

Council Meeting Minutes

TUESDAY 1 SEPTEMBER 2020

**Council Chamber (and by video conferencing)
273 Main Street
commencing at 6.00 pm**

Councillors John White (Mayor), Ben Buckley, Richard Ellis (via Skype), Natalie O'Connell (via Skype), Marianne Pelz, Mark Reeves, Joe Rettino and Colin Toohey

Officers Anthony Basford via Skype (Chief Executive Officer), Fiona Weigall via Skype (General Manager Assets and Environment), Stuart McConnell via Skype (General Manager Bushfire Recovery) Peter Cannizzaro (General Manager Business Excellence), Jodie Pitkin via Skype (General Manager Place and Community), and Vanessa Hack via Skype (Governance Administration Officer).

Our Vision

East Gippsland is the most liveable region in Australia. A place of natural beauty, enviable lifestyles, and opportunities.

Our Mission

A leading local government that works together with our communities to make East Gippsland the most liveable region in Australia.

Our Values

Accountability

We will take responsibility for our actions and decisions in an open and transparent way.

Inclusion

We will be accessible and active in engaging with our community. We will invite, listen to and seek to understand the views of others, and proactively share information about Council's plans, projects, services and activities.

Integrity

We will honour our commitments and conduct ourselves in an honest, ethical way.

Respect

We will value, support and help to develop our diverse community. We will respect the views and contributions of others and act with courtesy and consideration in all our interactions.

Resourcefulness

We will turn the challenges faced by our community into opportunities by being flexible and innovative in our response. We will actively seek better and more cost-effective ways to achieve the best outcomes for East Gippsland

Index

1.	Procedural.....	2302
1.1	Opening and Recognition of Traditional Custodians	2302
1.2	Apologies	2303
1.3	Declaration of Conflict of Interest.....	2303
1.4	Confirmation of minutes	2303
1.5	Next meeting	2303
1.6	Requests for leave of absence	2304
1.7	Requests to speak about your Community Project	2305
1.8	Public question time.....	2305
1.9	Record of Assemblies of Councillors	2306
1.10	Petitions	2309
	1.10.1 Petition - Planning application for duplexes in Glendon Drive Eastwood	2309
2	Notices of Motion and/or Rescission.....	2312
3	Deferred Business.....	2312
3.1	Councillor and Delegate Reports.....	2312
4	Councillor and Delegate Reports	2312
4.1	Cr Richard Ellis	2312
4.2	Cr Natalie O'Connell	2312
4.3	Cr Colin Toohey	2312
4.4	Cr Joe Rettino	2312
4.5	Cr Mark Reeves	2312
4.6	Cr Ben Buckley	2312
4.7	Cr Marianne Pelz	2312
4.8	Cr John White	2312
5	Officer Reports	2318
5.1	A Liveable Region.....	2318
	5.1.1 Addendum to Bullock Island Master Plan	2318
	5.1.2 Planning Permit Applications – Glendon Drive, Eastwood – Eight applications relating to eight lots, each proposal being for Development of Two Dwellings on a lot	2323
5.2	A Growing Region of Opportunities	2345
	5.2.1 Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Round Two 2019-2020 and Round One 2020-2021 Assessment.....	2345
5.3	Good Governance.....	2356
	5.3.1 Drone (Remote Piloted Aircraft) Policy Review	2356
6	Urgent and Other Business.....	2360
7	Confidential Business	2360

8 Close of meeting2360

Anthony Basford
Chief Executive Officer

1. Procedural

1.1 Opening and Recognition of Traditional Custodians

Welcome to East Gippsland Shire Council's Ordinary Council meeting of 1 September 2020.

Effective from 1 May 2020, amendments to the *Local Government Act 2020*, allows virtual council meetings to ensure decision making can continue during the coronavirus pandemic.

The Council meeting must be livestreamed.

East Gippsland Shire Council will livestream, record and publish its meeting via webcasting to enhance the accessibility of the meetings to the broader East Gippsland community. These recordings are archived and available for viewing by the public or used for publicity or information purposes.

Pre-recorded videos for public questions and requests to speak on an agenda item, submitted in the correct form prior to the Council meeting, will be played at the appropriate time during the meeting and included in the recording of the meeting.

No other person has the right to record Council meetings unless approval has been granted by the Chair.

As per the Minister's Good Practice Guideline issued by the Minister for Local Government on 29 April 2020, the intention is to ensure the normal ordinary business of council can continue through the use of electronic communication.

A member's attendance can only be recorded as present where the member can confirm that they meet all three of the following:

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

Councillors must confirm all of the above conditions to be noted as present for the meeting.

A quorum will not be made if these conditions are not met and the meeting will be adjourned until a quorum is met or postponed if a quorum cannot be met.

If technical difficulties are encountered by Council during the meeting including with the livestreaming, we will adjourn until resolution of the issue or postpone to later time and/or date.

I will now confirm with each Councillor, in turn, that they can see, hear and be heard by each other and to note assurance from each that the location they are participating from is secure to ensure deliberations are confidential Cr Ellis and Cr O'Connell:

- Can you see and hear us?

- Can you confirm that the location you are participating from is secure to ensure deliberations are confidential?

Councillors Ellis and O'Connell confirmed.

The Victorian Government announced on 23 April 2020 amendments to the *COVID-19 Omnibus (Emergency Measures) Bill 2020*, which relates to the *Local Government Act 2020*, allowing Council meetings to be conducted by electronic means (video conferencing from 1 May 2020 until 1 November 2020). The amendments have provisioned that Councillors will be able to electronically attend Council meetings and the requirement that Council meetings be open to the public will be satisfied where the meeting is live streamed. The amendments do not inhibit Councillors from attending a meeting in person in the Council chamber.

Members of the public are invited to view the Council Meeting livestreamed by following the link on Council's website or Facebook page.

On behalf of Council, I would like to acknowledge the Gunaikurnai People, the traditional owners of the land on which we are gathered and pay our respects to their elders both past and present.

1.2 Apologies

Cr Jackson Roberts

1.3 Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Cr Natalie O'Connell declared an indirect conflict of interest for item 5.2.1 *Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Round Two 2019-2020 and Round One 2020-2021 Assessment* due to her husband being a possible beneficiary from the round one 2020/21 of funding.

Cr Joe Rettino declared an indirect conflict of interest for item 5.1.1 *Addendum to Bullock Island Master Plan* due to being part of the working group, as part of his employment with TAFE Gippsland, that helped develop the addendum content for Bullock Island.

Anthony Basford, Chief Executive Officer declared an indirect conflict of interest for item 1.10.1 *Petition - Planning application for duplexes in Glendon Drive Eastwood* and item 5.1.2 *Planning Permit Applications – Glendon Drive, Eastwood – Eight applications relating to eight lots, each proposal being for Development of Two Dwellings on a lot* due to living in close proximity of the proposed development.

1.4 Confirmation of minutes

Cr Joe Rettino / Cr Mark Reeves

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 25 AUGUST 2020 BE CONFIRMED.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

1.5 Next meeting

Ordinary Council Meeting, 15 September be held at the Corporate Centre, 273 Main Street, Bairnsdale commencing at 6.00 pm.

1.6 Requests for leave of absence

Nil

1.7 Requests to speak about your Community Project

Nil

1.8 Public question time

Nil

1.9 Record of Assemblies of Councillors

1.9.1 Assemblies of Councillors – July / August 2020

Authored by Michelle Ingram, Governance and Compliance Officer

Endorsed by Peter Cannizzaro, General Manager Business Excellence

Document No 8620714

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with section 80A(2) of *the Local Government Act 1989* (the Act), this report provides a summary record of assemblies of Councillors held during the period 28 July to 20 August 2020, refer to table below. Also included in the report are four records from 17 February 2020, 20 April 2020, 11 May 2020 and 15 June 2020, not previously presented.

The assemblies of Councillors covered by this report are as follows:

Assembly of Councillors meetings:	Meeting date:
Councillor Briefing	28 July 2020 4 August 2020 11 August 2020 18 August 2020
Councillor Only Time	28 July 2020 4 August 2020 11 August 2020 18 August 2020
East Gippsland Shire Council – Disability Advisory Committee	3 August 2020
East Gippsland Shire Council Section 223 Committee – Draft Budget 2020/21	11 August 2020
East Gippsland Shire Council Planning Consultation Meeting – Planning Permit Application 83/2020/P	11 August 2020
East Gippsland Shire Council East Gippsland Drought Reference Group	17 February 2020 20 April 2020 15 June 2020 10 August 2020
East Gippsland Shire Council Livestock Exchange Consultative Committee	11 May 2020

A copy of the formal record for each of these assemblies of Councillors is provided at **Appendix 1**.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council notes the record of assemblies of Councillors that occurred during the period 28 July to 20 August 2020, together with four records not previously presented from 17 February 2020, 20 April 2020, 11 May 2020 and 15 June 2020, as provided at Appendix 1.

Cr Joe Rettino / Cr Ben Buckley

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT / CONTEXT

Discussion

As required by the Act, this report presents a formal record of assemblies of Councillors held during the period 28 July to 20 August 2020, together with four records from 17 February 2020, 20 April 2020, 11 May 2020 and 15 June 2020.

An assembly of Councillors is defined as a meeting at which matters are considered that are intended or likely to be the subject of a Council decision or the exercise of a delegated authority which is either of the following:

- A meeting of an advisory committee where at least one Councillor is present; or
- A planned or scheduled meeting that includes at least half the Councillors and at least one Council officer.

Organisational

- **Financial**

There are no financial implications for Council arising from this report.

Climate Change

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following Climate Change function/category:

Corporate/Strategic/Council Plan: Consideration is given to climate change in corporate, strategic or council plan(s) and includes responses to direct and indirect impacts.

Council Plan

Good Governance Goal 1 East Gippsland Shire Council is inclusive, engaged and open.

Legislation

On 24 March 2020 the Government passed the *Local Government Act 2020* (the new Act). Provisions from the new Act are being commenced in four stages. The first tranche of provisions commenced on 6 April 2020 with other tranches commencing on 1 May 2020 and 24 October 2020. All remaining provisions are commencing on 1 July 2021. The *Local Government Act 1989* applies in circumstances where the new Act has not commenced.

The East Gippsland Shire Council is required to make decisions under both Acts as the transition occurs. Council has implemented mechanisms to ensure decisions are made according to the relevant provisions of either the *Local Government Act 1989* or the *Local Government Act 2020* as in force at the date of the decision.

This report has been prepared in accordance with *Local Government Act 1989* s80A and s80A(2). S80A sets out the requirements Councils must observe in respect of assemblies of Councillors and s80A(2) requires the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that as soon as practicable after any meeting that is an assembly of Councillors under the Act, a written record of the meeting is reported at an ordinary meeting of Council and incorporated in the minutes of that meeting. The Act also specifies the type of information to be provided in the written record.

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights detailed in the Victorian Government's *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Appendices

1. Assemblies of Councillors records

Attachments

Nil

Conflict of Interest

Anthony Basford, Chief Executive Officer having declared a conflict of interest in item 1.10.1, left the meeting at 6.10 pm and was absent during discussion on this item.

1.10 Petitions

1.10.1 Petition - Planning application for duplexes in Glendon Drive Eastwood

Authored by Patricia Clive, Governance and Compliance Coordinator

Endorsed by Peter Cannizzaro, General Manager Business Excellence

Document No 8629105

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report informs Council of a petition submitted by Mr Wayne Stagg on behalf of residents of Eastwood objecting to the State Government's intention to develop a cluster of five duplex dwellings on a single residential block in Glendon Drive Eastwood. The petition is seeking council to vote against the proposal and to advise the Department of Health and Human Services to seek a location in keeping with its own policies and guidelines.

