor car parking on a land affected by Special Building Overlay”, to “Construction of a three storey building comprising 16 dwellings above a basement level on a land affected by Special Building Overlay”.
2. Modify wording of condition 1 and 2 to reflect the changes sought under this amendment application.
3. Modify wording of conditions 14 to 26 as required by Melbourne Water in their capacity as a Determining Referral Authority.
4. Modify wording of condition 36 in respect of the Waste Management Plan to ensure appropriate access to the basement for a waste truck.

The full set of conditions would then read as follows:

1. Before the commencement of the development, amended plans to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority must be submitted to, and approved by, the Responsible Authority. The plans must be drawn to scale with dimensions and must generally accord with the plans submitted with the application (identified as ‘Proposed 16 Townhouse Development 15-17 Station Avenue, McKinnon 3204, Project No.0204-2021, Sheets TP003, TP004, TP005, TP006, TP007, TP008, TP009, TP010, TP011, TP018 & indication of deck & NGL RLs for each unit, Revision F, dated 13/10/2021 and prepared by T3 Architecture) but modified to show:) but modified to show:

General

- (a) An updated landscape plan having regard to the amended design prepared by T3 Architecture in accordance with Condition 2.
- (b) Any modifications required in satisfaction of Melbourne Water conditions number 14-26 of this permit.
- (c) An appropriately proportioned streetscape elevation showing front fencing and well-integrated services to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
- (d) All habitable room windows and balconies on the northern and southern elevations to demonstrate compliance with Standard B22 (Overlooking) and the inclusion of any screening required in accordance with this Standard.
- (e) An updated acoustic report having regard to the amended design prepared by T3 Architecture to be provided and any requirements specified in this report to be noted on the plans.
- (f) The delineation of separate Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) & Tree Protection Fencing (TPF) for the following tree/s at the prescribed radial

distance from the base of tree trunk to define a tree protection zone (TPZ):

- Neighbouring trees to South – 2.0m each

Car Parking

- (g) The deletion of the front fence where it adjoins the pedestrian sight triangle on the northern side of the vehicle accessway or a statement from suitably qualified transport engineer that its position is acceptable.
- (h) Height clearances within the basement shown as per figure 5.3 of AS2890.1:2004.
- (i) Swept path assessments provided for all accessways (including the proposed ramp) using B99 vehicles (99.8% vehicle – large SUV).
- (j) Swept path assessments for the critical car spaces identifies as P 1.2, P 16.2, P 12.2, P 9.2, P 8.2, P 7.2, using B85 design vehicle (85% car – standard passenger car).
- (k) A note provided that the maximum height of all kerbs within the accessway is to be no greater than 150mm.
- (l) The curved section of the ramp dimensioned to meet the design requirements of Figure 2.9 of AS2890.1:2004 with this shown on the plans.
- (m) Provision of a complete set of ramp cross-sections with accurate gradients prepare by a qualified traffic engineer, including the gradient of the ramp after 1:8 for first 2.5m, and details around the flood proof apex.
- (n) An intercom system to be provided on the driver's side of the accessway ramp and setback 3 metres from the frontage or otherwise to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

When approved, the plans will be endorsed and will then form part of this Permit.

2. A detailed Landscape Plan must be submitted to Council, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. When the Landscape Plan is approved, it will become an endorsed plan forming part of this Permit. The Landscape Plan must incorporate the following:
 - (a) A survey, including botanical names, of all existing vegetation to be retained.
 - (b) Buildings and trees (including botanical names) on neighbouring properties within 3 metres of the boundary.
 - (c) A planting schedule of all proposed vegetation including botanical names; common names; pot sizes; sizes at maturity; quantities of each plant; and details of surface finishes of pathways and driveways.
 - (d) Landscaping and planting within all open space areas of the site.
 - (e) Advanced canopy trees (minimum 3.0 metres tall when planted unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Responsible Authority) in the following areas:
 - (i) 7 trees along the side North boundary;
 - (ii) 7 trees along the front East boundary;
 - (iii) A scheme of smaller trees/screen tree planting within planter boxes along the southern edge of the property boundary/southern edge of the raised decking areaOr 14 trees as above in locations to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

3. The landscaping as shown on the endorsed Landscape Plan must be carried out, completed and maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
4. The landscaping as shown the endorsed Landscape Plan must be maintained, and any dead, diseased or damaged plant replaced in accordance with the landscaping plan to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
5. Trees are not to be sited over easements. All species selected must be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Prior to the commencement of the buildings and works (including demolition), a tree protection fence must be erected around the following tree/s at the prescribed radial distance from the base of the trunk to define a tree protection zone (TPZ):

- Neighbouring trees to South – 2.0m each

This fence must be constructed of star pickets and chain mesh (or similar) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

The tree protection fence must remain in place until the construction within the tree protection zone is required. The tree protection zone for that component of the development not required for construction must remain fenced until construction is complete. No vehicular or pedestrian access, trenching or soil excavation is to occur within the tree protection zone.

No storage or dumping of tools, equipment or waste is to occur within the tree protection zone.

The ground surface of the tree protection zone must be covered by a protective 100mm deep layer of mulch prior to the development commencing and be watered regularly to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

6. Any required pruning to retained site tree/s and the overhanging canopy of any neighbouring tree/s is to be done by a qualified Arborist to Australian Standard – *Pruning of Amenity Trees AS4373 – 2007 Standards Australia*.
7. Any pruning of the root system of any retained site tree or neighbouring tree is to be done by hand by a qualified Arborist.
8. Prior to the commencement of the development, a fee of \$768.16 must be paid to the Responsible Authority for the removal and replacement of the existing street tree – White Cedar (*Melia azedarach*). The street tree will be replaced with the species, maturity and location of which will be selected by Council's Parks Services Department.
9. Prior to the commencement of the buildings and works (including demolition), a tree protection fence must be erected around the street tree – Brush Box at a radius of 4.1 metres from the base of the trunk to define a 'tree protection zone'. Temporary fencing is to be used as per AS 4870-2009 section 4.3. This fence must be constructed of star pickets and chain mesh (or similar) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The tree protection fence must remain in place until the construction within the tree protection zone is completed. The tree protection zone for that component of the development not required for construction must remain fenced until construction is complete.

No vehicular or pedestrian access, trenching or soil excavation is to occur within the tree protection zone. No storage or dumping of tools, equipment or waste is to occur within the tree protection zone.

10. The ground surface of the tree protection zone must be covered by a protective 100mm deep layer of mulch prior to the development commencing and be watered regularly to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Above ground canopy TPZ (Tree Protection Zone) to be adopted. No works, structures or machinery will come within 1m of the trees crown/canopy as per AS 4870-2009 section 3.3.6.

Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) fencing must be adopted to protect the street tree's trunk. Set at edge of TPZ on all sides (Finishing at paved surfaces). Temporary fencing to be used as per AS 4870-2009 section 4.3.

Hand excavate any area within 1.5m of the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). If roots over 40mm are found, Park Services are to be notified and further inspections will be carried out.

Ground protection is to be used if temporary access for machinery is required within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). Strapped rumble boards are to be used within TPZ to limit ground compaction as per AS 4870-2009 section 4.5.3.

11. No excavation is to come within 2.8 metres of the existing street tree – Brush Box (measured from the centre of the trunk) without the prior consent of the Responsible Authority. Any excavation within 1.5m of the tree protection zones must be hand excavated. If roots over 40mm are found, Park Services are to be notified and further inspections will be carried out.

Ground protection is to be used if temporary access for machinery is required within the TPZ (Tree Protection Zone). Strapped rumble boards are to be used within the tree protection zone to limit ground compaction as per AS 4870-2009 section 4.5.3.

12. The layout of the site and size, design and location of buildings and works as shown on the endorsed plans must not be altered without the prior written consent of the Responsible Authority. Note: This does not obviate the need for a permit where one is required.

13. This Permit will expire if:

- The development does not start within two (2) years from the date of this Permit; or
- The development is not completed within four (4) years of the date of this Permit.

The Responsible Authority may extend the time referred to if a request is made in writing before this Permit expires or within six (6) months after the expiry date if the use/development has not commenced.

If the development has commenced, the Responsible Authority may extend the time referred to if a request is made in writing within twelve (12) months of the expiry date.

