



Public Submissions

Draft Budget 2022-23

Draft Finance Plan 2022-2032

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
1	Submitter 1	<p>Increased parking fines, YES PLEASE</p> <p>Here in the Borough, my delivery work is disrupted by civilians parking where they should not, especially on the busiest days when time is very limited. And I see cars parked all day (sometimes by local workers) in zones which are time-limited to encourage space for shoppers.</p>	<p>This is a comment on parking enforcement rather than a comment on the budget</p> <p>Council is in the process of reviewing its local law operations with a view to prioritise and determine the best use of the limited resources available to this area of the business. The management of car parking will be a key aspect of this review.</p>
2	Submitter 2	<p>Part 1</p> <p>For a number of years I have been noticing the deterioration of the metal handrail at the beach entrance 10B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Beach Access - Repair or replace the metal handrail on the stairs leading to beach 10B b. Please consider a handrail on BOTH sides of the stairs, for safety and ease of access. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Council has an annual funding allocation for asset renewal requirements. The 10B beach access handrail will be replaced within the operational budget in the 2022-23 financial year. b. Council officers do not consider an additional handrail necessary at this location.
		<p>Part 2</p> <p>The ascetics on entering our town aren't incredibly appealing and would be an easy and cost efficient to "fix".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Low planting on this patch of ground opposite the gates of Wyuna is in need of a welcoming makeover. This is near the entrance into our town and looks very sad. b. Driving from the Ferry Terminal where is our WELCOME TO THE HISTORICAL COASTAL VILLAGE OF QUEENSCLIFF sign? Currently the signs encourage visitors to keep driving..... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Landscaping improvements are being considered as part of Council's management of Avenue of Honour. Landscaping will be progressively completed in conjunction with the Avenue of Honour tree replacement program. b. A review of town entrance signage (Wadawurrung signage) is included within the draft budget. The review will consider all town entrances including new signage for visitors arriving by ferry. Council will also work with the Department of Transport to seek their support for a change in road sign content at the Ferry terminal in order to include Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale as destination towns.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>Part 3 This is the bicycle/walking path crossing, from the Harbour Fish and Chip shop linking to the path, from the Ferry to town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The planting needs to be maintained as to not encroach onto the crossing. b. The sandy access to the bike/walking path from/to the Harbour, needs to be paved to avoid an accident for bike riders and pedestrians. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Wharf Street is managed by Regional Roads Victoria as a State managed highway. However, Council will undertake vegetation maintenance on the pedestrian refuge and draw resources through its operational maintenance budget. b. This area is managed by the Parks Victoria. Council will bring this matter to the attention of relevant officers at Parks Victoria.
		<p>Part 4 Provide more Pavilions/Gazebos for shelter and rest. * A pavilion at the top flat section of land at the High School sight, would encourage people to stop for a picnic on their way into town. * A pavilion at the end of Bay Street in Fishermans Flats. There is no protection for the families that come here to fish or have a picnic, also very little seating. * A grand bandstand pavilion at the Bullring would be the perfect addition to this area. The cyprus trees that once offered locals/visitors the protection from the elements have been removed and this area is no longer offering any protection or shelter and is VERY unappealing for anyone to stop, park, visit the beach or facilities. * A pavilion on the walking path overlooking Swan Bay. This area is offered up for weddings and has NO protection from the sun or the elements.</p>	<p>Taking into consideration the current financial plan officers do not consider that the building and the maintenance costs resulting from increasing the number of pavilions or gazebos in the Borough provides a community benefit that would offset or balance the unfavourable financial sustainability outcome.</p> <p>Council will continue the asset renewal program that applies to existing assets in these areas, and will be undertaken vegetation replacement works at the Bull Ring.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>Part 5 The intersection at the corner of Bethune Street, Stokes Street and Nankervis Parade has recently had it's upgrade!!! However we have witnessed a number of 'near misses' here due to the signage and rules changing. * Clearer signage, stating GIVEWAY or STOP, at the entrance to Nankervis Parade from Stokes Street, and also from Nankervis Parade into Stokes Street. * Update the old and unreadable signs please * Install NO PARKING signs at this crossing, as many parents park next to this intersection to deliver/collect their children to school. It's an accident waiting to happen. * 40km SCHOOL SIGNS need to be placed closer to this intersection, in Nankervis, Bethune and Stokes</p>	<p>The addition of give way signage at the entrance to Nankervis to Stokes has the potential to create ambiguous interpretation depending on which lane the sign is viewed from. The current turning lane and line marking for vehicles turning right from Stokes Street to Nankervis Pde is consistent with the Australian standards and guidelines for intersections.</p> <p>The older faded signage at this location will be renewed within the annual asset renewal budget for 2022 - 23.</p> <p>Further, the Queenscliff Traffic Management Strategy is currently being undertaken within the 2021-22 budget. This project is reviewing traffic data within Queenscliff along with existing relevant strategies and plans with the objective of engaging with the community and developing key traffic management strategies.</p>
		<p>Part 6 The most uncomfortable seats are on the borough!! * It would be an easy fix, by just providing an extra timber plank and attaching it to each bench seat on the Borough. * Reset the seats and tables at an appropriate height, especially at the Bullring. * Please consider this as a matter of urgency, we wonder why this type of seating is so rarely used.</p>	<p>Council undertakes a continual, progressive renewal of park furniture within an annual funding allocation for renewal works.</p> <p>The Rotary Club have expressed an interest in funding a community project. The replacement of the picnic tables and seating at the Bullring would be a project that we would present to the Rotary Club.</p> <p>Council officers will approach Rotary Club Impact on budget – Asset renewal</p>
3	Submitter 3	<p>Spending \$40,000 of ratepayer money, "to extend and upgrade the fence at Narrows Beach. (1) It has been my understanding that Council's responsibility starts at the high water mark. The existing fence, and the proposed extension, would be considered the high water mark. Why</p>	<p>Council is not proposing a groyne and it is still the responsibility of the State Government, via DEWLP.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>are you intending to spend local funds on this stretch of beach, at the high water mark, that has in the past been the responsibility of the State government, via DEWLP or other body?</p>	
		<p>(2) The use of the words “extend and upgrade”, do not provide an indication of precisely what is being planned. One could imagine that you intend to extend the existing fence further east towards Queenscliff, but such an extension would not achieve one of your aims, that of keeping children off the dunes. The existing low height of the fence serves very little purpose; it will not hold back the force of the waves, nor will it limit the ability of children to climb the fence. I personally cannot see a \$40,000 spend in the manner proposed, holding back the wave impacts, and I would be happy to read any professional report that suggests otherwise.</p>	<p>This would involve measures to increase public safety extending fencing to reduce access to dune</p>
		<p>(3) Recently DEWLP held a workshop, at the Dog Beach. Is your intention to extend and upgrade the Narrows Beach fence, as a result of conversations with DEWLP, as being an appropriate temporary solution to the worsening erosion in the area? If the answer is Yes, why then are the Queenscliff Council planning on outlaying \$40,000, when past experience tells us this is the responsibility of DEWLP?</p>	<p>Council is aware the existing fence does not mitigate erosion, and that an extension to the fence will not change this. This is only a public safety measure to reduce access to dune.</p>
		<p>(4) If DEWLP have not been included in the discussion of the best way to handle the continued erosion on this stretch of beach, on</p>	<p>Following the recent engagement session at the Dog Beach, the consultants engaged by DEWLP have completed a first pass assessment of the erosion and the potential solutions raised by the community.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>whose advice is the Council acting in proposing to extend and upgrade the fence at the Narrows Beach, as a solution to this ongoing problem?</p>	