The petition contains the following:

This petition of the residents of Eastwood (3875) in the State of Victoria, draws the councillors attention to the State Governments intention to develop a cluster of five Duplex dwellings (residents) on single residential blocks in Glendon Drive, Eastwood (in addition to a department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) family crisis centre). This will result in, approximately 60% of this two hundred meter long residential street being occupied by DHHS facilities. This is inconsistent with the Government's own Public Housing Renewal Program guidelines and the findings of the Parliamentary inquiry into the Adequacy and Future Directors of Public Housing in Victoria (2010).

The petitioners therefore request that councillors should vote against the proposal in its present format and should advice DHHS to follow its own policy and guidelines and find other more suitable locations where public housing can be dispersed indistinguishably, to achieve the Government's goal of sensible community assimilation.

A letter has been sent to Mr Stagg acknowledging receipt of the petition.

Governance Rule 7.7(6) stipulate that a petition relating to a planning matter which is subject to a public submission process in accordance with the relevant legislation will be treated as a joint submission in relation to the planning matter. The planning proposal in a matter listed for consideration at this Council meeting and forms part of the Planning Officers report.

NOTE: Councillors have been provided a copy of the petition separately. In the interests of respecting the privacy of signatories, and in accordance with the Privacy and Data Protection Act 2014, a copy of the petition has not been included with this report.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. *receives the petition lodged by Mr Wayne Stagg on behalf of the residents of Eastwood requesting Council to vote against the proposal to develop a cluster of duplex dwellings in Glendon Drive Eastwood*
2. *notes that the matter is listed for consideration at this Council meeting and forms part of the Planning Officers report.*

Cr Colin Toohey / Cr Mark Reeves

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT / CONTEXT

Discussion

A petition from Mr Wayne Stagg requesting Council on behalf of residents of Eastwood objecting to the State Government's intention to develop a cluster of five duplex dwellings on a single residential block in Glendon Drive Eastwood was received by Council on 24 August 2020. The petition, with 80 signatures, is seeking council to vote against the proposal in its present format and to advise the Department of Health and Human Services to seek a location in keeping with its own policies and guidelines. The planning proposal is a matter listed for consideration at this Council meeting and forms part of the Planning Officers report.

In the interests of respecting the privacy of the petition's signatories, a copy of the full documentation received with the petition is not presented with this report but has been circulated to councillors separately.

Council Policy

Strategic Goal 4.1 in the Council Plan 2017-2021 is, "East Gippsland Shire Council is inclusive, engaged and open."

The petition has been received and presented in accordance with Governance Rule 7.7. As the petition relates to a planning matter being addressed in the relevant Planning Officer's report in the agenda for the Council Meeting being held on 1 September 2020.

Legislation

On 24 March 2020 the Government passed the *Local Government Act 2020* (the new Act). Provisions from the new Act are being commenced in four stages. The first tranche of provisions commenced on 6 April 2020 with other tranches commencing on 1 May 2020 and 24 October 2020. All remaining provisions are commencing on 1 July 2021. The *Local Government Act 1989* applies in circumstances where the new Act has not commenced.

The East Gippsland Shire Council is required to make decisions under both Acts as the transition occurs. Council has implemented mechanisms to ensure decisions are made according to the relevant provisions of either the *Local Government Act 1989* or the *Local Government Act 2020* as in force at the date of the decision.

This report has been prepared in accordance with section 60 *Local Government Act 2020* which requires Council to maintain Governance Rules for the conduct of Council meetings. The Governance Rules outline the process for petitions.

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights detailed in the Victorian Government's *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

Organisational

- **Financial**

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

Climate Change

There is no perceived climate change impact associated with the adoption of the governance arrangements.

Consultation

No consultation was undertaken in respect of the recommendations of this report.

Conflict of interest

The Officer preparing this report has no conflict of interest to declare.

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Nil

Attendance

Anthony Basford returned to the meeting at 6.14 pm

2 Notices of Motion and/or Rescission

Nil

3 Deferred Business

3.1 Councillor and Delegate Reports

Note This item was deferred at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Tuesday 25 August 2020 to allow Councillors to provide a substantial report at the Council meeting scheduled for Tuesday 1 September 2020. This item will be considered at item 4.

4 Councillor and Delegate Reports

4.1 Cr Richard Ellis

Cr Ellis spoke to his written report at folio 2312.

4.2 Cr Natalie O'Connell

Cr O'Connell spoke to her written report at folio 2313.

4.3 Cr Colin Toohey

Cr Toohey spoke to his written report at folio 2313.

4.4 Cr Joe Rettino

Cr Rettino spoke to his written report at folio 2313.

4.5 Cr Mark Reeves

Cr Reeves focussed his report on an article in the latest Snowy River Mail where they wrote of the recent funding announcements for bush fire recovery and redevelopment.

4.6 Cr Ben Buckley

Cr Buckley focussed his report on how well his local community are coping with the COVID-19 restrictions.

4.7 Cr Marianne Pelz

Cr Pelz spoke to her written report at folio 2314.

4.8 Cr John White

Cr White spoke to his written report at folio 2315.

COUNCILLOR WRITTEN REPORT

Cr Richard Ellis

First and foremost, I would like to welcome everyone who may be viewing the streaming of our “remote Ordinary Meeting” streamed live from the Chamber in Bairnsdale this evening.

After experiencing the pleasure of a return to the Chamber last month I have now found I am back attending the meeting remotely due to the more recent COVID – 19 directions for state officers and representatives under the DELWP umbrella. Hopefully I may gain another opportunity to attend the Chamber before the end of this Council term.

Having run through the activities recorded in my diary the majority of which have been cancelled or held remotely it is easy to reflect on how different a world we are currently operating in as I have previously observed.

Now accustomed to teleconferencing and working from home I would like to mention the following community contacts which are all associated with matters I have brought to the Council’s attention hopefully with some success.

Firstly, my congratulations go to Ms Bianca Basset and Mrs Brenda Murray for being appointed Chair and Deputy Chair of Councils recently renamed Disability Advisory Committee. I wish them the very best in leading the recently reformed and populated committee.

Importantly Meeting with the State Architect’s Advisory Panel and Council’s Architect to discuss the renewed Jemmy’s Point Lookout Facility concept plan prepared at the request of Council after the first concept plan was rejected by Council. I was pleased to be given the opportunity by the Panel’s Chair to address the Panel and advise them and our architect of the importance of Jemmy’s Point to the history and community of Lakes Entrance highlighting the fishing industry and oil industry. Points that had not been taken on board by our architect or the panel. Prior to speaking the panel had principally directed their interest to the association of the site with the local aboriginal clans’ and its native vegetation. I concluded by stressing the need for any proposed facility to possess a Wow factor incorporating attractions such as an interpretive area, recognition of our first peoples, quality meeting spaces and food service – an economic benefit to the region. A simple viewing platform was not what was sort. I do hope that that message is relayed back to Council by the community in the short and arguably restricted community consultation process currently being run on council’s website.

I should add that the attention of the Panel was probably a first for East Gippsland and I would like to thank Mr Watson, Architect and Council Officers for being able to engage the interest of the Panel. It is to be hoped that the Panel members get the opportunity to visit our region in the future.

Partaking in the Public consultation process conducted by the Marine and Coastal Authority chaired by Anthony Boxshall in forming the new Marine and Coastal Strategy document. The strategy is to replace the current Victorian Coastal Strategy and is an important statewide planning document.

Attending the executive meetings of the Australian Coastal Councils Association.

Attending the Timber Towns Victoria general monthly meeting and taking part in the discussions held in regard to the negative impacts of recent government decisions upon the future of our some of our communities associated with the timber industry and of course the negative impact upon our regional economy.

Attending and Chairing Council's Marina Advisory Committee where issues relating to the management of Council's marinas and moorings were addressed.

Attending and Chairing meetings of the Gippsland Waste Resource and Recovery Group Board and further attending the quarterly Waste Forum meeting arranged by that group which involved all six Gippsland Councils.

Attending several Planning Consultation Meetings over the month.

Meeting and conversing with a number of Community Groups and interests across our wider Shire, including members of the recently formed Bullock Island Development Inc Group headed by Messrs Munns, Jones and Butler-Cole

Cr Natalie O'Connell

During the last month I have attended via video conferencing two Chief Executive Officer (CEO) performance and remuneration committee meetings – these have been in relation to the CEO's annual review and also for reviewing Expressions of Interest candidates for the role of the chair for the CEO performance and remuneration committee going forward. I along with the Mayor also interviewed prospective candidates to fulfill the role of independent chair for the CEO performance and remuneration committee meetings.

I am also attending weekly Omeo MTB meetings in relation to the marketing and branding of the Omeo MTB Park. We have now secured a marketing agency and look forward to seeing community consultation and brand/logo development. The meetings also involve business and investment as well as trail construction.

I'd also like to acknowledge the three grade six students from Omeo Primary School who watched last week's meeting via livestream to complete part of their Junior Rotary Award. They were Grace Anstey, Ryli Ayton and Henry Thorne.

Cr Colin Toohey

04/08/20	Onsite meeting at Deptford Road re:- Planning Application – 123/2020/P
12/08/20	CEO Performance and Remuneration Committee meeting
14/08/20	Marina Consultative Committee Meeting
18/08/20	CEO Performance and Remuneration Committee meeting
21/08/20	Received Petition from Eastwood residents re:- Glendon Drive
24/08/20	Planning Consultation Meeting - 17 Forge Creek Road, Eagle Point

Cr Joe Rettino

Date	Report Item
15/07/20	Telstra 5g Webinar: Councillor O'Connell, Mayor and I attended this 5g Webinar hosted by Telstra Gippsland's Regional Manager Lorretta Williton. The briefing session was designed to keep the community and community leaders informed with the latest information on the relevant Australian Safety Standards and compliance relating to 5G. As Telstra rollout 5G across Australia, some people have raised concerns about this technology. There have been numerous misleading and controversial pieces of information circulating and Telstra wanted to provide an opportunity to hear from experts, who will provide information on the

	<p>research and facts. Also, in attendance from Telstra</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michelle Fuge – Community Engagement and Governance Manager • Mike Wood – Electromagnetic energy (EME) Strategy Manager
11/08/20	<p>East Gippsland Shire Council Audit and Risk Committee: I attended the final ARC meeting on the 11th. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank all the external members that make up this important oversight committee work so well in its independent oversight charter.</p>
17/08/20	<p>East Gippsland Shire Council Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC): I attended the final EDAC meeting this week. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Anthony Basford and Sharon Raguse for refining the statement of purpose for our external members of that committee. The key items discussed at this final committee meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boston Consulting Group Workshop – Recommendations to Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide a summary of workshop notes and request for priority recommendations to Council. • 2.2 Proposed Project Evaluation Process (decision making matrix for evaluating funding request proposal) • 2.3 Economic Development Strategy – Approach and Timeframe • 2.4 EDAC New Committee Appointment Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outline of Timeline and Process

Cr Marianne Pelz

Thank You Mr. Mayor,

Our face coverings tonight are not part of a fancy dress theme they are now State Government Law in the prevention of spreading the COVID-19 virus; mandatory face masks must be worn when leaving our home premises out in public spaces.

