

**Public Question Time** 

# **ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

Tuesday 26 June 2018 6:00pm

Community Hub
Room 1
48 Burns Street, Maryborough

# **AGENDA**

5:30pm

29

Item	Title	•	Page
1.	Commenceme	ent of Meeting, Welcome and Opening Prayer	
2.	Apologies		
3.	Leave of Abse	ence	
4.	Disclosures of	Conflicts of Interest	
5.	Confirmation of	of the Minutes of the Previous Council Meeting	3
6.	Reports from 0 6.1 Noting o Committee me	f the Approved Minutes of Special Committee meetings and Adviso	ory 4
7.	Petitions		
8.	Officer Report	s	
	8.1 ASSEM	BLIES OF COUNCILLORS	6
		ISATION AND GOVERNANCE REFORM PROGRAM	4.0
		ESS REPORT	10
		IL PLAN REVIEW AND REFRESH	13
		INITY GRANTS PROGRAM 2018 AL GOLDFIELDS SHIRE PRIORITY PROJECTS	16 18
			_
		OMMUNITY SATISFACTION SURVEY ON FROM THE MARYBOROUGH SKATEPARK COMMITTEE	21 24
	8.8 RENAM	ING OF PART OF CHAPLINS ROAD	26

8.9 RENAMING A SECTION OF ARGYLE ROAD

	<ul> <li>8.10 PROPOSED CARISBROOK FLOOD AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP</li> <li>8.11 PROPOSED 2018/19 BUDGET AND FEES AND CHARGES</li> <li>8.12 FINANCIAL REPORT APRIL 2018</li> </ul>	34 38 46			
9.	Documents for Sealing Confirmation	49			
10. Notices of Motion Nil					
11.	11. Urgent Business				
12.	12. Confidential Business Nil				
13.	13. Meeting Close				

#### 5 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

To present for confirmation, the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 22 May 2018.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The relevant Council Plan references are:

4.3 Ensure Council's regulatory environment operates efficiently and effectively

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The minutes of meetings remain unconfirmed until the next meeting of Council.

#### **REPORT:**

Section 93 of the *Local Government Act 1989* requires Council to keep minutes of each meeting of the Council and Special Committees, and for minutes to be submitted to the next appropriate meeting for confirmation.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

The unconfirmed minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 22 May 2018 are presented for confirmation.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of Ordinary Council Meeting held 22 May 2018

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council confirms the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 22 May 2018.

# 6.1 NOTING OF THE APPROVED MINUTES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Manager: Chief Executive Officer

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

#### **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

To present for noting the confirmed minutes of Council's Special Committees established under section 86 of the *Local Government Act 1989* 

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The relevant Council Plan references are:

4.3 Ensure Council's regulatory environment operates efficiently and effectively

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

In accordance with section 86 of the *Local Government Act 1989*, Council has established Special Committees.

The Terms of Reference for the Special Committees require the minutes to be presented to Council for noting.

Minutes of Special Committees are confirmed/approved at the next scheduled meeting of that Special Committee.

# **REPORT:**

The Talbot Hall Committee of Management (Sec. 86 Committee of Council) has provided confirmed minutes from its previous committee meeting for consideration.

The Tullaroop Leisure Centre Committee of Management (Sec. 86 Committee of Council) has provided confirmed minutes from its previous committee meetings for consideration.

#### **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

The Committee of Management for the Talbot Town Hall, and the Tullaroop Leisure Centre have provided the minutes of their meetings

# **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

No resource implications.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Recently received, confirmed minutes of Council's Special Committees established under section 86 of the *Local Government Act 1989*, are presented to Council for noting.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. Talbot Hall Committee Minutes for 19 March 2018 (confirmed 20 May 2018)
- 2. Tullaroop Leisure Centre Committee Minutes for 6 December 2017 (confirmed 21 February 2018)
- 3. Tullaroop Leisure Centre Committee Minutes for 21 February 2018 (confirmed 16 May 2018)

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council notes;

- 1. The confirmed Minutes of the Talbot Hall Committee held on 19 March 2018
- 2. The confirmed Minutes of the Tullaroop Leisure Centre Committee held on 6 December 2017
- 3. The confirmed Minutes of the Tullaroop Leisure Centre Committee held on 21 February 2017

#### 8.1 ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Manager: Chief Executive Officer

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to provide the record of any assembly of Councillors, which has been held since the last Council Meeting, so that it can be recorded in the Minutes of the formal Council Meeting.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

An amendment to the Local Government Act 1989, which came into effect on September 24, 2010, requires the record of any assembly of Councillors to be reported to the next practicable Council Meeting and recorded in the Minutes.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The Local Government Act provides a definition of an assembly of Councillors where conflicts of interest must be disclosed.

A meeting will be an assembly of Councillors if it considers matters that are likely to be the subject of a Council decision, or, the exercise of a Council delegation and the meeting is:

- 1. A planned or scheduled meeting that includes at least half the Councillors and a member of Council staff; or
- 2. An advisory committee of the Council where one or more Councillors are present.

The requirement for reporting provides increased transparency and the opportunity for Councillors to check the record, particularly the declarations of conflict of interest.

# **REPORT:**

Outlined below are the details of Assemblies of Councillors since the last meeting:

Councillor Attendees  Attendees  Council Staff Attendees  Corporate Performance; Rebecca Stockfeld, General Manager Infrastructure Assets & Planning; Brenton West, General Manager Infrastructure Assets & Planning; Brenton West, General Manager Community Wellbeing; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager Governance;  Conflict of interest disclosures:   NIL   Matters Considered  Mr. John Wright (Maryborough) Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road a Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger report refers to?"  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of aiscussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the neuron passence of the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is minroved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supporte	00 May	_	20 May 2040 Mostings Overtice Time				
Attendees Council Staff Attendees At			22 May 2018 Meeting: Question Time				
Council Staff Attendees  Lucy Roffey, Chief Executive Officer; Paul Brumby, General Manager Corporate Performance; Rebecca Stockfeld, General Manager Infrastructure Assets & Planning; Brenton West, General Manager Community Wellbeing; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager Governance;  Mr. John Wright (Maryborough)  Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing  Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough)  Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current positic the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. I that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move							
Attendees    Corprate Performance: Rebecca Stockfeld, General Manager Infrastructure Assets & Planning: Brenton West, General Manager Community Wellbeing; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager Governance;   Mr. John Wright (Maryborough) Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook    Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.    Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services    Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.    Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger report refers to? If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?    Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away to the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.							
Infrastructure Assets & Planning; Brenton West, General Manager Community Wellbeing; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager Governance;  Conflict of interest disclosures:   NIL    Matters   Mr. John Wright (Maryborough)   Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook   Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing   Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough)   Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services   Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If the dual gauge system that the council has previously supports the dual gauge system that the council has previously supports.			Lucy Roffey, Chief Executive Officer; Paul Brumby, General Manager				
Conflict of interest disclosures: NIL  Matters Considered  Mr. John Wright (Maryborough) Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger raservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. I that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. I that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away to the dual gauge sys		ndees					
Mr. John Wright (Maryborough) Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger r services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertiser report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.			Infrastructure Assets & Planning; Brenton West, General Manager				
Mr. John Wright (Maryborough) Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertiser report refers to?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have having a number of discussions with the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Commu		Community Wellbeing; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager Governance;				
Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger is services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	nterest disc	flict of inte	rest disclosures: NIL				
Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road at Chaplins Road, Carisbrook  Question: The submissions regarding Development (50 AC) corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger is services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Mr. Jo	ters	Mr. John Wright (Maryborough)				
corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be expected RE outcome of objections.  Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger r services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. I that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away if the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Regard	sidered	Regarding: The development at the corner of Tullaroop Road and				
Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough) Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger r services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported. Our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	corner		corner Tullaroop Rd and Chaplins Rd. When can an answer be				
Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Respo		Response: Taken on Notice and will be responded to in writing.				
Regarding: Maryborough passenger rail services  Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Mr Ra		Mr. Barry Parsons (Maryborough)				
Question: In the attached Maryborough and District Advertiser report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decid that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the currer service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.			, , , , , ,				
report of 31 March 2017 Central Goldfields Shire Council decide that fast passenger rail to Maryborough was not possible and reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the current service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to Ballarat.  Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported.	Regard		Regarding. Maryborough passenger fail services				
Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still supported by Central Goldfields shire?  What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger reservices to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported Our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	report of that fast relucta service		reluctantly agreed to an inferior, in terms of speed of the current service, 80km per hr passenger service on dual gauge rail to				
What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger r services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertise report refers to?  If the 2017 council support for the dual gauge has changed, whis the basis for the change?  Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service.	Is a du		Is a dual gauge rail link from Maryborough to Ballarat still				
Response: Whilst I am aware that the Central Goldfields Shire took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. If that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported Our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service	What he service capabi report		What has been achieved by Council "in enhancing passenger rail services to compensate for the possible loss of competitive capability from the reduced passenger rail speed" the Advertiser report refers to?				
took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have be having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we working hard to ensure that the quality of the current service is maintained but also the frequency of the service is improved. It that does mean, of course, that there is a need to move away the dual gauge system that the council has previously supported Our position is that the quality and the frequency of the service			,,				
, ,	took a having and the around the couple working mainta that do the during cannot		took a formal position in relation to the train service, we have been having a number of discussions with the rail service providers, etc and there is a number of lobby groups that are out there working around this whole issue of the rail services. The current position of the council is that we do not support a reduced service for the people of Maryborough in terms of speed or frequency; and we are				

current position that we have conveyed to the Victorian Rail Freight Alliance. That will mean of course that there will need to be a dedicated train, passenger train on this line to enable passenger train to operate at standard gauge and that is the position that we have put at this particular point in time.

