MINUTES

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL

Tuesday, 12 November 2013

Held at the
Belmont Bowls Club
Reynolds Road, Belmont
commencing at 7.00p.m.

COUNCIL:

Cr. T. Ansett (Windermere) (G21 Geelong Regional Alliance, Governance Regional Cities, Women in Community Life)
Cr. L. Ellis (Coryule) (Heritage, Rural Communities)
Cr. J. Farrell (Beangala) (Coastal Communities, Infrastructure, Parks and Gardens)
Cr. K. Fisher (Corio) (Community Safety, Education and Youth)
Cr. B. Harwood (Kardinia) (Community Development)
Cr. M. Heagney (Brownbill) (Enterprise Geelong)
Cr. J. Irvine (Austin) (Arts and Culture, Central Geelong)
Cr. E. Kontelj (Cowie) (Sport and Recreation)
Cr. Dr. S. Kontelj (Kildare) (Aboriginal Affairs, Multicultural Affairs)
Cr. R. Macdonald (Cheetham) (Finance)
Cr. R. Nelson (Deakin) (Major Projects, Planning, Knowledge Economy)
Cr. A. Richards (Buckley) (Major Events, Tourism)
SECTION A - PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Acknowledgements ............................................................................................................ 1
Apologies ............................................................................................................................ 1
Confirmation of Minutes .................................................................................................... 1
Declarations of Conflicts of Interest ................................................................................... 1
Question Time ..................................................................................................................... 2-4
Petitions ............................................................................................................................. 4

SECTION B - REPORTS

1. Amendment C285 Manzeene Village, Lara – Consideration of Submissions .............................. 5-21
2. C265 Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption ................................................................. 22
3. Revocation of Flood-Prone Area Designation of new Lots at Armstrong Creek ............................................ 23-28
5. Emergency Management Three Year Strategic Plan 2014-2016 ......................................................... 41-45
6. Planning Authority for Avalon Airport Rail Link .................................................................................. 46-49
7. Recreation Vehicles (RV’S) Issues and Opportunities .......................................................................... 50-55
9. Geelong Major Events Committee – Appointment of External Representative ...................................... 59-61
10. Plaques and Memorial Policy ........................................................................................................... 62-63
11. Council Attendance at International Gambling Conference ................................................................ 64-67
12. Delegation to the Chief Executive Officer – Stead Park Hockey Precinct Development Tender .................................................................................. 68-70
13. 2014/2015 Budget – City Plan Timetable ......................................................................................... 71-76

SECTION C – NOTICES OF MOTION

SECTION D – ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS
PRESENT: Cr B Harwood (Acting Mayor), Crs T Ansett, J Farrell, K Fisher, M Heagney, J Irvine, S Kontelj, R Macdonald, R Nelson, A Richards

Also present: S Griffin (Chief Executive Officer), M Kelly (Acting General Manager Corporate Services), P Bettess (General Manager Economic Development, Planning and Tourism), B Gaudion (Acting General Manager City Services), J McMahon (General Manager Community Services), D Frost (General Manager Projects, Recreation and Central Geelong), J Brown (Manager Administration and Governance), R Bourke (Governance Coordinator) D Chiller (Co-ordinator Communication and Marketing)

OPENING: The Acting Mayor declared the meeting open at 7.00pm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The Acting Mayor acknowledged that we are here today on the land of the Wathaurong People and we pay our respects to Aboriginal elders past and present.

APOLOGIES: Crs E Kontelj, L Ellis

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

Cr S Kontelj moved, Cr Nelson seconded -

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 22 October 2013 be confirmed and signed.

Carried.

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST:

Cr Ansett declared an Indirect Interest by Close Association in Agenda Item 2 – C265 Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption in that he has relations in the flood prone area.

Cr Heagney declared an Indirect Interest by Close Association in Agenda Item 2 – C265 Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption in that her parents-in-law own a property in the Portarlington area being considered.

Cr Heagney declared a Direct Interest in Agenda Item 10 – Plaques and Memorial Policy in that she is a member of the Board of the Geelong Cemeteries Trust.

QUESTION TIME:
Question Time is an opportunity for questions to be addressed to Council and while the minutes record the general content, they do not purport to be a transcript of what was said by individuals. Likewise Councillor or Officer verbal responses are in summary form only. Views expressed may not be the views of Council.

Council’s practice is to provide a separate document on its website setting out questions and responses including any more detailed written responses which may be provided subsequent to the meeting.

David Pavia asked the following:

A landfill has operated in Fyansford since 1989 when it was granted a 10 year permit by the shire of Bannockburn. When the permit was due for renewal in 2000, protracted negotiations occurred between COGG, the Land Fill operators and the residents of Fyansford who had raised a number of concerns about the Landfill operations. At Council’s meeting in October 24 2004, Council directed the Planning department to issue a five year extension to the Landfill permit provided a number of strict conditions were met and if conditions were not met with in a specific time-frame, the permit was to be cancelled. It has recently come to the residents’ attention that the planning department never issued the permit as directed by Council and has allowed the landfill operation to operate without a valid planning permit for the past 10 years.

What will Council do to ensure that it meets its statutory obligations to protect residents from uncontrolled activities and what steps will be taken to identify the failure to carry out the directive of the 2004 Council?

Peter Bettess responded that Council is currently investigating the 2004 decision. Council will be taking up issues of compliance during a meeting scheduled with the site Manager this Friday, and indicated Council will be in contact when the investigation process concludes.

Cr Farrell asked if there was a permit or not.

Peter Bettess responded that as he was not in Council’s employ during 2004, he would need to make further investigations.

Judith Brooks asked that given Barwon Heads doesn’t have one pedestrian crossing will Council undertake immediate discussions with the relevant Council officers regarding solutions, however temporary, to pedestrian safety before the coming crowds and traffic gather for the holiday season?

Cr Richards responded that Bridge Road and Golf Links Road are the responsibility of VicRoads and Council has no say. We have asked VicRoads to improve safety in Hitchcock Avenue but without success – but will continue to raise the issue.

Can Council reassure the Barwon Heads community that building a new community asset, a kindergarten, in the Barwon Heads Village Park which is now designated as a Bush Fire Prone Area, is still the best option for Barwon Heads? Are Councillors still fully confident, in the light of recent warnings on climate change, that the Bush Fire Attack Level of 12.5 for the building is adequate for the safety of children?
QUESTION TIME (CONT’D)

Are Councillors aware that Australia has had more bush fires in the last 13 years than the whole half of the last century?

Cr Richards advised these questions were responded to during the Barwon Heads Association’s Meeting in July. Council is confident that it meets the requirements in relation to the Kindergarten’s construction, and is happy to release details of the Bush Fire Assessment.

Richard Littlewood asked why won’t Council do anything about cars parked illegally in Thompson Street and Culbin Avenue, Belmont. I am concerned cars on nature-strip and footpath near the corner of Thompson and Mt Pleasant Roads are going to cause an accident because of the school opposite, despite sending photos to By-law officers with registration numbers and many complaints on phone, I am continually fobbed off with excuses. Also sign on nature-strip outside Sip Café is a hazard to motorists?

Jenny McMahon responded she was aware of the situation and had received a lot of complaints. Five officers have recently attended the site and cars have been legally parked. She indicated that contact will be made tomorrow to arrange a meeting on-site.

Maria Neagle addressed Council as follows in relation to the proposed telecommunication tower at Hamlyn Park Recreational Reserve:

Are you aware that the community is still very worried about the proposed telecommunications tower being put in Hamlyn Park Recreational Reserve?

Are you aware that members of this community are attending a VCAT Practice Day hearing this Friday, 15 November 2013?

Are you aware that the grounds of our VCAT submission include the following key arguments:

Firstly, a issue of amenity: The key factors underlying the amenity argument include the effect on the ambience of the recreational reserve and the fact that the location of this tower will directly interrupt the existing walking and bike track, and will effectively obstruct the existing connection between the Vines Road Redevelopment Project incorporating Western Height College with Hamlyn Park Recreational Reserve?

Are you aware that both of these features of the existing reserve were identified as of very high importance within the guiding master plan compiled for Council by Capacity Consulting and adopted by Council in September 2010?

As you aware that we are mounting a public health argument which is our second key ground for objection?

Finally, are you aware that at the VCAT practice hearing we will be asking Telstra to provide us with reasons why the alternative sites within the grid that they have investigated for such a tower are in fact worse for the community than the Hamlyn Park Recreational Reserve, such that they have deemed them to be inappropriate?

Cr Harwood responded that the issue has been discussed at length and Council has received many emails, however there is also a process to follow.
QUESTION TIME (CONT’D)

We have to wait and see what happens at VCAT and let discussions take place and submissions heard. Council grasps what you are saying, but also recognizes that the applicant has the right to pursue this application and we have a right to respect that. Cr Eddy Kontelj has been working very hard in relation to this issue.

Councillors cannot express a view, but we do understand, and we also understand about the natural process currently taking place.

Cr Ansett added the issue is very frustrating, especially when VCAT over-rides us as the elected members.

Sally Poehland provided Council with a presentation outlining their concerns with the Portarlington East C265 S.B.O. in 100 Year Flooding pertaining to 40 The Esplanade, Portarlington, and asked Councillors to give them a fair and impartial consideration of their submission. Their in-going aim was to have their property declared flood free. If this is not possible, would Council at least give our home and garage an exemption from 1 in 100 year event flooding?

Cr Harwood indicated that consideration of the report may be deferred.

Council is well aware of the issue and both Peter Bettess and Cr Ellis have met on-site inspecting the property.

Peter Bettess added Council has spent a lot of time on this issue and has a duty of care to provide guidelines and advice in relation to flood prone areas.

Reece Booth asked what is being done to promote Heritage in Geelong?

Cr Ansett responded that Council would welcome any energy around Heritage in Geelong. Council has the Heritage Centre in the City and the Botanical Gardens, but realise we need to do more. Cr Ansett indicated he would make contact with Mr Booth to discuss further.

PETITIONS: Nil
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Portfolio: Planning - Cr Macdonald  
Source: Economic Development, Planning and Tourism - Strategic Implementation  
General Manager: Peter Bettes  
Index Reference: Council Reports 2013

**Purpose**

This report considers submissions received to Amendment C285 and recommends the submissions be referred to an Independent Planning Panel.

**Summary**

- Amendment C285 seeks to rezone 60 hectares of land at Lara, constituting 26 Rural Living zoned lots, to the General Residential Zone.

- The rezoning is accompanied by a Development Plan Overlay, Development Contributions Plan and Overlay, and a Native Vegetation Precinct Plan to transition the land for urban use.

- The land affected is bounded by Patullos Road, O'Halloran's Road, Kees Road and the rear of existing residences to the east, on the western edge of the Lara Township. At full development, the land will provide for approximately 550-600 residential lots and compliment the adjacent Lara West Growth Area.

- Public exhibition of the Amendment commenced on 22 August 2013 and closed on 30 September 2013.

- As required by Ministerial Direction No. 15, a Planning Panel Hearing has been pre-set for the week commencing 16 December 2013. The panel hearing dates were included in the exhibition notice.

- Council received 35 submissions. 16 submissions objected to the Amendment while the remainder supported, offered in-principle support or did not object to the Amendment.

- Key issues arising from the submissions included: stormwater drainage management; road and traffic management; the high pressure gas transmission pipeline; land in the south west corner should be zoned for commercial uses and the drafting of the Development Plan Overlay Schedule.

- In accordance with the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*, Council must now either: change the Amendment in the manner requested by the objecting submissions; refer the submissions to an Independent Panel; or abandon the Amendment or part of the Amendment.

- Council officers have considered the submissions and do not recommend any major departures from what was exhibited.

- This report addresses the issues raised in the submissions and recommends they be referred to an Independent Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning.
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Cr Ansett moved, Cr Macdonald seconded -

That Council, having considered all submissions to Amendment C285 to the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, resolves to:

1) Request the Minister for Planning to appoint an Independent Panel under Part 8 of the Planning and Environment Act, 1987;
2) Refer all submissions that have not been resolved to the Panel; and
3) Submit to the Panel its response to the submissions generally as outlined in this report.

Carried.

Background

A rezoning application was made on 6 December 2012 by Spiire Australia on behalf of Dacland Pty Ltd. The area to which the rezoning applies is bounded by Patullos Road, O’Halloran’s Road, Kees Road and the rear of existing residences to the east, on the western edge of the Lara Township. Further to the west is the proposed Lara West Growth Area (Amendment C246).

The Amendment C285 land is proposed to be rezoned from the Rural Living Zone to the General Residential Zone.

The land is approximately 60 hectares and referred to as ‘Manzeene Village’ by the proponent. Dacland have formed an agreement with 23 of the 26 rural living landowners – a combined landowner entity known as the ‘Manzeene Avenue Development Trust Pty Ltd’. The other three landowners have been notified about the Amendment.

At its meeting on 9 July 2013, Council resolved to support the preparation and exhibition of Amendment C285 to the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, subject to authorisation by the Minister for Planning. Ministerial Authorisation was received on 12 August 2013.

Public exhibition of Amendment C285 commenced on 22 August 2013 and closed on 30 September 2013.

The exhibited Amendment proposes to:

- Rezone the land from the Rural Living Zone to the General Residential Zone and insert Clause 32.08 (General Residential Zone);
- Apply a new Schedule to Clause 43.04 (Development Plan Overlay);
- Apply a new Schedule to Clause 45.06 (Development Contributions Plan Overlay);
- Replace the Schedule to Clause 52.16 with a new Schedule to include the Manzeene Avenue Development, Lara, Native Vegetation Precinct Plan.
- Incorporate the following documents to the Schedule to Clause 81.01:
  - Lara West Development Contributions Plan, August 2013.
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Letters and notices were sent to relevant Government departments, statutory authorities and all land owners directly affected by any zoning or overlay changes, as well as to surrounding landowners.


A complete set of the Amendment documents were available on the Geelong Australia and Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure (DTPLI) websites, as well as hard copies at 100 Brougham Street, Geelong and at the Lara Regional Library.

Appendix 1 shows an aerial map of the land proposed to be rezoned. Appendix 2 shows the proposed Greater Geelong Planning Scheme map changes.

**Discussion**

As a consequence of the Amendment C285 exhibition, a total of 35 submissions were received. Appendix 3 contains a schedule which summarises the submissions and Planning Officer response.

For the purposes of this report, a detailed breakdown of submissions shows:

- 9 in-principle or no objection submissions were received from State Government Departments and Authorities.
- 10 supporting submissions were received from:
  - 9 from landowners of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust Pty Ltd.
  - 1 from a landowner in the Amendment C285 area, but not part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust.
- 16 objecting submissions were received from:
  - 7 from landowners of the Lara West Growth Area, including the proponent of Amendment C246: Lara Lakes Pty Ltd.
  - 1 from a landowner part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust (currently in discussion with the proponent to resolve their issues).
  - 1 from a landowner in the Amendment C285 area, but not part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust.
  - 5 from surrounding landowners.
  - 1 from the proponent, Spiire Australia on behalf of Dacland Pty Ltd (Spiire lodged a supporting submission subject to several changes to the exhibited documentation).
  - 1 from the Urban Development Institute of Australia raising concern over the proposed permit condition within the DPO Schedule to notify future land buyers of the existence of the high-pressure gas pipeline via a section 173 agreement.

Pursuant to the *Planning and Environment Act* 1987, the Council is required to consider all submissions made to an Amendment and must either: (1) change the Amendment as requested by the submissions; or (2) refer the submissions to an Independent Panel; or (3) abandon the Amendment.
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The next section of this report outlines the key issues raised in the submissions and provides an officer response. Submissions which requested changes to the exhibited Development Plan Overlay Schedule have been responded to in a table format in Appendix 4. A track-changes version of the Schedule will be prepared for the Panel Hearing.

In the event the submissions are referred to an Independent Panel, as recommended, the responses in this report will form the basis for Council’s presentation to the Panel.

High pressure gas pipeline

As shown in the Appendix 1 map a natural gas transmission pipeline of strategic importance to the State of Victoria – known as the South West Pipeline (The Iona to Lara Pipeline), traverses land adjacent to the Amendment C285 land. Changes to land use within close proximity to the pipeline need to consider Australian Standard 2885 and Clause 16.03-6 of the Planning Scheme.

This is the same pipeline that was considered as part of Amendment C246 Lara West Growth Area adopted by Council on 22 October 2013. Extensive discussion on this issue can be found in the 22 October 2013 Council Minutes. Outcomes from the Amendment C246 process have assisted in the drafting of the Development Plan Overlay Schedule for this Amendment for referral and notification requirements.

Submissions were received from Energy Safe Victoria (ESV) and APA GasNet Australia (Operations) Pty Ltd. ESV request that the Development Plan Overlay Schedule be altered to seek the views of the ‘appropriate authority for planning matters related to the administration of the Pipelines Act 2005’, instead of ESV. ESV also requested that the wording for the requirement to enter into an agreement be in a form ‘acceptable to’ the ‘Minister administering of the Pipelines Act 2005’.

APA submitted that they own and operate the pipeline. APA supports the submission of ESV and supports the proposed development. The submission provides guidance for any works within the pipeline easement and highlights the public safety needs to be considered in proximity to gas pipelines. The submission notes on 18 June 2013 a Safety Management Study (SMS) was held on the Manzeene Avenue development and the SMS report is in the process of being finalised. The SMS found that certain types of uses should preferably be located 554 metres from the edge of this pipeline’s easement.

Spiire, on behalf of Dacland, does not agree with the Development Plan Overlay Schedule requirement for all landowners within the ‘measurement length’ of the gas pipeline to enter into a Section 173 Agreement. This requirement is intended to act as a mechanism to inform potential landowners of the proximity of the pipeline.

The submission goes on to say:

A s173 agreement is an inappropriate mechanism to communicate with landowners about the gas pipeline, and sets a burdensome precedent on all development in Victoria if implemented. The Manzeene Avenue SMS determined the ‘measurement length’ of the T92 Iona asset as 550m from either side of the 20m pipeline easement. The measurement length corridor extends approximately 1km. The current amendment alone would result in s173 agreements being required for approximately 112ha of land. Considering that high pressure gas assets extend over Victoria for several hundred kilometres, the regulatory burden of applying and enforcing such a mechanism to all affected land would create an unreasonable impost on both government and the community. We submit that separate s173 agreements with all landowners is a costly, onerous, inefficient and impractical mechanism to inform residents of the existence of the pipeline.
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We understand that Energy Safe Victoria (ESV), the Department of Environment and Primary Industries (DEPI) and the APA are currently working to establish a notification process that ensures landowners (and relevant planning authorities) are provided appropriate information regarding high pressure gas pipelines. The process being undertaken by the regulatory bodies and licensee expert group should determine what, if any, notification mechanism is appropriate.

Furthermore we consider it imperative to ensure the community is not misinformed about the relationship between development and gas pipeline infrastructure. The Manzeene Avenue SMS has determined that the development being facilitated by the rezoning can proceed as all potential risks posed by the gas pipeline assets have been identified and managed by the APA, under scrutiny from ESV and the DEPI. Gas pipelines are common and long established infrastructure items that when managed correctly can co-exist with urban development with no credible risk to public safety. Introducing an onerous s173 agreement creates the perception that high pressure gas pipelines are a danger or liability to landholders. This is not an outcome that benefits Council, the relevant regulatory authorities or the community, and should be avoided at all cost.

A submission from the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) raised similar concerns to that of the Spiire/ Dacland submission.

Officer response

The minor word changes to the Development Plan Overlay Schedule suggested by ESV and supported by APA are agreed. References in the APA submission as to work within the pipeline easement, while important, are not relevant as the easement is not located within the Amendment C285 land.

The arguments raised by Spiire and the UDIA are valid and are not dismissed by Council. However, at this point in time it is not considered appropriate to support the submissions and remove the DPO requirement for a Section 173 Agreement. It is noted that neither ESV nor APA in their submissions sought to remove this requirement.

Council has included the same requirement in the planning controls for Amendment C246. This was the result of a recommendation where the C246 Panel Report said “It is in no-one’s interest that prospective land purchasers are ignorant of the presence of the pipeline or the risks associated with it and therefore notice for newcomers buying into the area about the existence of the pipeline is reasonable”. Council sought legal advice from Maddocks on the Panel’s recommendation. Maddocks advised that the use of an Agreement under section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 is an appropriate mechanism of giving notice.

Council should take a consistent approach on this matter, guided by the advice from the C246 Panel (and future C285 Panel), ESV, APA and the Department of State Development, Business and Innovation.

Hall & Wilcox Lawyers on behalf of APA in a letter to Council dated 3 September 2013, queried the proposed Section 173 Agreement as part of the Amendment C246 planning controls. The letter then states that APA “… intends to take this up as part of a broader submission to DPI and the Minister for Planning in respect of the need for the Victoria Planning Provisions to deal more strategically with the presence of infrastructure such as the pipeline.”
1. **AMENDMENT C285 MANZEENE VILLAGE, LARA - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS (CONT’D)**

Council, as part of its resolution to Amendment C246, will write to the Planning Minister’s department to investigate the need for a planning control to recognise the gas pipeline and its measurement length. Council officers also understand that a State Government working group has been established to focus on land development around existing gas pipelines.

**Proposed Neighbourhood Activity Centre in the south west corner of Manzeene Village**

Spiire/Dacland submit that the land at the south west corner of the site be rezoned to the Commercial 1 Zone to allow for a future Neighbourhood Activity Centre (NAC) to be considered. The submission highlights the current chronic undersupply of retail services, particularly grocery shopping opportunities in Lara. Dacland has consistently said that land on the corner of Patullos and O’Hallorans Roads is the most appropriate site for a NAC.

The Spiire submission notes that the C246 Panel said there is planning policy support for the development of a NAC within the Lara West Growth Area. This was supported by Council. Dacland accept the Panel finding however consider the NAC is unlikely to be viable until at least 2027. Dacland maintain that an additional NAC is required and their corner site has strategic merit, with negligible impact to the ability of other activity centres to achieve their full potential.

Submissions received from landowners in the Lara West Growth Area, Lara Lakes Pty Ltd and CTS Property Investments do not support the Dacland proposal for a NAC in Manzeene Village. The submissions support the rezoning of the Amendment land to the General Residential Zone only.

**Officer response**

The exhibition of Amendment C285 includes rezoning all the land to the General Residential Zone only. There is no support to rezone part of the land to the Commercial 1 Zone. To support the Dacland submission would be a transformation of the Amendment and require the Amendment to be reconsidered at a Council Meeting, re-authorised by the Minister for Planning and then exhibited again.

The proposed General Residential Zone, with land in the south west corner abutting a Road Zone, provides for a number of commercial uses, including but not limited to, hotel, food and drink premises and service station. The Development Plan Overlay Schedule supports this approach.