On the 13th and 14th of August South East Australian Transport Strategy Inc (SEATS) held its Annual General Meeting in its first online Skype meeting hosted by the Wellington Shire Council, which went very well due to the good preparedness of our Executive officer Andrew Martin. In the SEATS constitution Victoria and NSW alternate two yearly to have a fair representation. I have proudly been the Chair representing Victoria for the past two years and I pleasingly have the honour of congratulating Cr. Patricia White from Shoal Haven as the incoming Chair. We are still represented well in Victoria with the Deputy Chair going to Cr. Keith Cook from Baw Baw, who is an ex Vic rail worker and understands the signalling Issues for the Gippsland region train line. We look forward to some great work evolving in this space with regards to Gippsland rail commuters shortly.

South East Australian Transport Strategy Inc has been a group I have been involved with for the past 12 years of my term on Council and I have found it very active, progressive and rewarding on many levels. The amount of money this group has advocated for in the past 12 years for Infrastructure and safety improvements is in the hundreds of millions of dollars which we the roads users are now privileged to be using. Whilst I will not be standing for Council this time round I will still be a private member of this group and have been elected onto the executive group which I can still retain post Council.

Rural Councils Victoria (RCV) have been Lobbying Politian's in the best interest of Rural Council needs. Specifically, in regards to cross boarder issues for all our bordering Councils. Hopefully some common sense solutions will be put in place shortly.

Unemployment figures due to the COVID-19 pandemic are hitting hard and now being further realised in our state of Victoria with many businesses realising they can no longer sustain the pandemic roller coaster. Many large companies who have been family household names such as Canon, etc are finding they can no longer survive the COVID-19 pandemic hardships and having to close their doors.

A member alert was sent out earlier this week promoting the Community Engagement toolkit is now up on the Rural Council Victoria's website for viewing as well as the Population Attraction and Retention toolkits, both are well worth a read and a comparison as to how they compare to our own Council policies. A letter was sent to the Victorian Ombudsman regarding the scope and timing issues relating to the Investigation into council responses to financial hardship.

Following the meeting Minister Symes last week, we are in the process of arranging a meeting with the new Minister for Roads and Road Safety, Ben Carroll, to further discuss roads funding issues facing rural communities, including the \$20 million AgriLinks Upgrade Program.

In terms of the next steps Rural Council Victoria (RCV) is finalising the Draft Strategic Plan, for the future path of RCV.

This concludes my report for the month.

Cr John White

03/08/20 – East Gippsland Shire Council Livestock Exchange Committee Meeting

06/08/20 – Native Forest Timber Harvesting Meeting

10/08/20 – Native Timber Taskforce (NTT) General Meeting

11/08/20 – Meeting with The Hon Jane Garrett

11/08/20 – Special Audit and Risk Committee Meeting

11/08/20 – Planning Consultation Meeting

12/08/20 – CEO Performance and Remuneration Committee Meeting

14/08/20 – One Gippsland Mayoral Catch-Up

18/08/20 – CEO Employment and Remuneration Committee Meeting

21/08/20 – One Gippsland Mayoral Meeting

21/08/20 – Local Government Act 2020 – Implementation Matters Webinar

21/08/20 – One Gippsland Board Meeting

24/08/20 – Planning Consultation Meeting

25/08/20 – The Hon Jane Garrett meeting

25/08/20 – Ordinary Council Meeting

26/08/20 – CEO Employment and Remuneration Committee Interviews – Independent member

27/08/20 – EGSC Cross Border Collaboration with CRJO – Discussions

28/08/20 – Telstra Regional Australia | Bushfire Post Incident Review

Numerous conversations and catch-up with Victorian Border Mayor's and Senator Bridget McKenzie

Conflict of Interest

Cr Joe Rettino having declared a conflict of interest in item 5.1.1, left the meeting at 6.34pm and was absent during discussion on this item.

5 Officer Reports

5.1 A Liveable Region

5.1.1 Addendum to Bullock Island Master Plan

Authored by Tom Weatherall, Manager Assets and Projects

Endorsed by Fiona Weigall, General Manager Assets and Environment

Document No 8612663

In Attendance Tom Weatherall, Manager Assets and Projects

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Bullock Island Concept Master Plan (the Master Plan) was formally adopted by Council in 2015. At present the only component of the Master Plan that has been implemented is the construction of the parking area by the Cunningham Arm section of the island (south west). With the allocation of funds for the Lakes Entrance Fishing Limited Fish Café, Reeves Jetty extension and the recently announced funds for other improvements to Bullock Island public open spaces, now managed by Council, the need to update the Master Plan was identified to reflect both current and future planned works and to provide more detailed planning around areas of the public areas of the island.

A widely representative Project Reference Group was established to guide a review of the Master Plan. The Reference Group recognised that much of the original Master Plan was still sound and it needed updating rather than replacing. Therefore, the need for an Addendum to the Master Plan was developed, rather than wholesale revision of the original Master Plan.

This Addendum confirms that the vision for Bullock Island and any upgrade to the island should be to enhance the visitor experience maximise visitation and contribute to the visitor economy of Lakes Entrance and the broader region.

It is anticipated that realisation of the revised Master Plan priorities will begin to occur within a short time frame, with significant funding having been committed by State and Commonwealth Governments and Council.

As the original Bullock Island Concept Master Plan is a Council adopted plan, the addendum to the Master Plan is now presented as **Appendix 1** to Council for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1. adopts the Addendum to the Bullock Island Concept Master Plan provided as Appendix 1;***
- 2. agrees that the Addendum to the Bullock Island Concept Master Plan provided as Appendix 1 is also presented to other agencies with land manager roles on Bullock Island for their formal consideration.***

Cr Richard Ellis / Cr Marianne Pelz

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT / CONTEXT

Discussion

In 2015 a Concept Master Plan was developed to guide the development of Bullock Island. This plan was jointly developed by East Gippsland Shire Council, Gippsland Ports and the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP). Development of the Master Plan involved significant consultation with other landowners, users of the island and the broader community.

Significant changes have occurred over the five years since the Master Plan was prepared and adopted. These changes include:

- Transfer of management responsibility of the large, undeveloped portion of the island from the Department of Environment, Land Water and Planning (DELWP) to East Gippsland Shire Council in late 2019;
- Advancement of plans and funding for a Fish Café by Lakes Entrance Fishing Limited (LEFL) and broader movement to integrate tourism with industry;
- Growth of fishing and crabbing on the island;
- Planned extension of Reeves Jetty by Gippsland Ports;
- The identified need to replace the Bullock Island Bridge; and
- The recent State and Commonwealth government announcements to allocate significant funding for broad scale improvements on Bullock Island.

As a result of this change, there was a need to update the Master Plan to reflect both current and future planned works and to provide more detailed planning around the public areas of the island, to guide the investment into these upgrades.

Council lead the Master Plan review process in partnership with a comprehensively represented Project Reference Group. This Reference Group comprises representatives from the local community (including Lakes Entrance Action and Development Association), Lakes Entrance Fishing Limited, Gippsland Ports, Gippsland TAFE, Regional Development Victoria, Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation (GLaWAC), Destination Gippsland, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, local Members of Parliament and Council.

The reference group recognised that much of the original Master Plan was still sound and it needed updating rather than replacing. Therefore, the need for an Addendum to the plan was developed rather than wholesale revision of the original Master Plan.

The changes proposed as part of the Master Plan Addendum, that differ from the originally adopted Master Plan include:

- Better definition of pathways and separation between pathways and roads
- Identification of two public toilet sites
- Removal of the road from North Arm to Bullock Island Bridge
- Identification of bridge upgrade
- Identification of new Fish café
- Identification of future proposed landing area abutting LEFL building
- Identification of extension to Reeves Jetty
- Identification of areas of proposed boardwalk and wall fishing areas
- Removal of kickabout area / active recreation area
- Removal of the Kiosk at the North Arm
- Modified descriptions of areas and the purpose of each area and inclusion of Aboriginal interpretation

Whilst most of the changes are relatively subtle, they do better match the investment intentions of LEFL and the needs of the island.

Council Plan

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following goals set out in the Council Plan 2017-2021:

A Liveable Region Goal 1 - East Gippsland has safe, accessible and well utilised open spaces and built environments that reflect the priorities of our community

A Growing Region of Opportunities Goal 2 - East Gippsland is Australia's number one adventure destination. We offer unforgettable tourism experiences for people of all interests, ages and abilities

Council Policy

Bullock Island has been identified for redevelopment under several documents including the Lakes Entrance Urban Design Framework 2007 and the Lakes Entrance Foreshore Management Plan 2011.

Legislation

There is deemed to be no legislation impacting on the deliberation of the Addendum to the Master Plan, though the works and improvements proposed in the plan will be subject to a range of approvals.

Community

In addition to contributing to the tourist experience, the Master Plan targets improvements to be enjoyed by the local community. This includes improved access for vehicles and active transport, improved accessibility on the island, provision of toilet facilities, improvements to recreation and fishing facilities and general enhancements to the island's amenity.

Organisational

- **Financial**

The adoption of this Master Plan in itself does not generate a financial obligation for the organisation. However, the Master Plan does identify a range of infrastructure improvements and other initiatives requiring investment. These recommendations will be considered in the preparation of the annual budget and will be subject to normal budget consideration processes.

Approximately \$6.875 million is currently committed to the projects identified in the Addendum to the Master Plan, by external sources. Provision for further upgrades to Bullock Island is also made in the Draft 2020/21 Council budget.

The Addendum could also be used to seek additional funds to implement the remainder of the Master Plan.

- **Human Resources**

Adopting this report has no impact on the human resources allocated to the management of this service.

Amenity/Environment

The Addendum once implemented will significantly improve the amenity of the Island and will ensure a sensitive development preserving natural elements to the undeveloped area within Council's Committee of Management.

Climate Change

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following Climate Change function/category:

Corporate/Strategic/Council Plan: Consideration is given to climate change in corporate, strategic or council plan(s) and includes responses to direct and indirect impacts.

The impacted of climate change and sea level rise has been considered in the development of the Addendum.

Consultation

In 2014 and 2015 the original Bullock Island Master Plan went through an extensive public consultation process prior to adoption. This community input has been honoured as much as possible, with much of the input still reflected in the Addendum. As part of drafting this Addendum a range of discussions have been held with tourism operators, visitors, fishing industry representatives, community members and reference group representatives.

The draft Addendum to the Bullock Island Master Plan was made available to the community on 10 August 2020 on Council's website and via a front-page article in the Lakes Post.

Officers have also consulted with the recently formed Bullock Island Development Inc group and do not consider that the Addendum prevents this group from continuing to refine their vision for additional attractions on the island.

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Appendices

1. Addendum to the Bullock Island Concept Masterplan (Final Draft)

Attendance

Cr Joe Rettino returned to the meeting at 6.44 pm

Conflict of Interest

Anthony Basford, Chief Executive Officer having declared a conflict of interest in item 5.1.2, left the meeting at 6.44 pm and was absent during discussion on this item.

5.1.2 Planning Permit Applications – Glendon Drive, Eastwood – Eight applications relating to eight lots, each proposal being for Development of Two Dwellings on a lot

Authored by Nicole Reynolds, Acting Manager Planning

Endorsed by Jodie Pitkin, General Manager Place and Community

Document No 8600329

In Attendance Nicole Reynolds, Acting Manager Planning
Robert Pringle, Acting Senior Land Use Planner

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Council Report is to seek formal resolution in relation to eight individual planning permit applications which are each seeking approval for the development of two dwellings. Each of the individual applications relate to vacant allotments located in Glendon Drive, Eastwood. The Applications have been lodged individually concurrent to one another.

Each of the planning permit applications have been subjected to public notice and have attracted a significant number of written objections (**Attachment 1**). A Planning Consultation Meeting has been conducted in accordance with Council Policy (Minutes at **Attachment 2**).