		<p>(5) If the safety of children on the dunes is the priority given to this \$40,000 spend, why then has there been no response to repeated requests for a Water Safety Audit and improved signage on our beaches. Such requests have been made consistently over the last three years, by the PLSLSC and PLCA, following a freak wave event at the dog beach, which in turn drew attention to the lack of appropriate signage in a number of our “on the beach” locations. Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale will be amongst the most heavily impacted by sea level rises over future decades. To be serious on mitigation, and other climate change preparedness measures, the Borough needs stronger representation to our local Ministers, and it would seem apparent that a combined approach with the LG communities around the three headlands, may be a more productive way forward</p>	<p>Water Safety Audit and improved signage</p> <p>Prime responsibility lies with DEWLP regarding this matter. However, Council has done some preliminary work by obtaining a quotation from Life Saving Victoria to undertake a risk and signage assessment and audit covering the coastal areas of the Borough.</p> <p>Council officers will continue to look for grant opportunities and continue to advocate that DEWLP fund the project.</p> <p>Council will continue to advocate that DEWLP fund the project.</p>
4	Submitter 4	<p>QCAG’s office bearers have prepared an annual budget (attached), looking at the running costs required for QCAG to engage the community in implementing the many actions that require community mobilisation and input across the CERP. These costs are not directly attributable to the delivery of individual CERP projects but are required for QCAG to support their implementation through community engagement and mobilisation. QCAG is seeking \$15,000 in financial support from BoQ on an annual basis. QCAG will continue to operate on a</p>	<p>Council has recruited a dedicated officer on a fixed-term contract to lead CERP initiatives on behalf of the Community.</p> <p>Council has an ongoing annual allocation of \$30,000 for various CERP-related activities including actions to educate and involve the community to take an active role in implementing the CERP. Council could consider funding certain activities of QCAG from this allocation under the current MOU arrangements, subject to a service agreement that requires certain activities be undertaken to further the implementation of the CERP.</p> <p>QCAG is encouraged to use Council’s Community Grant program which now provides a strong consideration to projects that support the principles of</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		100% volunteer basis and is seeking funding from other sources (including philanthropic and government grants and the establishment of a Membership program) to support CERP Implementation.	Council's Climate Emergency Response Plan (CERP), in seeking funding support for specific activities QCAG wish to undertake.
5	Submitter 5	(1) We noted last year's budget had a line item for the Queenscliffe Tourist Park Operational review. This has been completed, however there is no further funding the budget to progress or for any consultation feedback process. Our association was extremely disappointed in the report and the inaccuracy of some of the data. We look forward to elaborating on that through the appropriate processes.	Although the consultant has completed his review of the Queenscliffe Tourist Park, the overall initiative is still in progress. Officers are in the process of reviewing the Consultant's report to make appropriate recommendations to Council. Council will consider whether any additional budget allocation is required when finalising the quarter 2 forecast for the 2022-23 financial year.
		(2) Given the Operational report is under review and growing significant divide, we request that Golightly annual permit fees are held at current rates.	Council reduced Golightly annual permit fees by 0.9% in the current financial year. Council believes that the 3.0% increase proposed in the draft budget is reasonable considering the anticipated cost escalations of Council's operations due to the prevailing economic conditions. Based on the preliminary details of the recent public tender in relation to amenity cleaning services for the Borough, the costs associated with the cleaning and sanitation will see a significant increase in the coming financial year. In addition Council will be continuing to manage increased utility costs (electricity etc...) which will be more than 3% in the upcoming Financial Year.
		(3) Given the high fees that are applicable only to Golightly, we request that our licenses should allow the following visitors; - The owners of a van - Any person from the owner's immediate family	Council is in the process of developing a governance structure for each park as a part of the ongoing operational review process. Council will consider making changes to accommodate some of these requests as they relate to the rules and regulations for Golightly Park.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The above comes with a few strict conditions, such as - The number of people staying in a van at any one time must not exceed the number of people the van can sleep - Queenscliff Tourist Parks must be advised whenever people from within the family group are going to stay at the van. - The existing restrictions about the number of days that the van can be used remain - There is to be no sub-letting 	
6	Submitter 6	Seeking the inclusion within the budget of funds to provide a toilet at the Point Lonsdale front beach foreshore playground adjacent to Loch Street. The type of toilet proposed is a small pre-fabricated toilet available through many suppliers and which is already designed	<p>The works currently included in the 2022–23 budget are in line with the toilet strategy of the Borough and any new works will follow based on future community consultation and availability of resources.</p> <p>A public toilet at the northern end of the Point Lonsdale Beach opposite Loch Street Council is identified in the 2015 – 2025 Queenscliffe Public Toilet Strategy as a proposed capital works project and nominated for construction in year 9 or 2024.</p> <p>Council will undertake a review of the current toilet strategy in response to this submission and other enquires Council has received on other aspects of the current strategy in preparation for the 2023- 24 budget process.</p>
7	Submitter 7	<p>(1) Point Lonsdale Maritime and Defence Precinct (unexpected windfall grant)</p> <p>The recent unexpected Government announcement to award an additional \$1 million to help restore the Point Lonsdale Maritime and Defence Precinct is a great opportunity. When coupled with \$200,000 set aside by Council for</p>	Council officers note that the project to re-clad and reroof the P1 Huts is funded and underway with completion due by October 2022.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>the design and construction of a new toilet block and what remains of the original RDV funding grant, it should allow improvements to finally start happening on the site. No details are available however possible site works could include re-cladding and re-roofing of the P1 Huts, urgent repairs to the WW1 and WW2 foreshore military installations and hopefully some pathway and parking improvements and some landscaping. The area could also be made more appealing if the ugly overhead wires could be placed underground at some point.</p> <p>After some 15 years of very little happening there is now a great opportunity to complete the project on this iconic Point Lonsdale Site.</p>	
		<p>(2) Hub Overrun Costs At the last meeting I attended BoQ was facing extra costs of the order of \$300,000 due to covid related delays and problems associated with materials. Associated with the loss of the public toilet in the central activities area some 2 years ago this year's budget contains \$250,000 for a new toilet in Hobson Street Queenscliff. This all represents additional ratepayer spending not envisaged for the original project. If the toilet project proceeds I think it's important that it respects the key heritage precinct in which it will be located.</p>	<p>Based on the latest report (21 April 2022) officers have received from the project managers of the QHub project. The estimated total cost overrun of the project is approximately \$308,000 which is 5.3% of the initial project budget. This includes the additional cost to cover a combination of latent conditions within the existing library (roof, walls, etc.), minor design changes required as a response to the availability of materials, changes requested by users (including Council), and COVID related delays.</p> <p>Officers, expect further cost variations due to the current challenges in the construction sector though it is expected that those additional variations will not be significant.</p> <p>The QHub includes public toilet facilities. The new toilet in Hobsons Street is a new separate project requested by the community.</p>
		<p>(3) Sale of Council Land</p>	<p>Council will seek community feedback in the future to identify suitable investment opportunities to best use sales proceeds of the Murray Road land.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>Some \$3.5 million from the Murray Road land sales will come into Council's coffers this year. Given the Borough is debt free there is a great opportunity to undertake a worthwhile project for the community instead of just placing the money in an account.</p>	<p>Council intends to invest such money only on projects that will generate additional revenue to the Borough or bring a greater level of operational efficiencies (invest to save).</p>