So the short answer is, no we do not support a reduction in the

So the short answer is, no we do not support a reduction in the quality or the frequency of the rail service, passenger rail service to Maryborough, in fact quite the contrary, want it to improve, but we also, make that there is a lot of sense in actually making sure that the ability to link in with the rest of the standard gauge system is possible, so that is the position that the Council is currently taking at the moment.

	at the memorit.				
Date	23 May 2018	Meeting:	Tour of Edlyn Foods		
Councillor	Noel Harvey, Chief Administrator; Karen Douglas, Administrator; Hugh				
Attendees	Delahunty, Administrator				
Council Staff	Lucy Roffey, Chief	Executive C	Officer		
Attendees					
Guests	Windsor Main				
Conflict of inte	rest disclosures:	NIL			
Matters	Tour of Edlyn Food	ds.			
Considered					
Date	28 May 2018		Kinross Farm		
Councillor	Karen Douglas, Ad	lministrator;	Hugh Delahunty, Administrator		
Attendees					
Council Staff			Officer, Rebecca Stockfeld, General		
Attendees			ture Assets and Planning		
Guests	Peter Scott, Philip	<del></del>			
Conflict of inte	interest disclosures: NIL				
Matters	Tour if Kinross Farm				
Considered					
Date	5 June 2018 Meeting: Meeting with Dan Tehan MP				
Councillor	Noel Harvey, Chief Administrator, Karen Douglas, Administrator; Hugh				
Attendees	Delahunty, Administrator				
Council Staff	Lucy Roffey, Chief Executive Officer				
Attendees					
Guests	Dan Tehan MP Member for Wannon				
	onflict of interest disclosures: NIL				
Matters			vernment support through the Building		
Considered	71 7				
Date	12 June 2018		Strategy Briefing Meeting		
Councillor	Noel Harvey, Chief Administrator; Karen Douglas, Administrator; Hugh				
Attendees	Delahunty, Administrator  Lucy Poffoy, Chief Executive Officer: Evoline Ord, Acting Manager				
Council Staff Attendees	Lucy Roffey, Chief Executive Officer; Eveline Ord, Acting Manager				
Attendees	Governance; Anna Bartlett, Finance Manager; Sandra Hamilton, Acting General Manager Go Goldfields; Ron Potter, Manager Engineering and				
	Services; Bill Scott, Assets and Project Engineer.				
Conflict of interest disclosures:   NIL					
Matters	1. Carisbrook Recreation Reserve Upgrade				
Considered	1 9				
Considered	3. Go Goldfields Work Readiness Updated				
	J. Go Goldhei	as WOIN INE	αυπουν υματεα		

- 4. Central Goldfields Shire Priority Projects
- 5. Pick My Project Local Government Update
- 6. Community Satisfaction Survey 2018
- 7. Organisation and Governance Reform Program Progress Report
- 8. Review and Refresh of Council Plan 2017-2021
- 9. Community Grants Program 2018
- 10. Proposed Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan Implementation Community Reference Group
- 11. Skate Park Petition
- 12. Renaming of Chaplins Road
- 13. Argyle Road Naming
- 14. Finance Report April 2018
- 15. Discussion on Budget Submissions

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council note the record of Assemblies of Council as outlined in this report.

# 8.2 ORGANISATION AND GOVERNANCE REFORM PROGRAM PROGRESS REPORT

Author: Director Business Transformation

Responsible Director Business Transformation

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

This report provides a status update on the progress of the Organisation and Governance Reform Program as at 16 June 2018.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The relevant Council Plan references are:

- 4.1 Ensure the Financial Sustainability of Council
- 4.2 Deliver the 'core business' of Council in an efficient and effective way
- 4.3 Ensure Council's regulatory environment operates efficiently and effectively
- 4.5 Pursue a best practice approach to leadership and governance

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

In September 2016, following receipt of various allegations, the Inspectorate commenced a formal investigation into council matters including an alleged conflict of interest relating to the CEO, alleged false claiming of expenses and numerous allegations of poor governance and noncompliance with legislative requirements.

These investigations, in general terms related to council's lack of internal controls, inadequate policies and procedures, and an overall lack of compliance.

In August 2017, the Inspectorate delivered its report "Protecting integrity: Central Goldfields Shire Council investigation". Due to the comprehensive nature of this investigation and the large number of issues identified, for the purpose of this report, the findings generally related to the following areas:

- Asset mismanagement
- Financial mismanagement
- Human resources mismanagement
- Governance failures.

In addition, Central Goldfields Shire Council has had two instances where a Municipal Monitor has been appointed by the State Government under section 223CA of the Local Government Act 1989. Municipal Monitor Bill Jaboor was in place between 11 October 2016 and 31 December 2016, and again between July 2017 and September 2017. The Municipal Monitor prepared a report which identified the need for a range of governance improvements.

# **REPORT:**

Central Goldfields Shire has developed a comprehensive action plan to respond to the shortcomings identified in the Local Government Investigations and Compliance Inspectorate Report, and the Municipal Monitor's Report. This Action Plan seeks to address all of these issues and ensure a sustainable organisation with strong governance. The Action Plan encompasses the following four themes;

- Asset Management
- Financial Management
- Human Resource Management
- Governance.

Since the last report Council has adopted a new Privacy Policy and the Community Engagement Framework on 22 May 2018. The Business Transformation Team has completed the review of Corporate Records systems as they relate to a number of governance functions (Action 22). This review found that significant progress has been made in improving these systems. It also made recommendations about further process enhancements which were accepted by the Executive Team at its meeting on 30 May 2018.

As a consequence of this, new drafts of an IT security policy and records management policies have now been finalised, and Council has purchased a best practice Freedom of Information Procedures Manual for implementation within the Governance function. These achievements now complete Action 23.

Action 28 specified a review of the current framework across Council, and subsequent policy development work. While some collation of polices had been made, this work was not well advanced when the new Project Director commenced. A full review has now been completed and Council's policy suite has been benchmarked against Council policies for a number of similar sized rural Councils. The Executive Team have considered a report from this review and is developing a prioritised action plan to complete and update Council's suite. Additionally, the Business Transformation Team has developed new policy and procedure templates, and a comprehensive policy register which names policies, responsible officers and due dates for policy reviews. The management team has now received training in writing policies and procedures based on these guidelines. The final piece of the policy framework is a set of guidance and procedural notes for policy owners which will provide the Governance Unit with the tools to keep Council's policies in order into the future.

Team based culture planning sessions (Action 32) have been completed over June and teams have developed their own actions. The Executive Management Team have also received a report of suggested cross-organisation actions which will be implemented over the next three months.

The attached Action Plan excerpt provides details of all identified actions with associated timeframes and indicates whether each action item is currently on target to be achieved by the due date.

The table below provides an overview of the status of actions in accordance with Action Plan.

Total	Not started	Completed	Underway – on track	Underway – not by due date
37	0	30	6	1

Note: Above table relates specifically to those 37 items in the Action Plan which are relevant to the Inspectorate Report or the Monitors Report.

The one action which is overdue is the re-positioning of the Governance function to give it a greater profile across the organisation. While this is being partially achieved through strengthening the accountability, compliance and monitoring roles of the Governance Manager in policy and procedures as they are re-drafted, the review of the organisational structure (Action 14, due October 2018) will consolidate this structurally.

# **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

The Business Transformation Team works closely with teams and managers in undertaking its reviews and reports. Staff are actively informed of team activities through the regular staff newsletter. The Corporate Leadership Team will place a leading role in the development of culture plans with their teams.

#### FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Dedicated Council resources have been allocated to this project to ensure that all of these matters are resolved in accordance with the timeframes identified in the Action Plan.

# **CONCLUSION:**

This Action Plan demonstrates a strategy to respond to all shortcomings which have been identified through the Local Government Investigations and Compliance Inspectorate, and the Municipal Monitor, and represents a positive future for Central Goldfields Shire Council. The one item not on track to be fully completed by the due date is dependent on a broader action which is due later in the year.

# **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Organisation and Governance Reform Program Progress Report as at 16 June 2018.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council notes the June 2018 Organisation and Governance Reform Program Progress report.

# 8.3 COUNCIL PLAN REVIEW AND REFRESH

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

#### SUMMARY/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information relating to activities measured against the 2017-2021 Council Plan and the review and refresh of the current Council Plan ensuring its relevancy for the life of the Plan.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

Local Government Act 1989 Section 125(7): At least once in each financial year, a Council must consider whether the current Council Plan requires any adjustment in respect of the remaining period of the Council Plan.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The 2017-2021 Council Plan was adopted by Council at the 27 June 2017 meeting. This followed a program of facilitated township meetings.

In March 2018 the Corporate Leadership Team held a workshop to identify areas of achievement against the 2017-2021 Council Plan.