What Council does not support is the establishment of a supermarket and associated specialty shops at this location. Council has consistently maintained that a NAC in the western part of Lara is best located central to the Lara West Growth Area supported by a range of other land uses and services in an orderly, planned manner.

Officers agree that the Lara West NAC may not be viable until 2027 but this is not considered to adversely impact on the local community. The time lag will allow for full development of the expanded Lara Town Centre, with preliminary works having commenced. This is a long-term project that has required significant investment by Council and other parties. The establishment of both a Coles and Woolworths full-line supermarket in the Town Centre will provide for the convenient shopping needs of western Lara residents, including future residents of Manzeene Village.
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Council reiterates that it has never understood its own strategic planning and various panel reports and any other strategies done as ever contemplating two NAC's in planning for growth in western Lara.

Road and traffic management

A coordinated submission from the Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure (DTPLI) and Public Transport Victoria (PTV) supports the Amendment. In particular the requirement in the Development Plan Overlay Schedule to prepare a Road Network Plan that provides for the continuation of the main East-West Connector Street from the Lara West Precinct through to Manzeene Avenue. According to PTV, this will enable a planned bus route to run through the central spine of Lara West and continue through Manzeene Village, creating a more direct and reliable route.

The Spiire submission acknowledges the need for efficient public transport in the area and provides in-principle support for a bus route through the Manzeene Village site. Spiire however consider it imperative that any future connection be constructed as an Access Street rather than a Connector Road. According to Spiire, an Access Street Level 2 with a road cross section of 16 metres and additional pavement area of between 7 and 7.5 metres is sufficient to accommodate a bus route if required.

Spiire further consider that continuing the East-West road as a Connector Street would undermine O'Hallorans Road as it results in two north south Connector Streets running parallel. Spiire submit that this upgrade creates a ‘rat-run’ scenario where motorists travelling north to Kees Road would shortcut through to Manzeene Avenue rather than the designated Connector Street network.

The DTPLI submission comments on some of the proposed intersection treatments. Given the close proximity of the Windermere Road / Kees Road and Windermere Road / O'Hallorans Road intersections and the use of Windermere Road as a truck route, the Department recommends that channelized right turn lanes are provided for both of these intersections.

The Department also notes that the SIDRA analysis of the Patullos Road and Manzeene Avenue intersection indicates that there would be significant delays for vehicles turning right from Manzeene Avenue. To alleviate this problem the Department says consideration could be given to modifying the proposed intersection treatment at Patullos/ O'Hallorans/ Elcho Roads to enable the right turning traffic from Manzeene Village to prop in the medium as per the design for Patullos/ Elcho Road.

A submission from the landowner of 140 Kees Road – a property located on the opposite side of the C285 Amendment land, raises concerns about the current state of Kees Road and it being unsuitable to cater for traffic from the development. The submitter asks who is responsible for the upgrade to Kees Road and will it be upgraded before development begins.

Officer response

The submission from DTPLI/PTV regarding a proposed bus route through the development site is supported. It is noted that the position of PTV is consistent with comments provided to Council Officers and Spiire in February 2013. A well planned, efficient bus service through the growth areas of western Lara is an important part of creating sustainable, connected communities.
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Officers do not agree that this bus route would create a ‘rat-run’ scenario. The continuation of the main East-West Connector Street from the Lara West Precinct though to Manzeene Avenue and Kees Road will be a planned Connector Street able to accommodate buses, vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. Its function will be that of a Connector Street. This is consistent with the Lara West Precinct Structure Plan which shows an ‘arrow’ to indicate the possible extension of the main East-West Connector Street.

The DPO Schedule does not prescribe the cross-section of the Street but it must be compliant with the Department of Transport Public Transport Guidelines for Land Use and Development (2008). The design would be expected to be similar to roads in the Lara West Precinct that include a bus route. An Access Street Level 2 as proposed by Spiire would not meet the Department of Transport guidelines.

Officers support the recommendation to provide channelized right turn lanes for the intersections of Windermere Road / Kees Road and Windermere Road / O’Hallorans Road. This recommendation will be implemented by an additional requirement in the DPO Schedule and changes to the Development Contributions Plan. The cost implications to the Development Contributions Plan are expected to be minimal.

The DTPLI concerns regarding vehicles turning right from Manzeene Avenue into Patullos Road has highlighted a gap in planning for the development – the broader issue of traffic management and access to land in the south west corner. There are opportunities for this area to accommodate non-residential uses such as a hotel, food and drink premises and service station, although there is also the possibility that the land will be used for residential purposes.

The Cardno Traffic Impact Assessment in Section 5 should provide the basis for more detailed analysis once the uses in the south west corner are known. New requirements to the Urban Design Masterplan and the Road Network and Traffic Management Plan of the DPO Schedule are considered appropriate to address vehicle access/ egress, particularly in relation to limiting the use of Manzeene Avenue and management of the Patullos Road interface (both in its current configuration and the new Patullos/ O’Hallorans/ Elcho Road intersection design).

With regard to the concerns of the Kees Road landowner, Kees Road will need to be upgraded by the developer to the satisfaction of Council for its length between Benjamin Drive and Windermere Road. The construction of the road would occur when land fronting Kees Road is subdivided or as specified in the Development Plan.

**Stormwater drainage management**

A submission was received from the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority. The Authority provides in-principle support of the proposed Amendment subject to the inclusion of additional requirements to the Development Plan Overlay Schedule.

The Authority had previously advised the Council and proponent in February 2013 that no increase in extent, depth or velocity of flooding neighbouring properties is acceptable under proposed development conditions. The Authority notes that the site is subject to flooding during 1% AEP flood events and detailed stormwater assessments form part of the Amendment documentation.
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The Authority has concerns that the assessment does not clearly outline the assumptions around filling of the site and how this has been allowed for in the modelling. The potential loss of floodplain storage at this location is of concern to the Authority given the extensive floodplain of Hovells Creek and the proposed confining of this floodplain at the subject site.

The landowners of 6 and 7 Denise Court, Lara, support the development provided it achieves a resolution of the flooding currently experienced on their property. The submitters' land backs onto the Amendment land and they consider the drain at the rear of their property has inadequate capacity to cater for stormwater runoff. The submission requests that the DPO Schedule include a specific outcome to avoid the current overland flooding problems, not just ‘restricted to pre-development levels or flows’. This would also include removal of the existing ‘Flood Map’ over the submitters’ land. The submission also raises concerns about the impacts of the proposed fill works on visual amenity and requests the DPO Schedule include the option of constructing an underground drain along the site boundary.

A submission was received from CTS Property Investments (Vic) Pty Ltd – its shareholders are the owners of 85 Manzeene Avenue and part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust. The submission supports the rezoning but objects to elements of the proposed DPO Schedule and drainage scheme. CTS advises that there have been discussions with Dacland Pty Ltd to try to resolve the issues in dispute and is scheduled to meet with Dacland in mid October.

Spiire on behalf of Dacland in its submission noted that the Development Contributions Plan (DCP) as exhibited does not include any drainage infrastructure. The submission considers it possible that joint infrastructure will be required to cater for flows from the Lara West development. Spiire believe investigations should be undertaken to a point that provides Council and the developers of Manzeene Avenue confidence that no shared infrastructure will be required, or if found to be required, that such infrastructure is included in the DCP.

Officer response

The submission of the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority is currently under review by Council drainage engineers, who will work closely with the Authority and developer on this matter. Changes to the DPO Schedule to include the Authority’s requirements will be finalised prior to the Panel Hearing.

The concerns outlined in the submission by the landowners of 6 and 7 Denise Court, Lara are currently being reviewed by Council drainage engineers. Spiire engineers advise that the flooding affects within Denise Court have been modelled to be reduced as a result of the development. Requested changes to the Development Plan Overlay Schedule will be further addressed at the Panel Hearing.

Council acknowledges that the landowners of 85 Manzeene Avenue are part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust and is encouraged that the parties seek to resolve their issues in dispute. Resolution of drainage scheme matters relating to 85 Manzeene Avenue that result in changes to the Amendment documentation will need to be assessed and approved by Council and the Catchment Management Authority.
1. **AMENDMENT C285 MANZEENE VILLAGE, LARA - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS (CONT’D)**

The Spiire/Dacland submission, while raising concerns about drainage infrastructure being omitted from the DCP, does not identify the location (or locations), infrastructure requirements or costings that should be shared with the Lara West developers. Council officers will meet with the proponent before the Panel Hearing to further clarify this issue.

At the Amendment C246 Panel Hearing, Council submitted that there had been ongoing discussions between Council’s drainage engineers, the proponent and Dacland on the subject of drainage of these precincts; and it had been determined that the drainage design will be a developer-funded item. The Panel found that there is no need to include drainage infrastructure in the DCP.

Council officers have further reviewed the Spiire submission, in particular the planning and delivery of off-site infrastructure to Hovells Creek. The DPO Schedule includes a requirement for the Integrated Water Management Plan to address: ‘Easement creation and/or widening and realignment as necessary to ensure adequate provision for pipe laying and maintenance, both within the development Precinct, and to external affected properties’.

To safeguard Council’s interests, Officers consider there is a need to ensure all costs associated with the facilitation and delivery of down stream drainage works to Hovells Creek, including easement widening and outfall construction, are borne by the developer. This could be implemented by an additional requirement in the DPO Schedule Section 3.0 or the requirement for a section 173 agreement in Section 2.0.

**Public open space contribution**

The Spiire/ Dacland submission agrees that development of the Manzeene Avenue land must provide high quality areas of public open space that serves the needs of the community. Spiire however, consider the blanket application of a 10% open space contribution does not take into account the constraints, characteristics or infill development context of the site. Spiire say an open space contribution of 5% of developable residential land is appropriate.

The submission goes on to say that the usability and amenity provided by the drainage and environmental requirements of the development informs that a 5% contribution is capable of creating a vibrant, usable, public open space network.

**Officer response**

The submission is not supported. Clause 52.01 of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme is about public open space contributions and subdivision. The Schedule to the Clause requires a public open space contribution of 10% for 10 or more lots for land zoned for residential purposes after August 31\textsuperscript{st} 2007.

The proposed Development Plan Overlay Schedule requires: ‘An open space contribution equal to 10% of the developable land or in-lieu cash payment or combination of both. Encumbered open space, including drainage reserves and conservation areas, shall not form part of the open space contribution.’ This 10% requirement is consistent with all recent green field rezonings in the municipality. Examples include Plantation Road, Corio (DPO27); Moss Road, Leopold (DPO25); Princess Street, Drysdale (DPO24); Central Road, Drysdale (DPO23); Ocean Grove Growth Area (DPO22); Jetty Road Growth Area Stage 1 (DPO20); and the St Leonards Golf Club (DPO19).
1. **AMENDMENT C285 MANZEENE VILLAGE, LARA - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS (CONT’D)**

The argument that the site is an “infill development” was similarly raised in Amendment C246 and is again not supported here. The Manzeene Avenue area is no different to many other areas on the fringe of Melbourne and Geelong that simply integrate with future green field developments. They are un-serviced and undeveloped areas as opposed to infill sites that usually have surrounding infrastructure and facilities already provided and therefore only need to contribute to the increased infrastructure demand of these sites alone.

Council has consistently maintained that land set aside with drainage as its primary function is encumbered land. Land suitable for a public open space contribution has public park and recreation as its primary function and has no constraints (such as flooding within 1:100 ARI, easements or utilities infrastructure, specific native vegetation management requirements under an NVPP, etc.) on what recreation-facilitating landscaping, infrastructure and activities are allowable.

Council does not consider the use of flood-prone land (land within the 1:100 year ARI) or land set aside to retain native grasses as appropriate locations for usable public open space, although it encourages public open space to be located adjacent to such areas.

**Environmental implications**

The new Schedule to the Development plan Overlay and the Lara West Native Vegetation Precinct Plan forms part of the Amendment and will be incorporated into the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

These documents are underpinned by extensive technical assessment and review and include a range of objectives and requirements to reduce environmental impacts and support sustainable development.

**Financial Implications**

The Development Contributions Plan (DCP) is the primary mechanism for funding infrastructure to service the new growth area. The growth area requires in the order of $40M of infrastructure of which the DCP will fund approximately $36M. The infrastructure will be delivered over the 20 year life span of the DCP.

Council will be responsible for managing the funds collected through the DCP and either directly delivering the required infrastructure or making arrangements for developers to construct infrastructure as “works in lieu”.

**Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications**

Clause 11.02 ‘Urban Growth’ of the State Planning Policy Framework requires planning authorities to ensure that sufficient land is available to meet forecast demand. Lara is a designated primary growth node in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

The ‘Manzeene Avenue/Kees Road’ area is identified as ‘Conventional residential’ in the Lara Structure Plan and Clause 21.13 of the Planning Scheme. Clause 21.13 supports the rezoning of this area with appropriate Development Plan Overlay and Development Contributions Plan Overlay controls.
1. AMENDMENT C285 MANZEEENE VILLAGE, LARA - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS (CONT’D)

Alignment to City Plan

The Amendment supports the Growing our Economy and Sustainable Built and Natural Environment strategic directions of City Plan.

The rezoning will maintain an appropriate supply of residential land in northern Geelong, and facilitate significant, long term investment in an area identified in Council’s Municipal Strategic Statement for growth.

The Lara West Precinct Structure Plan and Development Contributions Plan promote development of a sustainable built environment. This will be achieved by delivering community and retail facilities, integrated management of stormwater and open space, and an efficient transport and movement network.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No Council officer involved in the report has any direct or indirect interest, in accordance with Section 80(c) of the local Government Act.

Risk Assessment

Pursuant to Ministerial Direction No. 15 timeframes have been imposed on all planning authorities amending planning schemes across Victoria. Under section 12(2) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, a planning authority must have regard to the Minister’s directions.

Failure to comply with the timeframes in the Direction may prompt the Minister to exercise powers under section 185 of the Act. This section allows the Minister to direct a planning authority to take any steps in the amendment process within a specific time. Not implementing the recommendation in this report to refer the submissions to a Panel may result in Council failing to meet its statutory timeframes for the amendment.

There are no other notable risks associated with implementing the recommendation contained in this report.

Social Considerations

Councils are required to ensure a sufficient supply of land is available in designated growth areas for residential and other urban uses, including affordable housing close to jobs, transport and services.

The Manzeene Avenue development will be a fully planned community that provides a mix of housing opportunities. The development is a charge area of the Lara West Development Contributions Plan to provide western Lara with services and infrastructure to support these new communities.

Human Rights Charter

The Amendment will not impact on any basic rights, freedoms and responsibilities as set out in the Charter. Planning legislation ensures an open community consultation process occurs, enabling people to freely express their views and if necessary obtain a fair hearing before an Independent Panel.
1. **AMENDMENT C285 MANZEEENE VILLAGE, LARA - CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS (CONT’D)**

*Consultation and Communication*

The Amendment was exhibited in accordance with the provisions of the *Planning and Environment Act 1987*.

In accordance with Clause 4(2) of Ministerial Direction No. 15 the following panel hearing dates have been set for this Amendment:

- Panel hearing: in the week commencing 16 December 2013.