Melbourne Water requirements (Conditions 14 to 26):

14. The dwellings must be constructed with finished floor levels set no lower than 29.13 metres to Australian Height Datum (AHD), which is 300mm above the applicable flood level of 28.83m to AHD.
15. Prior to the issue of an Occupancy Permit, a certified survey plan, showing finished floor levels (as constructed) reduced to the AHD, must be submitted to Melbourne Water to demonstrate that the floor levels have been constructed in accordance with Melbourne Water's requirements.
16. Imported fill must be kept to a minimum on the property and only be used for the sub floor areas of the dwellings and driveway ramps.
17. A revised hydraulic report/memo must be submitted to Melbourne Water for assessment and approval for the changed levels as per updated site survey. The revised hydraulic report/memo must show that existing flood levels in the surrounding area will not be impacted/increased and that there will not be any loss in flood storage on site due to the changes in site levels and proposed development (Note: Previous Melbourne Water accepted hydraulic memo by Water Technology dated 01 September 2021 (Bjorn Bryant/Water Technology) confirmed that the plans referenced: Rev D; dated 29th June 2021 had kept aside 40% of the site on natural surface levels for flood storage as per Melbourne Water's permit conditions of 2018).
18. Decking must be constructed with unenclosed foundations to allow for the passage of overland flows.
19. Any new fence must be of an open style of construction (minimum 50% open) to allow for the passage of floodwaters/overland flows.
20. All doors, windows, vents and openings to the basement car park must be a minimum of 300mm above the applicable flood level.
21. No retaining walls are to be used in the development of the land.
22. The entry / exit driveway of the basement carpark must incorporate a flood proof apex of a minimum of 300mm above the applicable flood level.
23. The areas outside the building envelope must maintain 'where possible' on existing surface levels. No filling of the property is permitted outside of any building footprint and all fences must be of an open design so as to ensure that overland flooding can still flow through the site during a significant event. Altered natural ground surface levels due to site preparation work (survey plan submitted with amended site levels referenced: Ver: A; Dated 11/11/2021) must be captured in hydraulic report to be submitted to Melbourne Water as per condition 17 above.
24. Prior to the commencement of works a separate application direct to Melbourne Water, must be made and approved of any new or modified storm water connection to Melbourne Water's drains or watercourses.
25. Prior to the commencement of works, a Site Management Plan detailing pollution and sediment control measures, must be submitted to Melbourne Water for approval.
26. Pollution and sediment laden runoff shall not be discharged directly or indirectly into Melbourne Water's drains or waterways.

27. No buildings or works are to be constructed over any easement or other restriction on the land or any sewers, drains, pipes, wires or cables under the control of a public authority without the prior written consent of the relevant authority and the Responsible Authority.
28. Prior to the occupation of the development, the walls on the boundary of adjoining properties must be cleaned and finished in a manner to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Painted or bagged walls must be finished to a uniform standard and unpainted or unrendered walls must have all excess mortar removed.
29. Privacy screens must be in accordance with the endorsed plans and must be installed prior to the occupation of the development. The privacy screens must be maintained to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
30. The car parking allocation for the approved development must be:
 - One (1) car space be allocated to each of the one/two-bedroom dwellings;
 - Two (2) car spaces be allocated to each of the three-bedroom dwellings.
31. Areas set aside for the parking of vehicles and access lanes as shown on the endorsed plan(s) must be:
 - (a) constructed;
 - (b) properly formed to such levels that they can be used in accordance with the plans;
 - (c) surfaced with an all weather sealcoat;
 - (d) drained;to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Car spaces, access lanes and driveways shown on the endorsed plans must not be used for any other purpose.
32. Vehicular crossing(s) must be constructed to the road to suit the proposed driveway(s) to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and any existing crossing or crossing opening must be removed and replaced with footpath, naturestrip and kerb and channel to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.
33. Prior to the completion of the basement floor construction, written confirmation by a Licensed Land Surveyor must be provided to the Responsible Authority verifying that the basement floor has been constructed in accordance with the endorsed plans (prior to the construction of the levels above being commenced).
34. Prior to the completion of the ramp to the basement, written confirmation by a Licensed Land Surveyor must be provided to the Responsible Authority verifying that the basement ramp has been constructed in accordance with the endorsed plans.
35. Prior to the commencement of any site works including demolition and excavation, the owner must submit a Construction Management Plan to the Responsible Authority for approval. No works including demolition and excavation are permitted to occur until the Plan has been approved in writing by the Responsible Authority.

Once approved, the Construction Management Plan will be endorsed to form part of this permit and must be implemented to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The Plan must be to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must provide details of the following:

- (a) delivery and unloading points and expected frequency;
 - (b) Truck haulage routes, circulation spaces and queuing lanes;
 - (c) Details how traffic and safe pedestrian access will be managed. These must be in the form of a Traffic Management Plan designed by a suitably qualified traffic practitioner;
 - (d) a liaison officer for contact by owners / residents and the Responsible Authority in the event of relevant queries or problems experienced;
 - (e) an outline of requests to occupy public footpaths or roads, or anticipated disruptions to local services;
 - (f) any requirements outlined within this permit as required by the relevant referral authorities;
 - (g) hours for construction activity in accordance with any other condition of this permit;
 - (h) measures to control noise, dust, water and sediment laden runoff;
 - (i) measures to ensure that sub-contractors/tradespersons operating on the site are aware of the contents of the Construction Management Plan;
 - (j) any construction lighting to be baffled to minimise intrusion on adjoining lots.
36. Prior to the occupation of the approved development, the owner/permit holder must prepare and have approved in writing by the Responsible Authority a Waste Management Plan (WMP) for the site with respect to the collection and disposal of waste and recyclables associated with the proposed uses on the site to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. The WMP must provide for the following:
- (a) The collection of waste associated with the uses on the land, including the provision of bulk waste collection bins or approved alternative, recycling bins, the storage of other refuse and solid wastes in bins or receptacles within suitable screened and accessible areas to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Commercial waste bins being placed or allowed to remain not in view of the public, and receptacles not emitting any adverse odours.
 - (b) Designation of methods of collection including the need to provide for private services or utilisation of council services. If private collection is used, this method must incorporate recycling services and must comply with the relevant EPA noise guideline relating to the time of collection.
 - (c) Appropriate areas of bin storage on site and areas of waste bin storage on collection days.
 - (d) Details for best practice waste management once operating.
 - (e) Details of loading, unloading, and waste collection procedures.

Where this involved collection from the basement, these details should include swept path assessments of the proposed vehicle, demonstration of appropriate clearances to accommodate applicable vehicles, and details of any measures required to minimise disruptions to traffic movements.

Once approved the WMP will be endorsed to form part of this permit and must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority and must not be varied except with the written approval of the Responsible Authority.

37. The location of any substation/services/metres to be clearly shown on the plans (to have limited visibility from the streetscape) and in a location to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority. Any on-site substation must not be located in the front setbacks and must not reduce any open space for each apartment.
38. Prior to the occupation of the approved development, a permanent sign must be erected by the applicable planning permit holder in a prominent position in the car park and in any foyer/s stating that "Residents of this development will not be issued Residential Parking Permits (including visitor parking permits)". The sign must measure approximately 0.2 square metres in area, to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority.

Permit notes (The following notes are for information only and do not constitute conditions of this permit):

- A: The amendments specified in Condition 1 of this Permit and any additional modifications which are "necessary or consequential" are those that will be assessed by Council when plans are lodged to satisfy that condition. Any "necessary or consequential" amendments, in addition to those required by this condition, should be specifically brought to the attention of Council for assessment.

If other modifications are proposed, they must be identified and be of a nature that an application for amendment of permit may be lodged under Section 72 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. An amendment application is subject to the procedures set out in Section 73 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.
- B: This Planning Permit represents the Planning approval for the use and/or development of the land. This Planning Permit does not represent the approval of other departments of Glen Eira City Council or other statutory authorities. Such approvals may be required and may be assessed on different criteria from that adopted for the approval of this Planning Permit.
- C: Any failure to comply with the conditions of this permit may result in action being taken to have an Enforcement Order made against some or all persons having an interest in the land and may result in legal action or the cancellation of this permit by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.
- D: Nothing in the grant of this permit should be construed as granting any permission other than planning permission for the purpose described. It is the duty of the permit holder to acquaint themselves, and comply, with all other relevant legal obligations (including any obligation in relation to restrictive covenants and easements affecting the site) and to obtain other required permits, consents or approvals.
- E: Consideration is required when installing domestic services (i.e – air conditioning units, heaters, pool pumps, water tanks and the like).

The owner/occupier/permit holder/developer must take all reasonable and practicable measures in locating domestic services in position that reduce any amenity impact on adjoining properties. This includes selecting an appropriate installation position and enclosing the domestic service. Further information regarding noise from domestic services can be found in the Environmental Protection Act 1970.