		<p>(4) Spending on Parks and Reserves Given latest years storm devastation and subsequent culling of many trees I support \$40,000 on replanting in Victoria Park. This coupled with some possible grant funding will help restore this important Public Park. I suggest Council might also focus on "Greening" Queenscliff with more planting on the former High School site and in other parks and reserves throughout the Borough. It would be worthwhile if this year's budget cycle also included removal of pest plants and replanting at Shortland's Bluff.</p> <p>Not sure what ever happened to Council's tree management policy for the Borough.</p>	<p>Council has an existing operating budget for the removal of pest plants at Shortlands Bluff.</p> <p>Any planting at the former High School would require community consultation given the sensitivity to any proposed use of this land. This consultation could be achieved within existing operational budget allocations if Council decided to investigate planting.</p> <p>The Tree Management Policy is under development. A Draft policy was presented to Councillors in March 2022. Council officers are now using the Councillors' feedback to develop the next draft.</p>
		<p>(5) DELWP's RAMSAR Wetlands Extensions DELWP are proposing to expand the region's RAMSAR international bird treaty areas, which are thought to be used by some 20,000 migratory birds each year. DELWP are now seeking community input into their proposal to include 11 new areas into the wetlands network. Potential new locations such as Lonsdale Lakes and Lake Victoria Wildlife Reserve, Lakers Cutting, Swan Island and Sand Island are all included in the mix. I am supportive of this</p>	<p>Council officers note that the Council Plan includes the following intended action under priority 4 of the Environment Portfolio:</p> <p><i>Continue to encourage the expansion of the Port Phillip Marine National Park and Swan Bay Ramsar wetland area by including Lakers Cutting.</i></p> <p>Council has made a submission to that effect as part of the current DELWP engagement</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>initiative and hope the Borough of Queenscliffe will also support it.</p>	
		<p>(6) Royal Park Point Lonsdale I have been contacted by people concerned about the appointment of an architect to design a large toilet and sports change room facility and another entrance from Point Lonsdale Road for Royal Park. As part of the plan a \$60,000 upgrade of fencing, irrigation and lighting is being included. It's likely the existing BBQ shed would be demolished and plans are afoot to install a caravan waste dump facility in the park. Given the park is a valued resource used many in the community as well as campers and caravanners, a comprehensive masterplan for Royal Park (not just another caravan plan), which includes local community engagement, should be considered before the project is rushed through Council's planning approvals process and project managers take charge of the project. In my view it would be a great shame if Royal Park (one of our prettiest parks) was simply developed along the same lines as the Recreation Reserve.</p>	<p>Council has decided to defer the planning work for this project. This will be reflected in the updated budget.</p>
		<p>(7) Spending on Consultants and Service Providers I have concerns regarding the general level of spending on consultants/service providers and projected spending especially for Royal Park - \$330,000 and \$210,000 (carried forward from 2020-21 budget) to complete our Coastal and Marine Management Plan. These come hard on heels of multiple consultancies for the ATS, Caravan Parks Management Review and many arborist reports etc. Surely some of this work</p>	<p>Council engages contractors/consultants when work cannot be undertaken in-house. In some cases Council does not have in-house subject matter experts in other cases Council's operational resources are at, or beyond capacity, managing the day to day operations of Council.</p> <p>Council has decided to defer the planning work for the Royal Park project.</p> <p>Council is yet to make any commitment against the \$210,000 budget allocation. Council will use in-house resources where possible but will procure specialist</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		could be undertaken in house by professionals employed by BoQ in conjunction with local expertise.	services to help meet the requirements set out in the CMMP drafting guidelines.
		<p>(8) Heritage Review I am not sure of the current status of this project given it has gone on for years. I think it would be beneficial if this was finalised sometime soon.</p>	Please see Appendix A – Heritage Review Implementation
8	Submitter 8	<p>(1) Consideration of BBV grant in calculating Underlying Result in the 2021-22 Budget and 2022-23 budget</p>	<p>BBV grant Council signed an agreement with Better Boating Victoria (BBV) for 3 years (2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22) where BBV agreed to compensate the Council for the loss of income from boat ramp parking fees. Council has not been provided with any update about the continuation of this grant funding facility except for providing an additional grant payment in 2021-22 when the Council queried about the future of this arrangement.</p> <p>2021-22 Budget The 2021-22 Council budget was prepared based on the previous Council plan.</p> <p>The previous Council plan had not identified any financial sustainability indicators suitable for the Council considering the size and the nature of its operations. In the absence of Council defined sustainability indicators, Council used the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF) based measures to assess the financial sustainability of its operations.</p> <p>With respect to the underlying result, the LGPRF framework required Council to consider all operating income received or receivable during the financial year irrespective of whether that operating income is recurrent or non-recurrent, in calculating the underlying result.</p> <p>Based on this measure, Council considered BBV grant in calculating underlying result for 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments												
			<p>Council did not include any grant monies from BBV as income for 2022-23 and beyond at the time finalising the 2021-22 budget and the Long Term Financial Plan. There was no any assurance provided by BBV about the continuation of this facility after the financial year 2021-22. In the absence of any funding commitment from BBV, it was correct for Council to note the loss of income due to cessation of income form boat ramp parking fees as one of the factors for projected deficits.</p> <p>2022-23 Budget The 2022-23 draft budget is in line with the current Council Plan. The Current Council Plan has identified financial sustainability measures that the Council has decided to use in assessing its financial sustainability. Council believes those measures provide a more accurate picture of the Council’s ongoing performance considering the size and the nature of its operations.</p> <p>The underlying result based on the Council Plan measure, excludes the impact of non-recurrent operating income and expense items, and is adjusted for the timing of recurrent operating grants where applicable.</p> <p>On page 13 of the Draft Budget Council has provided the below projections,</p> <p>(**)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1093 938 2002 1150"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1093 938 1653 1023"><i>Key Statistics</i></th> <th data-bbox="1653 938 1821 1023"><i>2021-22 Forecast \$million</i></th> <th data-bbox="1821 938 2002 1023"><i>2022-23 Budget \$million</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1093 1023 1653 1058"><i>Total Operating Expenses</i></td> <td data-bbox="1653 1023 1821 1058">\$12.4</td> <td data-bbox="1821 1023 2002 1058">\$12.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1093 1058 1653 1093"><i>Comprehensive Operating Surplus</i></td> <td data-bbox="1653 1058 1821 1093">\$8.0</td> <td data-bbox="1821 1058 2002 1093">\$0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1093 1093 1653 1150"><i>Underlying operating surplus / (deficit) – Council Plan based</i></td> <td data-bbox="1653 1093 1821 1150">(\$0.2)</td> <td data-bbox="1821 1093 2002 1150">(\$0.3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Though Council has received a grant payment from BBV in 2021-22, that amount is not considered in calculating the above projections. So the comparison is like for like.</p> <p>In summary, BBV has not provided any assurance about the continuation of this grant facility after the financial year 2021-22. As a result, Council cannot;</p>	<i>Key Statistics</i>	<i>2021-22 Forecast \$million</i>	<i>2022-23 Budget \$million</i>	<i>Total Operating Expenses</i>	\$12.4	\$12.5	<i>Comprehensive Operating Surplus</i>	\$8.0	\$0.1	<i>Underlying operating surplus / (deficit) – Council Plan based</i>	(\$0.2)	(\$0.3)
<i>Key Statistics</i>	<i>2021-22 Forecast \$million</i>	<i>2022-23 Budget \$million</i>													
<i>Total Operating Expenses</i>	\$12.4	\$12.5													
<i>Comprehensive Operating Surplus</i>	\$8.0	\$0.1													
<i>Underlying operating surplus / (deficit) – Council Plan based</i>	(\$0.2)	(\$0.3)													