In April 2018, Council launched its Have Your Say Campaign to assist with informing Council of community aspirations for future plans and strategies. The Have Your Say Campaign has informed the process of refreshing the 2017-2021 Council Plan to ensure its relevance.

#### **REPORT:**

The areas of achievement against the 2017-2021 Council Plan were compiled at a Corporate Leadership Team workshop that was held in March 2018. Further input was received from the Corporate Leadership Team and Executive Team throughout the following months. Attachment 1 – Actions against the Council Plan 2017-2021 list the achievements relating to the four strategic objectives in the plan. Whilst some initiatives have been completed, others are underway and will continue for the life of the Plan.

In April 2018 the Have Your Say Campaign was launched throughout the Shire. This campaign sought to gather feedback from the community, particularly parts of the community who historically did not have much input to plans and strategies ensuring that future direction of the Shire is community driven. The campaign was designed to be simple, inclusive and mindful of our diverse demographics. The campaign consisted of a post card system with 40 collection points throughout the Shire and social media was also used to gather feedback from our communities via an online survey. Have Your Say was advertised widely through local media outlets.

The three questions asked were:

- 1. What do you love about the Shire?
- 2. What do you imagine for the future of the Shire?
- 3. What specific results would you like to see?

524 responses were gathered from around the Shire. Some main themes have emerged through the analysis of the responses. These themes are:

Question 1 Response Themes: What do you love about the Shire?

- The community
- The rich and unique history
- Open spaces and scenery
- Beautiful parks and gardens
- We are close to everything including major centres
- We still have a country feel whilst having the facilities

Question 2 Response Themes: What do you imagine for the future of the Shire?

- Industry growth
- Employment opportunities and growth
- A confident community
- More for youth
- Improvement in our footpaths
- Better transport
- Assistance for existing business
- Maintaining and improving infrastructure
- Focus on children
- Better parking
- A more cohesive Shire (inclusive of smaller towns and areas)

Question 3 Response Themes: What specific results would you like to see?

- A new skate park
- Disabled change rooms at the Maryborough Leisure Centre
- Empty shops filled
- · More activities for the youth to keep them occupied
- Better transport options
- New industry to the Shire
- More employment opportunities for the youth and for people returning to work
- Support for small business
- Good recreation for people in the Shire

By far the most prominent feedback was the need for Industry growth and increased employment opportunities.

The initiatives that have already been completed and underway are listed in Attachment 1: Actions against the 2017-201-21 Council Plan. This work has assisted in the refresh of the Council Plan.

The feedback received from the Have Your Say Campaign, together with the feedback received from the initial consultation when developing the Council Plan 2017-2021 have been used to refresh the current Council Plan and ensure its relevancy for the remaining life of the plan.

# **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

Initial consultation to develop the 2017-2021 Council Plan and the Have Your Say Campaign has provided valuable community input to the refresh of the Council Plan.

Council is required to advise the Minister for Local Government of the details of the adjustment to the Council Plan within 30 days. A person may make a submission under section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989 on any proposed adjustment to the Council Plan.

# FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial or resource implications

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Actions against the 2017-2021 Council Plan, the original Community Consultation Process and the results of the Have Your Say Campaign have provided invaluable information to be able to measure the work that has occurred over the past twelve months and to provide a refreshed Council Plan that is community driven and relevant for the remaining life of the plan.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. Actions over the past twelve months measured against the 2017-2021 Council Plan
- 2. Refresh of the 2017-2021 Council Plan.

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. That Council receives and notes the report detailing the actions against the 2017-2021 Council Plan for the past twelve months
- 2. That Council receives the draft Refresh of the 2017-2021 Council Plan and place the attached document on public display for a period of 28 days as required under section 223 of the Local Government Act 1989
- 3. That submissions be received until close of business on 26 July 2018. That a Hearing Meeting be scheduled for 31 July at 5.30 pm
- 4. That the Proposed Refresh of the 2017-2021 be presented to Council for consideration at the next available meeting.

#### 8.4 COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAM 2018

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

#### **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to facilitate consideration of the Community Grant applications for 2018.

# **POLICY CONTEXT:**

Council Plan. Our Community: 1.2 Support volunteerism in the community

Provide a Community Grants Scheme to assist work of

community groups.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

At the 27 March 2018 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council resolved to endorse the opening of the 2017-18 Community Grants Program. Accordingly, the process of publicising the 2018 program and inviting applications commenced in April with a close off date for applications of 11 May, 2018.

It was also resolved that the Community Grants Program for Central Goldfields Shire be reviewed and considered at a future Ordinary Council Meeting.

# **REPORT:**

The Community Grants Program has proved to be a very valuable source of funding for many Community groups that may not have access to funding from other sources.

Council has stated in its 2017-2021 Council Plan that it places particular focus on working with the community, and recognising collaboration and partnerships in meeting our challenges and opportunities.

The response from community groups in this year's Grant's Program has been considerable. 20 applications have been received with the amount requested from Council totalling \$35,392 and a total project cost (including other funding and in-kind contributions) of \$67,112.

The amount allocated for the 2018 Community Grants Program is \$20,000.

A Panel was convened consisting of:

- Eveline Ord Acting Manager Governance
- Graeme Gilmore Procurement Manager
- Marc Cassidy Revenue Officer and
- Marita Turner Organisation and Governance Reform Project Officer

Panel members have signed a Conflict of Interest Declaration and no conflicts of interest were declared.

All applications have been assessed in accordance with the Grant program Guidelines. A weighted scoring process was used:

- 25% Strategic alignment to Council Plan
- 50% Benefit to the community
- 25% Project delivery

Of the 20 applications received, 13 projects are being proposed to receive a level of funding.

#### **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

Media releases and advertisements inviting applications to the Community Grants Program have been run in local newspapers, on the council web site and social media.

# FINANCE & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

The 2017-18 (current budget) has an allocated amount of \$20,000 for the Community Grants Program.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

20 applications were received for the 2018 Community Grants Program. The total funding sought across all applications was \$35,395. All applications have been assessed by a panel of Central Goldfield Shire Officers in accordance with the Grant Program Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:	
That Council grant the following funds from the 2018 Communit	y Grants Program
Bowenvale-Timor Hall Committee	\$3,000.00
Dunolly & District Inc.	\$1,689.00
Dunolly Football Netball Club Inc.	\$1,276.00
Carisbrook Football Netball Club	\$1,900.00
Central Highlands Historic Machinery Society Inc.	\$3,000.00
Talbot Golf Club Inc	\$900.00
Bealiba Progress Ass. Inc - Bealiba Historical Society	\$896.00
Carisbrook Senior Citizens Centre Inc	\$1,850.00
Bealiba Hall Indoor Carpet Bowls	\$980.00
Adelaide Lead Hall Committee	\$1,540.00
Maryborough Toy Library	\$969.00
Maryborough Little Athletics	\$1,000.00

Betley Mechanics Institute Hall	\$1,000.00	
---------------------------------	------------	--

# 8.5 CENTRAL GOLDFIELDS SHIRE PRIORITY PROJECTS

Author: Chief Executive Officer

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is for Council to endorse the Central Goldfields Shire Priority Projects document to support the progress and funding of these projects.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The projects prioritised are in line with a number of strategies in the current Council Plan 2017-2020 including:

- 1.6 Optimise community participation in recreation and sport. Provide a range of facilities and programs across the municipality. Continue to implement Recreation Plans.
- 1.7 Support positive development for residents of all ages and abilities. Build connections for young people. Support positive life opportunities for people living with a disability.
- 2.7 Pursue a sewerage scheme for Talbot Township
- 2.8 Grow events in Central Goldfields

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The Agenda Group were contracted to provide support in preparing an advocacy document to support priority projects in the Shire leading up to the State and Federal Elections. The Agenda Group interviewed key staff and undertook a workshop with the Executive and Administrators to identify projects that were under development and had strong strategic and community support.

# **REPORT:**

There are seven projects identified in the document. The table below summarises the funding required and the grant program identified:

# **Table 1 Project summary**

Project name	Total project cost	Possible funding sources
Carisbrook Reserve upgrade	\$1.7 million	State – SRV Federal - BBRF
Deledio Reserve multi-use facility	\$2.5 million	State – SRV Federal - BBRF
Preserving heritage at Maryborough Outdoor Aquatic Centre	\$4.0 million	State – Heritage Vic & SRV Federal - BBRF
All-abilities access at Maryborough Sports and Leisure Centre	\$350,000	State – SRV application underway
Wastewater for a growing Talbot	\$6.5 - \$7.5 million	State – RDV Federal - BBRF
A hub for disengaged young people	\$3.0 million	State – RDV Federal - BBRF
Supporting Energy Breakthrough – an innovative learning experience	\$200,000	State – Visit Victoria Federal - BBRF

Whilst Council resolved to seek funds from the State Government to undertake remediation works at the Carisbrook Town Hall, this project has not been included at this time in the Priority Projects document as the projects listed above are considered to be a higher priority due to the level of use/beneficiaries of each of the projects.

#### CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:

Carisbrook Recreation Reserve Committee have recently briefed the Administrators on their project and have developed a comprehensive business case. The Deledio Reserve Sports Committee recently wrote to Council seeking support for concept designs to progress the project with State Government. Considerable community consultation was undertaken in the development of the Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the Maryborough Outdoor Pool. Works required at the Maryborough Sports and Fitness Centre were identified in a DDA audit and are supported by a concept plan. The Talbot wastewater project has had numerous reports developed in consultation with the community and the community continue to advocate strongly for the project. The Youth Hub project has been developed by the Go Goldfields Youth Alliance. The Energy Breakthrough project is supported by the Special Committee appointed by Council.

# FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Council has committed funds in the 2018/19 Budget to undertake designs for the Carisbrook Reserve upgrade and the Deledio Reserve multi use facility (\$200,000), a contribution of \$50,000 toward the all access changing rooms at the Maryborough Sports and Fitness Centre and has applied for a \$2:\$1 grant (total project cost \$150,000), Council's contribution to all projects will also include project management.

# **CONCLUSION:**

A document outlining priority projects has been prepared to undertake advocacy for these projects to seek funding support from the State and Federal governments.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Central Goldfields Priority Projects

#### RECOMMENDATION:

1. That Council endorse the Central Goldfields Shire Priority Projects document for use in advocacy for funding support from the State and Federal governments.

#### 8.6 2018 COMMUNITY SATISFACTION SURVEY

Author: Chief Executive Officer

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

#### **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is for Council to receive the 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey for noting.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

Each year Local Government Victoria (LGV) coordinates and auspices this State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey throughout Victorian local government areas. There are a number of measures that are mandated under the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework. Participation in the LGV survey is not mandatory however it is the most cost effective way for Councils to collate the information mandated under the Act while collecting information on a broader range of services and community concerns.

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

This survey is conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18+ years in Central Goldfields Shire Council.

The survey sample is matched to the demographic profile of Central Goldfields Shire Council as determined by the most recent ABS population estimates, and includes up to 40% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents within Central Goldfields Shire Council, particularly younger people.

A total of 400 completed interviews were undertaken in Central Goldfields Shire Council. Survey fieldwork was conducted in the period of 1 February 2018 to 30 March 2018.

# **REPORT:**

Central Goldfields Shire Council's overall performance index score of 43 is significantly lower than the 2017 result, decreasing by nine index points over the past year. Council's overall performance ratings have declined by more than 20 points since 2015, with the greatest declines occurring between 2016 and 2018.

All groups rated Council significantly lower in 2018 than in 2017 with the exception of residents aged 18 to 34 years (index score of 47, four points lower than 2017), who experienced more modest declines.

In addition to overall performance, Council's ratings declined significantly in the areas of consultation and engagement (index score of 45), lobbying (index score of 44), and community decisions (index score of 42) in the past year.

While performance ratings for customer service (index score of 67 in 2017 and 66 in 2018) and overall direction (index score 46 in 2017 and 47 in 2018) stabilised in the past year, ratings remain significantly lower than results achieved in these areas between 2012 and 2016.

Council's results are significantly lower than State-wide averages for councils on all core measures with the exception of customer service. Customer service remains a positive result for Council and was mentioned frequently by participants as one of the best things about Council.

The poor results from the 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey were expected given the outcomes of the Municipal Monitor report and the Local Government Inspectorate report "Protecting integrity: Central Goldfields Shire Council Investigation" which both identified significant governance failures.

There have been a number of actions undertaken by Council over the last six months that address the findings of these reports and are outlined in the Organisation and Governance Reform Program. Specific actions that are expected to see future improvements in community satisfaction results include the development and implementation of: the Engaging Central Goldfields Community Engagement Framework; Complaint Resolution Policy; Service Charter; Protected Disclosure Policy; Prevention of Fraud and Corruption Policy and Privacy Policy.

Council also undertook an extensive Have Your Say Campaign in April 2018 to seek input from the community into the refresh of the Council Plan which has also informed the inclusion of key projects in the 2018/19 Budget. A Priority Projects document has been prepared which highlights key projects for which funding will be sought from the State and Federal Governments. Council continues to advocate on behalf of the community on key issues such as the proposed redistribution of Federal Electoral Boundaries.

Implementation of these key policies and strategies which have been developed in consultation with the community will improve the decision making and governance of Council resulting in outcomes that align with community aspirations and expectations.

# **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

The results of the 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey will be published on Council's website and the mandatory measures will be reported in the Performance Statement which is published in the Annual Report.

# FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

n/a

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Results from the 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey have been received and show declines across all key measures. Customer Service results continue to show strong results.

Council has implemented a number of activities to address the concerns highlighted by these results through the Organisation and Governance Reform Program. The 2018 results will be made available to the community on Council's website.

# **ATTACHMENTS**

1. 2018 Central Goldfields Shire Community Satisfaction Survey results

# **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1. That Council note the 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey results; and
- 2. The 2018 Community Satisfaction Survey results be made available to the community on Council's website.

#### 8.7 PETITION FROM THE MARYBOROUGH SKATEPARK COMMITTEE

Author: General Manager Infrastructure Assets and Planning

Responsible General Manager Infrastructure Assets and Planning

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

Council has received a valid e-petition (on-line petition) from the Maryborough Skatepark Committee petitioning for an upgrade of the Maryborough Skatepark. The petition has 1000 signatures and has a vision to build one of the best skateparks in all of central Victoria.

This report will set out how a new skatepark is consistent with the Central Goldfields Shire Council Plan 2017 – 2021 and has funding in the draft budget to commence feasibility and conceptual planning.

The petition will be tabled and received at the June 2018 Council meeting.

# **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The Central Goldfields Shire Council Plan 2017 – 2021 'Community' platform priorities include:

Objective: To support community cohesion, and, health and wellbeing.

- 1.6 Optimise community participation in recreation and sport
- Provide a range of facilities and programs across the municipality.
- 1.7 Support positive development for residents of all ages and abilities.
- Build connections for young people.

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

A council owned skatepark is located on Majorca Road, Maryborough adjacent to the Maryborough Sports and Fitness Centre.

The skate park is a smaller facility with some half pipes and other simple ramps.

#### **REPORT:**

The Maryborough Skatepark Committee seek to have a new, great standard skatepark, built within the township. The committee have included quotes from signatories indicating the skatepark vision would include:

- A contemporary facility;
- A facility that caters to a range of users (skaters, scooters);

- A challenging facility for a range of age groups;
- Provides an opportunity for fun and fitness.

Council's draft budget includes \$28,000 for design works for a new skate park. Council staff will need to work with the community to develop a site and design brief for a new skate park (subject to budget approval). Once a site and design is finalised Council staff will also need to work with funding agencies and potential sponsors to finalise development and delivery of the skatepark.

#### CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:

Design and development of the skatepark will be undertaken in consultation with the community, including representation from the Maryborough Skatepark Committee.

# FINANCIAL & RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

Council's draft budget includes \$28,000 for design works for a new skate park.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Council has received a petition from the Maryborough Skatepark Committee petitioning for an upgrade of the Maryborough Skatepark. The petition has 1000 signatures and has a vision to build one of the best skateparks in all of central Victoria.

The design and delivery of a new skatepark is consistent with the Central Goldfields Shire Council Plan 2017 – 2021 'Community' platform priorities. Design of the skatepark has been included in the draft 2018-2019 budget.

# **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Maryborough Skatepark Committee petition.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

That Council receive the e-petition from the Maryborough Skate Park Committee.

# 8.8 RENAMING OF PART OF CHAPLINS ROAD CARISBROOK

Author: GIS Manager

Responsible General Manager Corporate Performance

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to update Council on the consultation process carried out for a road name change as a result of an engineering project recently completed. Council as a naming authority is required to maintain the best possible public safety outcome by managing the addresses of properties within the Shire in line with the Victorian Geographic Naming Rules and AS/NZS 4819:2003 Rural and Urban Addressing Standard.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The Council Plan 2013-2017 requires:-

Theme Reference: Built and Natural Environment.

Priority Reference: Maintain the Council's major asset categories.

Key Project: Review rolling programs of works and implement

as per budget.

The Local Government Act 1989 and the Road Management Act 2004 both include provisions for the naming of roads, and both require those provisions to be exercised in accordance with the Geographic Names Act 1998 and Council's Naming of Streets and Roads Policy. Council, as the designated Naming Authority is required to comply with the Naming Rules for Places in Victoria 2016

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Council is continuing to improve public safety by redesigning intersections within the municipality to make them safer. These changes in road priority and extent will also have an impact on the existing addresses of properties. In order to maintain compliance with *Principle (A) Ensuring Public Safety of the Victorian Geographic Naming Rules and AS/NZS 4819:2003 Rural and Urban Addressing Standard*, these physical changes will require changes to Road Names, extents and start points for Rural Addressing. This in turn will require some property addresses to be changed.

Prior to Council undertaking works at this intersection, Tullaroop Road ended at Chaplins Road in an effective "T" intersection, (as Wills Street is an unmade road). Council altered this intersection to create a sweeping bend from Tullaroop Road to the Southern end of Chaplins Road. These works resulted in the Northern end of Chaplins Road now ending at a "T" intersection on the sweeping bend.