Asset Engineering Advise:

- F: Council records indicating that there is an existing Council 375mm drain that runs along the western boundary of the property. Protection works must be in place during excavation and construction of the building to protect the Council's drain. Developer/Owner is required to submit the proposed protection works plan to Council for approval prior to the commencement of any works.
- G: The developer/owner is required to submit a CCTV report of the easement drain before and after the construction. Any damage to the drain will be the responsibility of the developer/owner and any reinstatement works to be carried out must be to Council satisfaction at the developer/owner's cost.
- H: No net increase in peak stormwater runoff in Council drainage network is permitted. Post development peak storm water discharge to Council drainage network must be maintained to the predevelopment level for 10 year ARI to the satisfactory of Council's Asset Engineering Department.
- I: Engineering Services encourage using of rainwater tanks for storage and reuse for toilet and irrigation purposes and/or stormwater detention systems.
- J: Drainage associated with basement construction (seepage and agricultural waters are to be filtered to rain water clarity) must be discharged to the nearest Council Drain /Pit and not be discharged to the kerb and channel.
- K: All stormwater runoff must be connected to Council's underground drainage network. No uncontrolled stormwater discharge to adjoining properties and footpaths is permitted.
- L: Any firefighting equipment for the building must be accommodated within title boundary. Firefighting facility as required under Building Act/Regulation must be within the subject land and not in the Council Road Reserve.
- M: An Asset Protection Permit must be obtained from Council's Engineering Services Department prior to the commencement of any building works.
- N: All relevant Engineering Permits must be obtained prior to any works within the Road Reserve and/or stormwater connection to Council drainage network.

Melbourne Water Advise:

- O: The subject site is located south of the Koornang Road Main Drain (DR 4950). Land and flood level information available at Melbourne Water indicates that the property is subject to flooding from Melbourne Water's drainage system and the applicable 1% AEP flood level for the site is 28.83 metres to Australian Height Datum for a storm event with a 1% chance of occurrence in any one year.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.3 VCAT WATCH

Moved: Cr Cade**Seconded: Cr Esakoff**

That Council notes the update on VCAT matters.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.4 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT (31 JANUARY 2022)

Moved: Cr Zhang**Seconded: Cr Zmood**

That Council notes the Financial Management Report for the period ending 31 January 2022 in Attachment 1 to the report.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.5 DRAFT HOUSING STRATEGY 2022

Moved: Cr Pilling**Seconded: Cr Zhang**

That Council:

1. endorses the draft documents attached to this report (listed below) for community consultation for a period of six weeks:
 - *(Draft) Glen Eira Housing Strategy 2022 (GECC) December 2021*
 - *Glen Eira City Council: Our Community Profile (GECC and SGS Economics and Planning) November 2021*
 - *Glen Eira Housing Capacity and Demand Analysis (SGS Economics and Planning) 15 November 2021*
 - *(Draft) Glen Eira Neighbourhood Character Assessment and Future Character Framework (Tract Consultants) 2021*, comprising:
 - Volume 1: Neighbourhood Character Assessment & Built Form Assessment
 - Volume 2: Future Character and Built Form Precincts
 - *(Draft) Glen Eira Landscape Character Review (Tract Consultants)*
2. in addition to the actions contained in the *Communication and Engagement* section of this report, requests officers to seek and consider feedback from the Community Engagement Advisory Committee on the Draft Housing Strategy Community Survey and FAQs prior to their release.
3. notes that in addition to the actions contained in the *Communication and Engagement* section of this report:
 - an additional summary document will be available;
 - letters will be sent to occupiers in and around the Housing Investigation Areas;
 - letters will be sent to absentee owners in the Housing Investigation Areas;
 - a set of updated maps clearly showing the investigations areas will be available on Council's Have Your Say page
 - a community information session will be held in the form of an on-line webinar, incorporating a community question and answer component.

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Zhang****Seconded: Cr Pilling**

That Council grants Cr Athanasopoulos a three minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**Procedural Motion****Moved: Cr Zyngier****Seconded: Cr Zmood**

That Council grants Cr Esakoff a three minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Magee Seconded: Cr Esakoff**

That Council grants Cr Zmood a one minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**For the Motion:** Crs Athanasopoulos, Magee, Pilling, Zhang and Zyngier (5)**Against the Motion:** Crs Esakoff, Cade, Parasol and Zmood (4)

The Motion Moved by Cr Pilling and Seconded by Cr Zhang was **CARRIED**

8.6 DRAFT CAULFIELD STRUCTURE PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

Moved: Cr Zyngier**Seconded: Cr Athanasopoulos**

That Council:

1. endorses the Draft Caulfield Structure Plan for consultation; and
2. receives a further report on the consultation outcomes and revisions to the final Caulfield Structure Plan.

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Zyngier Seconded: Cr Zmood**

That Council grants Cr Athanasopoulos a three minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**For the Motion:** Crs Athanasopoulos, Magee, Parasol, Pilling, Zhang and Zyngier (6)**Against the Motion:** Crs Cade, Esakoff and Zmood (3)

The Motion Moved by Cr Zyngier and Seconded by Cr Athanasopoulos was

CARRIED

8.7 WOODFIRE HEATING

Moved: Cr Zyngier**Seconded: Cr Zhang**

That Council notes the information presented in the report and endorses the advocacy approach.

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Zmood****Seconded: Cr Parasol**

That Council grants Cr Zyngier a one minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

8.8 INCLUSION OF 5 TREES IN THE CLASSIFIED TREE REGISTER

Moved: Cr Zmood**Seconded: Cr Parasol**

That Council:

1. includes the following trees in the Classified Tree Register:
 - a) Silky Oak (*Grevillea robusta*) located in Centenary Park, Bentleigh East – 88/CTR/2021;
 - b) Algerian Oak (*Quercus canariensis*) located along the Rosstown Rail Trail, Glen Huntly – 150/CTR/2021;
 - c) Red Flowering Gum (*Corymbia ficifolia*) located at 19 Cosy Gum Rd, Carnegie – 217/CTR/2021;
 - d) Spotted Gum (*Corymbia maculata*) located at 21 Godfrey St, Bentleigh – 254/CTR/2021;
 - e) Cork Oak (*Quercus suber*) located in Princes Park, Hawthorn Rd, Caulfield South – 339/CTR/2021;
2. notifies each person who nominated a tree detailed in this report;
3. notifies all relevant landholders of the trees detailed in this report; and
4. authorises a notice to be published in the Victorian Government Gazette of the decision to include the trees outlined in his report in the Classified Tree Register.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.9 ADVANCED WASTE PROCESSING

Moved: Cr Pilling**Seconded: Cr Zhang**

That Council:

1. as a shareholder, commits to enter a Contract with a successful tenderer if the tender conforms to all of the predetermined conditions as specified by South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Pty Ltd (ACN 654 660 438) including the:
 - Project being located at the agreed Site;
 - Waste supply deed issued for tender; and
 - Gate fee being within an agreed limit for the South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Project;
2. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to send the letter shown in Attachment 1 to the report;
3. endorses a minimum tonnage guarantee arrangement for the South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Project;
4. endorses the provision of a financial guarantee, under which the Councils guarantee that South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Pty Ltd will remain solvent and will not be wound up during the term of the Contract;
5. endorses partial bid reimbursement costs to unsuccessful tenderers who submit a compliant tender and if Councils choose to cancel the tender for the South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Project; and
6. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to take any further actions necessary to facilitate Council's participation in the South East Metropolitan Advanced Waste Processing Project.
7. notes Attachment 3 to the report remains confidential in accordance with section 3(1)(g) and section 66(5) of the *Local Government Act 2020* or until Council resolves otherwise; and
8. authorises Council officers to disclose any confidential information in relation to this item, but only to the extent necessary to give effect to the resolution.

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Zmood****Seconded: Cr Zhang**

That Council grants Cr Zyngier a three minute extension of speaking time.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**For the Motion:** Crs Cade, Esakoff, Pilling and Zhang (4)**Against the Motion:** Crs Athanasopoulos, Magee, Parasol, Zmood and Zyngier (5)

The Motion Moved by Cr Pilling and Seconded by Cr Zhang was **LOST**

8.10 GLEN EIRA PHILANTHROPIC PARTNERSHIP POLICY

Moved: Cr Parasol**Seconded: Cr Pilling**

That Council endorses the Philanthropic Partnership Policy shown as Attachment 1 to the report with the following changes to Part 5 Partnership Exclusions:

- a) Remove the word 'support'; and
- b) Include a new dot point 'alcohol industry'.