Planning Panels Victoria will notify all submitters of the Panel dates and invite requests to be heard at the Panel Hearing.
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## Appendix 3: Summary of Submissions and Officer Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>APA Group</td>
<td>Daniel Tucci, Senior Concept Engineer APA GasNet Aust (Operations) P/L 180 Greens Road Dandenong VIC 3164</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>APA GasNet owns and operates the high-pressure natural gas transmission pipeline that traverses land adjacent to (but not within) the Amendment site. The submission requests minor changes to the draft DPO26 similar to that submitted by ESV. APA recommends that “T2” high density and “sensitive” land uses are preferably located 554m from the edge of the pipeline’s easement. APA also understands that the predominant land use in this area will be conventional residential land and consistent with AS2885. The submission outlines development needs to be restricted in the pipeline easement and requests to be notified of any works such as intersection improvements at Elcho / Patullos Roads.</td>
<td>The APA submission is acknowledged and Council will continue to work closely with the pipeline licensee. The pipeline issue is addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barwon Water</td>
<td>Justin Franklin Acting Mgr Asset Planning 61-67 Ryrie St GEELONG 3220</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>Barwon Water does not object to the rezoning. The submission notes that BW has previously reviewed the proposal and its comments have been accurately reflected in the Amendment documents and servicing report. A DN225mm main drain will need to be constructed along Manzeene Avenue as shown in Figure 2 of the submission. BW note that this main is not shown in the Spiire Servicing Report.</td>
<td>Submission noted. An addition to the Spiire Servicing Report will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Best Hooper for L Hemingway &amp; ors</td>
<td>Ian Pitt Special Council, 563 Little Lonsdale Street Melb VIC 3000</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Submission made on behalf of the owners of 35 Manzeene Avenue, Lara. Submission states that Dacland has no legal or equitable interest in the land (35 Manzeene Ave) and should not be in a position to dictate the form of development or location of infrastructure.</td>
<td>Not supported. The submission is addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section and Appendix 4 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4  | P & W Caddy | 140 Kees Road, Lara VIC 3212 | Objection | The submission notes the following:  
- The current state of Kees Road North is unsuitable for the amount of traffic required for the Manzeene Ave development;  
- What are the plans and who is responsible for upgrading Kees Road BEFORE development begins?  
- Will a copy of the Integrated Water Mgt Plan be available to adjoining land owners who will be potentially affected?  
- Hoping that current quiet lifestyle is not impacted by the development. | Kees Road will need to be upgraded by the developer to the satisfaction of Council where it abuts the land to be rezoned. The construction of the road would occur when land fronting Kees Road is subdivided or as specified in the Development Plan.  
The Integrated Water Mgt Plan forms part of the Development Plan. Anyone who is interested in viewing the Plan can contact the Statutory Planning Department after the Plan has been prepared and lodged with Council.  
The ‘current quiet lifestyle’ enjoyed by the landowners will inevitably be affected as development of Manzeene Avenue and Lara West occurs. Traffic volumes on Kees Road will increase. The construction phase particularly will see more heavy vehicles in the immediate area. |
| 5  | Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) | Dr G Taylor  
Floodplain Statutory Manager  
Colac VIC 3250 | In-principle support | The submission includes comments on existing waterways, floodplain storage and conveyance and floodwater afflux.  
The submission raises concerns about the potential loss of floodplain storage and notes that the drainage report does not clearly outline the | The CCMA submission is acknowledged and Council will continue to work closely with the Authority.  
Drainage management issues are addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section of this report. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assumptions around filling of the site and how this has been allowed for in the modelling. The Authority provides in-principle support of the proposed development subject to the inclusion of additional requirements in the DPO Schedule.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Any future roadside vegetation management program will be the responsibility of Council, working in consultation with the CFA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6  | Country Fire Authority            | Peter Hamilton, Fire Safety Officer CFA Barwon SW Region, District 7 North Geelong VIC 3215 | No Objection  | The submission makes the following comments:  
  • The site is not subject to a Bushfire Management Overlay.  
  • The site is within a Bushfire Prone Area and as such construction requirements in accordance with AS3959 apply.  
  • CFA recommends that a Roadside vegetation management program be implemented along O’Hallorans Road to ensure that vegetation fuel loads are maintained to a satisfactory level. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 7  | CTS Property Investments Pty Ltd  | G Petsinis Director PO Box 157 Albert Park VIC 3206                      | Objection     | The submitter has an interest as its shareholders are the owners of 85 Manzeene Avenue, which forms part of the Amendment C285 land. The submission supports the rezoning and proposed Development Contributions Plan Overlay. The submission objects to the proposed DPO26 and drainage scheme and is in discussions with Dacland to try and resolve the issues. Further, the submission does not support other elements of C285 and seeks changes from Dacland to:  
  1. Agree to vary concept and layout plans covering 85 Manzeene Avenue;  
  2. Amend the Manzeene Village Concept Plan;  
  3. Amend the drainage scheme that affects 85 | Submission noted – the parties are encouraged to continue discussions in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues. The CTS submission is further addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section of this report.                                                                                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C Cullen</td>
<td>65 Fakenham Rd Ashburton VIC 3147</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submitter is the owner of the land at 285 Patullos Road, Lara. The submission supports the rezoning of the Manzeene Avenue land to the General Residential Zone but only as long as the requirements of the new planning controls to be implemented by C285 are varied to reflect the outcome of C246 relating to the Lara West Growth Area and not changed to suit the developers in Manzeene Ave.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>G Cullen</td>
<td>65 Fakenham Rd Ashburton VIC 3147</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submitter is the owner of the land at 285 Patullos Road, Lara. The submission supports the rezoning of the Manzeene Avenue land to the General Residential Zone but only as long as the requirements of the new planning controls to be implemented by C285 are varied to reflect the outcome of C246 relating to the Lara West Growth Area and not changed to suit the developers in Manzeene Ave.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dept of Environment and Primary Industries</td>
<td>Geoff Brookes, Program Manager Barwon SW Region Geelong VIC 3220</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>DEPI officers have worked with Council and the developer consortium on the development of the Manzeene Avenue Draft Native Vegetation Precinct Plan. DEPI is satisfied that the proposed NVPP will fulfil the broad objectives of State Govt native vegetation policy. The submission notes that Govt policy is in the process of change and that only minor changes to the NVPP will be required. The submission lists the required changes.</td>
<td>Submission noted. The NVPP will be amended to reflect the recommendations of the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A &amp; C Derham</td>
<td>30 Manzeene Avenue, Lara</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitters are landowners/occupiers within the proposed Manzeene Village development.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIC 3212</td>
<td></td>
<td>The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP. The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dept of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure / Public Transport Victoria</td>
<td>Jozef Vass, Transport Coordination Mgr – Barwon SW Region, DoT PO Box 775 Geelong VIC 3220</td>
<td>In-principle support</td>
<td>Coordinated response from DTPLI and PTV. <strong>Public Transport</strong> PTV supports the exhibited amendment, in particular the requirement for the development plan to enable a planned bus route to run through the central spine of the Lara West PSP and continue through Manzeene Village. <strong>Cycling and Walking</strong> The requirement for the development plan to prepare a Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Plan is strongly supported. <strong>Intersections</strong> The submission recommendations minor changes to intersections at Windermere/Kees/O'Hallorans Roads and at Patullos Road/Manzeene Avenue. <strong>General</strong> It is noted that the DPO schedule specifies a number of requirements which are strongly supported and are consistent with an initial Feb 2013 submission. However it is also noted that the August 2013 version of the Cardno Traffic Impact Assessment is not consistent with these comments or the schedule.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Council acknowledges the continued support of the Department in planning for growth in western Lara. The submission is addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section and Appendix 4 of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T &amp; S Edhouse and others</td>
<td>155 Patullos Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitters are landowners/occupiers within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP. The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Energy Safe Victoria (ESV)</td>
<td>Steve Cronin</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>ESV suggests that references in the DPO26 Schedule to ‘Energy Safe Victoria’ and ‘other relevant authorities’ should be changed to the “Minister administering the Pipelines Act 2005”. ESV also suggests that the wording in Section 2.0 of the DPO about an Agreement be changed from ‘…in a form approved by…’ to ‘in a form acceptable to’.</td>
<td>The ESV submission is acknowledged and Council will continue to work closely with the regulator. The pipeline issue is addressed in the ‘Discussion’ section of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T &amp; J Hancock</td>
<td>65 Manzeene Avenue, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitters are landowners/occupiers within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C &amp; G Kahwagi</td>
<td>185 Kees Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>P Kop</td>
<td>40 Manzeene Avenue, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitter is a landowner/occupier within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP. The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported. Submission noted. Officers interpret the submission as generally supportive, but only in the context of being consistent with Amendment C246. The submission opposes a number of elements of the supporting Amendment C285 documentation prepared by Spiire, such as the concept plan shown on page 29 of the Planning and Urban Design Report. Officers note that the concept plan states: “This plan has been prepared by the proponent and is for discussion purposes only. This plan has no formal status and does not represent the views of the Geelong Council.” No concept plan forms part of the DPO Schedule and all of the exhibited planning controls for implementation into the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme are considered to be consistent with Amendment C246.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lara Lakes Pty Ltd</td>
<td>B J Spalding, Chairman</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submission identifies Lara Lakes Pty Ltd (LLPL) as the proponent of Amendment C246, i.e. the neighbouring Lara West Growth Area. LLPL has a vested interest in the outcomes of Amendment C285 regarding design integration, drainage and cost sharing as established in the DCP. The submission supports the amendment but does not support some elements of the accompanying Spiire/Dacland reports with respect to: 1. Accepting relevant recommendations of the C246 Panel; 2. Amending the Manzeene Village Concept Plan to accord with DPO26; 3. Accepting the exclusion of shop and similar retail uses; and 4. Accepting the proposed DCP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Officers reiterate that the exhibited C285 Amendment proposes to rezone the land to the General Residential Zone only. The DPO Schedule however does provide for the south west corner of the site to be used for non-residential uses permitted in the GRZ, such as a hotel, food and drink premises and service station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>J &amp; E McNeill</td>
<td>6 &amp; 7 Denise Court</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Supports the rezoning and residential development if it achieves a resolution of the flooding currently experienced on a regular basis over their properties. The submission suggests that the DPO be amended to require the development to improve drainage beyond ‘pre-development flows’. Also raises concerns about fill levels and visual amenity impacts. Suggests the option of constructing an underground drain along the property boundary. The submission also requests that the DPO Schedule considers a provision for future east/west pedestrian linkages between the land being rezoned and established residential development to the east.</td>
<td>The drainage concerns outlined in the submission by the landowners of 6 and 7 Denise Court, Lara are currently being reviewed by Council drainage engineers. Spiire engineers advise that the flooding affects within Denise Court have been modelled to be reduced as a result of the development. Requested changes to the Development Plan Overlay Schedule will be further addressed at the Panel Hearing. The matter of integrating the existing urban edge of Lara with Manzeene Avenue has previously been considered by Officers and discussed with the proponent. There is general agreement that a public connection would be a good planning outcome. The difficulty is in the implementation as all lots abutting the edge are in private ownership and developed with dwellings. Public acquisition is a complex process which Council does not take lightly. However this does not mean that the opportunity should not be explored. Officers will further review this matter in consultation with Spiire with a view to including a new requirement in the DPO Schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>D More</td>
<td>5 Barwon Blvd Highton VIC 3216</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitter is a landowner within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP. The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E Morrison</td>
<td>8 Honeyeater Crt Lara Vic 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submission supports the rezoning to the General Residential Zone but only if the C285 planning controls are consistent with the outcomes of C246 Lara West Growth Area. The submission says it is essential that the development of Manzeene Avenue is limited to residential use and in a form that links both sides of O’Hallorans Road to connect the two growth areas.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S Morrison</td>
<td>127 Isabella St. Geelong West VIC 3218</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submission supports the rezoning to the General Residential Zone but only if the C285 planning controls are consistent with the outcomes of C246 Lara West Growth Area. The submission says it is essential that the development of Manzeene Avenue is limited to residential use and in a form that links both sides of O’Hallorans Road to connect the two growth areas.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A Mueller</td>
<td>19 Patullos Road Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Supports the rezoning of the Manzeene Avenue land to the General Residential Zone but do not want it to include a business or trading area. The submitter says it as essential that the</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>J Paddle</td>
<td>55 Manzeene Avenue, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>development of Manzeene Avenue be limited to residential use and in a form that links both sides of O’Hallorans Road to connect the two growth locations. The submitter is a landowner/occupier within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP. The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td>Submission noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ben Spalding</td>
<td>800 Bacchus Marsh Road Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Objects to the proposed Manzeene Village design which shows zonings other than residential. If anything other than residential zoning is being considered I wish to be advised.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26 | Spiire Australia for Dacland P/L | Sarah Auld Senior Associate – Planning 469 La Trobe St Melbourne VIC 3000 | Objection| Submission lodged by the developers of the proposed Manzeene Village. Supports the amendment in principle but raises concerns with:  
• The proposed zone for land in the south west corner of the site;  
• The wording and requirement of the Schedule to the DPO; and  
• Drainage infrastructure being omitted from the Development Contributions Plan.  
Refer to the ‘discussion section’ of this report for a detailed summary of the submission.                                                                                     | Submission noted. |
<p>|    |                       |                                           |          | Refer to the ‘Discussion’ section and Appendix 4 of this report for a response.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                   |
| 27 | T &amp; R Turner          | 175 Kees Road, Lara VIC 3212              | Support  | The submitters are landowners/occupiers within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Submission noted  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Summary of Submission</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overlay controls and NVPP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vic Roads</td>
<td>Daryl Sinclair</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
<td>Vic Roads do not object to the proposed rezoning of the land.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Manager Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW Victoria, South Geelong VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wathaurung Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>John Young</td>
<td>In-principle support</td>
<td>The submission highlights two issues:</td>
<td>Spiire is presently reviewing this submission and has been in contact with Aboriginal Affairs Victoria. The matter will be addressed at the Panel Hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RAP Manager, PO Box 734</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) The property located in the south-east corner of the subject land does not form part of CHMP #12061.</td>
<td>Officer will remain in consultation with the Wathaurung RAP Manager in responding to this submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballarat VIC 3353</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Need to consider any impacts of the new General Residential Zone on the CHMP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>W Wells</td>
<td>55 Manzeene Avenue, Lara VIC</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitter is a landowner/occupier within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and overlay controls and NVPP.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3212</td>
<td></td>
<td>The submission acknowledges that the proponent of the development – Dacland Pty Ltd, on behalf of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust, has undertaken detailed investigations and the Dacland submission to Amendment C285 is supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>M Whelan</td>
<td>165 Kees Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The submitter is a landowner/occupier within the proposed Manzeene Village development. The submission supports the rezoning and is pleased that substantial vegetation will be retained. The submission supports and endorses the submission of Dacland Pty Ltd to the amendment.</td>
<td>Submission noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Beryl Wilks</td>
<td>290 Patullos Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Landowner of 290 Patullos Road which is part of the Lara West Growth Area (Am C246). The submission notes that C246 proposes carefully planned infrastructure. Concerned about a commercial precinct which will be in direct conflict with the already proposed Lara West Precinct Plan and the redevelopment of the current Lara shopping centre.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bill Wilks</td>
<td>290 Patullos Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Landowner of 245 O'Hallorans Road which is part of the Lara West Growth Area (Am C246). The submission supports the rezoning but objects to any commercial development or other elements of Amendment C285 that are inconsistent with C246. It is essential that the two areas develop in a coordinated, structured way.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>R Wilks</td>
<td>370 &amp; 465 Windermere Road, Lara VIC 3212</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The submission supports the rezoning of the Manzeene Avenue land to the General Residential Zone but only as long as the requirements of the new planning controls to be implemented by C285 are varied to reflect the outcome of C246 relating to the Lara West Growth Area and not changed to suit the developers in Manzeene Ave.</td>
<td>Submission noted. Refer to response to Submission no. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Urban Development Institute of</td>
<td>Tony De Domenico Executive</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The UDIA generally supports the proposed Amendment but holds considerable concern over the proposed permit condition within the DPO</td>
<td>Refer to the ‘Discussion’ section of this report for a response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summary of Submission</td>
<td>Officer Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia (Victoria)</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule to notify future land buyers of the APA high-pressure gas pipeline via a section 173 agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: Submitter requested changes to the DPO Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiire / Dacland</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In its submission, Spiire have requested several changes to the DPO Schedule.</td>
<td>Consistent advice from Council’s Statutory Planning Department – the responsible authority for assessing the development plan, is that one plan is to be prepared for the site. Regarding the land on the south east corner, there are also other landowners not part of the Trust, which would seem to strengthen the argument that one plan is to be prepared. Furthermore, irrespective of the existence of the Trust and its contractual arrangements with Dacland, 26 landowners with individual property rights mean there should be a single plan to ensure the orderly planning of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of a Development Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Alter the wording of Section 3.0 from ‘The development plan may be amended’ to ‘The development plan may be prepared in parts and be amended’. Spiire say the flexibility to prepare a development plan in parts is necessary and required as, for example, the land in the south east corner of the site is not part of the Manzeene Avenue Development Trust. | One development plan will also better assist the responsible authority in considering subdivision applications allowed under Section 1.0 of the DPO Schedule.  

The purpose of Clause 43.04 of the Planning Scheme includes: To identify areas which require the form and conditions of future use and development to be shown on a development plan before a permit can be granted to use or develop the land. The Clause also states that: The development plan may be amended to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. There is no reference in the Clause to preparing a development plan in parts.

For these reasons, the submission is not supported. |
| **Gas Pipeline Permit Condition**    |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Requirements                        |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Spiire request that this condition be removed from Section 2.0.                                                                             | The pipeline issue is addressed in the ‘High pressure gas pipeline’ section above. The submission is not supported. |
| **Urban Design Masterplan**         |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Remove dot point 2.4: Provides for dwellings and open space reserves to front roads to ensure there are no back fences to roadways. Spiire say this requirement is unnecessary and does not allow the flexibility to produce practical, innovative and site responsive design solutions. | The submission is not supported.  

This is best-practice urban design that is common among Councils and other growth areas within Greater Geelong. The requirement should in no way affect the ability to produce innovative and site responsive solutions. |
<p>| <strong>Integrated Water Management Plan</strong> |                                                                                                                                                  |
| Dot point 7 is supported by Spiire but they say the wording needs minor alteration to ensure the intended outcome is achieved without unnecessary restriction. The | The requested changes to dot point 7 are currently being reviewed by Council’s drainage engineers. Drainage matters will be addressed at the Panel Hearing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requirement should be changed to read:</td>
<td>Council officers have further reviewed this submission, in particular the planning and delivery of off-site infrastructure to Hovells Creek. To safeguard Council’s interests, Officers consider there is a need to ensure all costs associated with the facilitation and delivery of down stream drainage works to Hovells Creek, including easement widening and outfall construction, are borne by the developer. This could be implemented by an additional requirement in the DPO Schedule Section 3.0 or the requirement for a section 173 agreement in Section 2.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A stormwater management system that ensures peak discharge rates, of all stormwater leaving the site in critical 1yr, 5yr, 10yr, 20yr, 50yr and 100yr ARI (Average Recurrence Interval) storm events post development ensures no detrimental impact to any surrounding area, upstream or downstream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A stormwater management system that meets pollutant targets as per Best Practice Management Environmental Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Network and Traffic Management Plan</strong></td>
<td>The submission is not supported. The exhibited DPO requirement best articulates the direction for the bus route and is supported by Public Transport Victoria. This direction is also consistent with the Lara West Precinct Structure Plan which shows an ‘arrow’ to indicate the possible extension of the main East - West Connector Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reword dot point 1.2 to read: Enables integration with the Lara West Precinct, including a route to accommodate a bus route from O’Hallorans Road to Kees Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space and Landscape Masterplan</strong></td>
<td>The submission is supported in part. The NVPP is the proper planning mechanism to address native vegetation management, however a management plan is still considered necessary given that vegetation maintenance is only one aspect of what a management plan for a publicly accessible conservation site in a residential area will be required to include.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Amend dot point 1 to require a 5% open space contribution of developable residential land not 10%. The submission considers a blanket application of a 10% contribution does not take into account the constraints, characteristics or infill development context of the site. Spiire say that some of the encumbered land will remain accessible to the public and can be incorporated into the overall pedestrian and cycle network.</td>
<td>The requirement will be amended to read:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Amend dot point 6 to read: The extent of existing native grassland areas to be retained. Spiire consider the exhibited requirement is an unnecessary duplication of the requirements of the Manzeenee Avenue Native Vegetation Precinct Plan (NVPP). Spiire say the NVPP will be an incorporated document and all development will be required to be in accordance with the NVPP.</td>
<td>The extent of existing native grassland areas to be retained. The Masterplan must include specific reserve management actions addressing the retention and enhancement of the native grassland areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Hooper</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A submission was received from Best Hooper on behalf of the landowners of 35</td>
<td>Regarding preparing the development plan in stages, the submission is not supported for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Manzeene Avenue, Lara. They submit that the proposed Schedule to the DPO should be amended by inserting at the end of clause 1.0 the following:  
"With the consent of the Responsible Authority the Development Plan may be prepared in stages.  
No Development Plan may be approved without the consent of the owners of all of the land within the area to which the Development Plan applies" | same reasons as outlined in the Spiire submission response.  
Gaining consent from all of the landowners before a development plan is approved is also not supported. It is the responsibility of Council’s Statutory Planning Department to consider and approve the development plan. The submission is onerous and difficult to implement. |
| Energy Safe Victoria                                                      | The submission is supported and the Schedule will be changed.                    |
| Alter the Schedule to seek the views of the ‘appropriate authority for planning matters related to the administration of the Pipelines Act 2005', instead of ESV.  
ESV also requested that the wording for the requirement to enter into an agreement be in a form ‘acceptable to’ the ‘Minister administering of the Pipelines Act 2005’. | The submission is supported and the Schedule will be changed.                    |
| APA GasNet Australia (Operations)                                         | The submission is supported and the Schedule will be changed.                    |
| APA support the changes requested by Energy Safe Victoria                | The submission is supported and the Schedule will be changed.                    |
| Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure               | The support of the Dept is acknowledged.                                         |
| The Department notes that the Schedule specifies a number of requirements for the movement network which the Dept strongly supports.  
The Dept recommends that channelized right turn lanes are provided for the Windermere/ O’Hallorans Road and Windermere/ Kees Road intersections.  
The Dept says consideration could be given to modifying the proposed intersection treatment at Patulllos/ O’Hallorans/ Elcho Roads to enable the right tuning traffic from Manzeene Village to prop in the medium as per the design for Patulllos/ Elcho Road. | The recommendation is supported and a new requirement will be added to the Schedule.  
New requirements to the Urban Design Masterplan and the Road Network and Traffic Management Plan of the Schedule are considered appropriate to address vehicle access/ egress from the land in the SW corner, particularly in relation to limiting the use of Manzeene Avenue and management of the Patullos Road interface (both in its current configuration and the new Patullos/ O’Hallorans/ Elcho Road intersection design). |
<p>| Corangamite Catchment Management Authority                                | The submission of the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority is currently under review by Council drainage engineers, who will work closely with the Authority to address their concerns. Changes to the DPO Schedule to include the Authority’s requirements will be finalised prior to the Panel Hearing. |
| The Authority request the inclusion of the following requirements:-       |                                                                                   |
| 1. Afflux mapping of the detailed floodplain, stormwater and drainage infrastructure for the 1% AEP storm |                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>event demonstrating no increase in extent, depth or velocity of flooding on neighbouring properties. Mapping should cover an area within no less than 1.5 km from the development location in all directions. And must also consider any proposed topographic changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Details of the estimated extent, depth and nature of proposed filling at the site. To date cut and fill calculations have not been determined. Once calculations have been determined, additional flood mapping which considers 1% AEP post development condition, based on proposed filling at the site will need to be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Demonstration that floodplain storage (arising from the external catchment) has not been reduced at the site as a result of the proposed changes to the existing natural surface (e.g. cut and fill and associated earthworks/drainage of the site). Floodplain storage of the 1% AEP flood event must be maintained from the external catchment on the development site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In addition to the external catchment runoff, the internal development must also be designed to meet best practice stormwater management guidelines (e.g. Water Sensitive Urban Design, WSUD) which is addressed through the provisions of Clause 56. This is a separate set of calculations for storage and water quality than the flood modelling required to ensure exiting floodplain conveyance storage is maintained from external catchment runoff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrate that the development does not increase peak discharge in the existing outfalls, and does not have a detrimental impact on conveyance, storage or level of floodwaters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landowners of 6 & 7 Denise Court, Lara**

The landowners properties back onto the Amendment land and the submission requests the following:

- Include an outcome to improve drainage of the land to avoid the current overland flooding problems for existing residential development.
- Include an outcome to remove the drainage concerns are currently being reviewed by Council engineers.

Requested changes to the Development Plan Overlay Schedule will be further addressed at the Panel Hearing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existing ‘Flood Map’ over our land.</td>
<td>Officers will further review this matter in consultation with Spiire with a view to including a new requirement in the DPO Schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a requirement that the developer demonstrate how the flooding can be avoided post development (to landowners east of the site).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include the option of constructing an underground drain along the east boundary of the Amendment land without fill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission also considers that the DPO Schedule provide for future east/west pedestrian linkages between the land being rezoned and established residential development to the east.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cr Ansett declared an Indirect Interest by Close Association in Agenda Item 2 – C265 Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption in that he has relations in the flood prone area and left the meeting room at 7.35 prior to discussion.

Cr Heagney declared an Indirect Interest by Close Association in Agenda Item 2 – C265 Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report and Adoption in that her parents in-law own a property in the Portarlington area being considered and left the meeting room at 7.35 prior to discussion.

2. C265 FLOOD OVERLAYS IN PORTARLINGTON EAST, CORIO, NEWCOMB & WHITTINGTON - CONSIDERATION OF PANEL REPORT AND ADOPTION

Portfolio: Planning - Cr Macdonald
Source: Economic Development, Planning & Tourism
General Manager: Peter Bettess
Index Reference: Council Reports 2013 / C265 - Reports Council & Other

Purpose
To adopt a planning scheme Amendment to apply the Special Building Overlay to land potentially subject to inundation.

Summary
- Amendment C265 proposes to extend coverage of the Special Building Overlay (SBO) to reflect the findings of flood studies recently undertaken and adopted by Council.
- These studies identify the nature and extent of flooding in the Portarlington, Newcomb-Whittington and Corio areas.
- The exhibition of Amendment C265 resulted in the receipt of twenty five (25) submissions; including 2 concerning properties outside of the areas affected by the amendment, and 3 from government departments / statutory authorities, not objecting.
- The exhibited Amendment, together with all submissions was referred to an Independent Panel appointed by the Minister for Planning for consideration, as required by the Planning and Environment Act 1987.
- The Independent Panel has recommended that the Amendment be adopted as exhibited.
- It is recommended that the Amendment be adopted as described in this report.

Cr Macdonald moved, Cr Richards seconded -
That the report be deferred.

Carried.
3. REVOCATION OF FLOOD-PRONE AREA DESIGNATION OF NEW LOTS AT ARMSTRONG CREEK

Portfolio: Infrastructure – Cr Ellis
Source: City Services – Engineering Services
General Manager: Gary Van Driel
Index Reference: Subject: Drainage – Floods

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present a revision to the flood mapping for existing conditions produced within the early stages of the development of the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan (UGP).

Summary

• The flood mapping is subject to a revision due to the subdivision and development at 654-684 Torquay Road, 2-4 Stewarts Road, 42-80 Stewarts Road and part 82-110 Stewarts Road, Armstrong Creek. Prior to subdivision the parent lot was considered to be liable to flooding. This development site, which is also known as Warralilly Estate – Section C, achieves flood immunity for newly created lots for flood events up to and including the 100 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) event due to approved internal earthworks including the reshaping of Armstrong Creek.

• The earthworks undertaken have resulted in the floodwaters from the 100 year ARI event being contained within the boundaries of the Armstrong Creek reserve.

• Council has a statutory obligation under the Building Regulations 2006 to designate land as liable to flooding where it reasonably knows it to be prone to flooding. Conversely, there is an obligation to remove the encumbrance of designation from land that is no longer considered to be flood-prone.

• It should be noted that designation is separate to the creation of flood overlays within the Planning Scheme, which generally follows designation. In the case of the Armstrong Creek UGP area, the planning scheme amendment to create post-development flood zones or overlays is proposed after the design of the proposed precincts.

The current designated flood mapping (refer to Appendix 3-1) was designated by Council at its meeting of 12 December 2006, under the provisions of the Building Regulations 2006. Designation of land as liable to flooding enables the control of floor levels for acceptable building permit applications, or refusal of consent to building applications where there is likely to be a danger to life, health or safety due to flooding. Designation also enables disclosure of flood status within statutory information certificates.

Cr Richards moved, Cr Macdonald seconded -

That Council revoke the Council designation of 12 December 2006 of flood affected land as highlighted as Section C on Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan Flood Map dated 29 November 2006 as liable to flooding pursuant to Regulation 802(2) of the Building Regulations 2006.

Carried.
3. REVOCATION OF FLOOD-PRONE AREA DESIGNATION OF NEW LOTS AT ARMSTRONG CREEK CONT’D

Background

As part of the development of the Armstrong Creek Urban Growth Plan (UGP) a flood study was undertaken by specialist consulting engineers to identify the extents of the 100 year Average Recurrence Interval flood event for existing conditions. Following a public exhibition phase, the resultant flood mapping (refer to Appendix 3-1) was designated by Council at its meeting of 12 December 2006, under the provisions of the Building Regulations 2006.

On 25 October 2011, section 1 of this project was adopted at Council. This is section 2 of the area designation and further sections will be presented to Council in the coming years.

Designation of land as liable to flooding under Regulation 802 of the Building Regulations 2006 enables the control of floor levels for acceptable building permit applications, or refusal of consent to building applications where there is likely to be a danger to life, health or safety due to flooding. Designation also enables disclosure of flood status within statutory information certificates such as the Land Information Certificate and Building Information Request Form.