#### **REPORT:**

As a result of the above infrastructure changes, two renaming options were considered, and after initial consultation, Option 2 was put out for public consultation

# **Chaplins Road Carisbrook - Option 2**

Chaplins Road remains the name of the section of road between Pyrenees Highway and Tullaroop Road. The section of Chaplins Road between Tullaroop Road and Carisbrook Havelock Road becomes a continuation of Bucknall Street Carisbrook.

Four houses, two businesses and one piece of vacant land would keep their road name and address as Chaplins Road.

Two sporting bodies (Maryborough Gun Club and Maryborough Harness Racing Club), three houses, one farm and one piece of vacant land would become Bucknall Street and would require renumbering as per the Addressing Standard.

The Office of Geographic Names supported the name changes as outlined in Option 2 above.

Council is required to consult with immediately affected landholders.

An update on this matter was provided to Council at a Strategy and Briefing session held on 13 February 2018.

On 12 April 2018 letters were sent to the seven affected landholders, including two Sporting Clubs. The closing date for responses to the correspondence was 18 May 2018. No written submissions were received.

As the structural road intersection changes are complete it is imperative that the road name and address change process be progressed.

This is a process governed by the Geographic Names Act requiring the Naming Authority (Council) to process this request using the Naming Rules for Places in Victoria 2016. In this case the name being proposed is the extension of an existing street name so duplication is not an issue.

# Timelines:

Should Council approve the name, it will be lodged with the Office of Geographic Names. After 30 days the name will be gazetted, and if there are no objections, registered and placed in Vicmap Transport.

#### Risk Analysis:

Council strives to address all properties to the Australian Standard and for that to happen all roads need a unique name. Without a unique address there is always a risk when emergency services are required and the realignment of this intersection is a possible cause of ambiguity with road name and address. It is much easier for landholders to receive services and deal with government agencies regarding their property if the address appears in authoritative sources.

# **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

On 12 April 2018 letters were sent to the seven affected landholders, including two Sporting Clubs. The closing date for responses to the correspondence was 18 May 2018. No written submissions were received.

#### **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

Some administrative resources will be required for lodging the new road name application and changing address in Vicmap for use by Government agencies and 000, as well as updating address and road name information in Council systems, advising land holders, occupants and service authorities. Notwithstanding, this is core business for Council's existing staff.

Council will also need to purchase and install two road name signs, one at each end of renamed section.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Works have been completed to alter the intersection of Chaplins Road, Carisbrook. The alterations will require a road name change and will require the properties along that stretch of road to change their address. There have been no objections to the re-naming of that portion of Chaplins Road.

#### ATTACHMENTS:

1. Map detailing portion of road requiring name change.

# RECOMMENDATION:

 That Council applies to the Office of Geographic Names to rename that the section of road currently known as Chaplins Road between Tullaroop Road and Carisbrook-Eddington Road as Bucknall Street.

# 8.9 RENAMING A SECTION OF ARGYLE ROAD

Author: GIS Manager

Responsible General Manager Corporate Performance

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

# **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

To finalise the proposed renaming of the section of Argyle Road east of Gillies Street Maryborough.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The Council Plan 2017-2021 requires:-

Theme Reference: Built and Natural Environment.

Key Project: Review rolling programs of works and implement

as per budget.

The Local Government Act 1989 and the Road Management Act 2004 both include provisions for the naming of roads, and both require those provisions to be exercised in accordance with the Geographic Names Act 1998, including adhering to the Naming Rules for places in Victoria 2016 and Council's Naming of Streets and Roads Policy.

# **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Council previously made a physical change to Argyle Road, Maryborough whereby the road was closed at Gillies Street, and a court bowl was created at the end of the section of Argyle Road to the West of Gillies Street. As a result of these works it is no longer possible to drive along Argyle Road and cross Gillies Street. This situation represents a public safety risk, as it has potential to cause issues with emergency services being able to respond in a timely manner. Therefore Council needs to rename one end of Argyle Road to maintain clarity for the travelling public. The section of Argyle Road chosen for renaming was the Eastern section, because it has less houses and therefore will create inconvenience for a smaller number of landholders.

Public consultation was carried out to find a new name for the section of Argyle Road East of Gillies Street. One of the submissions received requested that this section of road revert to its original name which was Waterloo Road. Unfortunately, prior to this request Waterloo Flat Road had been created on the western edge of Maryborough and therefore Waterloo Road would not be approved by the Office of Geographic Names. Several other possible road names were supplied during the public consultation phase. Some of these did not meet the Office of Geographic Names naming requirements, whilst some residents were adamant that, as this road is the main access to the Maryborough Cemetery, it should be named Cemetery Road.

Council submitted Waterloo Road as the proposed road name and it was rejected by the Office of Geographic Names. Attempts were then made to have the existing Waterloo Flat Road renamed. This proposal was rejected by the residents of Waterloo Flat Road.

A further attempt was made to determine a completely new road name and although submissions were forthcoming, the decision of Council on 27 May 2014 was that item lay on the table for further discussion.

Late in 2017 a decision was made to reactivate this road naming process. A local community group sourced grant funding for an ANZAC commemorative naming project and proposed three possible ANZAC-related names for this section of Argyle Road.

#### **REPORT:**

Letters were sent to 29 affected landholders, including all the background information relating to the three potential road names submitted as part of the Anzac commemorative naming project, along with a voting slip. At the conclusion of vote counting, Layton Road was the most popular choice by affected landholders.

The final consultation with the affected landholders on the proposal to rename this section of Argyle Road to Layton Road has been completed, with a letter seeking feedback on the proposal being sent to affected parties. Only one objection was received to the name Layton Road.

The objection received stated:-

"We write to you in relation to the renaming of the section of Argyle Road referred to in your letter of 10th April 2018. On having second thoughts regarding the naming of this, we would like to submit that the name should be Cemetery Road. We believe this is self-explanatory in relation to direction within the town, especially when emergency vehicles are concerned. Also it does not conflict with any other street name within the town. The majority of homes concerned have lived along this section of road for thirty plus years and when directing people to our home, to say the Cemetery Road explains itself. On speaking with neighbours around us it has been expressed that it should have been Cemetery Road without question. Layton Road will always have to be said with Cemetery Road when explaining where Layton Road is."

There is a duplication criteria now strongly enforced by the Office of Geographic Names, whereby a duplicate road name cannot exist within 30km of the proposed road being named. There are already two Cemetery Roads and a Cemetery Track within 30 km of this section of Argyle Road, therefore the Office of Geographic Names will not allow another Cemetery Road.

One further consideration is this road continues outside the town boundaries and into State Forest. The relevant department was consulted in the original process in 2013-14 and was agreeable to meeting the costs of changing road signage within their jurisdiction. Discussion are now ongoing with Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to facilitate a timely change of all road signage along entire length of the renamed section of road when appropriate.

#### Priority/Importance:

Currently the addressing on this section of Argyle Road does not meet Principle (A) of the Naming Rules for places in Victoria 2016 - Ensuring Public Safety, and therefore Council should resolve this issue in an expedient manner.

#### Options/Alternatives:

Council now apply to register the name Layton Road for that section of Argyle Road between Gillies Street and Talisman Track.

Continue to negotiate with DELWP for road signage changes within the State Forest to be completed as soon as practical.

Affected properties will keep the same street number and only have to change their road name.

# Timelines:

Minimum timeframes are 30-60 days for the Office of Geographic Names audit, gazettal and notification.

# Progress:

Council at the Council workshop meeting of 24 October 2012 noted the proposed upgrade to the Gillies Street - Argyle Road intersection and that community consultation be undertaken.

Council at the Council Workshop meeting of 19 March 2013, noted the revisions suggested to the proposal to upgrade of the Gillies Street – Argyle Road intersection.

Council at the Council meeting of 26 March 2013, endorsed the proposal for the Gillies Street - Argyle Road intersection upgrade and approved the commencement of the process to rename the section of Argyle Road east of Gillies Street in accordance with the Guidelines of the Geographic Names 2010 and advises property owners and residents of the required changes.

Council at the Council meeting of 23 July 2013, resolved to advertise the preferred name for the section of Argyle Road east of Gillies Street as Waterloo Road.

Council at the Council meeting of 24 September 2013 resolved to name the section of Argyle road as Waterloo Road.

The Office of Geographic Names rejected the name Waterloo Road, based on the grounds of duplication and asked Council to resubmit.

Council at the Council workshop meeting of 22 October 2013, noted the report and referred the matter to the November 2013 Council meeting.

Council at the Council meeting of 13 November 2013 resolved to rename Waterloo Flat Road and Waterloo Break and consult with impacted property owners and DEPI for these roads on the matter.

At the Council meeting of 25 February 2014, Council considered submissions from affected property owners and resolved not to proceed with the Waterloo Flat Road and Waterloo Break road naming proposal. Council also resolved to commence the process of public consultation, to seek an alternative, unique new road name for the section of Argyle Road east of Gillies Street.

At the Council meeting of 27 May 2014 Council resolved that this item lay on the table for further discussion.

At the Strategic briefing of 3 October 2017 it was agreed that Council officers would consult affected landholders and residents on the three potential road names submitted by the ANZAC commemorative naming project community group.

At the Council meeting held on 27 March 2018 Council resolved:

That the name Layton Road, submitted as part of the ANZAC commemorative naming project and selected by affected parties from three names, be put out to public consultation as the chosen new name for the section of Argyle Road between Gillies Street and Talisman Track".