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Include any amount from BBV as an income in its 2022-23 budget and its Financial Plan; and 2. Consider this as a recurrent grant and include it in the calculation of the underlying result based on the Council Plan measure
		<p>(2) Royal Park Budget Design and Planning \$335,000 should have arguably been an amount beyond a delegated decision made by the CEO and required under Procurement Policy CP013 the following to have taken place.</p>	<p>Council's purchasing policy comes into operation when Council engage various suppliers. It does not apply when Council is identifying and allocating a project budget through the budget process.</p> <p>Council has not awarded a contract to a consultant for \$335,000, it is an allocation for the project in the 2022-23 draft budget. This is detailed below.</p> <p>Working within this project allocation, Council has undertaken an open tender process to procure the services of an architect to undertake the design development of the new Royal Park facility.</p> <p>The successful tender came in at under \$70,000. This amount sits within the CEO delegation set out in Councils procurement policy and within the total design project allocation.</p> <p>In implementing a decision that the Council made at 23 August 2018 Council meeting, the following two projects were included in the 2021-22 adopted budget,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. \$300,000, Royal Park changing rooms upgrade – design work based on the tourist park masterplan (design the proposed facility and subsequent changes to caravan park layout); and 2. \$60,000, Royal Park oval upgrade – scope and design (fencing, irrigation and lighting). <p>Subsequently; via the 2021-22 quarter 2 report presented to Council in February 2022, work estimated to be \$150,000 was carried over to the 2022-23 financial year.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			<p>And, via the 2021-22 quarter 3 report presented to Council in April 2022, further work estimated to be \$185,000 was carried over to the 2022-23 year. Council decided to identify these two projects as one project under the “Planning and design stage of Royal Park oval facility upgrade”.</p> <p>As a result of these changes due to the timing of work involved, a \$335,000 (\$150,000 + \$185,000) allocation was included in the 2022-23 draft budget as a project carried over from the 2021-22 financial year.</p> <p>Council has decided to defer this project and return the \$335,000 to a reserve account. This allocation will now come out of the 22-23 budget.</p>
9	Submitter 9	<p>(1) Evidence of community consultation-matching council plan to draft budget?</p> <p>1.a. On the surface there appears little alignment to the Council Plan and the budget priorities despite the Mayor’s claim.</p>	<p>Page 31 to 34 of the Draft Budget provide details about how the draft budget is linked to the Council plan.</p> <p>In addition, see Appendix B. for further details about the alignment of the Council Plan and the Draft Budget 2002-23.</p>
		<p>1.b. This particularly applies to Caravan Park upgrades. The planned Caravan Park Managerial Plan morphed into a high multi million investment plan that Councillors have rightly shown concern. The 2022/23 Draft has mysteriously increased the budgeted amount for Royal Park design now to \$335,000, \$35000 above the original budget allocation. This was a Park the community and council recommended had minimal change. It is normal to expect design, supervision and administration costs to represent around 10-12% of a project budget. It this planning and design cost is</p>	<p>Council has not identified or included any new projects based on the QTP review report in the draft budget for 2022-23. Officers are yet to make any recommendation for Councillors’ consideration.</p> <p>In implementing a decision that the Council made at 23 August 2018 Council meeting, the following two projects were included in the 2021-22 adopted budget</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. \$300,000, Royal Park changing rooms upgrade – design work based on the tourist park masterplan (design the proposed facility and subsequent changes to caravan park layout); and 2. \$60,000, Royal Park oval upgrade – scope and design (fencing, irrigation and lighting).