The subject of this report is the residential land at Armstrong Creek bounded by Torquay Road and Stewarts Road. At the time of the flood study the subject land comprised of four larger lots. Prior to subdivision the parent lot was used primarily as farmland.

The subdivision at 654-684 Torquay Road, 2-4 Stewarts Road, 42-80 Stewarts Road and part 82-110 Stewarts Road, Armstrong Creek was named Warralilly Estate Section C by the developer. The current designated flood extent affects multiple residential lots within the Warralilly Estate Section C.

Discussion

Overland flows that may occur within the subdivision during the 100 year ARI flood event are now contained within road and drainage reserves in accordance with accepted best practice for development within flood-prone areas. Best practice requires that any overland flows within residential areas satisfy public safety criteria with respect to velocity and depth of flow.

Council has a statutory obligation under the Building Regulations 2006 to designate land as liable to flooding where it reasonably knows it to be prone to flooding. Conversely, there is an obligation to remove the encumbrance of designation from land that is no longer considered to be flood-prone.

Appendix 3-1 shows the existing flood designation. Appendix 3-2 shows the change in flood mapping at 654-684 Torquay Road, 2-4 Stewarts Road, 42-80 Stewarts Road and part 82-110 Stewarts Road, Armstrong Creek after construction of the subdivision.

Environmental Implications

The revocation of flood-prone areas designation and designation of revised flood data does not result in any known adverse environmental impacts.

The removal of a minimum floor level requirement for new dwellings may result in a minor reduction in energy and material usage during construction. In addition, concrete slab-on-ground construction, which is normally used for a non-elevated floor, achieves the minimum energy rating more readily than a timber floor on stumps.
3. **REVOCATION OF FLOOD-PRONE AREA DESIGNATION OF NEW LOTS AT ARMSTRONG CREEK CONT’D**

**Financial Implications**

The costs of proceeding to revoke the existing designation and to designate the revised flood mapping at 654-684 Torquay Road, 2-4 Stewarts Road, 42-80 Stewarts Road and part 82-110 Stewarts Road, Armstrong Creek, in accordance with the requirements of the Building Regulations 2006, are provided for within the annual recurrent budget.

**Alignment to City Plan**

In revoking the Land Liable to Flooding (LLF) designation ensures that Council provides accurate and reliable information to its community, in line with Council's City Plan of How We Do Business.

**Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications**


Regulation 802(2) of the Building Regulations 2006 provides Council with the powers to ‘designate’ land liable to flooding. Regulation 802(3) provides that consent must be obtained from Council for an application to build on land liable to flooding.

Section 27 of the Interpretation of Legislation Act 1984 provides the power for Councils to ‘repeal or amend a subordinate instrument made in the exercise of that power’.

Section 807 of the Building Regulations 2006 requires Council to update the municipality’s designated special area maps at the Building Control Commission in the event of alterations to a designated special area. Designated special areas include areas designated as being liable to flooding.

Section 229 of the Local Government Act and Regulation 326 of the Building Regulations provide for the issue of information certificates containing prescribed information, including the flood status of properties.

The revised flood data for 654-684 Torquay Road, 2-4 Stewarts Road, 42-80 Stewarts Road and part 82-110 Stewarts Road, Armstrong Creek will assist the City in meeting its statutory obligations with regard to flood data.

The revised flood data will also assist in fulfilling the recommendations of the Municipal Emergency Management Committee adopted by Council in November 1998 (i.e. mapping of 1 in 100 year flood levels).

**Officer Direct or Indirect Interest**

There are no officer direct or indirect interests with respect to this report.

**Risk Assessment**

Council has a risk exposure through its statutory obligations under the Building Regulations 2006 to:

- Designate land as liable to flooding where it reasonably knows it to be prone to flooding;
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- Specify minimum floor levels in consultation with the relevant floodplain management authority (CCMA); and
- Refuse consent to building applications where there is likely to be a danger to life, health or safety due to flooding.

Council also has some risk exposure with any failure to disclose the flood-prone status of a property in a Land Information Certificate.

The designation of the flood data produced by the flood study Armstrong Creek UGP project is a key step toward minimising Council’s exposure to these risks.

Conversely, there is an obligation to remove the encumbrance of designation from land that is no longer considered to be flood-prone. Designation of land as being liable to flooding can result in extra construction costs and concerns regarding saleability, in some cases.

*Social Considerations*

Council has a responsibility to the community to provide the best possible information on areas that are flood-prone.

*Human Rights Charter*

We have taken into consideration all Human Rights as part of the drafting process of this report, none of which apply.

*Consultation and Communication*

The current designation was undertaken following a public exhibition in October 2006 with notification of affected property owners. These owners were sent letters and fact sheets with an invitation for submissions.

A revocation of designation does not warrant public consultation as it constitutes the removal of an encumbrance on land.

The owners of properties affected by the revocation will be notified so they are aware that disclosure of flood status on a Section 32 Vendors Statement is no longer required.

Relevant Council databases and flood maps will be revised and updates sent to the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority and Building Control Commission.
CURRENT FLOOD MAP
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Purpose

This report has two purposes:

1. Informs Council on the various emergency management activities that have been undertaken for the period June 2012 to October 2013; and

2. Informs Council on the long-range weather forecast for the period October 2013 to February 2014 and outlines Council’s preparedness actions currently being implemented for the 2013/2014 Fire Season;

Summary

• This report is to provide information to Council regarding Emergency Management activities over the period June 2012 to October 2013 as well what preparation actions are underway for the 2013/2014 Fire Season.

• The 50 fire preparedness actions (refer to Attachment 1) are currently being implemented according to the timeframes shown.

• As at 3rd October, 2013, the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) was advising that their own model as well as all of the international climate models surveyed by the BoM indicated that a neutral state, i.e. neither El Nino or La Nina conditions will persist throughout the remainder of the Spring and into Summer.

• The ensemble means for the September model run of International Model for area NINO3.4, (i.e. mid Pacific Ocean along the equator) outlooks are:
  - October : neutral (neither El Nino or La Nina)
  - December: neutral (neither El Nino or La Nina)
  - February: neutral, but tending slightly to weak El Nino event

• At the time of drafting this report, the Country Fire Authority’s District 7 Office had not advised as to the commencement date of the 2013/2014 Fire Season, i.e. Fire Danger Period (FDP). However, given the recent late Autumn and now Spring rain events the municipality and region is experiencing, the greatest fire risk for the 2013/2014 fire season is expected to come from fast moving grass fires rather than bushfires;

• Council’s fire hazard inspection program commenced on November 4th 2013

• Council’s Coordinator Emergency Management and the Municipal Fire Prevention Officer attended the 2013/2014 Fire Ready Communications Briefing on 9 October 2013. This briefing was coordinated by the Municipal Association of Victoria and the Department of Justice and included a Summer Fire Season Overview by the Fire Services Commissioner, Craig Lapsley.
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Cr Richards moved, Cr Macdonald seconded -

That Council:

1) notes the 2012–2013 report on Emergency Management Activity and Annual Fire Season Preparation Report; and

2) forwards a copy of the 2012–2013 report on Emergency Management Activity and Annual Fire Season Preparation be forwarded to the Western Region (Barwon South West) Emergency Management Inspector.

Carried.

Background

Each year, Council receives a Fire Season Preparation Report along with an Emergency Management Activity Report. This year, both reports have been combined into one.

The Emergency Management Activity and Annual Fire Season Preparation report provides an overview of a number of tasks undertaken by Council officers allocated emergency management responsibilities, along with a list of actions that are undertaken each year in preparing the municipality for the annual Fire Season.

Discussion

The past 12 months has been relatively free of emergency incidents. This has allowed for officers allocated emergency management responsibilities to action a number of tasks:

Document updates

Work has continued with the development and updating of a number of emergency management related documents including:

- The 2012 update of the Municipal Emergency Management Plan was released during January 2013. The 2013 update in now nearing completion and will be distributed during November 2013.

- A supervisor’s manual on financial management arrangements associated with an emergency event has been developed. This manual explains the importance of maintaining accurate financial records that will enable Council to maximise the value of reimbursement it receives via the State Governments’ Natural Disaster Financial Arrangements (NDFA).

- A three year Emergency Management Strategic Plan has been developed. The Plan, which is subject to a separate Council report, provides direction for emergency management planning for the period commencing at the start of the 2014/15 financial year and finishing at the end of the 2016/17 financial year.

- A Draft Fire Season Preparedness Manual has been developed.

- This Preparedness Manual collates into one document all the key actions that Council undertakes as part of its Fire Season Preparedness Actions. Once completed and as the fire danger period approaches, this document will be circulated to the relevant EM Council officers, and also to the Police Municipal Emergency Response Coordinator (MERC) and the Police Regional Emergency Response Coordinator (REMC).
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- Council’s Flood Warning Manual has been re-written during 2013 and expanded as the previous manual required updating and limited in content.

- A Flood Management Plan was developed by VICSES for the City during 2012/2013. The VICSES Plan was based on Council’s existing 200+ page Flood Operations Plan that has been developed by Council officers over the last ten plus years.

- A new Event Preparation Proforma along with a Field Deployment Checklist was developed in early 2013. The proforma summarises all key actions undertaken for a particular event and is circulated to key Council officers. The Checklist ensures that proper arrangements are in place for all field deployments.

- Updating the 2013 version of the MERO Aide Memoire is complete and the update distributed to the three deputy MEROS and Council Municipal Emergency Manager.

- Numerous sub-plans have received their annual review.

- Field inspections of Council’s Flood Levees and above ground urban retention basins have been completed.

- The Municipal Fire Management Plan has been reviewed by the Municipal Fire Prevention Officer and the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee.

- Preparations are currently underway for the Fire Prevention Units annual fire hazard inspection program. This program requires Council’s Fire Inspectors to transit every road within the municipality looking for fire hazards – in particular long grass. This inspection program commenced on November 4th 2013.

- Council’s Recovery Management Team have undertaken a range of review and improvement processes relating to their responsibilities in regard to Emergency Management, including targeted work in the areas of:
  - Vulnerable Persons planning
  - Standard Operating Procedures
  - Annual Review of Municipal Emergency Management Plan
  - Volunteering during emergencies
  - Training and development of staff in Emergency Management
  - Relief/Recovery Centre management – exercise attendance – Surf Coast Shire
  - Investigation of funding opportunities – RDV Resilient Communities Grant Program
  - 2014 MEMPlan Audit – commenced work preparing for audit
  - Social Media use in relation to Community Recovery in an emergency – development of an approach and procedure.
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- Council Public Health Emergency Coordinator (PHEC) is currently undertaking an annual review of the Animal Welfare in Emergencies Sub-plan and during October 2013, the annual review of Council’s Heatwave Plan is to be undertaken. In addition the following tasks are, or have been performed:
  - Attending Building Capability in Communities: A National Approach to Animals in Disasters 24 and 25 September, 2013
  - Due to review Heatwave Plan in October 2013, the PHEC will look into long hot days that haven’t technically triggered the Department of Health Heat Health Alerts
  - Pandemic Plan Review underway
  - Public Health Sub Plan Review underway
  - Unit now has five EHOs that have completed the Public Health Emergency Management Course at Mt Macedon.

Exercises

Council officers attended the following exercises:

- CFA Level 3 Incident Control Centre Exercise – 18 September, 2012
- VICSES Earthquake desktop exercise 10 December 2012
- Avalon Airport Emergency Committee meeting and exercise 13 December 2012.
- Shell Exercise – October 8th 2013.

Financial Claims

- The claim for the Rain & Flooding Events that occurred during May & June 2012 was finalised and Council received $125,000 back from the Victorian Government’s Department of Treasury and Finance.

State Municipal Emergency Management Enhancement Group (MEMEG) Meeting & Annual Conference

Councils Coordinator Emergency Management and Fire Prevention attended the State MEMEG meeting that was held on 21 May 2013 at Maribyrong City Council Municipal Offices and the General Manager City Services attended the Annual Conference that was held at Shepparton on 20 September 2013.

Work continues with the formation of a Barwon South West Regional MEMEG Committee. This new forum was suggested by the City of Greater Geelong at the May State MEMEG meeting and is supported by the State MEMEG Committee.

Community Meetings and Education

Work continues with the development of ‘Shelter-in-Place’ community education campaign. This campaign will be focused in the first instance on the northern suburbs as it contains information on chemical fires/incidents.
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A working group under the MEMPC has been established. A draft suite of community education documents have been developed, comprising:

- A letter to the Resident
- Information brochure
- Sheet of Frequently Asked Questions
- Fridge magnet

The working group is currently reviewing the document proofs. However, given the closeness of the 2013/2014 Fire Season it is unlikely that these documents will be distributed prior to the fire season. There needs to be a clear distinction between the ‘Leave and Leave Early’ message that the Country Fire Authority will shortly promote and the Shelter-in-Place message that ties back to a chemical fire/incident.

Community Meetings

The CFA have conducted a number of community meetings at Anakie and at St Leonards / Indented Head in order to develop Community Risk Management Plans. Council officer attended some of these meetings.

Following the conclusion of the St Leonards / Indented Head meetings, a community survey was conducted. It was clear from the survey results that a community education campaign is needed. To this end, Council officers will make a grant application to the Resilient Community Program that is managed by Regional Development Victoria that targets community education with respect to bushfire risk. Grant applications close early October 2013.

Officer Training

Training of Council’s new Flood Warning Officer and Deputy Municipal Resource Officers continues. This training consists of:

- Providing an understanding of the State/Regional and Local emergency management arrangements
- Knowledge of key documents including:
  - MERO Aide Memoire
  - MERO Operations Plan
  - Stormwater Pump Operations Manual
  - Flood Levee & Retention Basin Manual
  - Flood Warning Manual
  - MEMPlan and its sub-plans, and
  - Field inspections
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- Bushfire Related Training was conducted by the Country Fire Authority at the request of the City of Greater Geelong. This training took place during September 2013 and trained over 70 Council officers from various Council Divisions in basic bushfire behaviour and survival techniques for employees.

**Risk Assessments**

During February 2013 a Landslide Risk Assessment Workshop was held. This workshop, which was chaired by the City of Greater Geelong, focused on landslide risk particularly on the north coast of the Bellarine Peninsula. Following on from this workshop a Landslide Sub-plan was developed and endorsed by the MEMPC.

**Vulnerable People**

Work continues by Council’s Home and Community Care Unit in undertaking client assessments to determine their vulnerability to an emergency, ie. 'all hazards' assessments. This work complements the work previously undertaken by the Unit in assessing HACC Clients who are vulnerable from a bushfire.

In addition to this work, State and/or Federally funded facilities which deliver in-home services also continue to undertake assessment for vulnerability of their client base. Once an individual is assessed as being vulnerable they are then uploaded onto a state wide software program known as ‘MECC Central’. Access to this software is restricted. The database allows VicPol officers of the rank Senior Sergeant or above to produce a Vulnerable Persons report for the Evacuation Manager appointed to an emergency.

**Upgrade to the Hovells Creek Flood Warning System**

During 2012, improvements were made to Council’s Hovells Creek Flood Warning System. One major improvement included the installation of a data logger that now allows for key Council officers to send an SMS to the site and the site responds with key flood information included the real-time height of flood waters at the Flinders Avenue, Lara site. This information can be used in deciding if any downstream creek road crossing needs to be closed.

**Event Preparation Proforma and Field Deployment Checklist**

As mentioned above, a new Event Preparation proforma and Field Deployment checklist was developed. These new documents were used for a number of fire danger days including:

- 17 and 24 January 2013
- 6 and 18 February 2013
- 3 and 12 March 2013

The only field deployments in support of CFA crews were in late 2012 and on January 13, 2013 to a grass fire located to the north of Little River on Ripley Road.
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**Memorandum Of Understandings**

Most recently, Council’s Municipal Recovery Manager has negotiated access to the Geelong Showgrounds where subject to availability; the venue could be used as a potential tent city, mass feeding site and animal storage location.

**Preparation Action for 2013/2014 Fire Season**

As per previous fire seasons, Council has a broad range of preparation actions that it introduces prior to, and during the Fire Season. The following is a summary of these 50+ actions which are grouped under the key headings of:

- Training
- Database updates
- Community Education
- Documentation reviews
- Field Operations Actions and
- Miscellaneous Actions

Attachment 4-1 lists the various actions for each of the abovementioned key areas.

**Weather Forecast**

According to the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM), September is usually the time when El Niño events consolidate. However, recent cooling that has occurring is somewhat unusual; hence the risk of an El Niño event (ie. Dryer rather than wetter conditions) remains;

In the September 2013, El Niño Southern Oscillation Statement (ENSO) issued by the Bureau advised that indicators such as the Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) and tropical cloud patterns had remained at neutral levels, i.e. SOI = +4 (as at 22 September 2013).

As at 3rd October, 2013, the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) was advising that their own model as well as all of the international climate models surveyed by the BoM indicated that a neutral state, i.e. neither El Nino or La Nina conditions will persist throughout the remainder of the Spring and into Summer.

The ensemble means for the September model run of International Model for area NINO3.4, (i.e. mid Pacific Ocean along the equator) outlooks are:

- October : neutral (neither El Nino or La Nina)
- December: neutral (neither El Nino or La Nina)
- February: neutral, but tending slightly to weak El Nino event

**Environmental Implications**

It is an important fact that many emergency events do have an impact on the environment. Well planned response and recovery practices will only assist to minimise this impact. This is a further compelling reason for Council’s close attention to its emergency management role.
4. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY AND ANNUAL FIRE SEASON PREPARATION REPORT 2012 – 2013 (CONT’D)

Financial Implications
The attached preparedness actions involve officer time which is fully budgeted.

Budget impact will occur should an event transpire during the Fire Season and Council is called upon in its support role to the emergency services. However, some of these costs can be recovered from the Control Agency and/or the State Government.

No impact to budget is anticipated, but cannot be guaranteed.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications
Council’s Emergency Management Policy (CPL275.2) tasks Council with ‘…the provision of timely and coordinated response and recovery activities with its resources to assist in community emergencies…’

To this end, the emergency management actions as well as the Fire Season preparedness actions should decrease Council’s exposure to public liability claims.

Alignment to City Plan
The contents of this report relate to City Plan 2013–2017 Community Wellbeing strategic direction. The Plan provides a direct link to the Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEPlan) which is listed as a master plan to assist in delivering Community Wellbeing priorities.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest
No Council officers associated with writing this report have any direct or indirect interest, in accordance with Section 80 (C) of the Local Government Act.

Risk Assessment
Dealing with a bushfire event is high risk for all concerned. To this end, all preparedness actions that have been listed in this report are designed to ensure, as far as is practicable, that the risks to the community from a fire event are mitigated and that the City is prepared and well place to respond and recover from a bushfire/wildfire.

Social Considerations
The application of the outlined emergency management actions as well as the fire season preparedness actions will have a positive impact on the community by ensuring that the City maintains and enhances the support role it fulfils during an emergency event.

The outlined actions and fire season preparedness actions are key to ensuring that Council and the community is well prepared, as far as is practicable, for the challenges associated with an emergency event.
4. **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY AND ANNUAL FIRE SEASON PREPARATION REPORT 2012 – 2013 (CONT’D)**

*Human Rights Charter*

An emergency, depending upon its size and nature can affect the whole community and, once again, depending upon the type of emergency can have long lasting community impact. The implementation of all actions contained within this report strives to enhance community safety. Implementation of the emergency management actions and fire season preparedness actions is consistent with the obligations under the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibility.

*Consultation and Communication*

Each year, Council continues to promote and educate the community about the fire danger that exists, the actions that Council is taking and more importantly, the action that the community needs to undertake. This promotion/education program must be ongoing.