The individual applications are now presented to Council for formal resolution.

Given the circumstances, officers are presenting each of the applications for separate determination, providing herein an officer planning scheme assessment provided in an attachment to each of the applications (**Attachments 3 through 10 inclusive**).

Importantly, this Council Report has been prepared to provide an overview of the applications when considered together, critically providing an assessment of the cumulative impact of the planning outcomes with respect to neighbourhood character, streetscape and planning policy relating to housing affordability and integrated housing.

This Council Report presents five options that Officers have considered as part of the determination, in doing so presents an officer recommendation for a preferred Option A and the planning argument for each of the options.

The preferred option and recommendation is that two of the proposals at 8 Glendon Drive Eastwood and 14 Glendon Drive Eastwood be issued with a Notice of Decision to Grant a Permit with conditions (**Appendices 1 and 2** respectively). The second part of the recommendation is that six of the planning permit applications be issued with a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Approve a planning permit application based on four grounds of refusal (**Appendix 3**).

The proposed Grounds of Refusal relate to inconsistency with the planning policy framework in relation to housing affordability and integration of housing, the detrimental impact to the prevailing and emerging streetscape by virtue of the replication of duplex house design, and the inconsistency with neighbourhood character of the overall surrounding area.

On balance, the planning merits given the number of houses and the clustering of the housing type to a concentrated section of the street are considered to be uncharacteristic to the established neighbourhood character. The recommendation to approve two planning permit applications, resulting in four new dwellings is considered to achieve an appropriate integration of the housing type into the surrounding context and established pattern of residential development.

The officer recommendation is premised entirely upon support for the provision of social housing within the East Gippsland. This Report does not question the prevailing Victorian government policy in relation to social housing nor question the need to do so, rather and specifically it questions the implementation of the policy at an individual street level. In doing so questions, the use of a series of individual allotments at one location and the ability to achieve a policy aim of integrated housing.

The officer recommendation has not been taken lightly and is not intended to be in anyway making a professional judgement about social housing, instead making an assessment on the planning merits and impact to the existing residential context and neighbourhood character. There is no question as to the need or otherwise for the provision of additional social housing for the East Gippsland community.

Option A is the preferred option and the basis for the officer recommendations. The option is a balance of Council's role as the responsible authority for the East Gippsland Planning Scheme equally with its responsibility to and representation of the community.

The recommendation includes a request for endorsement of correspondence previously forwarded to the Department of Environment Land and Planning providing Council's position on the referral of the applications to the Minister for Planning by the Building Victoria's Recovery Taskforce (BVRT) (**Appendix 4**).

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 93/2020/P is consistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit for Development of two dwellings on a lot at 8 Glendon Drive, Eastwood, subject to the permit conditions at Appendix 1.**
- 2. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 140/2020/P is consistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Grant a Planning Permit for Development of two dwellings on a lot at 14 Glendon Drive, Eastwood, subject to the permit conditions at Appendix 2.**
- 3. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 91/2020/P at 4 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.**
- 4. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 92/2020/P at 5 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.**
- 5. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 94/2020/P at 17 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.**
- 6. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 95/2020/P at 13 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.**
- 7. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 139/2020/P at 12 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.**
- 8. That Council being the Responsible Authority and having considered all the relevant planning matters, determines that planning application 141/2020/P at 16 Glendon Drive Eastwood is inconsistent with the requirements and objectives of the East**

Gippsland Planning Scheme and therefore resolves to issue a Notice of Decision to Refuse to Grant a Permit in accordance with the grounds of refusal provided at Appendix 3.

- 9. That Council endorse correspondence by the General Manager Place and Community to the Minister for Planning at Appendix 4 in relation to the request for position by the Minister for Planning and reference to the Building Victoria's Recovery Taskforce through COVID19 for fast tracking planning approvals opposing a planning scheme amendment which proposes to apply a 'Specific Controls Overlay at clause 45.12 utilising section 20 (4) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.**

Cr Marianne Pelz / Cr Colin Toohey

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

Amendment to the Recommendation to include additional point

Cr Joe Rettino / Cr Mark Reeves

THAT COUNCIL REQUESTS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO WORK CLOSELY WITH APPROPRIATE MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO DEVELOP A PLAN THAT MEETS COMMUNITY NEED AND ADDRESSES THE BROADER ISSUE OF SOCIAL HOUSING NEEDS IN EAST GIPPSLAND.

CARRIED 01/09/20

For Crs O'Connell, Pelz, Reeves, Rettino and Toohey

Against Crs Buckley, Ellis and White

Cr Marianne Pelz / Cr Colin Toohey

- 1. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 93/2020/P IS CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO GRANT A PLANNING PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TWO DWELLINGS ON A LOT AT 8 GLENDON DRIVE, EASTWOOD, SUBJECT TO THE PERMIT CONDITIONS AT APPENDIX 1.**
- 2. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 140/2020/P IS CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO GRANT A PLANNING PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TWO DWELLINGS ON A LOT AT 14 GLENDON DRIVE, EASTWOOD, SUBJECT TO THE PERMIT CONDITIONS AT APPENDIX 2.**
- 3. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 91/2020/P AT 4 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST**

GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.

4. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 92/2020/P AT 5 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.
5. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 94/2020/P AT 17 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.
6. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 95/2020/P AT 13 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.
7. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 139/2020/P AT 12 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.
8. THAT COUNCIL BEING THE RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY AND HAVING CONSIDERED ALL THE RELEVANT PLANNING MATTERS, DETERMINES THAT PLANNING APPLICATION 141/2020/P AT 16 GLENDON DRIVE EASTWOOD IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EAST GIPPSLAND PLANNING SCHEME AND THEREFORE RESOLVES TO ISSUE A NOTICE OF DECISION TO REFUSE TO GRANT A PERMIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GROUNDS OF REFUSAL PROVIDED AT APPENDIX 3.
9. THAT COUNCIL ENDORSE CORRESPONDENCE BY THE GENERAL MANAGER PLACE AND COMMUNITY TO THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AT APPENDIX 4 IN RELATION TO THE REQUEST FOR POSITION BY THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND REFERENCE TO THE BUILDING VICTORIA'S RECOVERY TASKFORCE THROUGH COVID19 FOR FAST TRACKING PLANNING APPROVALS OPPOSING A PLANNING SCHEME AMENDMENT WHICH PROPOSES TO APPLY A 'SPECIFIC CONTROLS OVERLAY AT CLAUSE 45.12 UTILISING SECTION 20 (4) OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT ACT 1987.
10. THAT COUNCIL REQUESTS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO WORK CLOSELY WITH APPROPRIATE MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO DEVELOP A PLAN THAT MEETS COMMUNITY NEED AND ADDRESSES THE BROADER ISSUE OF SOCIAL HOUSING NEEDS IN EAST GIPPSLAND

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT / CONTEXT

Discussion

Overview – the planning permit applications

The matters currently before Council are 8 individual planning permit applications, each application for, “Development of two dwellings on a lot.”

The affected properties are 8 individual lots, ranging in size between 720 and 1030 square metres, all located on the same street. All of the subject lots are currently vacant. There are four additional adjacent lots that are also vacant (Nos. 3, 6, 7, and 15 Glendon Drive). Three single dwellings sit between the proposed development lots. A reserve borders the northwestern sites (adjacent No. 4 & 8) and contains drainage infrastructure and a walking track. Residential lots of a similar size range border on all sides, and each lot contains a single dwelling.

The subject land is zoned General Residential Zone 1. No overlays apply. **Attachments 3 through 10 inclusive** provide the following with respect to each application:

- Proposed development plans;
- Detailed assessment of the proposal against the East Gippsland planning scheme, inclusive of assessment against Clause 55 (two or more dwellings on a lot);
- A social impact comment submitted in accordance with the local policy framework;
- Assessment and response to objections specific to the application; and
- Recommendation, on the basis of review of all pertinent policy and provisions of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme, that the application be approved.

Following public notice, the applications each received between approximately 23 and 45 objections. The objections are provided at **Attachment 1**. The objectors for each application are largely the same, and the content of their objections are of a similar nature. A planning consultation meeting was held on 21 July 2020, with many objectors and the permit applicant participating. Minutes of the meeting are provided at **Attachment 2**.

Overview – planning policy framework

The purpose of this Report is to present eight individual Planning Permit Applications for determination, and in doing so present each concurrently to facilitate an ability to assess and consider the cumulative impacts and outcomes with respect to streetscape, neighbourhood character and integrated housing planning policy objectives.

This Report will provide a detailed planning assessment and analysis of each of the permit applications against the decision guidelines and criteria contained within the East Gippsland planning scheme.

The individual planning permit applications have each attracted a significant number of written objections which, whilst raising specific planning issues, have also raised important questions with respect to the social mix of public and private housing, questions relating to interpretation of Victorian Government public policy “*Homes for Victorians – Affordability, Access and Choice*”, the cumulative impact of building 8 of the same housing building response and issues relating to emerging and established neighbourhood character.

The written opposition is not about providing social housing, rather about the direct impact to the neighbourhood character by proposing to cluster 16 homes in one street in very close

proximity to one another. The opposition specifically questions the premise that the subject land meets the definition of land which is surplus to Government needs.

The opposition raises critical issues with respect to strategies contained within the planning scheme which aim to provide and facilitate for a mix of private, affordable and social housing in suburbs, activity centres and urban renewal projects. The criticism is that the combined impact of the 16 houses in the one location, is the creation of a 'cluster' of homes which are to be easily identified by the proposed design replication. When broadly considered, the provision of a mix of private and public housing overall is achieved within the Eastwood Estate. The objection is that the integration and the mix is not successfully achieved, as the mix and integration of public housing has not been progressively implemented over the progression of the creation of new housing Estate, rather concentrated in one small pocket of the residential estate.

The current circumstance is such that Council has the ability to assess, measure and consider the progressive and overall impact of the proposal, and determine whether on balance the outcome of the 8 planning permit applications achieve compliance with the Planning Policy Framework at clauses 16.01-S (integrated housing) and 16.01-4S (housing affordability), having regard to the progressive and combined impact of all of the Applications specifically assessing the streetscape, neighbourhood character and social mix.

On balance, having regard for the issues raised by the local community, particularly with reference to the concept of emerging neighbourhood character, integrated housing, social mix and interpretation of Victorian Government Policy relating to social housing, this Report recommends that it is not appropriate to approve all 8 individual applications.

Victorian Government Policy - "Homes for Victorians – Affordability, access and choice" (2017) ("the Policy")

The Policy is referred to specifically in the planning scheme as a relevant consideration for decision making, specifically the Planning Policy Framework (the PPF) at clauses 16.01-1S and 16.01-4S. The Policy is relevant to decision making within the planning scheme. The homes for Victorians initiatives include increasing the supply of housing through faster planning (page 5).

One of the initiatives is to pilot inclusionary housing to increase the supply of social and affordable housing, specifically on surplus government land. It relates to land that is no longer required for government needs and is repurposed for the housing market. In these instances, the government is prepared to discount the price of the land, in return for a proportion of social housing (p23). This is referred to as the inclusionary housing pilot program. The second component refers to inclusionary housing in major developments, wherein a clear framework is developed for voluntary arrangements for developers to offer packages that include the delivery of affordable housing (page 23). The agreements allow Councils to set up voluntary arrangements with developers and landowners to provide affordable housing in exchange for rezoning.

The cases at hand do not fit into either of these 2 initiatives.

The Planning Policy Framework

The relevant PPF strategies at 16.01-4S for discussion are.