Part 5 Partnership Exclusions to read:

Council will not enter into any Partnership Agreement with any partner/donor who may be seen to conflict with Council's responsibilities to the local community or whose reputation or image could prove detrimental to the public image of Council. This includes, but is not limited to, partners/donors involved in the production of:

- tobacco and associated products;
- gambling providers, products and services;
- armaments;
- fossil fuel industry
- sex industry;
- pornography;
- child labour;
- practices or products which cause unacceptable damage to the natural environment; or
- alcohol industry

Where there is any doubt regarding the partner/donor involvement in any of the above listed or may not be consistent with Clause 4.1, a paper will be submitted to Council for consideration.

It is recorded that Cr Athanasopoulos vacated the virtual meeting at 9:32pm and re-entered at 9:35pm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.11 DONATIONS FOR THE PROVISION OF PARK BENCHES POLICY UPDATE

Moved: Cr Esakoff**Seconded: Cr Parasol**

That Council endorses the updated Donations for the Provision of Park Benches Policy shown as Attachment 1 to the report.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Procedural Motion**Moved: Cr Magee****Seconded: Cr Athanasopoulos**

That Council extends the meeting to conclude at 11pm.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.12 POLICY REVIEW PROJECT

Moved: Cr Cade**Seconded: Cr Zmood**

That Council notes the report.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**8.13 GLEN EIRA BUSINESS AND ECONOMY ADVISORY COMMITTEE -
RECOMMENDED COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES**

Moved: Cr Cade**Seconded: Cr Parasol**

That Council:

1. appoints the following as community representatives to the Glen Eira Business and Economy Advisory Committee for a two-year period:
 - Bruno Karalus
 - Chris Giouris
 - Deepa Mani
 - Grahame Leonard AM
 - Jaai Parasnis
 - Keith Rhodes
 - Ruth Lewis
 - Shai Dagan
 - Steven Antunovic
 - Thanh Do
2. writes to the successful applicants congratulating them on their appointment, and to the unsuccessful applicants thanking them for their applications.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**8.14 PROVISION OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES
PANEL**

Moved: Cr Esakoff**Seconded: Cr Cade**

That Council:

1. appoints the panel of providers recommended to be appointed in the Procurement Australia tender as listed in the confidential attachment to the report;
2. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to execute the contract on Council's behalf;
3. notes the attachment to the report remains confidential in accordance with Section 3(1)(g) and Section 66(5) of the *Local Government Act 2020* or until Council resolves otherwise; and
4. authorises Council officers to disclose any confidential information in relation to this item, but only to the extent necessary to give effect to the resolution.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.15 QUARTERLY SERVICES PERFORMANCE REPORT - DECEMBER 2021

Moved: Cr Zhang**Seconded: Cr Esakoff**

That Council notes the Quarterly Service Performance Report for the period ending 31 December 2021 (Attachment 1 to the report).

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8.16 SUBMISSION : REVIEW OF THE RULES OF ASSOCIATION - MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION OF VICTORIA (MAV)

Moved: Cr Pilling**Seconded: Cr Cade**

That Council endorses the *MAV Rules Review -GECC Submission* as detailed in Attachment 1 to this report and authorises the Chief Executive Officer to submit it to the MAV on Council's behalf.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. URGENT BUSINESS NIL**10. ORDINARY BUSINESS****10.1 Requests for reports from a member of Council staff - Nil****10.2 Right of reply - Nil****10.3 Notice of Motion - Nil****10.4 Councillor questions**

Cr Athanasopoulos asked the following question of Cr Zyngier

At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 14 December 2021, Cr Zyngier was responding to Item 8.2, the Multi Deck Car Parks Community Engagement and Consultation and was not granted an extension of speaking time to complete his points.

What was Cr Zyngier planning to say at that meeting?

Cr Zyngier responded:

I was speaking about why the Officers' Report and Recommendation was flawed and should be rejected by Council/Councillors.

While the Officers Report includes all the data from the three collection methods, survey, in-person consultation and on-line comments, all the qualitative data was ignored. That is the gold standard for research trying to triangulate 3 parts of the same question.

Based on the information provided, was this commuter car park consultation about actually carparks for shoppers?

Only 80 of the 473 respondents to the surveys possibly read the detailed VLC Report and only 80 looked at any of the frequently asked questions. That might explain why their responses were in favour and recorded by both *Have Your Say* and *Community Voice* respondents about indicating a misunderstanding of the proposal – mainly due to the misinformation provided regarding the use of the carparks being available to shoppers and traders and not for commuters.

The detailed data explains why this confusion arose: The comments in response to the question "Why should Glen Eira proceed" all refer to a misconception about the proposed Commuter Car Park Project - that the proposal will provide for more parking near the shopping areas and it will reduce pressure on local parking networks.

These comments contrast with the feedback from the three in person focus groups which were privileged with a Q&A presentation from Council Officers. In all three groups the overwhelming majority were strongly opposed to the project continuing. The groups generally expressed negative views to the proposed carparks.

Finally of the 198 respondents who gave qualitative comments on the survey, over two-thirds were vehemently against proceeding.

Those most impacted by the project actually rejected the proposal

The respondents who chose Elsternwick or Bentleigh as their residential suburb were not supportive at all of using the funding or the chosen location.

What about the Climate Emergency?

The Officers' Report states that the analysis into congestion busting, aligns with our Climate Emergency Response. Park and Ride encourages people to not use public transport or active transport to access parking. Park and Ride in Glen Eira will remove only 1 CBD trip for every 3 carparks created. That is for every 210 car spaces provided, additional in Elsternwick, only 70 trips will be removed from the CBD.

Point of Order raised from Cr Pilling

The Mayor deemed the comment as not a valid Point of Order.

Cr Zyngier continued

Glen Eira Council declared a "Climate Emergency" in 2020. Council has set zero net corporate emissions by 2025 and zero net community emissions by 2030.

As one of the members of the on-line focus group commented:

"How does building more multideck car parks and encouraging greater use of fossil fuel burning vehicles align with Council policy? This is a disappointing combination of poor planning and total hypocrisy."

The environmental impacts of building multi deck car parks are not just from encouraging the use of cars over public transit or walking and cycling, but also from activities related to building and maintaining that infrastructure.

Providing free parking only encourages more cars onto local streets, and raises the levels of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide. Glen Eira has the lowest amount of open space within any Victorian municipality, and a tree canopy which is gradually being eroded. Building a multi deck car park on scarce open space, and removing the established, mature trees at the site would worsen these problems. A concrete multi deck car park would create an urban heat island.

10.5 Written public questions to Council

1. Joe Erftemeyer – Caulfield East

I reside along the Frankston railway line in Caulfield East. As part of the Glenhuntly/Neerim Rds level crossing removal works, residents were advised that a railway bicycle path will be constructed along Queens Ave. Most concerning was that it will be built on the reserve between the road and the racecourse and that all the trees and vegetation will need to be removed. This is a big concern as this will remove the current 'green' screen along Queens Ave and devastate local canopy cover as there are few trees on the racecourse side.

Is council aware of this proposal, and if so, does council support it?

Cycle paths must be located appropriately and without the loss of canopy and vegetation. We have lost so many large trees in this area the past few years and cannot afford any further loss.

Response:

Council is aware of the Level Crossing Removal Project's (LXRP) plan for the new shared-user path (SUP) along Queens Avenue and their proposed associated removal of trees along Queens Avenue.

Council supports the inclusion of the shared user path, however, have advocated for an alternative design that would require less tree removal. Council has been informed that our preferred outcome will cost in the vicinity of \$10 million and is therefore beyond the scope of the project. Nevertheless, Council officers are still in discussion with the LXRP trying to negotiate a better solution that retains as many trees as possible, however it is likely that a significant number of trees will need to be removed.

Where trees are removed, the LXRP has committed to replant 2 new trees for every one tree removed. Council will provide rigorous oversight to ensure the endorsed replanting strategy is implemented, and that canopy tree species are replaced like for like.

2. Rosetta Manaszewicz – McKinnon

- a) Council's Housing Strategy is proposing to remove the mandatory garden requirement for sites in certain areas zoned GRZ and also reduce site coverage, setbacks, and permeability requirements for certain sites in NRZ.