Following on from the 9 October 2013, 2013/2014 MAV Fire Ready Communications Briefing which were held at the City of Whittlesea, Council’s Coordinator Emergency Management and the Municipal Fire Prevention Officer meet with Council’s Communications and Marketing Unit in order to develop article(s) for the Community Update.
**Attachment 4-1**

**PREPARATION ACTION FOR 2013/2014 FIRE SEASON – as at 16th October 2013**

All actions are programmed to be undertaken at particular times of the calendar year and are allocated to particular officers. All actions are also incorporated into Council’s Corvu software program so that tracking the status of each action is possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Précis</th>
<th>Action Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre (MECC) related Training</td>
<td>Training of administrative officers who provide administrative support to the MECC. This includes the MECC (Facility) Manager</td>
<td>October/November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Safety at an Incident Scene (Wildfire Survival) Training</td>
<td>Training / re-training of Council officers on fire behaviour and what actions to take to maintain safety</td>
<td>Completed Sept – Oct 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Relief Centre (ERC) Management Training</td>
<td>Training of ERC Managers and support staff</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Database Reviews / Updates | | |
| Emergency Relief Centre (ERC) contact database | Check that contact phone numbers of ERC Managers has been updated, keys are available etc | September |
| Heavy Plant, equipment and other supplier database | Update contact details for equipment, heavy plant, hardware suppliers, pumps, water tanker etc | October - completed |
| Water Tanker Suppliers | Update water tanker supplier database | October - completed |
| Portable Toilet Suppliers | Update portable toilet supplier database | October - completed |
| Hardware Suppliers | Update hardware supplier database ie • PPE suppliers • Hardware • Pumps/sandbags • Marquees • Petrol Tankers • Mobile Cranes | October - completed |
| Contracted Plant | Update contracted plant/equipment supplier details contracted to the City | October |
| Static Water Tanks – sports grounds | MERO to liaise with Water Management Officer for current list of static water tanks at sports grounds | October - completed |

<p>| Community Education | | |
| Council’s Emergency Management Web Page | Undertake quality check of contents and hyperlinks | October |
| CFA Publications | Obtain copies of key CFA publications and distribute to Council’s Customer Service Manager for display at Customer Service Centres | October |
| CFA – Community Fireguard meetings | MFPO to attend CFA Community Fireguard meetings in high risk areas of the municipality | As per CFA timetable |
| Community Update | Discussions have already taken place with Council’s Media Unit to include articles on the following topics: • 10/30 &amp; 10/50 Right | November/December – assuming print space with Update exists |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reviews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013 Update Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMPlan)</td>
<td>All Parts of the plan to be reviewed and any changes to be approved by the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee</td>
<td>September - Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMPlan Contact List</td>
<td>Update Part 10 of Plan.</td>
<td>April &amp; October - Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Evacuation Strategy</td>
<td>Annual review of strategy by MEMPC sub-group and ensure that MEMPC approves any changes</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Animals During an Emergency Sub-plan</td>
<td>Sub – plan updated (in consultation with Department of Primary Industries). Now need to meet with Council Animal Control Unit</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushfire Sub-plan</td>
<td>Sub-plan to be considered by MEMPC</td>
<td>November MEMPC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fire Ban Management Procedure</td>
<td>Annual review of City Services Management Procedures of certain actions that are not performed on days declared as a Total Fire Ban and raise at Tool Box meetings</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERO Aide Memoire</td>
<td>Annual review of Aide Memoire that is used by MERO and Deputies. Document contains over 30 checklists that assists the MERO in the performance of his duties</td>
<td>September - Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECC Contact Lanyard</td>
<td>Update of contact lanyard that is distributed to all attendees at Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Contact Database</td>
<td>Update of outdoor staff contact details following annual staff reviews</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Rostering</td>
<td>EMG Review of Staff Rostering document and development of roster for key emergency management &amp; support staff</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Red Guidelines</td>
<td>EMT to review new draft CoGG guidelines that control movement/availability of key CoGG Emergency Management Staff</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Water Replacement Policy</td>
<td>Make necessary alterations following State Govt release/update of Policy</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit to Burn Signs</td>
<td>MFPO immediately prior to start of Fire Season to liaise with Works Maintenance Officers to have signs erected</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary 774 Warning Signs</td>
<td>Check that signs are in place</td>
<td>October - under way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Plug Maintenance</td>
<td>Annual check of fire plugs in high fire risk areas within municipality</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standpipes</td>
<td>Annual check of Council’s 12</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION B - REPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Access Tracks</strong></td>
<td>Annual check to ensure that maintenance works have been completed</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Hazard Inspections</strong></td>
<td>Fire Prevention Unit to commence 1st inspections during October</td>
<td>Commences November 4th, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadside Slashing Operations</strong></td>
<td>Council’s Parks Maintenance Unit undertake roadside slashing and prioritise works to;</td>
<td>Commences November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Fire Management Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roads identified within draft Township Protection Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specified reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Static Fire Tanks</strong></td>
<td>Annual check of Council maintained water tanks positioned at Anakie</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel Reduction Operations – Vacant Blocks</strong></td>
<td>Review of documentation used to employ contractors</td>
<td>September - completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Water Tankers</strong></td>
<td>Annual mechanical check</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks Knap Sacks</strong></td>
<td>Annual check of equipment allocated to tractors/mowers</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Kit bags</strong></td>
<td>City Services Stores Unit to recall bags that are deployed with staff deployed to assist CFA</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stores to check contents and re-issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Events</strong></td>
<td>Contact Council’s major Events Unit and obtain a copy of all events scheduled for Dec – Feb &amp;</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forward to CFA District 7 Operations Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECC Set-up Rehearsals</strong></td>
<td>Undertake two surprise rehearsals each year</td>
<td>April &amp; November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CFA Fire Season Briefing Meetings</strong></td>
<td>MERO &amp; MFPO to attend CFA Region 7 fire season briefings</td>
<td>As per CFA Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CoGG/CFA Annual meeting</strong></td>
<td>Annual meeting with District 7. Meeting used to discuss key issues</td>
<td>As per CFA Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Management Group</strong></td>
<td>Internal staff meeting to discuss fire season preparedness actions and weather forecasts</td>
<td>October - completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECC Activation Arrangements</strong></td>
<td>Confirm MECC standby/activation arrangements and Agency staffing at Nov MEMPC meeting</td>
<td>November MEMPC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECC Agency Boxes &amp; Systems Check</strong></td>
<td>Annual check</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief MEMPC on Preparedness Actions</strong></td>
<td>At last meeting of MEMPC for the year, MERO, MRM &amp; MFPO to brief the committee at its last</td>
<td>November MEMPC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting for the year on Council’s preparedness actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERO Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Arrange and coordinate MERO meeting with BoQ, SCS, GPS, WCC &amp; MSC</td>
<td>Early 2014 (to be co-ordinated by Surfcoast Shire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFPO Meeting</strong></td>
<td>Arrange and coordinate MFPO meeting with BoQ, SCS, GPS, &amp; MSC</td>
<td>Early 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Index Reference: Emergency Management

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to inform Council on a recently developed three year (draft) Emergency Management Strategic Plan.

Summary

- The draft Emergency Management Strategic Plan (the Plan) is the first of its type for the City of Greater Geelong.
- The draft Plan provides direction for emergency management planning for the period commencing at the start of 2014/15 financial year and finishing at the end of 2016/2017 financial year.
- Key strategies and performance indicators have been developed in conjunction with Council's multi-agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee as well as Council's internal Emergency Management Group.
- The draft Strategic Plan focuses on six key objectives:
  - Emergency Management Planning
  - Continuous Improvement
  - Knowledge Retention and Staff Development
  - Resource and Service Delivery
  - Community Education and Stakeholder Relationships
  - Financial Investment
- Each of the six objectives has a number of strategies, performance measures and timeframes for completion.
- The Plan contains a 3-year Funding Model that will be subject to Council's normal budgeting process coupled, where possible, with applications to State and Federal grant programs.
- The Plan is a key component that supports the Council in meeting its many obligations and will assist in preparing both the organisation and the community in preparing for, responding to and recovering from an emergency.
- Circulate a copy of the Emergency Management Strategic Plan to Councillors Working Space and a copy to each Councillor.
5. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT THREE YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN 2014 – 2016 (CONT’D)

Cr Richards moved, Cr Macdonald seconded -
That Council:

1) endorse the draft Emergency Management Strategic Plan 2014 – 2016;
2) approve the release of the draft Emergency Management Strategic Plan 2014 – 2016 for public comment for a six-week period; and

Carried.

Background

This is the first Emergency Management Strategic Plan that has been developed for the City of Greater Geelong. Its development has taken over 12-months and has involved consultation with Council’s multi-agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee as well as Council’s own internal Emergency Management Group. The latter group consists of council officers who have emergency management responsibilities and is chaired by the General Manager City Services.

The Plan provides direction for emergency management planning for the City, but in doing so recognises the numerous Victorian Acts and Regulations that relate directly to emergency management as well as the Victorian Government’s White Paper titled ‘Victorian Emergency Management Reform’ which was released in December 2012. The White Paper sets the agenda for emergency management particularly at the State level, but also has an impact at municipal level.

Discussion

The draft Emergency Management Three Year Strategic Plan 2014 – 2016 (the Plan) is the product of 12-months work following the ‘creation’ of what is essentially a new Business Unit for council back in late 2011, i.e. the Emergency Management & Fire Prevention Unit.

The Plan identifies six Objectives, over 30 Strategies and lists over 60 Performance Measures.

The six Objectives are:

- Emergency management planning
- Continuous improvement
- Knowledge retention & staff development
- Resource and service delivery
- Community education and stakeholder relationships and
- Financial investment

Each objective was selected so as to cover a broad spectrum of tasks that would enhance, in particular, council’s approach in fulfilling its emergency management responsibilities.

The Plan was developed through consultation with council officers allocated emergency management responsibilities and the multi-agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC).
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The development of the Plan is considered essential in establishing a way forward over the next three years as well as ensuring that the City maintains its ‘best practice’ approach to emergency management.

The final draft of the Plan was circulated to the MEMPC prior to its meeting held on 4th May 2013. At this meeting the MEMPC discussed the Plan and endorsed the Plan and recommended that it go before Council.

Council will be kept informed on the implementation of the Plan via an annual report, while day-to-day progress will be managed by Council’s internal Emergency Management Group. The Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee will also receive updates on the Plan’s implementation at its quarterly meetings.

Environmental Implications

There are no environmental implications associated with this report.

Financial Implications

Objective Six, Financial Investment of the Plan sets out the three year financial impost on the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Capital Funding</th>
<th>Recurrent Funding</th>
<th>Discretionary Funding</th>
<th>Totals (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$43,650</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$175,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$18,800</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>$120,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$13,800*</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>$85,800*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$276,000</td>
<td>$76,250*</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$352,250*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Other recurrent funding will be used to meet the maintenance cost associated with flood warning remote sensing field equipment as detailed within the Strategic Plan.

Future budget proposal

The preceding table and supporting notes summarises the funding model for the 3-year Strategic Plan.

Income levels are difficult to estimate as they are entirely dependant upon State and Federal grant schemes becoming available and applications being successful. Grant applications will be made in order to offset the full financial cost being funded by council, however, council will need to allocate ‘seed money’ to support any grant application. Typically, most grants in the emergency management ‘arena’ are funded on a dollar for dollar basis.
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*Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications*

Council’s Emergency Management Policy (CPL275.2) tasks council with ‘...the provision of timely and co-ordinated response and recovery activities with its resources to assist in community emergencies...’

To this end, the Plan identifies a number of strategies that will enable council to deliver timely response operations via the introduction of technological advances in remote flood level monitoring that is also capable of triggering automatic electronic traffic warning signs at a number of creek/river crossings particularly on Hovells Creek, Lara.

These installations along with undertaking an ‘all hazards’ Community Emergency Risk Management Assessment every three years should decrease Council’s future exposure to public liability claims.

*Alignment to City Plan*

The Plan ties into City Plan 2013-2017 Community Wellbeing strategic direction. The Plan provides a direct link to the Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMPlan) which is listed as a master plan to assist in delivering Community Wellbeing priorities.

*Officer Direct or Indirect Interest*

No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest relative to the advice provided in this report.

*Risk Assessment*

There are no risks associated with the recommendations contained within this report.

*Social Considerations*

The application of the Plan will have a positive impact on the community by ensuring that the City maintains and enhances the support role it fulfils during an emergency event. In addition the Plan has a strong focus on best practice by investing in training and technology.

The Plan is the key to ensuring that Council and the community is well prepared for the challenges of emergency management.

*Human Rights Charter*

An emergency, depending upon its size and nature can affect the whole community and, once again, depending upon the type of emergency can have long lasting community impact. The implementation of this Strategic Plan and the six Objectives, contained within strives to enhance community safety. Implementation of this Strategic Plan is consistent with the obligation under the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibility.

*Consultation and Communication*

During the development of the Emergency Management Strategic Plan, the strategy received input from the multi-agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee as well as Council’s internal Emergency Management Group.
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The draft Plan now needs to receive broader input from the community by seeking comments via an article placed in the December 2013 Community Update that outlines the Plan and encouraging residents to view the document on the GeelongAustralia website or visiting a Customer Services Centre.

All comments/suggestions received will be reviewed and summarised in a follow-up council report that will be tabled in early 2014 where Council will be asked to adopt the Plan.
CITY OF GREATER GEELONG

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
THREE YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
2014 - 2016
MAY 2013

WWW.GEELONGAUSTRALIA.COM.AU
Forward

This plan provides strategic direction for emergency management planning for the municipality by identifying key strategies to be pursued over the next three years and performance indicators against which the Municipal Emergency Manager can report on progress to the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee and Council.

The plan also addresses the heightened risk awareness within the local government sector which will require additional investment by councils in the emergency management ‘space’. Regular review and possible adjustment to the strategy will be necessary to accommodate future government directives such as the State Government’s response to the White Paper titled ‘Victorian Emergency Management Reform’ which was released in December 2012.

The Emergency Management Three Year Strategic Plan is a key component in ensuring the City of Greater Geelong is meeting its many obligations and will assist in preparing both the organisation and the community in preparing for, responding to and recovering from an event. This process should not be seen as a short-term journey, but rather a journey that will require long-term commitment to deliver sustained change in community behaviours and attitudes.

The plan was developed through consultation with council officers allocated with emergency management responsibilities and endorsed by the multi agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee at their May 2013 meeting.

Stephen Griffin

Chief Executive Officer
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Acronyms

AAHL  Australian Animal Health Laboratory
AHES  After Hours Emergency Service
BoM   Bureau of Meteorology
CERA  Community Emergency Risk Assessment
DHS   Department of Human Services
EHO   Environmental Health Officer
EMG   Emergency Management Group
EMMV  Emergency Management Manual Victoria
EMT   Executive Management Team
FWO   Flood Warning Officer
MAV   Municipal Association of Victoria
MECC  Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre
MEMEG Municipal Emergency Management Enhancement Group
MEMPC Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee
MERO  Municipal Emergency Resource Officer
MFMPC Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee
MFPO  Municipal Fire Prevention Officer
MRM   Municipal Recovery Manager
PHEC  Public Health Emergency Coordinator
PLC   Programmed Logic Controller
SME   Small and medium sized enterprises
VFRR  Victorian Fire Risk Register
VicPol Victoria Police
Aim

The aim of this strategy is to equip and prepare Council, its staff and the multi agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee to plan for, respond to, and recover from a disaster or emergency event by:

- Providing a framework for Council departments with emergency management responsibilities and ensuring relevant plans and procedures are in place;
- Enabling a prompt, coordinated response of all emergency agencies to minimise the loss of life and/or injury to persons and to minimise damage to property;
- Maintaining a culture of ‘best practice’ by investing in training and technology;
- Facilitating the restoration of Council activities/operations/services and the affected community back to normal in a timely and orderly manner.

Strategic planning is the key to ensuring that Council and the community is well prepared for the challenges of emergency management.

Purpose

To participate and work cooperatively with emergency services, other agencies and the community in planning for, responding to and recovering from an emergency affecting the City of Greater Geelong.

In seeking to achieve this, the emergency management activities of the City of Greater Geelong are focused through a number of objectives:

1. Emergency management planning (preparation, prevention)
2. Continuous improvement
3. Knowledge retention and staff development
4. Resourcing and service delivery
5. Community education and stakeholder relationships, and

This strategic plan has been developed to provide clear direction for the City and the multi agency Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee.
 Legislative Responsibilities

All Victorian local government authorities have legislated responsibilities including:

- Country Fire Authority Act 1958
- Emergency Management Act 1986
- Planning and Environment Act 1987
- Local Government Act 1989
- Water Act 1989
- Building Act 1993
- Water Industry Act 1994
- Electrical Safety Act 1998
- Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008, and
- Electrical Safety (Electric Line Clearance) Regulations 2010.

In addition, the Victorian local government sector and emergency services have responsibilities under the Emergency Management Manual Victoria (EMMV).

The listed Acts, Regulations and the EMMV relate directly to emergency management, however, emergency management intersects with many parts of council business including, planning and building, infrastructure management, operations, animal management, community services, economic development, environmental management, emergency management and fire prevention.

History of Emergencies within the Municipality

Below is a condensed list of emergency events that have occurred within the municipality or nearby where major disruption has impacted on the community and services. A more detailed list can be found in Appendix B.

Fires
The Geelong region has experienced some of the worst bushfires in Australia’s history. This is due to its close proximity to the Otway Ranges, Brisbane Ranges and large areas of grassland.

2006  Approximately 10,000 hectares were burnt mainly within the Brisbane Ranges. The fire lasted for 7 days and had a perimeter of 62km. The wildfire extended south as far as De Motts Road Anakie, north to Marshall’s Road, and east to Staughton Vale Road and west to Slate Quarry Road. No lives were lost.

2006  371 hectares were burnt out to the south of Woods & Coppards Roads, Moolap. DSE eventually had the fire under control within 48 hours. The fire was believed to have been caused by a burn off by a local resident on a day that had strong winds.

1985  A major fire started south east of Anakie, burning the You Yangs and was contained at the Princes Freeway. Two farms incurred losses of houses and out buildings. There were associated heavy stock losses as well as fencing in the Staughton Vale/Anakie, Lara and Little River areas. Two lives were lost.

1983  Ash Wednesday conflagration devastated areas to within about 20kms of the urban area, and a number of other fires burnt into parts of outer suburbs, notably Lara.

1977  Little River experienced two grass fires that destroyed around 2000 hectares each.
1969  Fire involved the areas of Lara and Little River and 18 people lost their lives, including 10 at Lara and 44 homes at Lara were destroyed. Eight people lost their lives on the Princes Highway near the 34-mile post.

1961  Significant fires occurred at the Shell Refinery.

1851  Ten people lost their lives along with extensive property and stock losses as fires were reported along the Moorabool Valley, Barrabool Hills and down to Barwon Heads. The unofficial maximum temperature that day was stated as 114°F (45.6°C).

Natural Gas Supply
The loss of the natural gas supply in 1998 from Esso’s Longford Plant, East Gippsland lasted for several weeks, and the impact on domestic and industrial users demonstrated the vulnerability of modern society to infrastructure that is out of mind and taken for granted.

Shipping, period since 1980 – 2000 (approx)
6  Fires on board ships
11  Fires on board small craft
23  Fires on wharves/jetties
2  Significant chemical spillages when discharging at wharves

Flooding
The City of Greater Geelong has a long history of flooding through the many river systems that flow though the municipality. The major river systems that cause flooding include the Barwon River (fed by the Leigh and Moorabool rivers) and Hovells Creek, Lara. These river systems have large catchment areas:

- Barwon River: 3700 sq km (includes both the Moorabool and Leigh River catchments)
- Moorabool River: 1150 sq km
- Leigh River: 900 sq km
- Hovells Creek: 230 sq km

In Geelong, the Belmont Common on the south side of the Barwon River and the South Geelong industrial area on the northern side are affected by floodwaters. The old Breakwater Bridge and Barrabool Road are rendered impassable at relatively low flood levels.

2005  Flooding during February 2005, saw the Granite Road rain gauge record 131mm over 36 hours, Wooloomanta 130mm over 48 hours, and Lara 124mm over 39 hours. Hovells Creek levels rose and lapped the underside of the Station Lake Road Bridge for two hours.

1995  Extensive flooding occurred in South Geelong and at Batesford due to flooding on the Moorabool River. This is the second largest Barwon River flood event recorded in the City of Greater Geelong.

1988  125mm of rain fell on the Hovells Creek catchment over a six hour period resulting in the highest flood level on record

1952  Barwon River flood. Floodwaters covered Wallington Road in Ocean Grove, however vehicles could still pass through. In the same year the central business/residential area of Barwon Heads was flooded with up to 1.3m of water entering the town via the Sheepwash. A levee bank was subsequently constructed – Plummer Bank. This levee was reconstructed following the 1995 Barwon River flood.

**Road and Air Accidents**

Small vehicle road accidents occur frequently, particularly on the Princes Highway/Freeway. These are responded to by Victoria Police, SES and CFA Units however Council can be called upon to assist in the recovery process both environmentally and to offer personal support to those affected.

Avalon Airport is a major airport with significant national air traffic. There is also a smaller airport at Connewarre on the Barwon Heads Road. Major incidents over recent years include:-

- **2013** Crash of joy flight sea plane operator into the ocean at Eastern Beach. No major injuries to the four people on board at the time.
- **2012** Four people killed in a two car collision on the Princes Highway near Lara.
- **2010** Crash of a light aircraft at the old Geelong Airport, Torquay Road (now closed). No injury but there was potential for a major incident due to the close proximity of highway traffic.
- **2004** 24-year-old female skydiver died when her chute failed to open following a jump at Barwon Heads Airport.
- **2002** Father and two children killed after a truck struck the car they were travelling in at a Corio intersection.
- **1996** A major road accident occurred in Waurn Ponds in 1996 involving a B-Double petrol tanker and a small vehicle, resulting in road closure for 18 hours and a major clean up exercise.

**Threats to Water Supply**

A threat to contaminate the Geelong water supply was made during the 1980s. The offender was apprehended prior to any action being taken. Nevertheless, it demonstrates the vulnerability of community water supplies.

The other threat to water supplies arises from severe and prolonged drought conditions.

**Storms**

Of Geelong’s severe storms, 70% have been experienced between the months of October to March. It has been estimated that urban Geelong receives between 12-15 thunderstorms in an average year.

Up to August 2000, six people have been listed as having been killed as a result of being struck by lightning, although many more have been struck but have survived.

**Drought**

One of the longest running drought periods was the 57-month stretch, from October 1880 to June 1885, when 1,997mm of rainfall was recorded. The worst 10-month period recorded only 121mm. 9 percent of that period was considered “severe” drought. Other drought years include the 1981 - 1983 period and prior to that 1966 - 1968. The most recent drought that affected the City of Greater Geelong commenced in 1998 and ended during 2008/09.

Water restrictions are put in place during drought conditions and in some instances Barwon Water may be forced to supply water of a lesser quality. The impacts of this action on industry, commerce and urban population may need to be assessed at the time.
**Municipal Emergency Management Committees Structure**

In fulfilling its emergency management responsibilities the City of Greater Geelong works in partnership with emergency services, agencies, community groups and private industry that come together as the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC).

The MEMPC performs a number of tasks including:

- Undertaking a risk assessment of the municipality and developing mitigation plans for these risks
- Maintaining the Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMPlan)
- Making certain that council’s legislated responsibilities are met
- Ensuring that council is in a state of readiness that will allow it to respond to and assist the community in recovering from an emergency, and
- Overseeing the activities of the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee and other sub committees/working groups where risks or a specific activity needs to be addressed. Some of which are listed below:
Roles and Planning Requirements

1. National, State and Local Government

The emergency management responsibilities of the three tiers of government are the result of Australia’s constitutional arrangements.

Under Section 51, sub-section 6, of the Constitution, the states and the Northern Territory have responsibility for the ‘protection and preservation of the lives and property’ of their citizens. This is why the police, fire and other emergency services are administered by state governments. It is also why the states are responsible for plans and programs relating to emergency management (MAV draft LGEM Handbook 2012).

Key emergency management responsibilities of councils stem primarily from Part 4 of the Emergency Management Act 1986. This Act requires councils to:

- Establish a Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee (MEMPC). This committee includes council officers, emergency services, state government representatives, industry representatives and community organisations. The committee is required to develop the Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMPlan);
- Facilitate the development and maintenance of the MEMPlan through the MEMPC, for consideration by council;
- Allow the audit of the MEMPlan; and
- Appoint at least one Municipal Emergency Resource Officer (MERO) who coordinates the use of council resources needed in responding to and recovering from an emergency.

In addition to the above (under Section 96A of the Country Fire Authority (CFA) Act 1958) the council is required to appoint a Municipal Fire Prevention Officer (MFPO) and establish a Fire Prevention Management Committee to prepare a Municipal Fire Management Plan (s54 and s55A). Additionally the role of the MFPO includes the inspection of hazards and the issuing of fire prevention notices (s41). More recently the CFA Act 1958 was amended to require councils to consider neighbourhood safer places for use as a place of last resort in bushfire.

Under the Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008, the council is required to appoint an Environmental Health Officer (EHO) (s29). For the City of Greater Geelong, the EHO also undertakes the role and responsibilities of the Public Health Emergency Coordinator.

In order for council to meet its statutory obligations, emergency management roles and responsibilities have been allocated to a number of council officers - refer to Operational Structure below.

2. Operational Structure

The City of Greater Geelong Emergency Management Team is lead by the General Manager City Services who also undertakes the key tasks of the Municipal Emergency Manager (MEM). All officers shown within the structure undertake their tasks in addition to their substantive roles. The exceptions to this are the positions of Coordinator Emergency Management & Fire Prevention and Municipal Fire Prevention Officer - both are full time positions.