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>budgeted at \$335,000 this means the overall project budget is likely to be near \$3m.</p> <p>It is noted without a current Marine and Coastal Management Plan, and a requirement all new developments in flood prone areas are referred to the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority for review, such a budget is questionable without some basic scoping and low cost preliminary planning. With an architect tendered and engaged the QCA questions why pay for detailed design until budget monies are secured or that Councillors are fully aware of the significant costs and sources of finance. Engaging a Quantity Surveyor to help scope the budget could be done with a preliminary sketch. Again, Council Officers appear to be prompting projects without full community consultation and following good project initiation and project planning.</p>	<p>Subsequently; via the 2021-22 quarter 2 report presented to Council in February 2022, work estimated to be \$150,000 was carried over to the 2022-23 financial year.</p> <p>And, via the 2021-22 quarter 3 report presented to Council in April 2022, further work estimated to be \$185,000 was carried over to the 2022-23 year and decided to identify these two projects as one project under the “Planning and design stage of Royal Park oval facility upgrade”.</p> <p>As a result of these changes due to the timing of work involved, a \$335,000 (\$150,000 + \$185,000) now has been included in the 2022-23 draft budget as a project carried over from the 2021-22 financial year.</p> <p>Based on Council’s past experience with similar projects, the overall cost may be as high as \$3m to \$4m. Council is not in a position to confirm the overall project budget until the completion of planning and design work.</p> <p>Quantity surveyors are able to undertake surveys at any stage of planning however surveys of concept plans have low confidence due to the minimal detail. Detailed planning is important to determine project costs accurately and position council for consideration by State and Federal funding programs.</p> <p>Council is committed as it is always is to undertake engagement for the project which will involve stakeholders and the broader community.</p> <p>Council has decided to defer this project and return the \$335,000 to a reserve account. This allocation will now come out of the 22-23 budget.</p>
		<p>1.c. At present such projects are beset by inadequate performance metrics around project delivery e.g. time, cost, quality and scope. It is also not possible to see which projects are internally funded and which are grant</p>	<p>Council developed a Project Management Framework (PMF) in 2021 and any proposed project is assessed against this framework before it is included in Council’s financial budget. The framework considers the following aspects in evaluating a project;</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>dependent. These are crucial and fundamental transparency issues that Councillors need to be enquiring about.</p> <p>Commencing a project, the Master Plan for which had been archived for many years, based solely on money set aside in a budget, the Master Plan subsequently altered without broader community engagement, and without Councillor scrutiny in a public agenda, (1) how were applicants assessed and evaluated, (2) were there Officer conflicts, (3) is the community getting value for money, (4) have the needs of the broader community been considered in a balanced approach in the activation and shared use of outdoor spaces and infrastructure, (5) does the project align with the intentions of the CERP, (consumption, waste, circular economy, use of materials), in other words, does the project stack up?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the project align with the Council Plan and objectives and strategies? How? Which objectives? 2. Does this project implement an adopted strategy of Council? 3. Does the project meet and asset management requirements 4. What will be the benefits to the community and/or the Borough as a result of this project? 5. How will we define success? 6. What is the estimated life cycle cost of the project? <p>All new priority capital projects identified in the 2022-23 budget have been assessed against this framework.</p>
		<p>1.d Equally concerning is that a \$335,000 project design can be advanced without Councillor knowledge and a Council Agenda recommendation. To split elements of the project into 'delegation' funding allowances this sets an extremely poor precedent and governance model.</p>	<p>As covered under 8.2. above, Council has approved this project in adopting the 2021-22 budget.</p> <p>Council has followed and will always follow Council's procurement policy in engaging consultants and service providers to implement this project.</p>
		<p>1.e. 'In the 2021-22 budget Council has included funds for a review of the Tourist parks operating model, with a view to improve operational efficiencies and improve occupancy rates.'</p> <p>Who authorised a massive infrastructure project that contained 5 pages of Organisational</p>	<p>The QTP review recommends a number of operational changes, which would have greatest effect if they were supported by changes to the configuration of the parks and investment in park infrastructure.</p> <p>Officers are in the process of reviewing the Consultant's report to make appropriate recommendations to Council.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		improvements and 195 pages of Design work?	
		<p>1.f. In a public meeting of January 2020, CEO Martin Gill stated “there will be no new projects until the backlog of work has been completed. Has this been achieved? The QCA request Council to work with the community and identify that backlog of work, ranked by priorities, covering the next 10 years. The expertise and knowledge in the community appears to be discounted.</p>	<p>There are only three new capital projects in this year’s draft Capital works budget. The most significant of those (\$250,000) is the Hobson Street Public toilet facility, a project that QCA requested and supports.</p> <p>The other two projects are asset upgrade that address specific risks.</p>
		<p>(2) Perceived lack of adherence to asset management policy As part of this Policy it is recognised that-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear justification of forward works programmes and funding requirements; • Improved accountability over the use of public resources occurs <p>What evidence supports clear justification and improved accountability has taken place as per Policy?</p> <p>Under the AM Policy the CEO is required to-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure that accurate and reliable information is presented to Council for decision making. • To promote and inform asset management awareness of the Councillors. <p>In relation to major spend asset items has this taken place and clear priorities ranked and full information is provided to Councillors?</p>	<p>These matters have been addressed in the response above for 9.1.1.c.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		(3) Adherence to financial plan	
		3.a. The QCA requests evidence to support strategic actions have supported aspirations. In the context of toilet replacement or upgrades in Hesse St is evident and Princess Park has long been recognised by residents for an upgrade and repair.	The works currently included in the 2022-23 budget, except for the new toilet in Hobson St are in line with the BoQ toilet strategy. With the exception of the Hobson Street toilet, any proposed upgrade or replacement works will follow a planning process and be subject to future budget consideration.
		3.b. The Draft Budget commentary echoes concern of new projects and future cost impositions. How are these to be managed?	As stated in the Draft Financial Budget, most of the new priority projects identified are subject to the availability of external funding. Those projects will mainly target asset renewal requirements to avoid or minimise capital projects that will create new assets resulting in additional asset renewal requirements in the future. Please refer to additional comments provided under 9.1.1.c about Council's Project Management Framework.
		3.c. The QCA requests is there a detailed Plan for this, identifying all locations and specific sites to be targeted. This would be useful for community feedback and input.	As stated in the draft financial Plan, only high-level cost estimates, based on anticipated asset function, have been used and the scope and timing of these projects are subject to community consultations and detailed feasibility assessments. Council will only be able to identify specific location/site for each project after a detailed site assessment and community consultation process.
		3.d. Concerning, there is a trend towards infrastructure projects being funded by the Victorian and Commonwealth governments while ongoing maintenance is left to councils. In cases such as the Queenscliffe Hub and the Queenscliff Boat Ramp upgrade, Council will be obligated to maintain these expensive facilities but not provided with a revenue stream to do so. Council will continue to advocate to other	Council is always open to, and will pursue, grant funding opportunities that align with the objectives or strategic priorities set out in the Council Plan, and grants that fund projects that do not have a negative impact on the long term financial sustainability of Council. Council would welcome other funding if that funding recognises the recurring costs of maintenance and operation of new assets, and insulates our community from additional financial commitments that will reduce other service levels.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>levels of government to consider maintenance costs when new projects are being funded in our community. ‘</p> <p>Can the narrative be clearly explained in the Budget response. Is Council happy or not getting grant funding? It appears some projects are being questioned as future cost impositions. It is suggested community support for some grants has been lacking over the years while some are embraced. It is tantamount for Council to undertake full consultation and engagement on grant funded projects.</p> <p>Applying the same reasoning every new project Council undertakes or has recently completed from Netball Rooms to Gym upgrade would be beset by the same issues. On- going maintenance and Depreciation (which presumably is a non cash outflow). Perceptions from the community is that regular maintenance rarely occurs. Council should possible consider its staffing priority if this is the concern as consistently relayed in the above passages or that efforts are made to negotiate maintenance service streams from Government as part of grant funding.</p>	
		<p>(4) Responses from 21-22 budget submissions</p>	
		<p>4.a. The Heritage Review needs to be completed. Included in 2021-22 draft budget and the project will be completed in 2021-22.</p>	<p>The Heritage Review is completed and implementation has commenced.</p> <p>The Coastal and Marine Management Plan is not complete</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
		<p>The Coastal Management Plan needs to be Included in 2021-22 draft budget and the project will be completed in 2021-22.</p> <p>Both these appear still incomplete despite assurances.</p>	
		<p>4.b. It was regretted no further thoughts or plans were undertaken to promote undergrounding of powerlines to improve and heritage streetscapes and tree assets.</p>	<p>No undergrounding of power initiatives are currently proposed.</p> <p>Undergrounding of power is very expensive (e.g. the undergrounding of power Hesse St South cost \$240,000 for 210m) and so further investigation is required to identify the community benefits or other outcomes that would justify this diversion of limited funds from other asset renewal or upgrade.</p>
		<p>4.c. The QCA further recommend improved heritage services and funding to improve the heritage of Hesse St.</p>	<p>Council has a funding allocation in the operating budget to engage a heritage advisor on a as need basis.</p>
		<p>4.d. The QCA request the completion of the Traffic Management Plan and reduced whole town speed limits.</p>	<p>The Queenscliff Traffic Management Strategy is currently being undertaken within the 2021-22 budget. This project is reviewing traffic data within Queenscliff along with existing relevant strategies and plans with the objective of engaging with the community and developing key traffic management strategies.</p> <p>Council is also progressing an Active Transport Strategy for the Borough funded within the 2021-22 budget. The Active Transport Strategy will consider barriers to the use of active transport including the current speed limits of local roads within the Borough.</p>
		<p>4.e. The QCA request a Good Planning design manual and policy and a Standards Guide be created and enforced.</p>	<p>The Borough of Queenscliffe Planning Scheme incorporates 11 Urban Conservation Design Guidelines for heritage precincts throughout the Borough.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			<p>The Planning Scheme also has a Design and Development Overlay with five specific schedules that provide design standards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole township of Point Lonsdale • The whole township of Queenscliff <p>The Office of the Victorian Government Architect also provides good design guidelines which Council can reference:</p> <p>https://www.ovga.vic.gov.au/good-design-coast-issue-3</p> <p>https://www.ovga.vic.gov.au/good-design-heritage-issue-7</p>
		<p>4.f. The fine line referenced in last year's submission relating to Administration costs received the following reply-</p> <p>'This small gap is an inherent risk for the Borough of Queenscliffe due to the limited number of the ratepayers and the increasing requirements and statutory responsibilities set out in relevant legislation. 70% of Council's budget is expended providing services required under legislation. Council is well aware of this risk as acknowledged in the 2021-22 draft budget. Decisions that will create additional ongoing operational commitments will be taken only after a very detailed and comprehensive analysis of the financial implications of such decisions.'</p>	<p>Total recurrent operating expenses As stated in the draft budget 2022-23 , despite current economic challenges, excluding non-recurrent expense items and waste management expenses, there is only a \$149,000 (1.6%) increase in recurrent operating expenses (on an ongoing basis) in the 2022–23 proposed budget compared to the total operating expenses on the same basis as per the 2021–22 adopted budget.</p> <p>Employee cost It is not correct to simply compare employee cost between the 2022-23 draft budget and the forecasted employee cost for 2021-22. The projected employee cost for the 2021–22 financial year is underestimated due to the impact of temporary staff vacancies.</p> <p>As stated in the page 7 to 8 and page 57-58 of the 2022-23 draft budget,</p> <p>Employee cost is expected to increase only by \$105,000 compared to the employee cost as per the 2021–22 adopted budget. This increase includes the impact of the reclassification of a contractor (senior planner) to a permanent</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments																																																												
		<p>What evidence has supported ongoing analysis of such implications possibly in a period of increased wage costs?</p> <p>It is noted Food and Health inspections have no officer assigned. Is this a core Council function or legislated function? Compliance of Planning does not take place. Is that a legislated requirement?</p>	<p>part-time position. Excluding the impact of the senior planner reclassification, the total employee cost is estimated to be increased only by \$45,000 (0.9%) despite an estimated 2.5% (\$118,000) increase in wages due to EBA and super guarantee increases.</p> <p>Food and Health inspections “Environmental Health Officer” position is in the budget though this position was vacant at the time of finalising the draft budget (page 42 of the draft budget).</p> <p>A summary of the number of full time equivalent (FTE) Council staff in relation to human resources expenditure, categorised according to the organisational structure of Council, is included below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1115 598 1921 890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Description</th> <th>2022-23 FTE</th> <th>2023-24 FTE</th> <th>2024-25 FTE</th> <th>2025-26 FTE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Health and Wellbeing</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permanent – Full time</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>3.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacant/new positions</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permanent – Part time</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>8.9</td> <td>8.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Women</td> <td>7.4</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Men</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>0.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vacant/new positions</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Health and Wellbeing</td> <td>11.7</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>12.2</td> <td>12.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Environment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The employee cost of this position is included in the employee cost estimate for the 2022-23 financial year. This is a legislated core function of Council.</p> <p>“Municipal Health and Wellbeing Officer” is a new position Council had decided to create at the time of finalising the 2021-22 budget. This position has now been removed from the organisational structure.</p>	Description	2022-23 FTE	2023-24 FTE	2024-25 FTE	2025-26 FTE	Health and Wellbeing					Permanent – Full time	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	Women	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	Men	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	Vacant/new positions	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	Permanent – Part time	8.4	8.9	8.9	8.9	Women	7.4	8.0	8.0	8.0	Men	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	Vacant/new positions	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	Total Health and Wellbeing	11.7	12.2	12.2	12.2	Environment				
Description	2022-23 FTE	2023-24 FTE	2024-25 FTE	2025-26 FTE																																																											
Health and Wellbeing																																																															
Permanent – Full time	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3																																																											
Women	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3																																																											
Men	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5																																																											
Vacant/new positions	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5																																																											
Permanent – Part time	8.4	8.9	8.9	8.9																																																											
Women	7.4	8.0	8.0	8.0																																																											
Men	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3																																																											
Vacant/new positions	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6																																																											
Total Health and Wellbeing	11.7	12.2	12.2	12.2																																																											
Environment																																																															
		(5) Specific items in budget																																																													
		5.a. Unknown amounts in Reserves. Can these reserves be specified or identified transparently in the Budget and dollar amounts shown.	Movements in reserves are detailed on page 65 to 66 of the 2022-23 draft budget. Any movement in reserve balances are always reported to Council via quarterly financial reports.																																																												