"Promoting good housing and urban design to minimise negative environmental impacts and keep costs down for residents and wider community".

"Facilitating a mix of private, affordable and social housing in suburbs, activity centres and urban renewal projects".

Both are relevant to the case at hand.

The proposals on an individual level provide for and promote good housing outcomes. The issues raised by the community response relate to questions of impact to the neighbourhood character and urban design resulting directly as a consequence of proposing multiple two dwellings sites at a concentrated location, proposing the same design, simply replicated. These issues do raise matters relating to urban design and the impact to the prevailing neighbourhood character.

The second policy seeks to provide for and facilitate the provision of a mix of private, affordable and social housing in suburbs. The proposals at hand do contribute to providing for a mix of public housing into the existing residential precinct and overall into the residential precinct.

It is important to note that the project sites are not urban renewal sites and do not represent sites which are surplus to government needs requiring a repurposing to residential, requiring a rezoning and negotiated provision of affordable housing. These sites are existing residential sites with a residential zoning, no rezoning is required. There is no ability to negotiate as part of a rezoning request, the provision of a suitable mix of affordable houses in the residential outcome.

The key consideration is that the mix of housing may be achieved overall when considering the whole of the residential estate, however the mix at precinct and street level is not achieved. The concept of integration overall is not achieved. Rather there is a concentration of a type of dwellings which will be identifiable by design and sameness. The concentration of the house type to the one location results in a clustering of social housing. The argument is that true integration and mix is not achieved, by the concentration of the social housing in the one street in proximity. It is considered that mix of housing tenure needs to be achieved in a new suburb in a progressive and dispersed manner. The integration should have been achieved by identifying vacant allotments throughout the estate over a progressive period of time.

The tenure of housing is not a relevant planning consideration. The question of tenure would not be in play, if the proposal was for a series of single dwellings, for which no planning permissions are required. The current matter is such that the development of each of the sites for two dwellings requires planning permission. The question of tenure is still not a relevant planning consideration, the question is rather in relation to whether the combined outcomes of the proposals, achieve the policy provision which requires a mix of private and social housing.

The question of social mix is an important concept one which leads with the principles that encouraging social mix offers access to opportunity, builds a sense of community and citizenship and reduces any stigma associated with social housing locations (*Doney R, McGuirk P & Mee, K "Social Mix and the Problematisation of social housing (2013), Australian Geographer, page 2)*

The concentration of the 8 proposals, representing a total of 16 dwellings, in one street and in close proximity to one another, is not considered to represent providing for a mix of private, affordable and social housing within the precinct. Rather proposing the approval of some of the applications, is considered more appropriate to result in achieving a reasonable mix in housing types and tenures.

Streetscape & neighbourhood character

The key element relates to the development of two dwellings on each of the 8 sites in close proximity to one another and the consequential impact on the neighbourhood character. The prevailing neighbourhood character is primarily single contemporary dwellings.

There are numerous examples of two dwellings developed within the estate, however these sites are dispersed throughout the estate. The question is not whether two dwellings are appropriate. Council has consistently supported and approved the development of two dwellings on sites within the estate.

The character issues relate to the concentration of a number of two dwellings sites in the one street on separate allotments. There has been no ability to plan comprehensively for the integration of the development of multiple dwellings, like on an urban renewal site.

There is an impact to the streetscape in the provision of the sameness and presentation of the same design in replication.

The introduction of 8 medium density sites into the one location will have an impact on the daily vehicle movements, however this is not considered an unreasonable impact to the functioning of the road system.

A key finding of the *“Build social housing for the future VCOSS submission to the Victorian Parliamentary inquiry into the Public housing Renewal Program”* (November 2017) was as follows;

“Ensure the building design does not differentiate social housing from private housing” (p3).

This element was reflective of the importance of the building designs not being easily definable as public housing. The question here is that the sameness and concentration will result in a precinct which will be distinguishable by the building design and co-location.

Options

It is recognised that there is a suitable level of community concern for the relative clustering of social housing in one particular street within Eastwood. It is also recognised that there is a significant commitment to the provision of social housing by the State Government which is highly commendable. The proposed development, when considered cumulatively, is considered to have a detriment to the locality, will be inconsistent with the established neighbourhood character of Eastwood, and has the potential to introduce a concentration of social issues.

To overcome the competing interests, including the planning merits, Council Officers have reviewed several options of how this Council may proceed with respect to the applications. The Options presented represent several feasible outcomes, noting that there are several thousand possible outcomes when considering the eight applications concurrently.

Option A

Approve a total of two of the applications, selected to be both as far apart as practical and with least impact to neighbouring property owners, and refuse the remaining six applications. Advise the landowner that despite the fact that an application on the remaining lots can be made for similar outcomes, Council as the responsible authority will likely make a determination to refuse similar applications made in the future for land in Glendon Drive. Encourage the land to be developed for single dwellings, which do not require planning permission.

Rationale: Recognising the conflict between Council's role as the responsible authority and its responsibility to and representation of the community, Option A allows for limited development

Risk: Objectors may apply for a review of the decision to grant the two permits to VCAT pursuant to Section 82 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. The risk is reduced by the officer recommendation on which permits to grant, however individual neighbours especially may be aggrieved by the proximity of the development to their property.

The permit applicant is likely to apply for a review of the decision (Section 77) to refuse to grant the other six permits, with the objectors likely to join such proceedings (Section 83(2)) in support of Council's decision to refuse. If VCAT is inclined to grant a permit for one or all of the applications, then Council will have limited input into appropriate conditions of approval through the review process.

Summary: Option A is the preferred option and the basis for the officer recommendations. The option is a balance of Council's role as the responsible authority for the East Gippsland Planning Scheme equally with its responsibility to and representation of the community.

Option B

Approve all permits in accordance with the recommendations resulting from the detailed planning assessment, subject to the conditions of approval as outlined in **Attachments 3 through 10 inclusive**.

Rationale: In accordance with Council's role as the responsible authority for planning decisions, this is the technically correct position and Council would not be held at fault for any alternative outcomes in the Tribunal.

Risk: Objectors will apply for a review of the decisions to VCAT pursuant to Section 82 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

Summary: With respect to Council's role as the responsible authority, Option B disregards Council's responsibility as representatives of the community, where the community respects the need for provision of social housing but is overwhelmingly against the concentration of such housing in this cluster on one residential street. Option B is not recommended, as it is considered to not be in the best interests of the community as a whole and is considered contrary to best practice in relation to provision of social housing.

Option C

Approve of four total applications, representing one application from each quadrant of land in Glendon Drive owned by the same landowner. Advise the landowner that despite the fact that an application on the remaining lots can be made for similar outcomes, Council as the responsible authority will likely make a determination to refuse similar applications made in the future for land in Glendon Drive. Encourage the land to be developed for single dwellings, which do not require planning permission.

Rationale: Recognising the conflict between Council's role as the responsible authority and its responsibility to and representation of the community, the option allows for limited development

Risk: Objectors are likely to apply for a review of the decision to grant the four permits to VCAT pursuant to Section 82 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*. The permit applicant is likely to apply for a review of the decision (Section 77) to refuse to grant the other four, with the objectors likely to join such proceedings (Section 83(2)) in support of Council's decision to refuse.

Summary: This is not the preferred option. The option is a balance of Council's role as the responsible authority for the East Gippsland Planning Scheme equally with its responsibility to and representation of the community but would impact negatively on the surrounding landowners and occupiers.

Option D

Approve one of the applications, selected to have least impact to neighbouring property owners, and refuse the remaining seven applications. Advise the landowner that despite the fact that an application on the remaining lots can be made for similar outcomes, Council as the responsible authority will likely make a determination to refuse similar applications made in the future for land in Glendon Drive. Encourage the land to be developed for single dwellings, which do not require planning permission.

Rationale: Recognising Council's responsibility to and representation of the community, the option recognises the strong community opposition to the proposals as a cluster, and the support for limited approval. The majority of objectors indicated that they would reasonably support one duplex development in the street.

Risk: The objectors are unlikely to apply for a review of the decision to grant a single permit pursuant to Section 82 of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, although there may be individual objectors aggrieved by Council's choice in which permit to approve who may seek a review on that basis. The permit applicant is likely to apply for a review of the decision (Section 77) to refuse to grant the other seven permits, with the objectors likely to join such proceedings (Section 83(2)) in support of Council's decision to refuse. If VCAT is inclined to grant a permit for one or all of the applications, then Council will have limited input into appropriate conditions of approval through the review process.

Summary: This option best aligns with the community response to the applications; however the option diminishes Council's role as the responsible authority for the East Gippsland Planning Scheme by failing to consider each application on its own merits.

Option E

Refuse all eight of the applications. Advise the landowner that despite the fact that an application on the remaining lots can be made for similar outcomes, Council as the responsible authority will likely make a determination to refuse similar applications made in the future for land in Glendon Drive. Encourage the land to be developed for single dwellings, which do not require planning permission.

Rationale: Recognising Council's responsibility to and representation of the community, the option recognises the strong community opposition to the proposal.

Risk: The permit applicant is likely to apply for a review of the decision (Section 77) to refuse to grant the permits, with the objectors likely to join such proceedings (Section 83(2)) in support of Council's decision to refuse. If VCAT is inclined to grant a permit for one or all of the applications, then Council will have limited input into appropriate conditions of approval through the review process.

Summary: This is not the preferred option. The option neglects Council's role as the responsible authority for the East Gippsland Planning Scheme. It was also clear from the community submissions that there was support for at least one duplex in the street.

Recommendation – Preferred Option

Officers have considered the streetscape character and potential amenity impact to private landowners and residents in recommending that two of the eight applications be approved. Ultimately, the recommendation is for 8 Glendon Drive (93/2020/P) and 14 Glendon Drive (140/2020/P) are suitable for approval.

With respect to 8 Glendon Drive, the development of two dwellings on the lot will have the least impact on private landowners and residents. 8 Glendon Drive is the largest allotment of the eight subject lots. With the larger lot size, the proposal includes a double width carport and appropriate street setback allowing for the maximum number of off-street car parking spaces. On site setbacks to the boundary are greater, with over 1 metre provided on either side of the carport to the boundary.

8 Glendon Drive has two lots which are currently vacant and owned by the Department of Housing at 4 and 6 Glendon Drive, which could be developed with single dwellings without a planning permit. The lot is bordered by public reserve to the south and west. The proposal includes additional landscaping, increasing the number of canopy trees in the frontage and rear.

With respect to 14 Glendon Drive, the development of two dwellings on the lot will have the least impact on private landowners and residents, while maintaining separation from number 8 and thus removing concerns about character of the streetscape being disturbed by the duplex style of development. The lot is bordered by two other Department of Housing lots which could be developed for single dwellings without a planning permit. Only one neighbour on Mistrana Court shares a boundary.

Of the applications submitted, the application at 5 Glendon Drive has a similar neighbour impact to 14 Glendon Drive but is then in too close proximity to 8 Glendon Drive. Had an application been made for 15 Glendon Drive of a similar nature, this may have been the preferred location for the second recommended approval. All other submitted applications are for lots which border on 2 or more private dwellings, and as such are less favourable outcomes for the community.

Correspondence Department Environment Land and Planning (DELWP) 13 August 2020

Correspondence dated 13 August 2020 has been received, a copy is attached at **Attachment 11**.

The correspondence confirms that the eight planning permit applications have been referred to the Minister for Planning by the Building Victoria's Recovery Taskforce (BVRT). The correspondence confirms that the Minister for Planning is considering preparing an amendment to the East Gippsland Planning Scheme under section 20(4) of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987* to introduce clause 45.12 "Specific Controls Overlay", apply a schedule to the land, and introduce an associated incorporated document to each site to facilitate each proposed development generally as proposed as part of the associated planning applications.