Letters were sent to 29 affected landholders, including background information on the three potential road names, along with a voting slip with. The outcome of the vote was that Layton was the most popular choice.

# Risk Analysis:

It is important that Council maintain its property addresses in accordance with all legislation so as to ensure high levels of public safety, including the dispatch of emergency service vehicles and the delivery of mail. Changing property address causes some inconvenience for those people affected. Council staff are able to offer assistance and advice to those people affected, and to liaise with external agencies in order to co-ordinate changes with the minimum possible disruption. For Council not to maintain its property addresses in accordance with legislative requirements is a far greater risk.

# CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:

Consultation process as set out in Naming rules for places in Victoria – Statutory requirements for naming roads, features and localities – 2016 has been followed

If this recommendation is adopted, discussion will also need to continue with DELWP in order to coordinate signage changes in the State Forest.

#### **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

Some administrative resources will be required for lodging the new road name application and changing address in Vicmap for use by Government agencies and 000, as well as updating address and road name information in Council systems, advising land holders, occupants and service authorities. Notwithstanding, this is core business for Council's existing staff.

There will also be costs involved in changing road name signage. Maryborough TAFE students have agreed to donate a portion of their funding grant to benefit the ANZAC cause, so these funds can be directed towards ANZAC commemorative road signage which will cost around \$200 to purchase, plus staff time and equipment to install.

# **CONCLUSION:**

Maintaining Council's property addresses in accordance with legislative requirements is a high priority for Council. This proposal addressed public safety issues and recognises the work of the ANZAC commemorative naming project community group in submitting potential names for this section of road. A public consultation process has enabled affected landholders to make the final choice for the name of the road on which their property is located.

# **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Argyle Road Map

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council applies to the Office of Geographic Names to rename the section of Argyle Road between Gillies Street and Talisman Track as Layton Road.

# 8.10 PROPOSED CARISBROOK FLOOD AND DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP

Author: General Manager Infrastructure Assets and Planning

Responsible General Manager Infrastructure Assets and Planning

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

#### SUMMARY/PURPOSE:

Implementation of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan has commenced with creek clearing and levy construction. Stages 1 & 2 of the Flood Levy where completed. Stages 3 & 4 are currently on hold pending council acquisition of the land required for levy construction. The original scope of creek clearing was completed in March 2016. A new community reference group is needed to re-engage with the Carisbrook community to complete the levy and undertake additional creek clearing works.

This report seeks approval to establish a Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan implementation community reference group. This group will work with council staff and the community to effectively and efficiently deliver the remaining flood management infrastructure and establish good community practices around flood management.

The terms of reference for the group are attached. Advertising for expressions of interest to be a reference group member can commence immediately.

# **POLICY CONTEXT:**

Council Plan

The flood mitigation works in Carisbrook are identified as a key action in the Council Plan 2017 – 2021.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

After the 2010/2011 floods the North Central Catchment Management Authority (CMA) received funding from the local, state and commonwealth governments to prepare the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan (the Plan).

The purpose of the Plan is to reduce the impact of future flood events on the township of Carisbrook.

The Plan identified key flooding issues in the town, determined flood levels for a range of flood events and recommend works to reduce the risk of future flooding.

North Central CMA led development of the Plan in partnership with the Central Goldfields Shire Council. A community-based Steering Committee oversaw the development of the Plan with support from a Technical Working Group consisting of representatives from the North Central CMA, Central Goldfields Shire, VicSES, Goulburn-Murray Water, VicRoads, Department of Sustainability and Environment, Bureau of Meteorology and VicTrack.

The community-based Steering Committee has completed its work with the delivery of the Plan.

Council received funding to implement the actions identified in the plan.

Works completed to date include the originally agreed section of creek clearing, levy design and Stages 1 & 2 of levy construction.

#### **REPORT:**

Establishment of a community reference group is needed to ensure a high level of community knowledge and satisfaction with the implementation of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan.

The terms of reference for the group will include:

- Attendance at reference group meetings;
- Advice on community understanding of the implementation project and ways in which to ensure a high level of understanding of the project;
- Community feedback on the remaining future project activities (additional creek clearing and Stages 3 & 4 of levy construction);
- Advice on how to implement the remaining future project activities;
- Facilitate interaction and communication regarding the project and progress of the project to the wider community;
- Advice on how the community can continue to interact around future flood management, such as community warning systems.

Establishment of the community reference group is important to successfully delivering the council plan action regarding flood plan implementation. Community advice and buy-in to the project is necessary to ensure good delivery of the Plan.

# Options/Alternatives:

Council could proceed with implementation of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan without further consultation or reference to the community. This would result in a community that was disengaged with the project, with little understanding of the levy system and creek clearing program and a degree of dissatisfaction with the outcome.

#### Timelines:

Advertising for expressions of interest for the community reference group can begin immediately.

A report to the July council meeting can appoint membership to the community reference group, and the first meeting of the group can be two weeks after its appointment.

# Risk Analysis:

Appointment of a community reference group carries an expectation that council will consult with the group and will carry out the works. The risk to council is that it does not deliver the remaining flood management works in accordance with adopted flood management plan.

The main obstacle identified in this project is that some of the land for the remaining levy bank is in private ownership and will require a statutory process for council to be able to develop that land. This risk can be managed through a thorough and transparent statutory process. The reference group will need to be informed and have an understanding of the length of time this statutory process can take.

#### **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

Through listening posts in the community and representation to council, it is clear that a community reference group is necessary to effectively and efficiently deliver the outstanding works identified in the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan.

The community reference group will re-engage council and the community to implement the plan and will also aim to develop ongoing management practices for the community to manage flood events (i.e. community warning systems).

Membership of the community reference group will be voluntary. An advertising process in the community seeking expressions of interest for membership will be undertaken.

The community reference group will form the basis of council's consultation with the community.

# **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

Resourcing of the community reference group will be undertaken by council officers. Any expert advice required by council will be sought when necessary and will be funded from the project budget given for implementation of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan.

# **CONCLUSION**

Establishment of a community reference group to assist in delivery to the remaining actions of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan is needed to re-engage with the Carisbrook community to complete the levy.

The group will work with council staff and the community to effectively and efficiently deliver the remaining flood management infrastructure and establish good community practices around flood management.

A draft terms of reference for the community reference group has been provided to detail expectations of the community members and council in the group.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. A draft Terms of Reference for the Community reference group are attached

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council approve:

- 1. the establishment of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan Implementation Community Reference Group;
- 2. the terms of reference for the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan Implementation Community Reference Group;
- 3. an expression of interest process to be advertised to the Carisbrook community for membership of the Carisbrook Flood and Drainage Management Plan Implementation Community Reference Group.

## 8.11 PREPARATION OF 2018/19 PROPOSED BUDGET/FEES AND CHARGES

Author: Finance Manager

Responsible General Manager Corporate Performance

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

## **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

The 2018/19 Proposed Budget has been prepared In accordance with section 127 (1) of the Local Government Act 1989, and is submitted for Council's consideration.

## **POLICY CONTEXT:**

Council Plan "Our Organisation: to support strong, transparent corporate governance".

Council Plan Priority: Ensure the financial sustainability of Council.

Legislatively – Local Government Act section 127 (i) "A Council must prepare a budget for each financial year" and related sections prescribing information to be contained in the Budget.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

In accordance with section 127, of the Local Government Act 1989, Council must ensure that the budget contains -

- (a) financial statements in the form and containing the information required by the regulations;
- (b) a description of the services and initiatives to be funded in the budget;.
- (c) a statement as to how the services and initiatives described under paragraph (b) will contribute to achieving the strategic objectives specified in the Council Plan;
- (d) Major Initiatives, being initiatives identified by the Council as priorities, to be undertaken during the financial year;
- (da) for services to be funded in the budget, the prescribed indicators of service performance that are required to be reported against in the performance statement under section 131;
- (db) the prescribed measures relating to those indicators;
- (e) any other information required by the regulations.

Council must also ensure that the budget contains -

- (a) the information Council is required to declare under section 158(1);
- (b) if Council intends to declare a differential rate under section 161, the details listed in section 161(2);

(c) if council intends to declare a differential rate under section 161A, the details listed in section 161(2).

In accordance with section 126 Council must also adopt a Strategic Resource Plan no later than 30 June.

#### **REPORT:**

Council has prepared this Proposed Budget for 2018/19 for community feedback and consideration. The Proposed Budget is financially responsible and contains measures to address the findings of the 2017 Inspectorate Report to be undertaken by the Governance Reform Team. It also continues to implement priorities identified in the Council Plan 2017-2021, and through consultation with the community during the Have Your Say Campaign in April 2018.

The Council Plan 2017-2021 sets out the vision "to be a vibrant, thriving and inclusive community", delivered through the strategic themes of:

- Our Community Foster community connectedness and social capital, and services which improve people's health and wellbeing.
- Our Economy Advocate, innovate and support to grow employment and diversify the local economy.
- Our Built and Natural Environment Value, conserve and enhance the rich built and natural heritage and environment.
- Our Organisation Implement strong, transparent corporate governance.