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			<p>The projected balance of \$3,807,000 in the draft budget for projects carried forward to future years consists of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murray Road Land (sales proceeds) - \$3,500,000 • A park to focus on children and families - \$181,000 • ICT Transformation project - \$48,000 • Review of Planning Scheme - \$78,000 <p>This will be reflected in the updated budget.</p>
		5.b. How much is in Unallocated Cash Reserves/General Reserves?	The projected balance as at 30 June 2023 is \$1,119,000 , as detailed in page 65 of the 2022-23 draft budget
		5.c. Asset replacement reserves? Discretionary Reserves?	\$977,000 is the projected balance in the asset replacement reserve as at 30 June 2023 (page 65, 2022-23 draft budget)
		5.d. Crown Land reserves? Others? e.g.	Council does not have a crown land reserve, any income earned from Crown land is used within the same financial year against the expenses associated with crown land management (page 16 2022-23 draft budget)
		5.e. Can the BBV grant allocation for loss of Boat Ramp income be recognised as an income/revenue figure?	Covered under 8.1
		(6) Further budget matters	
		6.a. Why does the Budget continually neglect the warnings laid out in the Our Coast Study, especially for sections of the Borough highly susceptible to rising sea levels. The recent Federal election clearly identified the impacts of Climate Change as the electorate's primary focus and for action by Government to no longer be neglected or delayed.	<p>Council continues to work in collaboration with Bellarine and Bayside councils and relevant state Government agencies to prepare, plan and implement remediation and adaption strategies to address coastal inundation due to sea level rise.</p> <p>Council is currently working with CoGG and DEWLP to establish the Bellarine and Corio Bay Coastal Climate Adaptation Regional and Strategic Partnership (RASP).</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			<p>The RASP has been set up as a mechanism specifically designed to deal with cross-jurisdictional issues, to bring parties together to resolve coastal issues at state, regional or local levels.</p> <p>The aim is to work collaboratively with other stakeholder authorities to address the impacts of extreme weather events and issues associated with a changing climate and develop collaborative strategic resilience planning and adaptation responses.</p> <p>Council also notes that the modelling output from Our Coast study have been a key consideration for new capital works. A couple of examples have been listed below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gravity stormwater outlet in Bay Street has been removed and replaced with a pumped stormwater system to remove the conditions for inundation from high sea level and storm surge. • Acting as the eventual asset manager, Council required the Boat Ramp to be designed in line with the learnings from the Our Coast study to ensure it complements other, future works to protect against sea level rise and storm surge. • Similarly the learnings of Our Coast informed the design of the renewal of sheet pile at Fisherman’s Wharf
		<p>6.b. We have implemented a CERP. This needs to be formalised into the BOQ Planning Scheme and for any development, new build or construction to identify and include climate responsible attributes and elements in its design.</p>	<p>The National Construction Code (NCC) is the appropriate regulatory mechanism to implement ESD principles. Council has been involved in advocacy during the review of the NCC review through Climate Emergency Australia.</p> <p>Council is also now working with the Council Alliance for Sustainable Built Environment and the Victorian Greenhouse Alliances to support a State Election advocacy project which is seeking to secure commitment from all parties to improve the response of the state planning system to climate change.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers Comments
			https://www.naga.org.au/advocacy.html
		<p>6.c. Is there a pathway in the Budget to comprehensively 'green' the Borough through the planting of trees and the overhaul and improvement of existing or potential garden spaces throughout the Borough.</p>	<p>Council allocates annual funds for tree planting.</p> <p>Council is in the process of planning 300 trees within the Borough as part of the annual street tree planning program and as replacements for lost storm damaged trees.</p> <p>In addition to these trees, Council along with partnering organisations plants thousands of plants, shrubs and ground covers within the Borough's coastal foreshore reserves. These have been reported on within past annual reports.</p>