In accordance with section 20(5), the Minister seeks Council's views about the proposed developments at each site and has requested any draft conditions that council would be seeking to implement for the proposal in the event that permits were granted.

A letter of response is attached at **Appendix 4**, which outlines the officer's response. A written response was required by no later than the 27 August 2020.

The response is summarised as follows.

- The projects in question are not considered to be 'shovel ready' and have received extensive community written objection.
- The community has raised concerns in relation to the social outcomes.
- Council is scheduled to make a decision on all eight planning permit applications at the next Ordinary council meeting of 1 September 2020.
- A copy of the objections is provided for background material.
- Council does not support the proposed planning scheme amendment process to introduce the sites as 'Specific Control Overlays'.
- Council is considered to be the relevant decision maker with respect to the planning permit applications in question.

Council Plan

The preamble to the introduction of the Council Plan includes reference to the higher order goal of representing the interests of the community. Reference is made to fostering community cohesion (page 5). The Council Plan then outlines key strategic objectives and strategies for Council and the most relevant to land use planning and in this case are strategies 24 and 25.

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following goals set out in the Council Plan 2017-2021:

A Liveable Region Goal 2 - Sustainable planning and growth supports thriving townships, while maintaining our commitment to sustainability and protecting our natural environment.

Strategies include.

"24. Advance planning that provides community members and landowners with certainty about the way that land will be used and developed in their town"

25. Ensure that the East Gippsland Planning Scheme continues to facilitate investment confidence to support sustainable growth in East Gippsland". (page 30).

Land use planning decisions are often very complex and require a careful balancing of facilitating economic growth and community net benefit with changing urban settlement patterns and community expectations. In the case at hand, the provision of additional social housing into the East Gippsland context is critical, however it is the details associated with the proposed implementation at a very localised level, that present as land use challenges. The proposed development-built form will result in a pattern of use into the streetscape which is uncharacteristic to the overall residential setting.

Legislation

On 24 March 2020 the Government passed the *Local Government Act 2020* (the new Act). Provisions from the new Act are being commenced in four stages. The first tranche of provisions commenced on 6 April 2020 with other tranches commencing on 1 May 2020 and 24 October 2020. All remaining provisions are commencing on 1 July 2021. The *Local Government Act 1989* applies in circumstances where the new Act has not commenced.

The East Gippsland Shire Council is required to make decisions under both Acts as the transition occurs. Council has implemented mechanisms to ensure decisions are made according to the relevant provisions of either the *Local Government Act 1989* or the *Local Government Act 2020* as in force at the date of the decision.

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights detailed in the Victorian Government's *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

The relevant planning context for assessing Applications is guided by section 60 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 and clause 65.01 of the East Gippsland Planning Scheme.

At the local level, clause 21.07 sets out Council's strategic vision for the built environment and heritage. The objectives include ensuring that future development contributes to, reinforces and enhances East Gippsland's identity, aesthetic quality and economic diversity. Housing Policy is found at clause 21.08, the objectives of which include

"To cater for the housing needs and preferences of all segments of the community", and

"To ensure social considerations are taken into account when considering application for residential development" (21.07-3).

The Planning and Environment Act 1987 requires that the orderly planning of the area is taken into account when making decisions.

Community

Public notice has been undertaken on an individual basis for all eight planning permit applications.

On average 36 objections were received per application.

On 22 August, Council received a petition regarding the proposal, which has been noted at Section 1.10 Petitions of the 1 September 2020 Ordinary Council Meeting. Under the *Planning & Environment Act 1987* and Victorian Case Law precedent, signatories to petitions are not considered to be individual objectors. The petition was created and submitted by an existing objector. 15 current objectors were signatories to the petition. 66 signatories are not registered objectors. These signatories will not be provided a copy of any notices in relation to the application unless they were to register their objection formally and individually prior to the determination of the matter. They make an application for leave to join the proceedings at VCAT.

The petition requests that Councillors should vote against the proposal in its present format.

Officers consider that the recommendations presented in this report to Council adequately address the concerns raised in the petition.

Organisational

- **Financial**

Any decision in relation to the eight planning permit applications has appeal provisions to the Victorian Civil & Administrative Tribunal (VCAT). In the event of any appeals, a combination of officer time and external assistance with professional consultancies may be required. Operational budget allocations for the statutory planning business unit allows for external professional consultancies if required.

- **Amenity/Environment**

There are no perceived adverse impacts or relevant statements relating to amenity and environment for this matter.

Climate Change

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following Climate Change function/category:

Land Use Planning: Consideration is given to climate change in the local land use planning and includes responses to direct and indirect impacts.

The planning scheme provides for assessment of impacts of development on climate, and the proposed development accords with the standards and objectives required of the scheme in relation to walkability, permeability, stormwater quality and quantity, and solar orientation. The proposed developments will not have a significant climate impact. Proposed landscaping will assist in microclimate management.

Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken in the following manner:

Referrals	None
Notification	<p>Notification of the proposal was undertaken in accordance with section 52 of the <i>Planning and Environment Act 1987</i>.</p> <p>The permit applicant was required to send letters to adjoining and surrounding neighbours and placed an A3 sign on each property frontage.</p> <p>Following the notification period, a statutory declaration was provided confirming that the notices had been provided in accordance with the instructions. Council officers audited the site signage on several random occasions through the notice periods.</p>
Objections at the time of writing this report	<p>91/2020/P: 44</p> <p>92/2020/P: 44</p> <p>93/2020/P: 44</p> <p>94/2020/P: 45</p> <p>95/2020/P: 43</p> <p>139/2020/P: 23</p> <p>140/2020/P: 25</p> <p>141/2020/P: 25</p>
Planning Consultation Meeting	<p>A planning consultation meeting in accordance with Council's Delegations Policy 2018 was held via Skype for Business on 21 July 2020. Minutes of the meeting are attached at Attachment 2.</p>

Objections

A copy of the objections can be viewed at **Attachment 1**.

The summarised grounds of objection are listed below with officer comments.

At the outset, it is important to note that each application must be considered on its own merits and the assessment of an application for two dwellings on a lot does not call up assessment of how the land will be used. The responsible authority cannot discriminate on the basis of socioeconomic status of occupants or the proposed duration of tenancy. The assessment of the application must be based on planning policy, zone and particular provisions (ResCode).

However, Council as the decision maker, may consider a range of factors in making its decisions, and can consider the broader implications of the cumulative development.

As such, the consideration of the objections in relation to all eight of the applications as a whole, differs from the individual

1. Not in accordance with neighbourhood character, loss of streetscape

Although the assessment of the planning permit application must consider the impact of two dwellings on a lot, not 16 dwellings on 8 lots. It is put that there may be an expectation that a single dwelling would be constructed on each lot as is the standard practice for the Eastwood Estate. Each application, on its own, will not affect neighbourhood character or the streetscape. That 12 lots are currently vacant on Glendon Drive out of 21 lots total means that the majority of the street character has not been established.

In relation to the broader neighbourhood, the end result of all 8 lots being developed with two dwellings on each lot will result in a cluster of higher density in an established area of Eastwood which is characteristically single dwelling. However, there are several examples of similar density within the Backwater section of the Estate, predominantly on corner allotments. Further deviations include portions of Morton Drive and the whole of Lowe Court. The point of difference in these cases appears to be in relation to ownership.

2. Loss of property value

The majority of objectors raise this ground, which is an economic consideration, not a planning consideration. It is noted that the cost of development per dwelling might be significantly less than that of the surrounding dwellings, however this can be attributed to the economies of scale associated with duplex development. Economic valuation should be tenure blind, and normally takes into consideration market and sale values of surrounding property.

3. Traffic Impacts and street parking

Each dwelling is provided with two off-street car parking spaces, including one under cover space, which meets the car parking standards of the Scheme. For convenience purposes, the majority of traffic generated would make the direct connection to Flinns Road which is a neighbourhood connector street. The design capacity of this street is suitable to accommodate a traffic yield of 80 vehicle movements per day above what would be anticipated from a single dwelling being constructed on each of the subject lots.

Minimal provision of on-street car parking would result from the narrow bitumen seal 7.75 metres with kerb and channel. Footpaths are constructed adjacent to the property frontages. Crossover locations for each dwelling proposes is adjacent to the lot boundaries. There would be ability to park on-street for a maximum of one car in front of each lot – 8 cars total in the street – without blocking one of the proposed driveways, or parking in front of vacant or other private land.

Returning to the main argument, each application assessed on its merit will result in increased vehicle trips per day of 10 per dwelling on average, and this would not be an unreasonable amount. Each dwelling is provided with 2 off street car parking spaces. There will be negligible detriment as a result of each proposal assessed on its own merit.

4. Social impacts, particularly the negative impacts from social housing

Valid concern is raised in relation to the social impact of the proposal in accordance with local planning policy. Additional information has been obtained in line with Council's *Guidelines*, however the nature of the Social Impact Comment rightly does not focus on the socioeconomic issues, as planning must be tenure blind in relation to proposals for residential development.

5. General amenity and noise concerns

Again, the issue of noise and general amenity is a discriminatory assumption based on the proposal being for social housing purposes. Planning must not consider this impact, especially in relation to proposals where the individual impact could reasonably be nil.

6. Use for crisis/emergency accommodation

It is considered that this concern is repeated primarily in response to the past proposal for a 6 unit community care accommodation facility at 12-16 Glendon Drive. To some extent it has not been made clear from the proposal whether some aspect of that use will be transferred to the dwellings proposed.

The planning scheme provides that places of community care accommodation, including shelters, refuges, and crisis accommodation should be exempt from planning consideration and afforded privacy and secrecy. As the individual planning applications are for two dwellings on a lot, Council should not further consider which of the dwellings, if any, would be used for community care accommodation.

7. Concerns regarding inability to organise, length of time to object

It is noted that several objectors raised concerns about the inability to congregate to discuss the matter. The PCM provided such a forum and was conducted in a meaningful and safe method. The standard notice period (14 days) has been applied in accordance with the *Planning & Environment Act 1987*. Notification instructions were distributed following lodgement of the applications, but the applicants could not reasonably have foreseen the global impact of Covid19, and the timing of lodgement was more in relation to the priority of this project for 1000 homes for the homeless and the availability of the land based on past purchases of the Department.

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Appendices

1. Permit conditions 93/2020/P, 8 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
2. Permit conditions 140/2020/P, 14 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
3. Grounds of Refusal
4. Correspondence to the Minister for Planning

Attachments

1. Objections (all applications)
2. Minutes of the Planning Consultation Meeting, 21 July 2020
3. Planning Scheme Assessment 91/2020/P, 4 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
4. Planning Scheme Assessment 92/2020/P, 5 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
5. Planning Scheme Assessment 93/2020/P, 8 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
6. Planning Scheme Assessment 94/2020/P, 17 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
7. Planning Scheme Assessment 95/2020/P, 13 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
8. Planning Scheme Assessment 139/2020/P, 12 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
9. Planning Scheme Assessment 140/2020/P, 14 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
10. Planning Scheme Assessment 141/2020/P, 16 Glendon Drive, Eastwood
11. Correspondence from DELWP, 13 August 2020.

Attendance

Anthony Basford returned to the meeting at 7.39 pm

Conflict of Interest

Cr Natalie O'Connell having declared a conflict of interest in item 5.2.1, left the meeting at 7.39pm and was absent during discussion on this item.