The Proposed Budget outlines the resources required to deliver the diverse range of services we provide to the Central Goldfields community. It outlines projects to undertake strategic planning for our services, assets, economy and land use and includes an extensive list of capital works to be completed during the 2018/19 year.

The Proposed Budget includes a rate increase of 2.25% in line with the State Government's Fair Go Rates System (FGRS) rate cap. Council has not applied to the State Government for a rate cap variation. Increases in waste charges are higher than CPI in this year's Proposed Budget due to changes in global recycling markets. This has added a significant cost to recycling resulting in proposed increases to the Waste Management Fee of \$10.05 and to the Recycling Charge of \$34.50. Council will continue to work with the State Government to find more cost effective solutions for recycling.

The Proposed Budget includes a capital works program of \$6.21 million including a small number of projects carried forward from 2017/18. Highlights of the capital works program include:

- Replacement of Porteous Road Wareek Bridge (\$600,000)
- Rehabilitation Drive in Court, Wilson Street to Ross Street (\$178,000)
- Unsealed roads renewal (\$316,000)
- Road resealing (\$875,000)
- Renewal of major culverts (\$90,000)
- Flood mitigation works Carisbrook (\$400,000) carry forward project
- Y Intersection safety upgrades (\$380,000)
- Renewal and expansion of footpaths (\$156,000)
- Major patching roads network (\$100,000)
- Bridge/major culverts safety upgrades (\$180,000)

- Carisbrook Transfer Station pavement rehabilitation (\$114,000)
- Renewal and expansion of kerb and channel (\$164,000)
- Upgrade and renewal of drainage (\$162,000)
- Road stabilisation works (\$100,000)
- Market Reserve playgrounds (\$90,000)
- Upgrade playgrounds (\$23,000)
- Skate park design works (\$28,000)
- All access changing rooms at the Maryborough Sports and Fitness Centre (\$150,000)
- E waste shed extension at transfer station (\$120,000)

#### Other initiatives include:

- Designs for recreation reserve upgrades (\$200,000)
- Development of a recreation strategy for the Shire (\$60,000)
- Development of an economic and tourism strategy for the Shire (\$100,000)
- The Road Trip project supporting new young drivers, TAC funded (\$180,664 over 3 years)

Grants will be sought from the State and Federal Governments to support some of these initiatives.

Go Goldfields brings together community members from Central Goldfields Shire with leaders from key services and government agencies, to improve outcomes for our children, youth and families. In recognising the importance and power of working collaboratively, we have adopted a collective impact approach to address some of the major complex social problems impacting our community. Go Goldfields receives financial support from the State Government and from two philanthropic funds.

There are significant changes to Home and Community Care funding arrangements going forward mainly as a result of the rollout of the NDIS. We are working with neighbouring Councils, the State and Commonwealth Government to ensure the transition to these new funding and service delivery models is appropriately managed.

The 2018/19 year is a revaluation year, and there have been significant changes to property values in the farming sector in this year's revaluation. This will result in a redistribution of the rate burden from residential rate payers to farm owners. Council receives no additional revenue as a result of a revaluation, it is simply a mechanism that redistributes rates between all properties. Some rate payers may experience a decrease in their general rates as a result of the revaluation.

The 2018/19 Proposed Budget was made available for review by the community for 28 days, with submissions to be made to the Council by close of business on Friday 15 June 2018, with the opportunity for submissions to be heard at a special hearing on Tuesday 19 June 2018 at 5:30pm.

Six submissions have been received by the end of the submission period. Of the six submissions, none requested to be heard at the special hearing, as such the special hearing meeting did not proceed. All submissions received were considered by the Administrators as part of the budget process, and adjustments were made accordingly.

#### 2018/19 PROPOSED BUDGET

The Proposed Budget relates to the financial year commencing on 1 July 2018 and ending 30 June 2019 and:

- 1. Discloses that as at 30 June 2018, the total amount borrowed by the Council will be \$4,460,115;
- 2. The Council proposes to borrow \$0 for 2018/19 financial year
- 3. Projects that \$574,803 of the amount previously borrowed by the Council will be repaid during the financial year;
- 4. Projects that, as at 30 June 2019, the total amount of Council borrowings will be \$3,885,313 the cost of servicing borrowings during the financial year will be \$170,369;
- 5. Projects that, as at 30 June 2022, the total amount of Council borrowings will be \$2,282,750.

### A. Amount Intended to be Raised

An amount of \$14,626,829 be declared as the amount which Council intends to raise by general rates, the municipal charge and an annual service (garbage/waste management/recycling) charge calculated as follows:

General Rate\$9,574,309Municipal Charge\$2,058,179Annual Service (Garbage/Waste\$2,994,341

Management/Recycling) Charge

Total Amount to be Raised \$14,626,829

## **B** General Rates

Council is required to declare rates and charges pursuant to Section 158 of the Local Government Act 1989. The general rates are to be raised by application of differential rates provided in Section 161, for the period commencing on 1 July 2018 and concluding on 30 June 2019 as follows:

Category	Rate Cents in \$	
Residential Maryborough	0.5131	
(General Rate)		
Residential Other	0.4105	
(80% of General)		
Commercial Maryborough	0.8210	
(160% of General)		
Commercial Other	0.6157	
(120% of General)		
Farm Land	0.4105	
(80% of General)		
Vacant Land Maryborough	0.9236	
(180% of General)		
Vacant Land Other	0.7697	
(150% of General)		
Industrial	0.5644	
(110% of General)		

It is considered that each differential rate will contribute to the equitable and efficient carrying out of Council's functions in that it is likely to achieve an equitable financial contribution to the cost of carrying out the functions of Council, including:

- the construction and maintenance of public infrastructure;
- the development and provision of health and community services;
- the provision of general support services.

## C. Municipal Charge

- (1) A municipal charge be declared for the period commencing on 1 July 2018 and concluding on 30 June 2019;
- (2) The municipal charge be declared in accordance with S.159(1) of the Local Government Act for the purpose of covering some of the administrative costs of the Council's operations;
- (3) The municipal charge be the sum of \$262.65 for each rateable land (or part) in respect of which a municipal charge may be levied; and
- (4) It be confirmed that the municipal charge is declared in respect of all rateable land within the municipal district in respect of which a municipal charge may be levied.

## D. Service Charge

- (1) An annual service charge be declared for the period commencing on 1 July 2018 and concluding on 30 June 2019;
- (2) The annual service charge be declared for the collection, removal and disposal of refuse, rubbish and recyclables;
- (3)(a) The annual refuse collection and disposal service charge be the sum of \$150.20 (1x80 litre bin service (urban) weekly 1 x 140 litre bin (rural) fortnightly) or \$256.90 (1x140 litre bin service (urban) weekly 1 x 240 litre bin (rural) fortnightly) for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service charge may be levied;
  - (b) The annual recycling charge to be \$134.40 (1x240 litre bin service fortnightly) for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service may be levied.

Notwithstanding sub paragraph (a).

- (i) in respect of properties which elect to receive a 140 litre bin service (urban) the charge will be \$256.90.
- (ii) in respect of properties which elect to receive a 240 litre big bin (rural) service the charge will be \$256.90.
- (d) The annual Waste Management charge be the sum of \$130.50 for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service charge may be levied, and, similarly the annual Waste Management charge be the sum of \$130.50 for properties which are not subject to the annual service charge as described in 3(a), 3(b), and 3(c)(i) and (ii) or to not receive a weekly or fortnightly garbage collection.
- (4) The criteria specified below be the criteria which form the basis of the annual service charge so declared:
  - (i) All residential, commercial and industrial land (whether rateable or nonrateable) on which a building is erected within the designated garbage areas is entitled to the refuse and recycle collection service and will be liable for the annual service charge whether or not the service is utilised; and
  - (ii) Where during the year a building is erected on vacant land within the designated garbage and recycling areas the service charge will be such sum as will proportionately represent the period between occupation of the building and the end of the rating year.

## E. Fees and Charges

As part of the Proposed Budget preparation process, Council has reviewed its fees and charges for the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019, taking into account the following:

- estimated CPI of 2.5 percent,
- market pricing;
- or a business case (where above 2.5 percent or market pricing).

There are also a number of fees and charges that are set by the State Government.

## **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

Copies of the Proposed Budget and Proposed Fees and Charges were made available for inspection at the Shire Office, Nolan Street Maryborough, between 8:30am and 5:00pm from Friday 18 May to close of business Friday 15 June 2018.

Copies of the Proposed Budget and Proposed Fees and Charges were also made available on Council's website <a href="www.centralgoldfields.com.au">www.centralgoldfields.com.au</a>, and at the following locations during normal business hours:-

Carisbrook Post Office

**Dunolly Rural Transaction Centre** 

**Dunolly Post Office** 

Bealiba Post Office

Talbot Post Office

Written submissions under Section 223 of the Act on any proposal contained in the Proposed Budget or Proposed Fees and Charges were to be made to the Council by close of business Friday 15 June 2018, with the opportunity for submissions to be heard at a special hearing on 19 June 2018 at 5:30pm, with the Proposed Budget and Proposed Fees and Charges to be adopted by Council on 26 June 2018.