- i) What are the precise number of sites that will be impacted by these proposed changes?
 - ii) Please specify the numbers for NRZ and GRZ separately.
- b) Council's proposed 'consultation' processes for the Housing Strategy are very minimal. Could council ensure that:
1. The community consultation committee is involved in the drafting of the survey questions
 2. That an open public forum is held for residents in order for them to provide feedback.
 - 3 That the time line is increased to at least 6 weeks
 4. A brief summary document that summarises the exact proposed changes are included in next month's Glen Eira News and that this document is available online?

Responses:

- a) The action of removing the "Garden Area requirement" from the General Residential Zone must be considered in the context of the overall strategy rather than in isolation. The requirement cannot be removed from the Neighbourhood Residential Zone.
- Recovering canopy cover and sustainably accommodating a growing and diverse population are important aims of the strategy. This has to be done by taking different approaches in each area due to the level of change proposed for each area.
 - The "Garden Area requirement" is only a percentage of a site that cannot be developed in certain ways. It is not a requirement for gardens. Due to the general nature of the requirement and the way that developments are designed, the requirement often results in odd lot configurations that wastes land that could be used for landscaping. A different approach is required for General Residential Zone areas, which is a zone where developments up to three storeys are supported.
 - The draft Housing Strategy proposes that for sites in the General Residential Zone (GRZ), the "Garden Area requirement" is switched off. The General Residential Zone represents 11 per cent of all land in Glen Eira (and 13 per cent of all land that allows for residential use in Glen Eira). The overall number of sites in Substantial Change Area 1 (translating to GRZ) as shown in the proposed housing framework plan and therefore proposed to have the garden area requirement switched off is 7,624.
 - The draft Housing Strategy aims to identify locations where we can have multi-unit / townhouse developments (up to two storeys), that are genuine medium density (units and smaller townhouses). The draft Housing Strategy includes an action to develop specific requirements to give effect to these aims. 7 per cent of the existing NRZ is proposed to have controls that will allow for multi-dwelling development and better support front landscaping outcomes. This translates to 5 per cent of Glen Eira or 3,075 sites.
- b) The consultation process for the Draft Housing Strategy was considered in item 8.5 on tonight's agenda. The consultation program includes both an online webinars and open forums which will be in the form of drop in sessions in each Ward. A summary of the draft Housing Strategy has been prepared, however the long lead times necessary for a print publication like GE News means it is very difficult to include timely information relating to engagement. The summary document will be made

available on Council's Have Your Say webpage, Customer Service Centre and Libraries.

All other requests from your question were resolved by Council's decision relating to item 8.5 on tonight's agenda.

3. Barbara Rodriguez – Caulfield North

- a) Given that the minimum tonnage predictions are uncertain beyond 2031, what are the implications of not meeting minimum tonnage commitments?
- b) Does this mean that the additional tonnage will come from the other established organics and recycling waste streams, that have taken many years to establish and that the community has supported in good faith?

Response:

- a) The minimum tonnage commitment is an aggregate of all participating councils in the contract. If the total actual tonnes collected from all participating councils is less than the agreed minimum tonnes, council can incur a higher gate fee. While the total aggregate minimum tonnage from all councils is an estimate, the total committed tonnes is considered conservative; the risk that councils will not be able to reach the minimum tonnage is low.

This minimum tonnage guarantee will also be assessed annually under the Waste Supply Deed between the Company (all participating councils) and the Contractor. However, if Council does not meet the minimum tonnes committed, this shortfall may be covered by waste from other councils or alternative waste streams secured by the Contractor. As such an obligation to contribute proportionately due to a shortfall, would only be triggered where the total aggregate waste provided by all participating councils did not achieve the requisite minimum tonnage guarantee.

Committing minimum tonnages is a similar model used in our current contracts for landfill, commingled recycling and organics recycling processing. Like the proposed model for this project, Council currently commits projected minimum tonnes for landfill disposal and recycling processing annually. If total aggregate tonnes from all councils in the agreement are lower than the projected tonnes for the year, councils may pay a higher rate.

- b) No, commingled and organic recycling will not be diverted to meet the minimum tonnage commitment.

There is an agreed Waste Acceptance Protocol which lists all waste that can be delivered to the facility under the Contract. Only waste that cannot be reused or recycled will be accepted at the facility and is in line with the Victorian government's waste to energy guidelines. Recyclable organic and commingled waste is non-permissible and therefore cannot be delivered to, or accepted by the facility.

Questions from Eva Garfinkel and David Brown in relation to pollution and amenity have been combined.

4. Eva Garfinkel (Light) – Caulfield

What do you mean by planning to burn waste? With all we know about air pollution. "Burning waste produces Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) including Dioxins which are bio-accumulating compounds pernicious to health. We would not want to live anywhere near such a facility, and don't believe the Council should be a party to inflicting this on anyone."

16. David Brown – Glen Huntly

Stonington tried to burn it's rubbish in the late 20th cent. There was an incinerator/huge chimney in Prahran/Windsor. The pollution effect on the immediate area & public outcry was huge. It no longer exists.

- a) What makes Glen Eira think this proposal is workable; even in terms of amenity around the incinerator, let alone the questions raised about pollution/carbon goals, etc?
- b) Does council want to spend huge amounts of money on what turn out to be a very short lived project?

Combined response:

Modern advanced waste processing facilities are significantly different from waste incinerators of the past. Modern advanced waste processing facilities have strict emissions protocols and must adhere to 24/7 monitoring and are heavily regulated. In Victoria, the building and operation of an advanced waste processing facility is regulated by the Environment Protection Authority Victoria (EPA). Facilities must be appropriately located, constructed, and operated according to strict regulations.

In other parts of the world such as Copenhagen, London and Berlin, advanced waste processing facilities are considered safe to build in city centres as these facilities also house air clean up systems, which take pollutants out of the air by capturing them.

Advanced waste processing facilities are also regulated by other agencies, such as WorkSafe and the councils, to ensure all permits are complied with. The EPA has adopted the European protocol (BREF – Best Available Techniques Reference document) and all facilities need to be built according to these standards.

Comparatively, the generation of PM10 emissions from travelling 3km in an average diesel heavy-duty truck, or 390km in an average petrol fuelled car, is the same as treating 100kg of waste in a European advanced waste processing facility.

Each Advanced Waste Processing facility houses an air clean up system, which takes pollutants out of the air by capturing them with activated lime. The residue which remains can then be further treated to remove the toxins and is used as filler for building materials.

The advanced Waste Processing project will be a long-term solution for the disposal of Council's residual municipal solid waste.

Questions received from Bruce Cutts, Kathryn Hannan and Jason Reading in relation to emissions reduction and sustainable waste practices have been combined.

Questions:

5. Bruce Cutts – Mordialloc

Does Glen Eira conduct an audit of net annual greenhouse gas emissions (in CO₂e - Carbon Dioxide Equivalent) from its waste disposal system, including both emissions and sequestration, to set a baseline for comparison with the proposed Advanced Waste Processing System, and if so what are the most recent figures?

7. Kathryn Hannan – Murrumbeena

In regard to the proposal for the Advanced Waste Processing Facility (Agenda item 8.9), the Director's notes state that it would significantly reduce emissions associated with waste disposal, particularly methane.

Has the capture of methane from landfill been factored in when making that statement? Secondly, given methane results from the breakdown of organic matter, shouldn't the goal be to reduce that as much as possible by diverting organic material to green waste bins?

8. Jason Reading – Elsternwick

a) How will we meet our target of net-zero emissions by 2030 if our waste is burned?

b) What will be the quantity (not a percentage) emissions for the proposed project? The Council Agenda states that the project will "significantly reduce emissions associated with waste disposal".

Combined response:

Our foremost goal is to support our community transition to a more circular economy, where waste is prevented, and if this is not possible, materials are recovered from waste to be reused and recycled at its highest value. This approach aligns with our target to reach zero net community emissions by 2030.

However, even with an approach where waste avoidance and a high level of material recovery is prioritised, it is expected there will still be some residual waste that will need a disposal solution.

According to the waste hierarchy, the recovery of energy from waste is preferred to disposal of waste in a landfill, and this is because fewer emissions are produced in an advanced waste processing facility compared to landfill, while also producing electricity considered to be a renewable energy source.

Based on estimates undertaken by Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group as part of this project, each tonne of waste diverted from landfill to an advanced waste processing facility will result in 0.4 t CO₂-e avoided, or 25 per cent less emissions. The facility will also generate 0.6 MWh of electricity per tonne of waste, displacing electricity from the grid, which is the equivalent of 0.6 t CO₂-e avoided.