5.2 A Growing Region of Opportunities

5.2.1 Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Round Two 2019-2020 and Round One 2020-2021 Assessment

Authored by Jeanette Seignior, Economic Recovery Events Officer

Endorsed by Sharon Raguse, Manager Economic Recovery

Document No 8609087

In Attendance Sharon Raguse, Manager Economic Recovery
Jeanette Seignior, Economic Recovery Events Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Regional and Districts Events Sponsorship (RADES) funding program is to facilitate the attraction and enhancement of events held in the East Gippsland Shire.

Funding for the RADES program has a focus on stimulating the direct and indirect economic benefit to East Gippsland and attracting visitors from around Victoria, interstate and internationally, into East Gippsland and value adding to marketing opportunities.

This report covers the assessment of applications for two RADES rounds; Round Two 2019-2020 and Round One 2020-2021. Round Two 2019-2020 closed 4 March 2020 but was delayed due to the escalating Covid-19 response, restricting public gatherings and events. This led to the cancellation and postponement of sponsored events from previous rounds as well as events recommended in this report.

The duration of COVID-19 restrictions and impacts is uncertain. Allocation of grants as recommended in this report provides organisers with confidence for planning, while recognising change or rescheduling may be required in response to COVID-19 restrictions. Officers will monitor changes and work with proponents as required.

Applications received in Round Two 2019-2020

Council received 14 applications for the second round of the 2019-2020 RADES funding program, with a total value of \$84,000.

The assessment panel has recommended the allocation of events funding as indicated below:

- 2020-2021 for nine applications total funds \$56,500
- 2021-2022 for seven applications total funds \$37,000
- 2022-2023 for seven applications total funds \$35,000

A summary of the events and recommended funding is provided in **Appendix 1 (Table 1)**.

Applications received in Round One 2020-2021

Council received six applications for the first round of the 2020-2021 RADES funding program, with a total value of \$50,500.

The assessment panel has recommended the allocation of events funding as indicated below:

- 2020-2021 for five applications total funds \$29,500
- 2021-2022 for two applications total funds \$12,000
- 2022-2023 for one application total funds \$2000

A summary of the events and recommended funding is provided in **Appendix 1 (Table 2)**:

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1. Approves the carry forward of \$55,230 remaining from the 2019-2020 Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) budget to the 2020-2021 RADES budget.**
- 2. Allocates \$56,500 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2020-2021 financial year (for year 1) for recommended projects from Round Two of the 2019-2020 Program, in accordance with the RADES Program Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table1):**
 - a) \$10,000 East Gippsland Marketing Inc - East Gippsland Winter Festival
 - b) \$1,000 Victorian Game Fishing Club - The Victorian Broadbill Swordfish Championship
 - c) \$3,000 Clearwater MG Pty Ltd - Marlo Hotel Annual Woodchop Event
 - d) \$10,000 Cupcake Communications Pty Ltd - Comedy and Canapes
 - e) \$10,000 Sailors Grave Brewing - Deep Winter
 - f) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association - Paynesville Music Festival
 - g) \$5,000 Food & Fibre Gippsland - Feast on East @ Metung
 - h) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association - Get into the Gippsland Lakes
 - i) \$7,500 Food & Fibre Gippsland - Slow Cooked Food and Great Wine - East Gippsland Style
- 3. Allocates \$37,000 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2021-2022 financial year (for year 2) for recommended projects from Round Two of the 2019-2020 the RADES Program, in accordance with Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table 1):**
 - a) \$10,000 East Gippsland Marketing Inc - East Gippsland Winter Festival
 - b) \$1,000 Victorian Game Fishing Club - The Victorian Broadbill Swordfish Championship
 - c) \$2,000 Clearwater MG Pty Ltd - Marlo Hotel Annual Woodchop Event
 - d) \$10,000 Sailors Grave Brewing to hold Deep Winter
 - e) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association - Paynesville Music Festival
 - f) \$4,000 Food & Fibre Gippsland - Feast on East @ Metung
 - g) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association - Get into the Gippsland Lakes

4. **Allocates \$35,000 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2022-2023 financial year (for year 3) for recommended projects from Round Two of the 2019-2020 of the RADES Program in accordance with the Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table 1):**
 - a) \$10,000 East Gippsland Marketing Inc - East Gippsland Winter Festival
 - b) \$1,000 Victorian Game Fishing Club to hold The Victorian Broadbill Swordfish Championship
 - c) \$1,000 Clearwater MG Pty Ltd - Marlo Hotel Annual Woodchop Event
 - d) \$10,000 Sailors Grave Brewing - Deep Winter
 - e) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association - Paynesville Music Festival
 - f) \$3,000 Food & Fibre Gippsland - Feast on East @ Metung
 - g) \$5,000 Paynesville Business & Tourism Association -Get into the Gippsland Lakes
5. **Allocates \$29,500 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2020-2021 financial year (for year 1) for recommended projects from Round One of the 2020-2021 Program, in accordance with the RADES Program Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table 2):**
 - a) \$3,000 Bicycle Network - Riding for Recovery - East Gippsland
 - b) \$10,000 Alps Link Regional Communities Development Association - Cattlemen 100 MTB Omeo
 - c) \$9,500 Bruthen Arts and Events Council - Bruthen Blues and Arts Festival
 - d) \$2,000 Clonlara Group Pty Ltd - The Great Aussie Hike
 - e) \$5,000 Hobie Cat Australasia Pty Ltd - Hobie Kayak Fishing Series 13
6. **Allocates \$12,000 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2021-2022 financial year (for year 2) for recommended projects from Round One of the 2020-2021 the RADES Program, in accordance with Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table 2):**
 - a) \$10,000 Alps Link Regional Communities Development Association - Cattlemen 100 MTB Omeo
 - b) \$2,000 Clonlara Group Pty Ltd - The Great Aussie Hike
7. **Allocates \$2,000 from Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) Program in the 2022-2023 financial year (for year 3) for successful projects from Round One of the 2020-2021 the RADES Program, in accordance with Assessment Panel recommendations as listed below and provided at Appendix 1 (Table 2):**
 - a) \$2,000 Clonlara Group Pty Ltd - The Great Aussie Hike
8. **Notes that the above recommended allocations would commit the following funds from future Council budgets:**
 - a) 2021-2022: \$49,000
 - b) 2022-2023: \$37,000
 - c)

Cr Colin Toohey / Cr Ben Buckley

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT/CONTEXT

Background

East Gippsland Shire Council has been running the Regional and District Events Sponsorship (RADES) program since 2010.

Through RADES, Council commits to financially supporting events for up to three years. This gives event coordinators certainty and to avoid the need for event coordinators applying annually for the same funding for the same event. Therefore, funding allocations are based on the economic benefit of the event, the grant amount requested by applicants and the funds available within the RADES budget.

The remaining funds available are as follows:

- **Round Two 2019-2020:** A total amount of \$84,000 from the 2019-2020 budget (of \$105,400) was already committed to previous rounds, leaving a balance of \$21,400 of unspent sponsorship. Note that returned sponsorship from cancelled events (due to Covid-19) totalled \$33,830, bringing the grand total of available to carry forward to 2020-2021 to \$55,230.
- **Round One 2020-2021:** A total amount of \$55,000 from the 2020-2021 budget (of \$107,500) has been pre-committed to previous rounds, leaving a balance of \$52,500, in addition to the \$55,230 to be carried forward from Round Two 2019-2020.

The table below outlines pre-committed events, starting 2019-2020 financial year and also shows events affected by Covid-19.

Pre-Committed Sponsored Events - 2019-2020 to 2020-2021

Event	Most Recent Date	Covid Response	Commitment
Snowy River Sprint	September 2019	No change	2 years ending 2019-2020
East Gippsland Challenge	December 2019	No change	3 years ending 2019-2020
Alpine Car Rally of East Gippsland	November 2019	No change	2 Year ending 2019-2020
Paynesville Food Van Fiesta	April 2020	2020 event cancelled	2 years ending 2019-2020
X-Marathon Expedition Adventure Race	November 2019	No change	3 years ending 2021-2022
Week of Bowls Carnival	February 2020	No change	3 years ending 2019-2020
Twin Rivers Bream Classic	July 2019	2020 event cancelled	2 years ending 2019-2020
East Gippsland Dog Show	August 2019	No change	3 Years ending 2020 -2021
Lakes Entrance New Year's Eve Festival	December 2019	2019 event cancelled due to bushfires	3 years ending 2020-2021
CLB3x3 Basketball	March 2020	2020 event postponed	3 years ending 2020-2021
Mitchell River Trail Run	December 2019	2019 event postponed due to bushfires; 2020 event cancelled	3 years ending 2020-2021
Friends of the Mitta Give Back to the Mitta	September 2019	No change	3 years ending 2021-2022
Paynesville Classic Boat Rally	February / March 2020	No change	1 year ending 2019-2020

Passing Endeavour *	April 2020	2020 event cancelled	1 year ending 2019-2020
Tambo Valley Producers Dinner	March 2020	2020 event cancelled	3 years ending 2019-2020
Gippsland Lakes Paddle Challenge	May 2020	2020 event cancelled	3 years ending 2020-2021
Tour of Gippsland	September 2020	2020 event postponed	3 years ending 2021-2022
Lakes Country Cruise	June 2020	2020 event cancelled	2 years ending 2020-2021
Field & Game Australia National Championships	November 2019	No change	1 year ending 2019-2020
Wildfighter Round 3*	October 2019	No change	1 year ending 2019-2020
Buick Car Club National Meet *	October 2020	TBC	1 year ending 2019-2020
Wild Harvest Seafood Festival	March 2020	2020 event cancelled	1 year ending 2019-2020
Lakes Entrance Lunar New Year Festival *	January 2020	No change	3 years ending 2021-2022

* New events.

Program Delivery

Round Two 2019-2020 of the East Gippsland Shire Council RADES program opened on 8 January 2020 and closed on 4 March 2020. Round One 2020-2021 opened 3 June 2020 and closed on 5 August 2020.

Both grant rounds were advertised by direct email to community groups, through Council Connect newsletters, local newspapers and social media. Media releases and advertisements were published in local newspapers to inform the community about the programs and of the closing dates.

Detailed information about Council's annual grants and funding programs, including the RADES program, was available on Council's website and included access to a comprehensive Grants Programs Guidelines booklet and relevant RADES application form. Council staff also promoted the grants program via their networks and databases.

Potential applicants were invited to contact Council's Event Officer for advice on the eligibility of their event and were encouraged to attend an information briefing.

Information sessions assist event organisers with their project queries, share examples of successful past recipients, provide advice on how to plan and write a project budget and introduce Council's event staff to foster greater interaction and ongoing engagement with event proponents.

For Round Two 2019-2020, a series of afternoon and evening Council Grants Information Sessions were held across the Shire in January including; Bairnsdale, Paynesville, Lakes Entrance, Omeo and Orbost.

For Round One 2020-2021, as a result of COVID-19 restrictions, two on-line information sessions were conducted in July. These were developed with the assistance of Council's Communications Team and twelve people participated in the sessions.

Assessment of applications

For both rounds, a selected panel assesses each application against the *East Gippsland Shire Grants Guidelines* and *RADES Eligibility Criteria* and then meet once to discuss and moderate.

Event organisers are required to address all application criteria and provide a financial plan detailing income and expenditure, and forecasting event profit or loss. This information is considered by the panel, along with the funding request, and informs the funding allocation recommendations of the RADES assessment panel.