The key tasks undertaken by all officers shown below helps to ensure that the City is suitably placed to deal with emergency events. The following officers comprise the Senior Emergency Management Group (EMG):

- Municipal Emergency Manager (MEM)  Municipal Emergency Resource Officer (MERO)
- Municipal Recovery Manager (MRM)  Municipal Fire Prevention Officer (MFPO)
- Public Health Emergency Coordinator (PHEC)  Flood Warning Officer (FWO)
- Deputy MEROS, MRM, PHEC and FWO
Note: The above structure excludes other council staff that undertake roles such as Vulnerable Persons Register Coordinator or work in support roles within the Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre (MECC) and Emergency Relief Centres (ERCs).

**Development of Municipal Plans**

The plans, sub plans, operations plans and manuals identified below are required to be in place as per state and local government policy/legislation, or are required due to an assessment of risks that face the municipality.

Ongoing management and updates of these documents are required to ensure their currency. A number of these plans are required to be assessed annually with three-yearly audits carried out on the overarching Municipal Emergency Management Plan (MEMPlan).

With the changing nature and increasing emphasis on local government to be the focal point of emergency management planning and recovery, it is anticipated that there will be an increasing need to develop emergency management plans for other hazards.

In addition to council’s Business Continuity Plan and the Climate Change Strategy, council has developed a number of additional document – see following pages

## Public Face of Emergency Management
- Municipal Emergency Management Plan
- Climate Change
- Emergency Management Web Page
- Business Continuity
- After Hours Emergency Service
- Fire Season Prep Council Report

## Response Documents / Assets

### Sub-Plans
- Catering
- Major Hazard Facilities
- Geotechnical Hazards
- (Fire) Separation St Property
- Cruise Ship HAL Statendam
- Cruise Ship Doulos
- Cruise Ship Silver Shadow
- Bushfire Event Preparation Planning Template (Parts 1 & 2)
- Bushfire Readiness Arrangements for the Fire Danger Period
- Single Incident Response Protocol
- Landslide / Landslips
- Public Health
- Flood Warning Manual
- Animal Welfare
- Municipal Fire Management Plan
- Climate Change related documents
- Dam / Detention Basin Plans

### Risk Management
- CERM 2010

### MEMO Docs
- MERO Aide Memoire
- MERO Ops Manual
- Plant & Equipment Schedule
- MEM/MERO Tour
- EMLO Kit

### Asset Inspections
- Flood Levees
- Above Ground Basins
- Hovells Creek & Moolap Flood Warning Systems

### Strategies
- Evacuation/Relocation
- Communications
- 3-year Emergency Management Strategy 2014-2016
- Waste Management in Level 3 Events

### Policies
- Flood Warning Policy (CPL275.1)
- EM Policy (CPL 275.2)
- MEMPC (CPL 275.3)

### Other
- CorVu EM Year Planner
- VBRC Implementation Plan
- VP Facility Database
- Code Red M’ment Procedure
- Shelter – in-Place Education Program
- EM Staff Movement
- Flood Folders x 2 No.

### Technical Manuals
- Levee Banks/Basins/Floodways
- Stormwater Pumps
- Supervisors (Financial) Manual
- Incident Manager Manual
- Tech Planning Manual
- Ops Manual
- AHES Technical Manual
- AHES Contact Database

### Memorandum of Understandings
- CoGG/ Barwon Water (Fire plug maint.)
- CoGG / CREST (Comms support)
- CoGG/GPS (Resource Sharing)
- CoGG/ BoQ (Resource Sharing)
- CoGG / Showgrounds (Access to kitchens & temporary accommodation)

### Operations-Plans
- Flood Operations Manual
- VP Contact Protocol
- Flood Sub-plan
- Expedite VoiceReach User Manual
- Moolap Flood Plan
- Map of Key Infrastructure
- Spill Management
- Agriculture Hazards & Droughts
- Rainfall/Impact Modelling

### MECC Related Docs
- MECC Central Users Guide
- MECC (Facility) Managers kit
- MECC Admin Kit
- MECC Establishment
- MECC Rostering
- MECC Info Booklet for EMLOs
- MECC Contact Lanyard
- MECC Registry Cell
- MECC Systems/Procedures

### MEOC Related Docs
- MEOC Manual
- Level 1 Flooding
- MEOC Manager
- Fires (Landfill)
- MEOC Rostering
- Storms
- Duty Officer Induction
- Road Accident

### Supporting Systems
- Hovells Creek & Moolap FWS FM 88

### Key:
- Docs under development
- Docs to be developed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sub – Plans</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC Management Kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Standard Operating Procedures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in the EM Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is Recovery Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Team Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities of MRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery (Staffing) of an Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Workload of the Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Recovery Activities are Activated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping and Costings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Establishing a Hot Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Material Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to Individual Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of ERCs and RCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxic &amp; Hazardous Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train Crash/ Major Road Crash/Aviation Accident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format for Community Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious Diseases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent changes in Emergency Management

1. Community Vulnerability

When we think about community vulnerability we tend to immediately focus on particular individuals or groups, services or facilities within our community. This may be due to the 2009 Black Saturday bushfires that devastated many parts of our state. However, the term ‘community vulnerability’ must be applied much more broadly.

As we go about our daily lives we rely heavily on ‘unseen’ systems and infrastructure that support our community. These ‘unseen’ components to our lives must operate efficiently. The impact of a disaster or the risk associated with a potential disaster on these components can be far reaching, for example the 1998 Longford Gas Crisis or an event involving the Australian Animal Health Laboratory.

To this end, the Council of Australian Governments stated in its 2011 Disaster Resilience Strategy that ‘...many known factors are increasing our vulnerability to disasters. Work-life patterns, lifestyle expectations, demographic changes, domestic migration, and community fragmentation are increasing community susceptibility, as well as altering social networks and sustainability of volunteer groups. The increasing complexity and interdependencies of social, technical, and infrastructure systems are also playing a role in increasing our vulnerability to disasters. Pressures for urban development to extend into areas of higher risk from natural disasters compounds the problem, as does the expectation that the same services and facilities will be available wherever we choose to live.’ (National Strategy for Disaster Resilience, Feb 2011).

2. Shared Responsibility

The 2009 Victorian Bushfire Royal Commission used the expression ‘shared responsibility’ as a term to describe increased responsibility for all. The Commission recommended that state agencies and the local government sector adopt leadership roles to improve emergency management. The Commission articulated that communities would also need to take on greater responsibility for their own safety and be proactive especially on days of high fire risk. This approach must be applied to all risks - fire, flood, climate change, heatwave, geotechnical etc - that face the City of Greater Geelong and could cause harm to its community.

3. Climate Change

Climate change will present many challenges to all levels of government, emergency services and the broader community. Council’s emergency management risk assessment processes need to be cognisant of potential climate change impacts and ensure that emergency management decision making and planning accommodates these impacts.

The Bureau of Meteorology states that modelling of climate change indicates the incidence and severity of extreme weather and natural disaster events may increase in the future. Climate change also means that the historical record will provide less reliable guidance on the expected range of seasonal conditions, increasing the value of accurate and timely seasonal forecasting services (source: BoM Review into the Bureau’s capacity to respond to future extreme weather events and natural disaster events and to provide seasonal forecasting services, 2011).


The reforms within this paper, if accepted by the State Government, will set the scene for the future direction of emergency management in Victoria. This paper sets out a roadmap for change. It affirms the importance of supporting the community to become more resilient and building the capability and capacity of the emergency management sector.
The Municipality

The City was founded in 1838 and is located 75 kms south-west of Melbourne. The municipality is located on the shores of both Corio Bay and Bass Strait and encompasses the lower reaches of the Barwon and Moorabool Rivers.

The City of Greater Geelong is a diverse municipality. It is one of the largest local government bodies in regional Victoria. The municipality covers an area of 1245 km$^2$ and has a population of 222,517 as at June 2011. By 2031, the population is forecast to reach 299,307. (Source: http://forecast2id.com.au/default.aspx?id=268&pg=5180)

The City of Greater Geelong with its large retail centre, many townships, large industrial zones, major research facility (AAHL), multiple retail areas, port, airport, major hazard facilities, rail corridors and an extensive road network (240km of declared main roads (excluding state highways) and 1200km of local roads) presents a challenge when looking to understand and plan for an emergency.

1. Major Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Schools that provide after school care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kindergartens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Childcare centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Major university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Caravan parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Disability centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Community halls and neighbourhood houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Aged care / hostels / nursing homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maternal and child health centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Senior citizen centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels preparation centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amusement parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Service stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above list is not exhaustive and does not include other meeting places such as churches, hotels, restaurants, cafes and nightclubs.

2. Response Agencies

The City has three permanently staffed CFA stations (Geelong City, Corio, and Belmont) and 25 individual CFA brigades that operate either entirely or partly within the municipal footprint.

VICSES has four units (Corio, Geelong, South Barwon and Bellarine) as well as the Geelong headquarters for VICSES Barwon South West. Victoria Police have six police stations including three that operate on a 24 hour basis.

3. Recovery Agencies

The City has a number of Regional State Government Offices within its municipal footprint including:

- Department of Human Services (Western Division)
- Department of Health
- Department Education and early Childhood Development
- Ambulance Victoria

In addition, the municipality also has a number of Non-Government Organisations located within its boundaries:

- Australian Red Cross
- Council of Churches
- The Salvation Army
- Barwon Health
- St Johns Ambulance Service
- Victorian Farmers Federation
Objectives, Strategies and Performance Measures

At the core of this three year strategy are six Objectives. These objectives were adopted by the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee. Each objective identifies the underlying strategies and performance measures that will be used to gauge the overall implementation of the Strategy:

Objective 1. Emergency Management Planning

Objective Two: Continuous Improvement

Objective Three: Knowledge Retention and Staff Development

Objective Four: Resource and Service Delivery

Objective Five: Community Education and Stakeholder Relationships

Objective Six: Financial Investment – Funding Model

The following tables show each Objectives key strategies, performance measures and target year for completion.
**Objective 1: Emergency Management Planning**

To undertake ongoing and priority based planning for emergency events that have been assessed as the greatest risk to the City of Greater Geelong and its community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MEMPc to participate in the VICSES led Community Emergency Management Assessment (CERA) program</td>
<td>MEMPC to undergo CERA Program every 3 years and use the outcomes as the main planning tool. VICSES to lead program.</td>
<td>3-year cycle as per EMMV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MFMPC to participate in the CFA led Victorian Fire Risk Register Program</td>
<td>MFMPC to undergo VFRR Program annually or on an as needed basis. CFA to lead program.</td>
<td>As per CFA prgm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Develop sub-plans, operations plans, standard operating procedures (SOPs) that outline how the City will respond to and recover from various emergency events</td>
<td>MEMPlan, MFMPlan, sub-plans, operations plans, SOPs developed and maintained for all identified risks</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maintain active and interesting MEMPc and MFMPC forums that make efficient use of meeting times by ensuring that meetings focus on planning for future events based on past experiences and a robust risk assessment process</td>
<td>EMG to develop base agenda for the MEMPc meetings and then seek agenda items from MEMPc members. In addition: ▪ Officers to proactively seek guest speakers. ▪ At 1st meeting per calendar year, MEMPc to identify 3 -4 key tasks to address through that year ▪ MEMPc to appoint necessary working groups to undertake focused planning for an event/risk</td>
<td>Quarterly meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Use of corporate programs such as CorVu to track the progress of allocated tasks</td>
<td>Officers allocated emergency management tasks tracked and completed as per CorVu timeframes;</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Continue to build and maintain constructive relationships with emergency service and agency representatives</td>
<td>Strong and consistent representation at MEMPc and/or MFMPC meetings by council officers, emergency services and agencies as well as council participation at exercises and Regional Emergency Management Response/Recovery meetings.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 In conjunction with Council’s Environment &amp; Natural Resources Unit develop a strategy, the purpose of which is to assess the risk of bushfire affecting bushland reserves and/or the surrounding properties, and consider any necessary response(s). The benchmark for the actions needed to minimise the risk while retaining the bushland character of the reserves</td>
<td>Meeting(s) between relevant departments held and strategy developed and introduced once MEMPc and the Council has signed off on same.</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ensure that emergency management planning ties into the City Plan and as such is cognisant of the Council’s Community Wellbeing Strategic Directions</td>
<td>Emergency management planning to consider: ▪ The impact of a growing population, urban development and fixed infrastructure with increasing sensitivity to the impact of severe weather, flash flooding, fires etc ▪ The cultural diversity of the community Changing demographics ▪ The potential impact on the City of Greater Geelong should a significant event impact a neighbouring municipality</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Investigate the need for Data Exchange Agreements with key emergency services and the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee. This puts in place an agreed set of protocols to allow staff to be able to quickly and</td>
<td>Data Exchange Agreements developed and signed off as needed</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Examine risks near municipal boundaries and in partnership with neighbouring municipalities develop response/recovery arrangements and/or plans that address these risks | Meetings held between municipalities, VicPol and relevant Control Agency representatives. For example, engage with Surf Coast Shire (SCS) in order to undertake planning that focuses on a large ‘Ash Wednesday’ type fire event impacting that municipality. For example:
- How to accommodate those SCS residents who may not be able to go home
- Joint MECC’s
- Relief Centres needed
For flood planning, discuss with the Control Agency and VicPol:
- Catchment based Flood (riverine) Management Plans rather than separate municipal flood plans | 2014 |

| 11 | Council emergency management officers to remain informed with council’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy 2011 | Implementation of suggested priority work areas and roadmap emergency management actions as outlined within the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Summary & Roadmap 2011
Climate change to be assessed as part of the 2013/2014 CERA risk assessment program. | On-going |

| 12 | Updating of Council Emergency Management policies and management procedures. | The following policies/management procedures updated as per council schedule:
- Flood Warning Policy CPL 275.1
- Emergency Management Policy CPL 275.2
- Code Red Service Delivery Procedure (currently under development) | Dec 2013
June 2016
2016 |

| 13 | In conjunction with Council’s Waste Unit, develop waste and recycling plans that focus on a coordinated waste and disposal operations associated with large events. These plans to consider; Staffing, equipment needs, collection and disposal of solid, liquid and hazardous waste materials | Meeting(s) between relevant departments held and plans developed and introduced once the MEMPC and Council has signed off on same. | 2014/2015 |
**Objective 2: Continuous Improvement**

Identify and introduce technologies that will enhance and improve the City’s approach to emergency management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Proactively seek out technological advancements / best practice that will be of benefit to the City of Greater Geelong and its community. This is to include undertaking studies into technologies and/or products that help inform council emergency management officers which, in turn, enhance response and recovery operations | Business Cases submitted for technological improvements for activities such as:  
- Sandbagging operations, i.e. identification and examination of alternatives;  
- Remote sensing with inbuilt SMS alarm capability of creek not monitored by the BoM, i.e. Windermere Rd and Rennie St, Lara; Barrabool Rd, Belmont installed;  
- Field based traffic management (electric diode) warning devices that can be activated remotely to advise of creek crossings impacted by flooding – flood triggers determines, warning devices installed;  
- Use of council’s network of irrigation rain gauges for emergency management, in particular in the development of ‘triggers’ for areas at risk of flash flooding;  
Assessment conducted on any proposed community building to determine if it is needed as an emergency relief centre, and if so ensuring that its floor plan can be adapted and any pre-wiring undertaken for this purpose;  
Detailed assessment of Expedite Voice Reach software that can be used for heatwave warnings;  
Places/Weave having the ability to display text boxes that can be populated with real-time capacity information on activated emergency relief centres:  
- Places Weave having greater application to emergency management e.g.:  
  - the ability to display vulnerable people/facilities and produce maps in an at risk environment for the VicPol Evacuation Manager;  
  - Discuss with Information Services about being able to display community demographic details that can be used for evacuation management/planning;  
  - Displaying various flood extents and listing properties that will be impacted by the flood event and then have an automated system whereby SMS messages can be sent to contacts for council managed/owned properties. | 2014/15  
2014/15 – 2016/17  
2014/15 – 2016/17  
2016/17  
2014/15  
On-going  
2014  
2014/15  
2014/15  
2014/15 |
Further enhancements to council’s Emergency Management website (restricted to MEMPC members) that includes:

- Spatial Flood Database developed (i.e. electronic database that contains photo, inundation maps for various flood events/ various sites) that can be downloaded during a flood event to provide a strategic picture of flood risk and flood behaviour within the municipality:
  - Data (maps, flood levels, photos etc) extracted from reports, personal / shared drives etc
  - Contact database (that users can log in and update their details)
  - The MEMPlan (full version) sub-plans, operations plans.

Relevant staff trained on how to upload information onto the EM website and Places/Weave.

During an event, the EM page/tab appear on the main Geelong Australia website rather than have it hidden behind the ‘Explore More’ tab.

The use of social networking examined and introduced into emergency management.

Dam Emergency sub-plans developed on large aboveground water bodies, including large retention basins following completion of Objective 1, Strategy 14.

Investigations on the cost/benefit to have remote sensing water level indicators installed on large above ground urban detention basins e.g.:

a) Barrabool Rd/Scenic Rd, Highton
b) Augustine Lake Reserve, Highton
c) Flood Levee – see below
d) McLeod’s Water Hole, Drysdale
e) McDonald Reserve, Belmont
f) Knollbrook Close, Highton
g) Prestige Park, Bell Park
h) Pepperdine Way/Parkland Crt, Highton
i) Barrabool Road / Thoroughbred Way, Highton

Undertaken and budget concept submitted where need is proven.

Investigations on the cost/benefit to have remote sensing water level indicators installed on flood levee systems e.g.:

a) Plummer Bank, Barwon Heads

Business case submitted and funds obtained

Recurrent funds obtained
2. Recurrent funding for the maintenance and quality checking of the Hovells Creek and Moolap Flood Warning Systems

3. Examination and use of existing technology that will allow CoGG staff with emergency management responsibilities to send information to managers/coordinators advising of an emergency that could impact of staff working in the field

Examined existing technologies completed in partnership with council’s Risk management Unit and Information Services Unit and approval from council’s Executive Management Team to use same

---

| 5 | Officers to attend local and interstate conferences and/or professional meetings where agendas or trade displays include state-of-the-art products | Regular attendances of council officers at:
- Regional Response and/or Recovery meetings;
- BSW Strategic Fire Management Planning meetings;
- MEMEG meetings;
- Regional MERO/MRM and or Regional MFPO meetings;
- Relevant conferences. | On-going |

6 | On-going development of council’s systems and procedures that will assist council officers in the performance of their allocated tasks | Systems improved and training enhanced by:
- ‘In the cloud’ technology introduced where applicable;
- Duty Statement for Information Services support officer allocated to the MECC prepared and agreed to by Manager Information Services;
- MECC Central program used with the Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre and the Municipal Emergency Operations Centre. | On-going | 2014/15 | On-going |

---

Thunderstorm super cell with a cloud lowering known as a ‘shelf’ or ‘arcus’
## Objective 3 Knowledge Retention and Staff Development

To improve council officer knowledge and general awareness of emergency management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | On-going officer development of skills that adequately equip the individual to perform during and following an emergency event | Training enhanced by:  
- Codes of practice/training/instruction manuals developed and implemented  
- Depth of training/experience of less experienced officers improved  
- Emergency Management Training officer identified.  
- CoGG to investigate with other municipalities within the Barwon South West Region the level of interest to establish a Regional MEMEG (Officer) Committee | On-going |
| 2 | Develop a program of ‘data mining’ undertaken within the organisation that identifies studies, and the like where the information collected can be used to enhance Emergency Management response and recovery sub-plans, e.g. flood studies, sea level studies, geotechnical studies, demographic studies etc | Program implemented and data included within appropriate sub and operations plans. | 2014/15 |
| 3 | Improve the depth of knowledge across the organisation regarding emergency management and the role Council undertakes | Discussions held with Council’s Organisational Development Manager regarding including a short presentation on Emergency Management & Fire Prevention at Corporate Induction programs | 2014/15 |
| 4 | Improve the overall knowledge of City Services Supervisors to ensure that non-eligible repair works are not claimed and eligible repair works are fully documented to improve the audit trail for claims being submitted to the Department of Treasury & Finance by the Coordinator Emergency Management and Fire Prevention. | City Services Information Manual developed and introduced to City Service Supervisors Group. | 2014/15 |

*Rowing clubrooms, Barwon Tce, 1983*
Objective 4: Resource and Service Delivery

Traditional approaches of allocating emergency management responsibilities to council officers who may be the ‘best fit’ may no longer be the most effective management model for council to meet its emergency management responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undertake an internal staff assessment / resource allocation of officer time allocated to emergency management to determine if the relevant staff are able to undertake their emergency management responsibilities or whether additional officer time is required</td>
<td>Gap analysis undertaken that examined staff resources allocated to emergency management versus what officer time is actually needed. Report tabled at Council’s Emergency Management Group and a report written for council’s Executive Management Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strengthen relationships with neighbouring municipalities</td>
<td>Relationships strengthened by:  - Memorandums of Understandings developed and signed off  - On-going MERO/MRM and MFPO meetings  - Discussions held between the City of Greater Geelong and the Borough of Queenscliffe regarding forming a combined Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee – ensuring full compliance with Part 4, s19(1) of the Emergency Management Act 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify staff who are interested in emergency management and commence a mentoring/education program</td>
<td>Mentor /training program developed and rolled out to staff who have displayed an interest in Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop a council policy that addresses service delivery into high fire risk areas of the municipality on Code Red days</td>
<td>Council policy developed and approved by the Executive Management Team following consultation with relevant council divisions and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Business Continuity  The Municipal Emergency Manager and/or Coordinator Emergency Management to become members of the Business Continuity Committee to provide a resource to the Committee with a thorough understanding of the Victorian Emergency Management Arrangements.</td>
<td>Council’s Business Continuity Committee extended to include the Municipal Emergency Manager and/or the Coordinator Emergency Management &amp; Fire Prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>In consultation with the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee seek funding that will allow for specific actions to undertaken to mitigate fire risk.</td>
<td>Budget concept(s) submitted and funds allocated for:  - Traffic management costs associated with roadside burns  - Vegetation offsets due to fuel reduction programs  - Undertake fire mitigation works on Strategic Fire Management Roads and develop a ‘compensation’ payment (s) model for property owners where mitigation measures are identified in conjunction with the CFA on private farmland, where these measures will help mitigate fire entry into high fire risk rural communities, e.g. ploughing 15m fire breaks on the north &amp; west sides of land that has traditionally been cropped Undertake investigations into how a bushfire is likely to enter a township from its rural / urban interface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 5: Community Education and Stakeholder Relationships**

Empower the community and promote/enhance general knowledge on risks and what the community or individuals can do to assist in risk reduction measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Enhance and strengthen community preparedness and build disaster resilient communities by regular articles appearing in the council’s Community Update as well as focused and fully funded promotional campaigns | - EMG to prepare budget concepts that will fund broad and/or focused community education programs  
- Regular educational and promotional information in Council’s Community Update  
- Build on the existing ‘Safe Return to Your Property’ which focus on fire damage to property and develop a similar document that targets damage to households due to flooding  
- Targeted community educational campaigns developed and introduced that focus on topics including:  
  • ‘Shelter-in-Place’ – chemical fires/spills  
  • Structure fires  
  • Leave Early (bushfires)  
  • Flood events  
  • Severe weather  
  • Community warnings  
These programs could target particular community groups, the broader community or particular age groups e.g.:  
  • Primary school children  
  • Elderly citizens – via senior citizen centres  
  • Service clubs (Rotary, Apex etc)  
  • Caravan park operators  
These campaigns could include:  
- Pamphlets/flyers developed and placed on display in Customer Service Centres or targeted delivery  
- Articles in the Community Update  
- Presentations  
- Web based educational programs  
- Information pamphlets given to caravan park operators and handed out to facility users upon check in  
- Enhance Council’s emergency management webpage to provide a greater focus on community education | As per funding model schedule  
2014/15  
On-going |
| 2 Expand the annual fire season ‘green waste’ clearance program provided to Breamlea during 2009 and 2010 to include other Very High and Extreme fire risk communities | Funds obtained from council and program expanded | 2014/15 |
| 3 Business Continuity for small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs). | Initiate discussions with council’s EDU re BC for SMEs  
In conjunction with the Economic Development Unit monitor developments via the MAV on a new 2-stage program focused on preparing business continuity resources for SMEs. Develop a methodology to promote this issue within the local business and tourism community. | 2015/16  
2015/16 |
Objective 6: Financial Investment - Funding Model

To increase the available pool of capital, recurrent and discretionary funds that can be used to enhance emergency management operations and introduce modern technology within the municipal footprint and to maximise reimbursement opportunities following an event.