Appendix A : Heritage Review Implementation



15.2 Heritage Review Implementation

File: QG-290-05-04
Author: Strategic Planner
Portfolio: Planning & Heritage
Portfolio Holder: Cr Grout

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the implementation of the recommendations made in the 2020 Heritage Review, undertaken by Lovell Chen.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Portfolio 4 in the draft 2021–2025 Council Plan talks specifically to the protection of our distinctive heritage values in the Borough of Queenscliffe.

In 2020 a comprehensive review of the 1984 *Queenscliffe Urban Conservation Study* was completed by Lovell Chen and adopted by Council at its Ordinary Meeting on 17 September 2020. This report seeks to update Council on the timing and next steps associated with the implementation of this work.

The first stage of work is associated with the preparation of planning scheme amendments C37quen and C39quen. These amendments implement recommendations contained in the Lovell Chen report that do not require further investigation or analysis. These amendments will introduce the Avenue of Honour into the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay and make a number of minor corrections and amendments to the Heritage Overlay schedule and mapping.

The remaining work associated with implementing the Lovell Chen work will be undertaken the two separate stages.

Stage 2 consists of investigation of existing heritage overlays in the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme. Existing precincts and individual listings will be reviewed in further detail as per the 2020 Lovell Chen recommendations.

Stage 3 consists of investigations and planning scheme amendment associated with the introduction of new heritage precinct or individual overlays in the Borough. The aim of this work is to expand, where required and justifiable, the coverage of the Heritage Overlay to ensure that the heritage register in the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme is as up to date as possible.

A timeline for critical next steps is identified in discussion section of this report.



Councillors Grout / Grigau

That Council notes and receives this report on the status of the heritage work plan.

Carried



REPORT

BACKGROUND

At its Ordinary Meeting of Council on 17 September 2020, Council resolved to adopt the Heritage Review (2020), prepared by Lovell Chen and progress the implementation of the study.

The resolution required officers to provide a work plan to Council by September 2021.

This report seeks to update Council on the current status of implementing this work as well as a proposed work plan for the next steps associated with implementation.

DISCUSSION

Progress on implementing the Lovell Chen study (LCS) has been severely affected by a number of factors. These include the refocus of resources to the completion of the Coastal and Marine Management Plan, the restrictions imposed by COVID-19 pandemic and an organisational realignment which sought to allow Council's senior officers to dedicate time to the strategic work plan. With this in mind the following update is provided.

Lovell Chen Study Status

This work is complete as far as practical. Officers have finalised changes where possible with the objective of finalising contractual requirements with Lovell Chen. Because of the quality of the initial work, this has proved challenging and will need to be refined further as part of the heritage work plan as detailed further below.

Stage 1 – Planning Scheme Amendment C37quen and C39quen to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme

This is the first planning scheme amendment implementing the LCS recommendations. Council officers have drafted Planning Scheme Amendment C37quen and C39quen. Amendment C37quen will implement all items in the Lovell Chen report which do not require further investigation. C37quen proposes to make corrections to Heritage Overlay (HO) numbering, correctly map two individually listed Norfolk Pine trees, corrects spelling errors, reorders the Schedule to the HO for ease of reference and removes individual HO listings on buildings that have been demolished.

Amendment C39quen proposes to apply the Heritage Overlay over approximately 32 original and replacement Cypress trees identified in the Heritage Review 2020 as the Queenscliffe Avenue of Honour.

It is critical to note that this work cannot be progressed until Planning Scheme Amendment C38quen is published in the Government Gazette by the Minister for Planning. By way of explanation, the Planning Minister prepared VC148 for all Victorian Planning Schemes. VC148, amongst other changes, proposed a new Planning Policy Framework (PPF) and integrated state, regional and local planning policy in all Victorian planning schemes.



Council Officers worked with the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) to complete the policy integration required by VC148. The resultant changes, defined as Amendment C38quen, will have an impact on the manner in which heritage protection policy is translated in the planning scheme. More specifically, the heritage precincts currently nominated in the local policy section of the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme, will be transferred to Clause 72 of the planning scheme.

Future work plan to implement the LCS

Stage 2 – Investigation of existing precinct and individual Heritage Overlays

The second phase to the implementation of the Lovell Chen work is mainly a review of the current heritage precinct boundaries to determine whether amalgamation and/or boundary realignment of precincts are required. The investigation must be undertaken by a qualified heritage advisor and, should changes be necessary, will require updated precinct citations and amendments to the Schedule to the Heritage Overlay.