Council collected approximately 28,000 tonnes of municipal solid waste that was sent to landfill, which equates to approximately 44,800 tonnes of lifetime greenhouse gas emissions (t CO₂-e) from the waste degradation in the landfill.

Using these estimates and applying the 2019-20 data, if 28,000 tonnes of residual waste were sent to the advanced waste processing facility, then 11,200 t CO₂-e would be avoided, and renewable electricity displacing grid electricity would be generated equal to reducing 16,800 t CO₂-e.

Based on minimum tonnages for the 25-year contract period, if Glen Eira's residual waste is sent to landfill over this period, this is approximately 775,000 t CO₂-e produced. If this waste is sent to an advanced waste processing facility instead of landfill, then the estimated emissions produced is 291,000 t CO₂-e, including reduced emissions from renewable electricity generation.

The final solution for the facility has not yet been decided, and as such the emissions produced by the facility is currently an estimate based on assumptions about the technology, size and site of the facility.

Overall, advanced waste processing will reduce emissions associated with residual waste, and will get us closer to net zero emissions by 2030 than if this waste was sent to landfill.

An environmental and social assessment of four proven advanced waste processing solutions was completed as part of the business case completed for the project in 2019. Carbon abatement, job creation and transport impacts were all considered as part of this assessment. All solutions were found to deliver a better environmental and social outcome compared to business as usual (landfill disposal).

Glen Eira's residual waste is currently sent to Melbourne Regional Landfill (MRL), in Melbourne's north-west. Landfill gas is generated from decomposing waste, and is comprised of methane and carbon dioxide. MRL collect the landfill gas onsite and generate electricity through combustion in a biogas energy plant. This electricity is then fed back into the local electricity grid.

However, even with technology to extract and capture this gas, there are fugitive landfill emissions that are released into the atmosphere. The quantity of fugitive emissions depends on the landfill management practices, as well as the quality of the cap and cover. From a greenhouse gas emissions perspective, when methane is recovered and flared or combusted for energy, the carbon dioxide emitted is not counted as an emission but regarded as part of the natural carbon cycle.

For Australian landfills, 1.0 tonne of municipal solid waste will result in 1.6 tonne of greenhouse gas emissions (that is from methane released into the atmosphere).

In line with the circular economy principles and the waste hierarchy, our goal foremost is to avoid the generation of waste (including recycling). Our new circular economy plan (currently in development) will look at projects and programs so our community can change their behaviour to avoid waste altogether or if this is not possible choose products that can be recycled.

Food and garden organic waste and recyclables will continue to be collected and recycled separately and delivered to facilities designed to specifically process and recycle these streams. An advanced waste processing facility is for processing of residual waste that cannot be recycled.

Questions received from Paul Caine and Paulette Smythe in relation to community engagement have also been combined.

Questions:

6. Paul Caine – Glen Huntly

My concerns are focused on Agenda Item 8.9 the Advance Waste Processing (AWP). This item has undoubtedly caught everyone by surprise. No public consultation was sought therefore no public input was received on this extremely important step in Glen Eira's waste strategy.

- a) Why was public consultation deliberately avoided? In the light of this failure to seek residents views. I therefore think committing to build a Advance Waste Plant should be halted, a 3 step public consultation process should be started with a selected community panel to represent residents.
- b) Is halting this process to commit to AWP plant possible, to allow for a full consultation process to be held?

15. Paulette Smythe – Caulfield East

Why is Council proposing to make a decision on such an important issue – incinerating our waste - without full consultation with and support from the community, especially when it is proposed to lock in this solution to our waste disposal for the next 25 years? It is far from clear that this is an environmentally responsible decision and considerably more work needs to be done before Council commits to such a drastic solution to the waste problem. A more sustainable solution would be to seek to reduce the waste in the first instance and then to recycle as much as possible.

Combined response:

As outlined in *Our Climate Emergency Response Strategy | Dhumbali Wurrungi-biik Parbin-ata 2021-2025* one of our objectives under item 6.3 is to **make it easy for our community to participate in a circular economy**, where waste will be reduced and prevented in the first instance. Where waste cannot be avoided, we will support better recycling and purchasing of products made of recycled content.

An advanced waste processing solution is specifically for the residual waste stream only, where the waste cannot be prevented, or the materials cannot be reused or recycled. Rather than sending this waste to landfill, an advanced waste processing facility helps reduce emissions that arise from residual waste in landfill and produces energy. According to the waste hierarchy, advanced waste processing is preferred to landfill, as energy is recovered from waste.

As part of this agreement, this facility will employ a 'Waste Acceptance Protocol' which lists all waste that can be delivered to the facility. Only waste that can't be reused or recycled can be delivered and accepted by the facility. However, our main goal is to prevent producing waste in the first place.

The Metropolitan Waste and Resource Recovery Group has been leading this project on behalf of the 16 councils in the south east, including communication and engagement. This has included community research in 2018-19, with a focus on understanding the drivers and barriers to community acceptance of advanced waste processing solutions, especially waste to energy facilities. This included eight qualitative group discussions and an online survey.

As part of the procurement process, public consultation will take place and all stakeholders will be invited to engage and state their views. This will have a panel of experts to consult and answer questions.

9. Lisa Toomey – Elsternwick

Multideck Car Park Elsternwick Council has stated: 'minimal impact it will have on the surrounding residential area'

- a) What is council going to do to ensure residents adjacent to the Elsternwick car park have 'minimal impact' if the multideck car park goes ahead?

- b) As community consultation took place before occupancy certificates were available for 24 apartments adjacent to the Stanley St car park, how can new Glen Eira residents be supported by council in relation to this proposed development?

Responses:

- a) Council has recently engaged an architect and strategic transport advisory consultant as part of the feasibility and concept development. The feasibility analysis will review the impact to the surrounding residential area to ensure that this will be minimised in the final design. Some things which will be considered in this analysis will be height, bulk and scale of the building, number of car spaces, façade treatments, functional layout and local traffic impacts.
- b) Once the feasibility and initial concept is developed, Council will undertake a further round of engagement with the community to seek feedback on the concept designs and feasibility outcomes. At this point the community will have another opportunity to provide their feedback via a survey on Have Your Say or by email/written submission. Consultation is likely to take place in the next couple of months and details will be advertised on Council's website, social media, by letter drop and in Glen Eira News.
-

10. Kay Gregory – Glen Huntly

I am extremely concerned about the removal of mature Plane Trees along Dorothy Avenue which have provided a canopy, shade, coolness, a buffer to noise and beauty for many years. I am further concerned about more tree/vegetation removal in the area.

- a) Why are trees being removed along Queens Avenue which have nothing to do with the Level Crossing project?
- b) Will 2 for 1 trees be replanted along Dorothy Avenue?

Responses:

- a) The Level Crossing Removal Project (LXRP) are extending the current shared user path (SUP) from Ormond Station through to Glen Huntly Station. It is proposed the new path will run along Royal Avenue, then up Station Place, crossing at Neerim Road and then will run the whole length of Queens Avenue, terminating at the Queens Ave Normanby Road Intersection. Council would like to see an alternative design from the LXRP which moves out the kerb on Queens Ave, which would enable the Shared User Path to be shifted and the trees to be retained. The current alignment of the path in the LXRP's design has significant tree loss.
- b) Council understands that the LXRP have committed to a 2:1 tree planting offset for all trees removed, however where those trees are planted will depend on the final design. The final design for Dorothy Avenue following the necessary works has not yet been resolved. Council understands that one of the options being considered is commuter car parking which would constrain the opportunity for offset tree planting. If you have views on this you may wish to make them known to the LXRP.
-

11. Warren Green – Bentleigh

- a) The following question was asked at the August 2021 Meeting. Is the CEO happy to meet with residents to present and discuss Council's Housing Strategy research findings on new housing opportunities, demographics, etc. prior to the development of a draft Housing Strategy? The CEO response provided was. Yes, at an appropriate time. While at the moment it would be premature, officers and the CEO are looking forward to communicating the research outcomes and discussing them with the community once the information has been more thoroughly considered and realistic options on how to provide a strong policy position within the planning system have been identified. Engaging with the community is certainly a priority and will most definitely continue throughout the process to produce and adopt the new housing strategy.

My question is, why didn't this important commitment to involve community occur?

- b) In response to a public question in August 2021, the CEO committed the Housing Strategy consultation would be based on the IAP2 Involve Level. This Level aims to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered. The aim with this IAP2 Level is to work with the community to ensure that concerns and aspirations raised are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input has influenced the decision.