Where possible council funds will be used to support applications for Federal and/or State grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Obtain approval of the Emergency Management Three Year Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Refer to following pages for recommended 3-year funding model</td>
<td>As per funding model (refer to pages 28 to 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2014 – June 2017, including the funding model that will then allow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the necessary recurrent and/or capital and/or discretionary funds to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocated that can then be used by the Emergency Management Group to fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities that at present cannot be pursued as well as target/maintain a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paradigm of continuous improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where possible grant application will be submitted to State and/or Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government to assist in reducing the overall budget commitment from council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Windermere Road, Lara, February 2011
Funding Model for 2014/2015 to 2016/2017

The following pages canvass the financial implications of the three year strategy. In developing the Strategies Funding Model, care has been taken to spread the financial cost over the three year term.

Special notes:

1. Where applicable, external grant applications will be made in order to offset the full financial cost being funded by the City of Greater Geelong.
2. The estimated costs shown below forms the total required. If a grant application is successful then council may only need to fund 50% of the totals shown below.
3. Grant applications cannot be made for on-going maintenance costs.

Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Capital Funding</th>
<th>Recurrent Funding</th>
<th>Discretionary Funding</th>
<th>Totals (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$43,560</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$175,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$18,800</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>$120,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$93,800*</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>$165,800*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$276,000</td>
<td>$156,160*</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$462,160*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Can reduce by $80,000 should the Emergency Management Officer’s position prove not to be needed. If the need is demonstrated then the cost of the position to council needs to be offset by an income stream from the State/Federal Government. This is tied directly back to a successful and on-going State Government funding bid.
### Objective 2: Continuous Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 <strong>Proactively seek out technological advancements / best practice that will be of benefit to the City of Greater Geelong and its community. This is to include undertaking studies into technologies and/or products that help inform council emergency management officers which, in turn, enhance response and recovery operations.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use of council’s network of irrigation rain gauges for emergency management, in particular in the development of ‘triggers’ for areas at risk of flash flooding.</strong> Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td>It will be necessary to engage a software engineer to write a program that will enable automatic downloading and tabulation of rainfall data from various data sources including three different software programs, ie the Environmon software program, the Rainbird Irrigation system and the BoM’s website data into a single spreadsheet and then plot the data onto 1hr, 12hr and 24hr total rainfall intensity grid maps of the municipality. Software engineer to also write program that will search Pathways and identify particular drainage related Requests For Service and plot these onto 1hr, 12 hr and 24hr total rainfall intensity grids of the municipality. Estimated Cost: $20,000</td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td><strong>$20,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply &amp; installation of creek height remote sensing with inbuilt, data logger, solar power, CCTV, SMS alarm capability warning of creek hazardous levels installed at: Rennie Street, Lara</strong> Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary estimate: $30,000 (capital).</strong> Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong> 2014/2015 &amp; on-going <strong>$5,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply and installation of field based traffic management (solar powered LED) 600 x 600 mm warning devices that can be activated by short haul radio links to both sides of floodway. Devices triggered by a data logger linked to a NextG modem housed with battery system in a cabinet. System can send out SMS to predetermined council officer contact numbers. Sign is triggered automatically by increasing creek height to advise drivers of:</strong> 1. Water over roads and 2. Road closed due to flooding</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary estimate for Rennie St site: $30,000 (capital)</strong> Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $1,200 pa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong> 2014/2015 &amp; on-going <strong>$1,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Continued ....

Investigations on the cost/benefit to have remote sensing water level indicators installed on large above ground wet or dry urban detention basins e.g.:

- a) Barrabool Road/Scenic Road, Highton
- b) Augustine Lake Reserve, Highton
- c) Plummer Flood Levee, Barwon Heads

Cost/benefit analysis undertaken and budget concept submitted where need is proven.

Supply and installation of remote water level indicators with SMS warning capability: $14,000 per site* (capital)

Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $4,200/site*

*fund 3 sites during 2014/2015 if cost/benefit for these 3 sites is proven

Business case submitted and budget concept submitted where need is proven.

Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained

Cost/benefit analysis undertaken and budget concept submitted where need is proven.

Supply and installation of remote water level indicators with SMS warning capability: $14,000 per site (capital)

Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $4,200/site

*fund 3 sites during 2014/2015 if cost/benefit for these 3 sites is proven

5. Recurrent funding for the maintenance and quality checking of the Hovells Creek and Moolap Flood Warning Systems.

Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained

Objective 4: Resource and Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. In consultation with the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee seek funding that will allow for specific actions to undertake and mitigate fire risk. | Budget concept(s) submitted and recurrent funds allocated to Fire Prevention annual budget for:  
- Traffic management costs associated with roadside burns.  
- Vegetation offsets due to fuel reduction programs.  
- Strategic Fire Management Mitigation Works Program developed for Strategic Fire Management Roads. Program also examines a ‘compensation’ payment (s) model for property owners where mitigation | Daily cost:  
1 x person traffic control unit: $500  
2 x person traffic control unit: $750  
Funds to be used to pay for offset program as determined by Council's Environmental Unit.  
Allow for $450/hectare compensation – depends upon crop type.  
$450/ha will allow for 5.5ha area to be compensated for (i.e. $2500/$450 = 5.5ha). Allowing for a 15m ploughed width will | 2014/2015 | Allow $3,000 |
|                                 |                      |          | & on-going     |               |
|                                 |                      |          | 2014/2015 & on-going | Allow $5,000 |
|                                 |                      |          | & on-going     |               |
measures are identified and these have a direct impact private farmland, that is, where these measures will help mitigate fire entry into high fire risk rural communities, e.g. ploughing 15m fire breaks on the north & west sides of land that has traditionally been cropped.

Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.

### Objective 5: Community Education and Stakeholder Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Enhance and strengthen community preparedness and build disaster resilient communities by regular articles appearing in the council’s Community Update as well as focused and fully funded promotional campaigns. | • Targeted community on-going educational campaigns developed and introduced that focus on topics including:  
  • ‘Shelter-in-Place’ – chemical fires/spills  
  • Structure fires  
  • Leave Early (bushfires)  
  • Flood events  
  • Severe weather  
  • Community warnings  
  These programs will target particular community groups, the broader community or particular age groups e.g.:  
  • Primary school children  
  • Elderly citizens – via senior citizen centres  
  • Service clubs (Rotary, Apex etc)  
  • Caravan park operators  
  These campaigns could include:  
  • Pamphlets/flyers developed and placed on display in Customer Service Centres or targeted delivery areas  
  • Articles in the Community Update  
  • Presentations  
  • Web based educational programs  
  Information pamphlets given to caravan park operators and handed out to facility users upon check in  
  Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained. | The objective of emergency management related activities across the State of Victoria is to reduce the impact that an emergency on can have on a community. This can be achieved by all levels of Government, however, the key is for individuals to take responsibility for their own safety and actively plan and prepare for an emergency.  
Community engagement and education is one method of preparing a community for an emergency. The ‘Shelter-in-Place’ campaign is a pilot program for the municipality and targets Chemical Fires.  
The commitment of recurrent funds for education and awareness programs is aimed at informing residents so as to allow the community to adapt to living with the threat of an emergency and help promote long term behavioural change along similar lines to the State Governments TAC campaigns.  
To support council’s funding commitment, it is anticipated that additional funds will be provided by Chemical Industry representatives.  
Campaign effectiveness to be assessed during 2015/2016. | 2014/2015 & on-going for 3-years | $10,000 |
| 2. Expand the annual fire season ‘green’ | Budget concept(s) submitted and recurrent funds | Estimate based on Breamlea program, i.e. $2500pa for 2014/2015 & | $6,000 |
A waste fire clearance program provided to Breamlea during 2009 and 2010 to include other extreme fire risk communities. Allocated to Fire Prevention annual budget for Anakie. Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained. Breamlea properties, therefore, for Anakie. Funds to be used for:
1. Advertising to local community
2. Removal costs
3. Waste disposal fees
Campaign effectiveness to be assessed during 2015/2016.

| 2014/2015 Business Concept Total (excl GST) | $175,560 | on-going |
### Objective 2: Continuous Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proactively seek out technological advancements / best practice that will be of benefit to the City of Greater Geelong and its community. This is to include undertaking studies into technologies and/or products that help inform council emergency management officers which, in turn, enhance response and recovery operations.</td>
<td>Supply &amp; installation of creek height remote sensing with inbuilt, data logger, solar power, CCTV, SMS alarm capability warning of hazardous creek levels installed at: Windermere Rd, Lara Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td>Preliminary estimate: $30,000 (capital). Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $5,000</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply and installation of field based traffic management (solar powered LED) 600 x 600 mm warning devices that can be activated by short haul radio links to both sides of floodway. Devices triggered by a data logger linked to a NextG modem housed with battery system in a cabinet. System can send out SMS to predetermined council officer contact numbers. Sign is triggered automatically by increasing creek height to advise drivers of: 3. Water over roads and 4. Road closed due to flooding Warning devices installed at: Windermere Rd, Lara Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td>Preliminary estimate for Windermere Rd site: $30,000 (capital) Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $1,200 pa</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigations on the cost/benefit to have remote sensing water level indicators installed on large above ground wet or dry urban detention basins e.g.: a) McLeod’s Water Hole, Drysdale b) McDonald Reserve, Belmont c) Knollbrook Close, Highton Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td>Supply and installation of remote water level indicators with SMS warning capability: $14,000 per site* Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $4,200/site*</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*fund 3 sites during 2014/2015 if cost/benefit for these 3 sites is proven</td>
<td>2015/2016 &amp; on-going</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2015/2016 Business Concept Total (excl GST)** $120,800
## Objective 2: Continuous Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proactively seek out technological advancements / best practice that will be of benefit to the City of Greater Geelong and its community. This is to include undertaking studies into technologies and/or products that help inform council emergency management officers which, in turn, enhance response and recovery operations.</td>
<td>Supply and installation of field based traffic management (solar powered LED) 600 x 600 mm warning devices that can be activated by short haul radio links to both sides of floodway. Devices triggered by a data logger linked to a NextG modem housed with battery system in a cabinet. System can send out SMS to predetermined council officer contact numbers. Sign is triggered automatically by increasing creek height to advise drivers of: 5. Water over roads and 6. Road closed due to flooding</td>
<td>Supply and installation of field based traffic management (electric diode) warning devices that can be activated remotely to advise of creek crossings impacted by flooding – flood triggers determines, warning devices installed at: a) Barrabool Road</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warning devices installed at: Barrabool Road, Belmont</td>
<td>Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $1,200 pa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 &amp; on-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigations on the cost/benefit to have remote sensing water level indicators installed on large above ground wet or dry urban detention basins e.g.: a) Prestige Park, Bell Park b) Peppermint Way /Parkland Crt, Highton c) Barrabool Road / Thoroughbred Way, Highton</td>
<td>Supply and installation of remote water level indicators with SMS warning capability: $14,000 per site*</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained.</td>
<td>Estimated recurrent (maintenance cost): $4,200/site*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016/2017 &amp; on-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Resource and Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Number and Description</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Undertake an internal staff assessment / resource allocation of officer time allocated to emergency management to determine if the relevant staff are able to undertake their emergency management responsibilities or whether additional officer time is required.</td>
<td>Gap analysis undertaken that examined staff resources allocated to emergency management versus what officer time is actually needed. Report tabled at Council’s Emergency Management Group and a report written for council’s Executive Management Team. Business case submitted and recurrent funds obtained provided that EMT agrees to reinstate position</td>
<td>Re-establishment of 86 Emergency Management Officers position (incl overheads) $80,000*</td>
<td>2016/2017 &amp; on-going</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Budget Concept submitted, but dependant on: a) Internal survey identifies serious gap in resource allocation given by officers allocated EM responsibilities but who also hold substantiative positions; and b) EMT approves EFT position increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016/2017 Business Concept Total (excl GST) $165,800
APPENDICES
## Key Tasks /Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Key Tasks /Responsibilities (summary only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mayor                     | • Preparation of advice ahead of a period of high risk  
• Notification of community meetings and relief and recovery services  
• Details of any disruptions to council services  
• Provide advice regarding the availability of support, counseling or insurance services, including locations of relief and recovery centres  
• General public announcements  
• Details of any public appeal for financial assistance for affected residents.  
• Play a linking role to other levels of executive government, working with the CEO on this action  
• Ensure that any media comments relate to representing the views of the community and/or what the City is doing in support of the emergency services |
| Councillors               | • Boost morale or provide comfort to residents affected by an emergency event.  
• Assist the affected community in connecting with support agencies |
| Chief Executive Officer   | • fulfils its municipal emergency management planning, mitigation and preparedness responsibilities under the relevant legislation and ministerial guidelines  
• responds to an emergency event appropriately  
• maintains critical business operations and priorities during and after an emergency event in accordance with its business continuity plan.  
• keep the organisation running – as much as possible council should meet the needs of the emergency as well as delivering core services to the community  
• provide leadership to council officers and staff, and act as the main contact point for the Mayor and councillors  
• in partnership with the Mayor, advocate to the State and Federal Government for support/assistance for community recovery  
• work with other levels of government, agencies and stakeholders to achieve the best possible outcomes for the community and council |

### Division: City Services

| Municipal Emergency Manager (MEM) | - Chairperson to the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee;  
• Ensure that the Municipal Emergency Management Plan is effective and current;  
• Ensure that a Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre(s) is able to be activated at short notice in event of an emergency;  
• Ensure that contractual arrangements with contractors likely to be requested to provide response or recovery support during an emergency are agreed to and documented in advance of likely events;  
• Ensure that appropriate operating procedures and processes are developed, documented and tested by those who will be required to use them during an emergency, then ensure that suitable training takes place;  
• Keep Council and Chief Executive Officer appraised of emergency management activities and events |

Source: Bureau of Meteorology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Municipal Emergency Resource Officer (MERO)** | - Deputy Chairperson to the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee;  
- Develop systems and procedures related to emergency management  
- Write Response Sub-plans and Operations Plans and Manuals  
- Oversee the implementation of the Victorian Bushfire Royal Commission Implementation Plan  
- Provide feedback on behalf of the MEM to MAV requests  
- Coordinate municipal resources in emergency response  
- Direct liaison with Emergency Services  
- Provide council resources when requested by emergency services or police during response activities  
- Keep the Municipal Emergency Co-ordination Centre (MECC) prepared to ensure its timely activation if needed  
- Oversee council’s emergency management plan, systems and procedures development within the response area  
- Undertake an annual review of the MEMPlan with representatives from the MEMPC  
- Undertake reviews of emergency management related documents, systems & procedures  
- Manage council’s After Hours Emergency Service (AHES)  
- Member of the Control Agency Emergency Management Team |
| **Deputy MERO & Flood Warning Officer (FWO)** | - Access all relevant information: BOM, VicSES, locally supplied information and observed information, and collated/interpret this information at the earliest possible time during a flood event and provide advice to MEM, MERO, MRM, CoGG incident Controller  
- Dissemination of Flood Warning (in conjunction with the Control Agency and Police) using all means available – FM88, fax stream, direct phone calls, phone trees, Expedite Voice reach, CoGG EM web page, local media (via CoGG Media Officer)  
- In conjunction with the MERO, evaluate all matters and information relating to the issue of flood warnings for an event.  
- Continuous improvement of the Flood Warning System.  
- Manage all council warning systems. |
| **Deputy MERO’s (Operations)** | - Attend the MECC or MEOC (when required)  
- When not deployed to MECC or MEOC, act in any of the positions within the IMT structure  
- Oversee response operations when deployed to the MEOC  
- Is the primary liaison officer between the MERO and the MEOC |
| **Deputy Flood Warning Officer** | In any absence of the FWO, undertake the key tasks allocated to FWO. |
| **Municipal Fire Prevention Officer (MFPO)** | - Fulfil the role of Chair and Executive Officer to the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee  
- Oversee the functions of the Municipal Fire Management Planning Committee and sub-committees  
- Oversee the development and maintenance of the Integrated Municipal Fire Management Plan & the Breamlea Fire Management Plan  
- Carry out statutory tasks related to fire prevention and fire related matters  
- Investigate and act on complaints regarding potential fire hazards  
- Facilitate community fire safety education programs and supports Community Fireguard groups in fire-prone areas  
- Liaise with fire services, brigades, other authorities and councils regarding fire prevention planning and implementation |
<p>| <strong>Deputy Fire Prevention Officer</strong> | In any absence of the MFPO, undertake the key tasks allocated to MFPO |
| <strong>Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre - MECC (Facility) Manager</strong> | The role of the MECC (Facility) Manager is to handle the general administration, including computer systems and Starboard operation of the MECC. The prime function of the MECC (Facility) Manager is to ensure an efficient and effective functioning MECC |
| <strong>MECC Admin Support Officers</strong> | To provide administrative services to the Municipal Emergency Coordination Centre (MECC). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division: Corporate Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECC IS Support Officer</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division: Community Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Recovery Manager (MRM)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liaise with the MEM &amp; MERO for the best use of municipal resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish an Information and Co-ordination Centre, i.e. Emergency Relief Centre/ Recovery Centre at a nominated ERC (as per MEMPlan) or a location appropriate to the affected area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Liaise, consult and negotiate with recovery agencies and council on behalf of the affected area and community recovery committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify any short comings in recovery planning and take steps to address these short comings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oversee the annual update of Council’s Recovery Management Plan, Part 5 of the MEMPlan and other recovery related sections of the MEMPlan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deputy MRM’s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Assist the MRM as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attend either the MECC or ERC(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with the MRM and DHS is assisting affected community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Public Health Emergency Coordinator</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Co-ordination of all matters relating to health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertake an annual review of the Municipal Public Health Emergency Management Plan and the Pandemic Plan and Heatwave Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activation of the Municipal Public Health Emergency Management Plan and/or Pandemic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infectious disease control, including immunisation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety of water supply: sampling, analysis and maintenance of water supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety of food supplies: safe handling, transport and storage of food, destruction of contaminated food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vector and vermin control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hazardous substances: containment, removal and disposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deputy Public Health Emergency Coordinator</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In any absence of the PHEC, undertake the key tasks allocated to PHEC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Emergency Relief/Recovery Centre Managers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Emergency Relief Centre (E.R.C) Manager’s prime responsibility is to coordinate resources and services within the Emergency Relief Centre in providing life support and essential needs to affected persons affected by an emergency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Emergency Relief/Recovery Centre Support Staff</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the scale of the emergency and the numbers of affected persons in the E.R.C., additional E.R.C. roles may need to be created. Roles should be scaled up, down or combined subject to needs, but all would ultimately come under the responsibility of the E.R.C. Manager with assistance from the MECC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Coordinator Vulnerable Person Register</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grants access to Funded Facilities to enter individuals that reside within the community and receive services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains council’s Vulnerable Person Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the primary contact for VicPol Officers should they experience access problems to the Vulnerable Person Register</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Barrabool Road & McIntyre Footbridge 2011
Appendix B

History of Emergencies

Storms

NB: Some references for this text have been provided from Lindsay Smail’s book – *Weather Wonders of Geelong, 1998 – ISBN 0 9598858 3 8.

- It has been estimated that urban Geelong receives between 12-15 thunderstorms in an average year. This is not a large number when compared with sub-tropical and tropical areas, but of those recorded about three are classed as “severe”.

- The Bureau of Meteorology defines a severe storm as one which produces any of the following features:
  - large hailstones over 2cms in diameter
  - damaging winds, usually stronger than 90kph
  - tornadoes
  - heavy rain for 30 minutes or longer, and normally at least 25mm in one hour, which causes flash flooding

- The most common features of storms over Geelong are strong winds and the least commonly reported are tornadoes.

- A number of events have demonstrated the propensity for the Geelong area to suffer from potentially disastrous wind and storm damage.

- Of Geelong’s severe storms, 70% have been experienced between the months of October to March.

- Up to August 2000, 6 people have been listed as having been killed locally as a result of being struck by lightning, although many more have been struck but have survived.

- A tornado-like event occurred on 1 October, 1891, apparently approaching the urban area from the Barrabool Hills and headed southeast over South Geelong and the Showgrounds. It left a narrow trail of considerable damage and demolished “substantially constructed buildings” and corrugated iron fences.

- Another tornado-like event occurred on 13 April, 1909, at North Geelong near Cowies Creek & the present Ford Factory. 30 men were working on the site, erecting a two-storied structure for a sawmill. The storm lifted the whole structure, crashing it to the ground killing 3 men and injuring most of the others working there. Although tornado-like, it may not have actually been a tornado.