As a result of recent planning permit applications, officers are intending to break this stage down further into Stage 2A, 2B (and so on) beginning with a review of the recommendations of the LCS in relation to the Fisherman's Flat precinct. The aim of this would be to expedite consideration of the recommendations of the LCS, for this precinct, as a priority. This would enable the correction of any errors and/or changes that may be required and translate these into the planning scheme as quickly as practical, where appropriate.

Officers will brief Council on the detailed scope and timelines associated with this work separately. However, the following steps and broad outline of timing associated with a "Stage 2A" has been provided below in order to give an indication of current expectations:

Task	Timelines
1. Development of brief	By December 2021
2. Tender process	Jan – March 2022
3. Appointment of preferred tenderer	April 2022
4. Investigations period and community engagement	May – November 2022
5. Preparation of amendments to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme	Dec 2022 – February 2023 (subject to feedback from preferred tenderer)
6. Authorisation and exhibition of amendments to the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme	March 2023



These timelines would be subject to feedback and discussion subsequent to the appointment of an appropriate heritage consultant. The timeline could be reduced with reduced community consultation however, in light of the passion residents of Fisherman's Flat have for the area, officers consider that it is prudent to leave as much time as possible for engagement to occur while balancing the need to get the changes into the planning scheme as quickly as possible.

Stage 3: Future heritage precincts and individual sites – identification and planning scheme amendment

The Lovell Chen report made a number of recommendations that require further work prior to translation into the planning scheme via a planning scheme amendment.

The LCS identified potential heritage value in 28 buildings, 8 gardens and 12 trees in Queenscliff and 11 buildings and 10 trees in Point Lonsdale and The Springs. The LCS did not investigate and confirm whether a heritage overlay could be justified for these properties and, as such, these sites form the basis of the third tranche of work required.

The steps associated with this work are similar to those above however would need to be dovetailed with the completion of the work on the existing overlays. For this reason, Stage 3 work is not anticipated to commence until at least January 2023 subject to further discussion and feedback with councillors on the strategic work plan

Options

- Option 1 – That Council note the update report.
- Option 2 – That Council resolve to adopt a modified recommendation.
- Option 3 – That Council refuse to adopt the recommendation.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT

Community Engagement



Community engagement will be in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 – Amendment of planning schemes in the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

Collaboration

Council officers will actively collaborate with officers from DELWP during the preparation and exhibition of planning scheme amendment C37quen. In addition consultation with the community will be part of the planning scheme amendment process.



GOVERNANCE CONTEXT

Relevant Law

Amendments to the planning scheme must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning & Environment Act 1987*.

Charter of Human Rights

This report has had consideration to, and complies with, the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

Gender Equality Act 2020

The *Gender Equality Act 2020* requires a Gender Impact Assessment to be undertaken when Council develops or reviews any Council policy, program or service that has a direct and significant impact on the public.

As this is an update report only on the Heritage Review a Gender Impact Assessment is not required to be performed.

Regional, State and National Plans and Policies

- Victorian Planning Provisions
- Applying the Heritage Overlay – Planning Practice Note 1 (August 2018)
- Ministerial Direction – *the form and content of planning schemes*
- Ministerial Direction No. 15 – *The Planning Scheme Amendment Process*

Council Plan Alignment

The Strategic Objective for Portfolio 4: Heritage, planning and infrastructure in the draft Council Plan 2021–2025 is as follows:

To protect our distinctive coastal, cultural and built environment, and provide sustainable, suitable infrastructure.

The priorities, nominated in the Council plan, that support implementation of recommendations of the LCS report are:

- *Enhance planning controls to protect neighbourhood character and promote environmentally sustainable design.*
- *Maintain and promote military, maritime and historic features on Council-managed land.*

Legal and Risk Implications

Exhibition of planning scheme amendments C37quen and C39quen is subject to the notice provisions of the *Planning and Environment 1987*. This will enable the community to make submissions which Council must consider. If Council is not able to resolve submissions, the amendment must be referred to a Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning.

Related Documents



The further work proposed in this report is based upon recommendations made within the *Borough of Queenscliffe Planning Scheme Review Volumes 1, 2, 3 & 4* (Lovell Chen, October 2021).

Disclosure of Interest

No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any conflicts of interest.

CONSIDERATIONS

Environmental Sustainability

There are no significant issues of environmental sustainability associated with the proposed planning scheme amendments.

Financial and resource implications

Funding for Stage 2 of the Heritage Review has been allocated in the annual budget.

Innovation and Continuous Improvement

Planning scheme amendments are an active demonstration of the need to innovate and improve based on the tools made available by the Minister for Planning to ensure that the Queenscliffe Planning Scheme remains current.

IMPLEMENTATION

Operational Impacts

Council's Strategic Planner and Director Place are responsible for the work nominated in this report.

Implementation Process

The implementation tasks and timeline for both planning scheme amendment C37quen and C39quen will be in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning & Environment Act 1987*.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil.

Appendix B: Evidence of community consultation matching Council Plan

Council Plan Action	2022-23 Draft Budget	
	Operational	Capital
Provide the Commonwealth Home Support Program	✓	
Continue to implement Council's obligations under the <i>Gender Equality Act 2020</i> and actions in our Gender Equality Action Plan	✓	
Promote and Implement Respect 2040	✓	
Facilitate and promote activities that reduce social isolation	✓	
Facilitate the regular meeting of the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC) and annual review of the EMP's work in collaboration with Regional MEMPC	✓	
Review Council strategy, policy and operational documents and amend to incorporate the objectives of the <i>Wadawurrung Healthy Country Plan</i>	✓	
Implement the short-term actions in the Borough of Queenscliffe Climate Emergency Response Plan	✓	✓
Finalise scope of Integrated Water Management Plan	✓	
Prepare Vegetation Management Policy	✓	
Develop the <i>Shop Local</i> campaign	✓	
Further streamline Council permit processes	✓	
Advocate for faster and more reliable digital services to facilitate new economic opportunities and work from home options	✓	
Work with Tourism Greater Geelong and The Bellarine to market the Borough of Queenscliffe and its tourism point of difference	✓	
Amend and update the Planning Scheme to incorporate recommendations of the Heritage Review	✓	

Council Plan Action	2022-23 Draft Budget	
	Operational	Capital
Development of a Coastal and Marine Management Plan (CMMP)	✓	
Partner with Wadawurrung Traditional Owners to develop a Reconciliation Action Plan for the Borough as accredited by Reconciliation Australia	✓	
Implement ICT Strategy	✓	✓
Participate in the G21 Integrated Transport Strategy	✓	
Continue to stream and record Council meetings for access via the website	✓	
Make submissions to key government policy initiative that align with the Community Vision and Council Plan	✓	
Contribute to the delivery of the Strategic Plan for prevention and addressing violence against women and children in the G21 region	✓	
Continue to advocate for the inclusion of Lakers Cutting in the Swan Bay Ramsar wetlands.	✓	
Collaborate with the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority to implement the Borough of Queenscliffe Priority Directions in the Regional Catchment Management Strategy	✓	
Implement the Public Toilet Strategy		✓
Complete and implement an Active Transport Strategy	✓	