Given this CEO commitment, why doesn't the Housing Strategy acknowledge, or respond to, critical community feedback over the last 6 years regarding overdevelopment? This includes the 2016 Planning Scheme Review feedback, as per the August 2016 Agenda, which states that "for our activity centres, the community feedback strongly indicated that there was a sense of overdevelopment, loss of character, and subsequent impacts on surrounding residential areas". An issue that is still unresolved.

Response:

- a) Item 8.5 Draft Housing Strategy 2022 sought Council's endorsement to undertake a further round of community engagement on the strategy. This is the opportunity to communicate the research, demographics and round one consultation outcomes. This has been the earliest opportunity to present this information together with a draft policy position. Attached to the Draft Housing Strategy 2022, is the phase one consultation report, community profile, and a housing capacity and demand analysis report, along with a range of other reviews and assessments. Once on consultation, all members of the public will have the opportunity to discuss this supporting information and the draft strategy.
- b) The Housing Strategy aims to encourage growth in the City's activity centres and along major transport corridors. This direction helps to protect many other residential areas, including the Neighbourhood Residential Zone which has a 2 storey height limit and makes up 80% of the residential zoned land in the municipality. Council cannot avoid growth and development but can plan for it. Council's role as a Planning Authority under the *Planning and Environment Act (1987)* is to plan for the interests of current and future communities, providing a suitable amount of land for each key land-use. The draft Housing Strategy provides the framework for future housing need in areas where it is most sustainable for it to occur.
-

12. Markus Oswald – Carnegie

- a) The Caulfield Structure Plan envisages the rezoning of certain precincts to an Activity Centre Zone. Will council guarantee that if these precincts are rezoned to Activity Centre Zone, there will be third party objection rights? Which precincts are expected not to have third party objection rights for planning applications?
- b) Have overshadowing diagrams been prepared? Will overshadowing diagrams be prepared and will they be made publicly available?

Response:

- a) The Caulfield Structure Plan envisages the rezoning of certain precincts to an Activity Centre Zone. However, translating any structure plan into planning provisions requires a separate and formal planning scheme amendment process. This future process requires robust strategic justification, a formal exhibition process and can include a rigorous independent planning panel review. Ultimately, it is the Minister for Planning's decision whether or not to approve a Council's proposed planning provisions.

The default provision of the Activity Centre Zone, if ultimately endorsed at a later stage, is that no third party notice, decision or review rights exist for any planning application subject to the zone.

Third party notice, decision and review rights can be reinstated in certain precincts (such as in residential precincts), or for particular uses (such as a hotel), or for particular forms of development (such as development that exceeds preferred maximum building heights).

The development of planning provisions to implement the structure plan will follow the current draft stage. These details are yet to be determined and taken through a formal community and stakeholder exhibition process.

The detailed urban design and land use analysis contained within the draft Caulfield Structure Plan sets the foundations for developing the planning controls for inclusion in the Glen Eira Planning Scheme. Consultation and feedback received from the community and stakeholders will further inform the drafting of the detailed controls, including consideration of exemptions from third party notice, decision and review rights across the different precincts.

If endorsed and a planning scheme amendment is pursued, the community will be given the opportunity to make further submissions on the detail, which would include all proposed planning controls.

- b) Overshadowing modelling was undertaken in the detailed urban design background analysis that informed building height and location across the Activity Centre. This information will be exhibited as part of any future planning scheme amendment.

13. Jim Walker – Caulfield North

- a) How will it be possible for Glen Eira Council to increase canopy tree cover in Glen Eira while decreasing permeable area requirements on private land, and building more sports grounds and other infrastructure on public land.
- b) How many potential canopy trees has Glen Eira Council planted over the last 5 years, by year, and how many potential canopy trees has Glen Eira Council scheduled to plant in the next 5, year, by year.

Responses:

- a) Council is actively implementing new initiatives and engineering solutions to enable the successful establishment of trees in areas that historically lack canopy cover such as within roadways, Council car parks and other paved surfaces. We are also increasing the number and density of trees within our open space areas such as recent plantings of 160 canopy trees within Lord and Koornang reserves. Officers are currently evaluating other open space areas with a view to increase the tree canopy in areas across the municipality.
 - b) Over the past 5 years Council planted on average 2000 canopy street trees each year, which was a combination of new and replacement trees. It is anticipated this annual number will increase significantly over the next 5 years through the implementation of new streetscape and biodiversity plantings in accordance with Council's Urban Forest Strategy.
-

14. Chelsie Dickson – Carnegie

In the Caulfield Structure Plan, when references are made to Maximum Number of Storeys and Maximum Preferred Number of Storeys are height limits mandatory or discretionary? Which areas will have mandatory height limits?

Response:

The Draft Caulfield Structure Plan proposes preferred or (discretionary) maximum building heights across the Activity Centre Precincts. No mandatory maximum building height controls are proposed.

17. Cristina Santos – Bentleigh East

The Council has previously claimed that it is committed to developing strategies that address the community's growing concerns around climate change. From memory there were several media releases from the Council acknowledging a "climate emergency" and outlining a commitment to becoming a carbon neutral Council area. The Council also claims through its "urban forest strategy" to support the growth of our green canopy and having participated in a couple of forums I am told by the Council representative and individual Councillors that Glen Eira's "urban forest strategy" refers to trees and plants more than knee high. Despite these assertions it appears the Council is now proposing to amend General Residential Zones to remove minimum garden requirements and reduce setbacks.

My question is: Could the Council articulate how the GRZ requirements align with its Urban Forest Strategy and climate emergency declaration.

Response:

The action of removing the "Garden Area requirement" must be considered in the context of the overall strategy rather than as a single element. Recovering canopy cover and sustainably accommodating a growing and diverse population are important aims of the strategy.

The General Residential Zone is a three-storey zone and represents only 13% of the residential land in Glen Eira. The "Garden Area requirement" is only a percentage of a site that cannot be developed in certain ways. It is somewhat of a misnomer as it is not a

requirement for gardens. A different approach needs to be investigated for General Residential Zone areas.

The draft Housing Strategy includes actions for pursuing increased canopy cover, as detailed in the Urban Forest Strategy, in a number of ways, including:

- Investigating, designing and testing specific requirements for the residential zones (including the General Residential Zone) to accommodate canopy tree planting.
- Investigating innovative approaches to street planting in the GRZ and RGZ areas, where higher site coverage on private land is necessary to provide for the community's diverse housing needs.
- Investigating a local law to retain mature trees.

The details of the specific policies and controls have not yet been determined. These will be prepared as actions of the final strategy. If endorsed and the project proceeds to the planning scheme amendment stage, the community will have a further opportunity to provide comment.

18. Simon Toomey – Elsternwick

Proposed Stanley Street multi-deck carpark.

- a) Through traffic on Riddell Parade towards Glen Huntly Road does not always slow nor look right for entering traffic at the Stanley St/Riddell Parade roundabout. Hence, the risk of vehicle collisions at this intersection would increase for higher traffic volumes due to use of the proposed multi-deck car park. Does the feasibility assessment include traffic management considerations including the safety of pedestrians in the area?
- b) What are the benefits of increasing the parking capacity at the Stanley St west carpark when the Stanley St east car park is seldom at full capacity?

Response:

- a) Yes, feasibility assessment will include analysis on local traffic impacts, including future modelling/predictions and safety.
 - b) The Stanley St west carpark is closer in proximity to the train station which means better access for transport users, particularly transport users with additional access needs. During off-peak periods, the carpark may be used by visitors to the activity centre. The proposed multi-deck carpark on Stanley St west will also be closer to the proposed Elsternwick Cultural precinct, as well as restaurants and bars located at the western end of Glenhuntly Road, which means patrons will have more available, accessible parking.
-

19. Bernadette Pierce – Caulfield South

- a) Boroondara City Council in their housing strategy recognises that the need for housing diversity should also be considered in conjunction with the capacity and functions of key infrastructure, such as roads, sewerage, drainage, public services and public transport. If these services cannot sustain additional population in particular locations, it would be unsustainable to increase densities in these locations until the necessary infrastructure can support the change. (BHS p.2).

Why has there has been no consideration of the capacity and functions of key infrastructure in the development of the Glen Eira City Council Draft Housing Strategy 2022?