As of close of business six submissions had been received by the end of the submission period. Of the six submissions, none requested to be heard by Council, as such the special hearing did not proceed. All submissions received were considered by Council as part of the budget process, and adjustments were made accordingly.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The 2018/19 Proposed Budget and 2018/19 Proposed Fees and Charges were placed on display for public submissions for a four week period from Friday 18 May 2018 to Friday 15 June 2018.

As at close of business on Friday 15 June 2018, six submissions had been received. Of the six submissions, none requested to be heard by Council, as such the special hearing did not proceed on Tuesday 19 June 2018. All submissions received were considered by Council, with adjustments being made to the budget accordingly.

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1. 2018/2019 Proposed Budget including the Strategic Resource Plan
- 2. 2018/19 Proposed Fees and Charges
- Submissions to the 2018/19 Proposed Budget and 2018/19 Proposed Fees and Charges

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. That the Proposed Budget including the Strategic Resource Plan, and the Proposed Fees and Charges prepared for the 2018/19 financial year for the purposes of Section 126 and 127 of the Local Government Act 1989 be adopted.
- 2. That Council strike the following rates and charges

### a. General Rates

Category	Rate Cents in \$
Residential Maryborough	0.5131
Residential Other	0.4105
Commercial Maryborough	0.8210
Commercial Other	0.6157
Farm Land	0.4105
Vacant Land Maryborough	0.9236
Vacant Land Other	0.7697
Industrial	0.5644

## b. Municipal Charge

The municipal charge be the sum of \$262.65 for each rateable land (or part) in respect of which a municipal charge may be levied

## c. Service Charge

- The annual refuse collection and disposal service charge be the sum of \$150.20 (1x80 litre bin service (urban) weekly 1 x 140 litre bin (rural) fortnightly) or \$256.90 (1x140 litre bin service (urban) weekly 1 x 240 litre bin (rural) fortnightly) for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service charge may be levied;
- The annual recycling charge to be \$134.40 (1x240 litre bin service fortnightly) for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service may be levied.
- in respect of properties which elect to receive a 140 litre bin service (urban) the charge will be \$256.90.
- in respect of properties which elect to receive a 240 litre big bin (rural) service the charge will be \$256.90.
- The annual Waste Management charge be the sum of \$130.50 for each rateable and non-rateable land (or part) in respect of which an annual service charge may be levied, and, similarly the annual Waste Management charge be the sum of \$130.50 for properties which are not subject to the annual service charge for refuse or recycle waste collection.

#### 8.12 FINANCIAL REPORT APRIL 2018

Author: Finance Manager

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

General Manager:

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

## **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

Monthly financial reports are presented to Council to show Council's financial performance and how it is tracking against the adopted (original) budget.

## **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The monthly financial report comprises the following:

- Operating Statement;
- · Balance Sheet;
- Statement of Changes in Equity;
- Cash Flow Statement;
- Statement of Capital Works
- Rate and General Debtor Information;
- Investment Schedule.

#### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

This finance report is provided for the year to 30 April 2018 and does not include results for Council's Section 86 Committees such as the Tullaroop Leisure Centre and Energy Breakthrough which are consolidated within the annual financial report.

#### FINANCIAL REPORT

### **Operating Statement**

The operating result for the year to date as at 30 April was a deficit of \$1,099,317. Income is at \$26.453 million compared to a budgeted income of \$27.422 million, a change of 3.5%, primarily due to the payment of 50% of Council's 2017/2018 Grants Commission funding in June 2017. Expenditure is at \$27.552 million compared to budgeted expenditure of \$24.450 million, a change of 121.7% for the year to date. The variation is partly attributable to the timing of flood recovery works, over expenditure in the Children Services area, the Organisation Reform program and as a result of works undertaken at the Penney and Lang site.

Council incurred \$5.519 million of flood recovery works as at 30 April 2018. Out of which \$1.5 million was received and accounted in 2016/2017, \$1.5 million was received as at 28 February, and a further \$1.2 million received on 2 March 2018, with reimbursement claims currently being processed.

#### **Statement of Financial Position**

Council's equity position has increased from 30 June 2017 due to the levying of rates and charges during August, which has progressively been collected during the year. Refer to the receivables summary for an explanation for the movement in current receivables.

The creditors balance on 30 April 2018 includes the Fire Services Property Levy (FSPL) which now totals \$449,955. This balance includes arrears, however, excludes the FSPL Concession (which effectively reduces the payable amount). Council's next instalment is due to be paid to the CFA by 28 June 2018.

## Statement of Changes in Equity

Council has budgeted to transfer \$100,000 into the Unfunded Superannuation Liability reserve; this transfer has not yet occurred.

\$224,766 has been transferred to the Gravel Reserve as a result of gravel issues during the year to date.

### **Cash Flow Statement**

The balance of cash and investments as at 30 April 2018 is \$5.37 million, which includes \$4.5 million in short-term deposits.

Council's cash position is slightly below budget, and the net cash inflow from operating activities has been impacted by the payment of 50% of Council's 2017/2018 Grants Commission funding in June 2017 and the timing of flood recovery reimbursement claims.

Future cash flows are being monitored closely to enable completion of scheduled works and meeting recurrent obligations, as well as ensuring surplus funds are invested to generate maximum interest revenue.

## **Capital Works Statement**

The 2017/2018 budget included a capital works budget of \$9,167,538, across property, plant and equipment and infrastructure asset classes. As at 30 April, Council had expended \$4,732,970 of this budget.

## **Receivables Summary**

The Rate Debtor balance on 30 April is \$2.882 million (excluding FSPL), which is \$0.195 million or 7% higher than this time last year. This increase is primarily due to the 2.0% increase in rates for the 2017/2018 year, and a higher level (10.6%) of arrears compared to this time last year (9.5% as at April 2017). Those ratepayers with arrears are currently being progressed for additional debt collection action in accordance with Council's Debt Collection Policy.

The Other Debtors balance totals \$849,551 which is \$537,265 or 172% higher than this time last year. Sundry Debtors is \$385,881 higher than this time last year, and at 30 April included \$240,000 invoiced to DEDJTR for the Local Roads to Market Program (received on 30 May 2018). In addition Council's GST Debtor is \$126,826 higher than this time last year, primarily due to the increased level of contractor expenditure as a result of flood recovery works.

## **Operating and Cash Flow Budget Amounts**

Council's budget forecast for 2017/2018 has been divided into monthly amounts. While every attempt is made to accurately predict when income and expenditure will occur and phase budgets appropriately, Council should make allowances for 'ups and downs' in these monthly allocations throughout the year. This is especially true for receipt of non-recurrent Government grants and completion of capital and large maintenance works which can be planned but not proceed due to weather.

The monthly YTD operating budget forecast amounts should be used to indicate budget position rather than an absolute result for each month.

## **CONCLUSION:**

The financial position to the end of April 2018 is impacted by a number of items including:

- Prepayment of Grants Commission funding (timing);
- Funding for infrastructure renewal due to floods (timing);
- Expenditure more than budgeted in the Children's services area;
- Expenditure on the works undertaken at the Penney and Lang site, and on the Organisation Reform Program

Rate Debtor balances will continue to be monitored with debt collection action to be undertaken in accordance with Council's Debt Collection Policy.

Surplus funds have been invested to ensure interest earnings are maximised, and cash flows are to be monitored closely.

Officers proposed to recommend the following to June 2018 Ordinary Council meeting

"That Council receives and notes the attached April 2018 Financial Report showing progress against the budget as presented".

#### ATTACHMENTS:

1. April 2018 Financial Report

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council receives and notes the attached April 2018 Financial Report showing progress against the budget as presented".

### 9.1 DOCUMENTS FOR SEALING CONFIRMATION

Author: Acting Manager Governance

Responsible Chief Executive Officer

**General Manager:** 

The Officer presenting this report, having made enquiries with relevant members of staff, reports that no disclosable interests have been raised in relation to this report.

## **SUMMARY/PURPOSE:**

To present documents that have been signed under Council's common seal, via delegation since the last Ordinary Council Meeting, to Council for endorsement.

#### **POLICY CONTEXT:**

The relevant Council Plan references are:

4.2 Deliver the 'core business' of Council in an efficient and effective way

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The Local Government Act 1989 (the Act) states that Council is a body corporate with perpetual succession and must have a common seal.

The *Act* also allows for the delegation to a member of the Council staff the power to sign, seal, issue, revoke or cancel any notice, order or agreement on behalf of the Council, via a Local Law.

In the case of Central Goldfields Shire Council, regulation of the common seal is dealt with under the Governance Local Law.

## **REPORT:**

The following Documents have been signed under seal;

Date	Details
23 May 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Talbot Town Hall Committee of Management.
23 May 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Adelaide Lead Hall Special Committee
23 May 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Daisy Hill Community Hall Committee of Management
23 May 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Dunolly Historic Precinct Committee of Management

28 May 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Energy Breakthrough Special Committee
18 June 2018	Instrument of Delegation to the Talbot Community Homes Committee of Management

## **CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION:**

Not applicable

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no resource implications.

## **CONCLUSION:**

Contracts for the provision of goods and services to Council and the provision of Instruments of Delegation are signed and sealed under delegation, so that the business of Council can run efficiently and effectively in between Council meetings.

# **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That Council endorse the above documents that have been signed and sealed under delegation on behalf of Council.