The assessment panel for Round Two 2019-2020 was comprised of:

- Manager Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- Events Officer Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- Events Administration Officer Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- Drought Assistance Officer Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- East Gippsland Visitor Economy Bushfire Recovery Manager, Destination Gippsland and,
- Marketing Manager, East Gippsland Marketing Inc (EGMI)

The assessment panel for Round One 2020-2021 was comprised of:

- Manager Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- Events Officer Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- Events Administration Officer Economic Recovery, East Gippsland Shire Council
- East Gippsland Visitor Economy Bushfire Recovery Manager, Destination Gippsland and,
- Marketing Manager, East Gippsland Marketing Inc (EGMI)

A total of 14 applications were assessed by the panel in Round Two 2019-2020 and 6 applications in Round One 2020-2021.

Conflict of Interest

A Conflict of Interest was declared in the assessment of applications to Round Two 2019-2020 by Hayley Hardy, Marketing Manager at East Gippsland Marketing Inc, for the event East Gippsland Winter Festival. Panel Assessment meeting took place on-line, therefore, Hayley Hardy was removed from the moderation while the other panel members made a final assessment of the event.

There were no Conflicts of Interest declared for applications to Round One 2020-2021.

East Gippsland Winter Festival

The East Gippsland Winter Festival (EGMI) is a fresh concept with high potential to become a signature event of East Gippsland during a period of low tourism numbers – a key strategic focus. The development of this festival concept came out of the 2019-2020 bushfire response and has support through State and Commonwealth bushfire recovery grants in order to help establish the inaugural event and maximise its success.

Proposed to run over a three-week window, the Festival aims to activate sites across the region and provide umbrella marketing and promotion to elevate awareness of other micro events being held during the same winter period.

Two of these events have, independently of the Winter Festival, applied for funding under Round Two 2019-2020. They are:

- Comedy and Canapes - Cupcake Communications Pty Ltd -Lakes Entrance
- Deep Winter - Sailors Grave Brewing - Orbost

While these events will form part of a 'winter festival' program they are separate initiatives and have been assessed and recommended for funding individually. Further the events are in different locations and target different markets. The assessment and recommendations have been informed by the strategic value of increasing visitation during a period of, normally, low tourism numbers, noting that together, the recommended funding of the festival and these events is significant.

Events that have been previously funded

Events that have been previously funded by RADES, who re-apply for further funding, are required to illustrate growth and innovation to event operations and programming. This can be demonstrated for example by developing the marketing of an event (such as branding, website or advertising), introducing new program incentives to attract visitors, or development of management of the event.

Events that have been previously funded are often unsuccessful if they are unable to provide evidence of continuous improvement leading to growth.

Both RADES rounds presented in this report recommend supporting events already previously funded, based on the evidence presented pointing towards growth (Feast on East @ Metung, Paynesville Music Festival), innovation (Deep Winter) and development (Bruthen Blues and Arts Festival).

Events not Recommended for Funding

Applications for events deemed as having a community focus, fall under Council's Community Projects Grants Program and are referred for Council consideration in a separate report.

Other events not recommended for funding may be due to applications being incomplete, funding criteria not met, unrealistic outcomes and budget or there being other more suitable sources of funding available. As part of the feedback process to unsuccessful applicants, officers provide guidance on how their applications could be strengthened in preparation for re-submission in future rounds or assist in redirecting applicants to alternative funding sources.

New Events

The RADES program has been successful in attracting new events to East Gippsland. New events often present creative ideas and collaborations, value adding upon previous events and help to foster greater awareness of East Gippsland as a quality event destination.

Round Two 2019-20 program attracted the following **new events**:

- East Gippsland Winter Festival
- Comedy and Canapes
- Get into the Gippsland Lakes
- Slow Cooked Food and Great Wine - East Gippsland Style

Round One 2020-21 program attracted the following **new events**:

- Riding for Recovery
- Cattlemen 100 MTB Omeo

- The Great Aussie Hike

Economic Impact

This report makes recommendations to fund events that have a focus on supporting the economic growth of our region driven by increased visitor expenditure, and that have demonstrated through their event plan, that the assessment criteria are likely to be achieved.

The measure for economic impact is expenditure that would not otherwise have occurred in the region had the event not taken place.

New expenditure may come from:

- Visitors and competitors attracted to the area by an event.
- Exhibitors, participants, officials and organisers.
- Externally sourced sponsorships and grants
- Engagement of local suppliers in delivering the event

Investing in attracting events to the region generates awareness East Gippsland and increases visitation, which in turn drives economic benefit for the community.

*Regions of similar size to Gippsland allocate approximately \$470,000 per year for event attraction. This translates to hosting an average 45 events attracting 75,000 unique visitors to the region, with a direct spend of over \$80 million.

**source; Destination Gippsland Event Procurement Strategy SMA 2018.*

Following the impacts of Bushfires and the coronavirus pandemic, now more than ever, supporting East Gippsland's visitor economy is dependent on getting visitors back to the region quickly as soon as permission for travel and mass gatherings is restored. Events are a proven and effective strategy for injecting this important economic boost.

Council Recognition

Recognition of Council's contribution to an event is a key criterion for successful applicants. Event organisers are obliged through their Grant Agreement to recognise East Gippsland Shire Council publicly in all advertising, media releases, promotional and marketing material and incorporate Council's logo in all advertising and promotional material relating to the event.

Council Plan

This report is aligned with the following goal set out in the Council Plan 2017-2021:

A Growing Region of Opportunities Goal 2 - East Gippsland is Australia's number one adventure destination. We offer unforgettable tourism experiences for people of all interests, ages and abilities

Legislation

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights detailed in the Victorian Government's *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

Organisational

- **Financial**

The following is the breakdown of the financials for both rounds

2019-2020 Budget

Annual Funding Pool 2019-2020	\$105,400
Less: Commitments from previous rounds	\$84,000
Plus: returned unspent sponsorship	\$33,830
Subtotal remaining for carry forward	\$55,230

2020-2021 Budget

Annual Funding Pool 2020-2021	\$107,500
Plus: reallocated unspent and returned sponsorship funds	\$55,230
Subtotal	\$162,730
Less: Commitments from previous rounds	\$56,000
Less: Recommended commitment to applications from Round Two 2019-20	\$56,500
Subtotal	\$50,230
Less: Recommended commitment to applications from Round One 2020-2021	\$29,500
Balance of funding pool remaining for 2020-2021 RADES budget	\$20,730

The report also recommends committing funding from future year budgets as follows:

2021 - 2022: Assuming a total funding pool of \$107,500:
Minus \$30,000 which was forward committed from previous rounds
Minus recommendation to allocate \$49,000
Leaves \$28,500 available for future rounds

2022 -2023: Assuming a total funding pool of \$107,500
Minus recommendation to allocate \$37,000
Leaves \$70,500 available for future rounds

- **Human Resources**

Council officers in the Economic Recovery Unit will be responsible for administering the RADES Program.

- **Climate Change**

Climate change is not currently a specific criterion considered in the assessment of event applications. None of the recommended events currently has a specific focus relevant to climate change. This aspect can be considered as part of any review of the RADES program.

Consultation

External stakeholder input was sought as part of the assessment panel from:

- EGMI, Marketing Manager
- Destination Gippsland, East Gippsland Visitor Economy Bushfire Recovery Manager

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Appendices

1. Funding Recommendation Summary Round Two 2019-20 (Table 1) and Round One 2020-2021 (Table 2)

Attachments

Nil

Attendance

Cr Natalie O'Connell returned to the meeting at 7.51 pm

5.3 Good Governance

5.3.1 Drone (Remote Piloted Aircraft) Policy Review

Authored by	Phillip Phillipou, Manager Information Services
Endorsed by	Peter Cannizzaro, General Manager Business Excellence
Document No	8610333
In Attendance	Phillip Phillipou, Manager Information Services and Simone Spykers, GIS Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The current Drone (Remotely Piloted Aircraft) Policy (the Policy) is due for Council review. The draft revised Policy is provided at **Appendix 1**.

The revisions made to the Policy are administrative and are listed below:

- updated officer titles in line with the current organisation structure; and
- updates to legislation – deletion of Air Navigation Act 1958 (Commonwealth), replacing Civil Aviation Safety Regulations Part 101 (Commonwealth) with Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998 (CARS) Part 101 and reference to *Local Government Act 2020*.

A marked-up copy of the Policy detailing the amendments is provided at **Attachment 1**.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1. adopts the draft Revised Drone (Remote Piloted Aircraft) Policy as provided at Appendix 1; and***
- 2. authorises the Chief Executive Officer to amend the adopted Council policy without formal Council consideration if the amendment required is a result of changes to officer titles or administrative changes that occur from time to time.***

Cr Mark Reeves / Cr Richard Ellis

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION BE ADOPTED

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 01/09/20

OFFICER COMMENT / CONTEXT

Discussion

The amendments made to the Drone (Remotely Piloted Aircraft) Policy (the Policy) are minor administrative changes that have occurred as part of Council's organisation re-structure and legislative updates.

The annual review of the Drone Program demonstrates that the major objectives of the Drone Program are being met. The annual review was presented to Council's Audit and Risk Committee on 28 July 2020.

The legislative reference for the Air Navigation Act 1958 (Commonwealth) was removed from the Drone Policy as all requirements have been included in the *Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998 (CARS) Part 101* which is specifically for Remote Piloted Aircraft.

Reference to the Local Government Act has been updated to 2020. (previously 1989).

Council Plan

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following goals set out in the Council Plan 2017-2021:

Good Governance Goal 2 - Our relationships with other levels of government and partners deliver great outcomes for East Gippslanders.

A Liveable Region Goal 1 - East Gippsland has safe, accessible and well utilised open spaces and built environments that reflect the priorities of our community.

A Liveable Region Goal 2 - Sustainable planning and growth supports thriving townships, while maintaining our commitment to sustainability and protecting our natural environment

Legislation

On 24 March 2020 the Government passed the *Local Government Act 2020* (the new Act). Provisions from the new Act are being commenced in four stages. The first tranche of provisions commenced on 6 April 2020 with other tranches commencing on 1 May 2020 and 24 October 2020. All remaining provisions are commencing on 1 July 2021. The *Local Government Act 1989* applies in circumstances where the new Act has not commenced.

The East Gippsland Shire Council is required to make decisions under both Acts as the transition occurs. Council has implemented mechanisms to ensure decisions are made according to the relevant provisions of either the *Local Government Act 1989* or the *Local Government Act 2020* as in force at the date of the decision.

This report has been prepared in accordance with *Local Government Act 2020* Part 5, Division 8 Section 54

The implications of this report have been assessed and are not considered likely to breach or infringe upon the human rights detailed in the Victorian Government's *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*.

Organisational

- **Financial**

The Drone Program has been in operation for 3 years and during this time has achieved efficiencies and benefits. This has been achieved whilst enduring the impacts and challenges of the recent bushfires and COVID-19 restrictions. The main benefits to date have been from undertaking drone surveys at Council's waste facilities and tree inspections.

Climate Change

This report has been prepared and aligned with the following Climate Change function/category:

1. A liveable region Sustainable planning and growth supports thriving townships, while maintaining our commitment to sustainability and protecting our natural environment.

Consultation

As this report indicates, the draft revised Drone (Remotely Piloted Aircraft) Policy has been updated to reflect administrative changes, therefore consultation and stakeholder engagement has been limited to Council officers.

APPENDICES AND ATTACHMENTS

Appendices

1. Draft Drone (Remotely Piloted Aircraft) Policy 2020

Attachments

1. Marked up Drone (Remotely Piloted Aircraft) Policy 2018

6 Urgent and Other Business

Nil

7 Confidential Business

Nil

8 Close of meeting

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.

Confirmed _____

Cr John White, Mayor

Date: 15 September 2020