- b) Glen Eira residents have tried so many times to have their voices heard through thousands of submissions and letters: - Opposing overdevelopment in Elsternwick (STET); opposing Amendment 184: Carnegie; opposing Amendment 184: Bentleigh; opposing Glen Huntly Draft Structure Plan; opposing local developments throughout the city (occurring weekly). So many petitions have been tabled in Council, (the petition in Dec 2020 had close to 2000 signatures). And yet, our voices have been disregarded.

Why has Glen Eira City Council tabled a draft Housing Policy which ignores the requests of the residents of Glen Eira community?

Response:

- a) Glen Eira's current housing framework (including the use of the three main residential zones), and the population and household projections identified as part of the Housing Strategy, place Glen Eira in a fortuitous position to plan for the future. In so far as change is concerned, only minimal planning control changes need to be made as the focus is on housing diversity rather than seeking housing numbers. Therefore, existing infrastructure is readily capable of supporting the increased housing diversity the strategy is seeking. The housing strategy encourages development in and around activity centres and along public transport routes. This is to ensure new residents have access to shops and transport close by, all in walking distance which reduces car dependency and traffic on local roads. The current and proposed level crossing removals on the Dandenong and Frankston lines will result in increased train services to cater for new residents. Council recognises that more open space is required for the current and future communities with the Open Space Strategy setting out a framework for new and improved open spaces. Appropriate infrastructure and service needs have been considered in the drafting of the strategy.
- b) Population growth and development to provide for housing occurs regardless of whether Council plans for it or not. Planning for growth allows Council to concentrate development activity in areas most suitable for it to occur.

This includes Activity Centres and along public transport corridors. As an inner-south east municipality, Glen Eira has a role to play in accommodating growth across metropolitan Melbourne. This is something we cannot avoid. Council's role as a Planning Authority is to plan for the interests of current and future communities, providing a suitable amount of land for each key land-use.

The draft Housing Strategy is an opportunity to consider what types of households are likely to exist. With diverse household types, there is a need for a range of dwelling types. This is an issue the strategy aims to address in Glen Eira. The proposed housing strategy, which proposes minimal changes on the whole, is a proposed future vision to support diversity and character as we plan for the current and the future community.

20. Geoff Langford – Bentleigh

In reviewing the 590 Agenda pages associated with the Draft Housing Strategy, there are many elements that don't make sense and/or require further clarification.

These include:

- 1) Lack of justification around the requirement for 50,000 dwelling opportunities, which equates to around 60 years of dwelling supply
- 2) Lack of any comments around overdevelopment as a major theme from extensive community feedback provided over a long period
- 3) Lack of reference to capacity, amenity, infrastructure as it relates to sustainability
- 4) Lack of any measure on liveability including open space provision
- 5) Commentary around the recommended reduction in permeability and garden areas as it relates to environmental impact
- 6) Absence of key background information of Glen Eira such as the lowest level of open space, current population density, ability to meet future growth requirements, etc. Can Council provide further advice on these points?

Response:

1. The housing strategy does not state there is a requirement for 50,000 dwelling opportunities. The capacity analysis indicates there is *currently* capacity for approximately 50,000 additional dwellings. The housing strategy states that there is land to provide for the overall number of dwellings expected to be needed over the next few decades. However, it states that the current planning controls are limiting the types of dwellings available and there is therefore a diversity issue to address. The concept of “overdevelopment” can be subjective. There are locations better suited for growth than others. Much of this will be seen in our activity centres and along major public transport routes, areas more suitable for development and more often seen because of the way we travel through the municipality. Currently, 80% of residential zoned land is in the Neighbourhood Residential Zone where heights are mandatory 2 storeys.
2. The proposed housing framework plan identifies only limited “changes” from the levels of change contemplated by the current zones. The vast majority of sites will continue to have the level of change that aligns with their current zones. Amenity and infrastructure are therefore readily able to support proposed changes.

21. Susan Nolle – Caulfield

Since his last Ordinary Council Meeting attendance on the 12th of October 2021, Rosstown Ward Councillor, Tony Athanasopoulos, has missed five of the six Public Council Meetings held prior to 22nd of February 2022. He attended the November 3rd Zoom meeting and nominated Cr Magee for mayor. The minutes of the Records of Assembly, for the weekly meetings when there is no Public Meeting, show that, since the 19th of October, Cr Athanasopoulos was completely absent from seven of the ten meetings. Of the three remaining meetings the minutes indicate his sporadic attendance at two meetings. On two consecutive occasions, prior to his attendance, via Zoom, on November 3rd to nominate Cr Magee for mayor, he was absent without apology. Will the Mayor please explain how this behaviour is acceptable under Council’s Code of Conduct for Councillors ?

Response:

It is correct Cr Athanasopoulos was not present at 5 of the 6 public meetings due to a personal matter. However, through part of the period you question, Cr Athanasopoulos responded to emails and provided input to Councillors on matters before Council.

There were 14 Assembly of Councillor meetings held from 19 October 2021 up to and including 1 February 2022. Cr Athanasopoulos attended 4 and was an apology for 10, although 3 of those 10 were optional workshops.

For a more accurate representation of Councillor attendances at public meetings, please view Council's Annual Report on Council's website. These figures do not include the many informal meetings with the community, Advisory Committee meetings and phone calls that are undertaken as part of a Councillor's role.

Councillors are normal people who from time to time have personal matters that preclude them from attending 'work'. There is no breach of the Councillor's Code of Conduct.

22. Therese Green – Bentleigh

Can Council please provide an update on the status of the interim controls for Bentleigh beyond March this year? Can Council also advise of the insights from the research undertaken as part of the Housing Strategy to strategically justify these controls for Bentleigh?

Response:

Council has sought an extension to the interim controls for the Bentleigh Major Activity Centre to 30 June 2023. A decision is anticipated from the Minister for Planning before the current interim controls expires. Please check our [Amendments page](#) closer to the expiry date for an update.

Council's focus for Bentleigh is the revision to the structure plan to inform the preparation of permanent planning controls for the centre. The Housing Strategy, supporting documentation and consultation outcomes will inform the structure plan revisions being undertaken this year.

23. Helen Fischer – Bentleigh

Residents would ask Council to please consider an alternate bike path design along Queens ave, which does not remove the mature trees.

An alternate plan is referred to on the Council website, which is more costly, however as so many residents are in favour of saving the trees along Queens ave, this should be considered.

When will the alternate plan design, which would save the trees and connect two rail trails, be released to the public with full costings and movement and place assessments for consultation?

Response:

Council prefers the shared user path (SUP) along Queens Avenue to be realigned to protect all the trees. This would require the kerb to be shifted and services to be relocated, as well as extensive road works.

At this stage, the Level Crossing Removal Project (LXRP) has determined this alternative design option to be out of scope due to cost. It is estimated this option would cost in the vicinity of \$10M. Given this, it is unlikely that the LXRP will issue this design for consultation.

Council will continue to advocate to the LXRP for an alternative design that will see less tree removal and deliver better outcomes for our community.

Council will be releasing an updated Advocacy Plan for the Glen Huntly Level Crossing Removal Project in the coming weeks. This will include, among other things, information on our preferred design for Queens Avenue.

24. Jenni Lanfear – Elsternwick

My questions are in relation to the Urban Congestion Fund and building multi-deck parking particularly the Elsternwick site as I am a local resident and it will directly impact me. Please note, I have read the attachments/minutes from your December 2021 meeting and am aware of the information on your website regarding this proposed development.

- a) I received a response from your project team that as part of your community consultation and engagement you say 65% residents (I am assuming this is from the 307 responses from the 'Have your Say survey?') said you should proceed with developing commuter car parks. In looking over the report many of the written comments from Have your say, the Community Voice, written feedback received actually oppose the multi-deck parking proposal. Can you please explain how only this one question around percentage (65% saying yes) justifies the cost, environmental impact, impact to residents, increased congestion in the municipality - for what seems like a minimal reduction in cars into the city? Also, I am finding it hard to find what the question 'based on the information provided...' refers to? Did they know they were saying yes to a multi-deck car park?

Response:

- a) In December 2021, following a phase of community engagement, Council resolved to proceed to the feasibility phase of the Multi-deck commuter car park projects, including site investigation, due diligence, development of an early concept design and scoping.

The community engagement was intended to gauge community support for Council accepting funding from the Federal Government under the Urban Congestion Fund to build Multi-deck carparks in Elsternwick and Bentleigh. The consultation also sought community views on other congestion busting initiatives that Council could advocate for.

Further community engagement will occur on the concept design and feasibility assessment outcomes.

11. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Nil

12. CLOSURE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 10.59pm.

Confirmed this 15 day of March 2022

Chairperson.....