- The “Highton Tornado” occurred on Wednesday 21 July 1926. A series of storms left a narrow path of destruction that could be traced from Lismore and Cressy. A tornado developed over the Barabool Hills. Areas affected included Ceres, Highton, Belmont, Marshall, St Albans, Lake Connewarre and Wallington to Queenscliff. In Belmont, flying debris killed a child and an older man died later of injuries. At least eight others were reported as injured. Low population densities of those suburbs at that time undoubtedly contributed to the low death count. St Johns Church of England and Highton Methodist Church (now St Lukes) were destroyed. This would put the new suburb of Wandana Heights in the path of that tornado. Damage indicated that wind speeds of over 250kph.

- The Bellarine Peninsula Tornado occurred on 14 December 1984. It struck the Portarlington Caravan Park and 50 caravans were overturned or blown away, with 1 carried 50 metres. Bureau of Meteorology estimated wind speed at 90 knots (167kph).
Flooding

To Geelong residents, “flooding” means Barwon River flooding, in particular inundation of the low-lying floodplain that cuts through the Geelong urban area and continues downstream to the swampy surrounds of Lake Connewarre. This flooding is not to be confused with the very short-term flash flooding that occurs with heavy storms and is generally associated with the inability of local drainage systems to carry storm flow.

At Lara, where the focus is on Hovells Creek and not the Barwon River, the distinction between flooding and flash flooding is a little blurred as heavy rain can quickly fill Hovells Creek resulting in flash flooding which is just as disruptive as any other flooding. Hovells Creek is fed via a significant rural catchment and passes through the township. As a result of the 1988 floods, a major levee bank system is now in place with banks generally constructed at a level 600mm above the 1988 flood level. Mobile pumps can be installed in Lara to assist in alleviating flooding by moving water trapped behind the levee bank into the creek.

In Barwon Heads, flash flooding and river flooding are threats. Levee banks have been constructed on the immediate river frontage to the urban area and another upstream to stop back flow from the rising river entering the town from a westerly direction. In addition there are six pump stations to relieve flash flooding within Barwon Heads.

Flood Plans, Standard Operating Procedures and a detailed MEMPlan Sub-Plan have been developed for each of these areas in the late 1990s as an outcome of the November 1995 floods. Lara had a flood levee system constructed and a flood plan developed for Hovells Creek as a consequence of the 1988 flood.

Barwon River, Geelong

- Floods are a frequent occurrence along the Barwon River Valley, which is fed by the Leigh and Moorabool Rivers.
- The highest recorded flood was September 1880 with a reading in Geelong of 5.59m at the Macintyre Bridge.
- The worst flood in terms of property inundation and disruption was in June 1952 with a reading of 5.47m at the Macintyre Bridge.
- Other significant floods occurred in May 1852 (4.91m), August 1909 (4.60m), August 1951 (5.17m), November 1978 (4.48m) and more recently 1995 (5.23m).
- There are approximately 150 years of historical records and on this basis the 1952 flood has been calculated as having an annual exceedance probability of 1.25%.
- In Geelong the Belmont Common on the south side of the Barwon River and the South Geelong industrial area on the northern side are affected by floodwaters. Breakwater Bridge and Barrabool Road are rendered impassable at relatively low flood levels.
- Kardinia Creek (now piped underground and exits via the large drain upstream of the Shannon Ave Bridge) and Waurn Ponds Creek have the potential to cause minor damage.
- In the 1952 Barwon River flood, floodwaters covered Wallington Road in Ocean Grove; however vehicles could still pass through. In the same year the central business/residential area of Barwon Heads was flooded with up to 1.3m of water entering the town via the Sheepwash. A levee bank was subsequently constructed – Plummer Bank. This levee was reconstructed following the 1995 Barwon River flood.
King tides may also have an effect on Barwon Heads and Ocean Grove, adjacent to the River particularly if strong south-west winds are present.

**Hovells Creek, Lara**

- Recent flooding occurred in 1973, 1978, 1983 and 1988 causing extensive damage to private property. In 1988, 125mm of rain fell over a six hour period resulting in the highest flood level on record.
- Flooding during February 2005, saw Granite Road rain gauge record 131mm over 36 hours, Woolloomanta, 130mm over 48 hours, and Lara 124mm over 39 hours. Creek levels rose and lapped the underside of the Station Lake Road Bridge for 2-hours. The levees were not overtopped.

**Bush Fires**

- The Geelong region has experienced some of the worst bushfires in Australia’s history. This is because it is so close to the Otway Ranges, Brisbane Ranges and large areas of grassland. Fires generally result from lightning strikes or by human carelessness, accident or wilfulness. Some of the more serious incidents are listed as follows. (Reference: L. Smail – Weather Wonders of Geelong, 1998).
- 6 February 1851, 10 people lost their lives along with extensive property and stock losses as fires were reported along the Moorabool Valley, Barrabool Hills and down to Barwon Heads. The unofficial maximum temperature that day was stated as 114 °F (45.6 °C).
- 16 February 1983, the Ash Wednesday conflagration devastated areas to within about 20kms of the urban area, and a number of other fires have actually burnt into parts of outer suburbs, notably Lara.
- 8 January 1969, fire involved the areas of Lara and Little River and 18 people lost their lives, including 10 at Lara and 44 homes at Lara were destroyed. Eight people lost their lives on the Princes Highway near the 34-mile post. Little River experienced two grass fires in 1977 that destroyed around 2000 hectares each. In 1982, 500 hectares of grass and stubble was destroyed in Anakie east.
- A major fire occurred on the 14 January 1985, commencing south east of Anakie, burning the You Yangs and was contained at the Princes Freeway. Two farms incurred losses of houses and out buildings. There were associated heavy stock losses as well as fencing in the Staughton Vale/Anakie, Lara and Little River areas. Two lives were lost.
- In early 1997 a fire burnt the Ocean Grove Reserve and was of concern due to its proximity to the residential area of the Woodlands Estate.
- There have been two significant fires at the Shell Refinery, 1961 and 1979.
- January 2006, 6900 ha were burnt mainly within the Brisbane Ranges. The fire lasted for 7-days and had a perimeter of 62km. The wildfire extended south as far as De Motts Road Anakie, north to Marshalls Rd, east to Staughton Vale road and west to Slate Quarry Road. No lives were lost.
- August 2006, 371 ha were burnt out to the south of Woods & Coppards Roads, Moolap. DSE eventually had the fire under control within 48 hours. The fire was believed to have been caused by a burn off by a local resident on a day that had strong winds.

**Threat to Water Supply**

- On one occasion in the 1980s a threat to contaminate the Geelong water supply was made. The offender was duly apprehended prior to any action being taken. Nevertheless, it demonstrates the vulnerability of community water supplies.
- The other threat to water supplies arises from severe and prolonged drought conditions.
Drought

- In Australia, a drought, moderate or severe, is said to occur if rainfall is in the lowest 10 percent of all recorded falls over at least a six-month period. This being the case, it can be said that any year when Geelong has received less than 385mm can be called a drought year. (Reference: L. Smail – Weather Wonders of Geelong, 1998).

- Using this classification, Geelong has suffered 16 “drought years”, moderate or severe, since 1871.

- One of the longest running drought periods was the 57-month stretch, from October 1880 to June 1885, when 1997 mm was recorded. The worst 10-month recorded only 121mm. 9 percent of that period was considered “severe” drought.

- Other drought years included 1981 - 1983 period and prior to that 1966 - 1968. Parts of the Municipality and other areas of Victoria are currently suffering drought conditions. The existing drought commenced in 1998.

- Water restrictions are put in place during drought conditions and in some instances Barwon Water may be forced to supply water of a lesser quality. The impacts of this action on industry, commerce and urban population may need to be assessed at the time.

Shipping, period since 1980 – 2000 (approx)

- Fires on board ships: 6
- Fires on board small craft: 11
- Fires on wharves/jetties: 23
- Significant chemical spillages when discharging at wharves/jetties: 2

Natural Gas Supply

- The loss of the natural gas supply in 1998 from the East Gippsland’s Longford Plant for several weeks, and the impact on domestic and industrial users demonstrated the vulnerability of modern society to infrastructure that is taken for granted.

Earthquakes


At the request of Council, a preliminary study of earthquake risk for the urban area of the City of Greater Geelong was undertaken to ascertain if in fact there was any risk. Completed in May 2000, the study concluded that:

- The intraplate earthquakes experienced in Victoria are relatively infrequent, unpredictable and shallow. However, they have potential to cause considerable damage, such as that experienced by Warrnambool in 1903, or damage comparable to the Newcastle (NSW) earthquake in 1989.

- Over 500 earthquakes have been recorded in the Geelong region since 1837. The majority are small in magnitude (<ML 4) and unlikely to cause significant damage. Although no fatalities have been recorded, injury and damage were reported from two events – the 1977 Balliang earthquake and the 1922 Bass Strait earthquake.

- The regional compressional stress field and neotectonics indicate that several faults should be considered active within the City of Greater Geelong. Three of these faults – the Rowsley Fault, the Torquay Fault and the Selwyn Fault show correlation with higher magnitude (> ML 4) historical earthquake activity. The Bellarine Fault, the Barrabool Fault and the Wurdiboluc Fault have experienced smaller earthquakes.
- Areas most at risk of damage are those underlain by unconsolidated fill and alluvium.
- It is important to note that damage within the City of Greater Geelong could be generated by a major earthquake outside the city limits.
- There are a number of buildings and infrastructure deemed to be at potential risk within the City of Greater Geelong due to non-favourable surface geology.
- The experiences in the Newcastle Earthquake indicate a similar event in Geelong could have the potential for similar levels of loss of life and damage.
- Most recent earthquake occurred on May 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2013, when a magnitude 3.1 event occurred. The epicenter was located south-east of Geelong. Prior to this event other earthquakes that affected Geelong include:
  - magnitude 2.3 occurred on June 16\textsuperscript{th} 2012 that affected Norlane
  - magnitude 4.6 occurred on March 6\textsuperscript{th} 2013
  - magnitude 4.5 occurred on March 18\textsuperscript{th} 2009 south-east of Melbourne that affected Belmont, Grovedale and Waurn Ponds

Road Accidents
- Small vehicle road accidents occur frequently, particularly on the Princes Highway/Freeway. SES & CFA units attend these accidents.
- A major road accident occurred in Waurn Ponds in 1996 involving a B-Double petrol tanker and a small vehicle, resulting in road closure for 18 hours and a major clean up exercise.

Oil Spills
- The occurrence of oil spills has been relatively infrequent. The most significant recent spill was from the Shell Refinery Wharf with subsequent on shore deposition on the beach adjacent to the Geelong Grammar School.
- Occasional spillage emanates from stormwater drains.

Release of Gases
A number of industrial complexes have the potential to release gases should there be a fire or accidental spillage. Several years ago, inadvertent action at Pivot Fertilisers, North Shore caused the release of a toxic gas which descended on Norlane High School. Several students were treated for gas inhalation.
6. PLANNING AUTHORITY FOR AVALON AIRPORT RAIL LINK

Portfolio: Planning - Cr Macdonald
Source: Economic Development, Planning and Tourism
General Manager: Peter Bettess
Index Reference: Project: Avalon Airport
Subject: Council Reports 2013

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek Council’s views on the Minister for Planning being the planning authority for a planning scheme amendment to reserve land for the Avalon Airport Rail Link.

Summary

- The State Government has committed to planning a rail link to Avalon Airport and is working to secure funding and support from the Commonwealth Government and Avalon Airport.

- The rail link to Avalon Airport is part of the Victorian Government’s initiative to plan and secure transport links to meet Victoria’s future travel needs, and support the development of Avalon Airport as Victoria’s second international airport.

- The State Government project team from the Department of Transport, Planning and Local Infrastructure (DTPLI) has been investigating possible route alignment options for a rail corridor to Avalon Airport that provide a direct connection with the Melbourne-Geelong rail line.

- As part of the Phase One investigations the study area was expanded to look at the area extending from Corio to Werribee to find the best possible area for a rail link to the airport. Phase One findings showed that the study area between Lara and Little River is the preferred area for a future rail link.

- In early 2013, Phase 2 consultation was undertaken on 3 preliminary route alignment options all located between Lara and Little River being eastern, central and western routes.

- DTPLI has not yet committed to a particular option but have began discussions with Council officers about a planning scheme amendment to recognise a preferred route in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

- The planning scheme amendment would include a Public Acquisition Overlay, recognition of the route in the Municipal Strategic Statement and modifications to the Special Use Zone that currently applies to Avalon Airport.

- DTPLI is seeking Council’s view on the Planning Minister acting as the planning authority for the amendment to secure the Avalon Airport Rail Link reservation.

- Council officers recommend that Council agree to the Minister running the amendment process as it is a State project and the Minister will be responsible for any compensation claims.
6. PLANNING AUTHORITY FOR AVALON AIRPORT RAIL LINK (CONT’D)

Cr Macdonald moved, Cr Ansett seconded -

That Council supports the Minister for Planning being the Planning Authority for a planning scheme amendment to secure the Avalon Airport Rail Link.

Carried.

Background

The rail link to Avalon Airport is part of the Victorian Government’s initiative to plan and secure transport links to meet Victoria’s future travel needs, and support the development of Avalon Airport as Victoria’s second international airport.

Phase one investigations involved desktop studies to understand the various technical, land use and environmental constraints of the area between Corio and Werribee.

Preliminary investigations assessed all possible areas for a rail alignment to find the most appropriate and workable area for a future rail link. The assessment identified the current study area between Lara and Little River as the preferred area for further investigating options for route alignments.

DTPLI has not yet committed to a particular option but have began discussions with Council officers about a planning scheme amendment to recognise a preferred route in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

Discussion

Phase Two of the study focussed on three preliminary route options – eastern, central and western alignments (shown in map below)
6. PLANNING AUTHORITY FOR AVALON AIRPORT RAIL LINK (CONT'D)

Consultation on the three options included two community workshops at Lara on 13 and 14 March. 82 participants attended.

A number of stakeholder organisations were also consulted and Council officers were requested to provide comments. A Council officer letter of 28 March 2013 provided technical feedback and covered the following issues: future freight potential, road connections, the Avalon Airport Masterplan, drainage, native vegetation, impact on community and land fragmentation.

DTPLI has not yet committed to a particular option but have began discussions with Council officers about a planning scheme amendment to recognise a preferred route in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

The planning scheme amendment would include a Public Acquisition Overlay, recognition of the route in the Municipal Strategic Statement and modifications to the Special Use Zone that currently applies to Avalon Airport.

DTPLI is seeking Council’s view on the Planning Minister acting as the planning authority for the amendment to secure the Avalon Airport Rail Link reservation.

Council officers recommend that Council agree to the Minister running the amendment process as it is a State project and the Minister will be responsible for any compensation claims.

Environmental Implications

The route options for the rail link all traverse areas of environmental significance, particularly native grasslands and associated habitat. The State Government will need to address environmental issues as part of any planning scheme amendment. It will also need to determine if an Environmental Effects Statement is required under State legislation and requirements under Commonwealth environmental legislation.

Financial Implications

This is a State Government project and does not pose any particular financial implications for the Council.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

A planning scheme amendment would include recognition of the Avalon Airport Rail Link in the Local Planning Policy Framework section of the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme.

The State Government would be the acquiring authority for any compulsory acquisition of land for the rail corridor.

While the Minister for Planning is recommended as the Planning Authority for the planning scheme amendment, Council would retain its ongoing role as responsible authority for the area including the Avalon Airport which is subject to a Special Use Zone.

Alignment to City Plan

An Avalon Airport Rail Link supports the Growing our Economy strategic direction of City Plan.
6. PLANNING AUTHORITY FOR AVALON AIRPORT RAIL LINK (CONT’D)

**Officer Direct or Indirect Interest**

No Council officer involved in the report has any direct or indirect interest, in accordance with section 80(C) of the local Government Act.

**Risk Assessment**

There are no notable risks associated with implementing the recommendation contained in this report.

**Social Considerations**

The rail link may have social impacts on Lara and Little River residents – particularly the eastern and western options.

**Human Rights Charter**

The Planning Authority for the rail link will need to ensure the amendment does not impact on any basic rights, freedoms and responsibilities as set out in the Charter. Planning legislation ensures an open community consultation process occurs, enabling people to freely express their views and if necessary obtain a fair hearing before an Independent Panel.

**Consultation and Communication**

As outlined earlier in this report, the State Government has undertaken consultation as part of the Avalon Airport Rail Link investigations. It would be expected that any planning scheme amendment would go through a full public exhibition process and include the opportunity for people to make submissions and appear before an independent panel or advisory committee.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Portfolio: Tourism and Major Events - Cr Nelson
Source: Planning & Tourism
General Manager: Peter Bettess
Index Reference: Subject: Recreation Vehicles (RV’s) issues and opportunities

Purpose
The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the facilities available for Recreation Vehicles visiting Geelong.

Summary
- The City of Greater Geelong has been lobbied by the Caravan and Motorhome Club of Australia (CMCA) over the past ten years to provide a low or no cost RV park with associated facilities to support overnight stays within the City of Greater Geelong.
- The RV lobby group maintains that the City of Greater Geelong is missing out on the economic contribution RV users make to the economy because at present no RV facilities are provided by the City. Therefore RV’s either do not stay in the City or revert to illegal camping in the suburban streets or public recreation areas.
- The facilities required to support the establishment of an RV park in Geelong, and thus be considered and promoted as “RV Friendly” (registered trademark) includes: access to water supply, public toilets, blackwater dump point, links with public transport into City Centre and safe area to park. Based on CMCA criteria Greater Geelong should be regarded as an RV welcoming destination.
- The owners of the 26 commercial Caravan Parks (holiday parks) located in the City of Greater Geelong state that there is adequate opportunity and dedicated facilities within the current commercial parks to cater for RV’s (see attached report).
- The City of Greater Geelong (as per State Legislation) ensures that commercial caravan parks comply with regulations relating to safety, amenity, environment and registration standards.
- The requirement for competitive neutrality has been embraced fully by some States of Australia (Tasmania and Queensland) in relation to Local Government establishing RV parks. Under the National Competition Policy should Local Government establish an overnight camping site for self-contained recreation vehicles, such sites must comply fully with same regulatory requirements provided by commercial caravan parks (fire, safety and environment) and charge the true market value for the provision of such services and amenities. It should be noted that compliance to regulations and full cost recovery principle amounts to many hundreds of thousands of dollars in both the establishment phase and ongoing management stage of developing and maintaining an overnight RV park.
- Geelong should improve it’s standing with RV owners by encouraging visitation to the Municipality through the provision of dedicated parking options for RV’s and through specific information packs to better assist and inform RV users of what they can do and where they can stay in Greater Geelong.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES (CONT’D)

- At a City of Greater Geelong Council meeting held on 12 March 2013, Council resolved to investigate the issues and opportunities associated with catering for the needs of Recreation Vehicle users in the City of Greater Geelong.

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Fisher seconded -

That Council:

1) will promote Greater Geelong in partnership with the tourism industry (as per Council Tourism Policy) as a destination that welcomes RV’s to the city and highlights the facilities and experiences that encourages visitation and increased length of stay;

2) recognise the opportunity to better cater for the needs of RV’s users visiting the City of Greater Geelong by providing dedicated short term parking options and welcome information packs that gives details of overnight and long stay options in the 26 commercial parks located throughout the Municipality;

3) acknowledges that current commercial parks have the capacity and facilities available to cater for the current needs of RV users wanting to stay overnight in the municipality.

Carried.

Background

The Recreation Vehicle (RV) market has grown in members over the last ten years with their peak body, Caravan and Motorhome Club of Australia (CMCA) indicating a membership of over 64,000 individuals.

The RV sector seems to be fragmented into at least three specific sub categories namely ‘Grey Nomads’ (people (often retirees) who spend their days travelling Australia with their RV being their residence for much of the year); International budget youth traveller (Wicked Campers – seeking experiences and wanting to minimise accommodation cost); and Up Market RV owners (seeking ‘free camping’ as a right).

‘Free camping’ for RV’s has been met by 23 townships in Victoria and these townships have been designated as RV Friendly Towns by the CMCA.

The RV sector through its peak club CMCA has lobbied Local Government across the State and Nation to expand the concept of RV friendly towns (registered trade mark) by urging Local councils to establish no cost/low cost overnight RV camp sites.

At the same time that RV sectors have experienced growth so has the demand for and quality of commercial holiday parks increased significantly.

Commercial holiday parks account for 12% of accommodation and are a significant employer of staff within our region.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES (CONT’D)

A recent study by the Caravan, RV & Accommodation Industry of Australia (2012) found that on average each commercial park contributed $1.2m to their local economy per year. Further to this, a recent report (2013) conducted by independent consultants BDO, interviewed 556 visitors staying at both commercial (339 visitors) and free campsites (217 visitors). The report compared the relative expenditure at each destination by both free campers and those staying in commercial parks. The study resolved that those staying in commercial parks spent approximately 4 times more at each destination. Free campers spent on average $213 at each destination whilst commercial campers spent on average $829.

As a result of meeting legislative and regulatory imposts, the cost of running a commercial park is significant with compliance costs for fire services alone exceeding $100,000 per park. Further to this there are also significant costs associated with meeting environmental, health and planning regulations.

The management of running a commercial park that complies with all the requirements mandated by Local and State Government is a major business undertaking and the cost of compliance is reflected in the charge costs to users of the commercial parks.

The philosophy and demands of RV users in seeking free camping is at direct odds with commercial park operators who charge a fee structure that is inclusive of the costs to meet health and safety standards established by Local and State Government.

Local Government manages health and safety compliance in the commercial parks.

Commercial park operators with the support of their peak industry body (Vic Parks) have initiated legal challenges to Local Councils who introduce ‘free or low cost’ camping facilities that do not comply with competitive neutrality and National Competition Principles.

Discussion

Tourism is critical to the economic wellbeing of the City of Greater Geelong. Each year, tourism generates expenditure of over one billion dollars within the City and this expenditure supports over 3,355 jobs (Economic Impact Analysis – Geelong 2012 Compelling Economics)

Tourism is part of economic development and each initiative to expand tourism should be measured against an economic framework.

The City of Greater Geelong has established a partnership with the tourism industry through Geelong Otway Tourism (Tourism Policy).

Geelong Otway Tourism Business Plan focuses on yield (visitor expenditure, length of stay) not on volume (guest arrivals).

Through this philosophy (yield not volume) not all visitation is viewed as being beneficial to either the destination, the industry or the broader community.

When the issues of cost verses benefit, need verses the current capacity, the principles of competitive neutrality and the request for subsidy, it is difficult to mount a case from a tourism industry/economic development perspective to support the establishment of free/low cost overnight sites.

Geelong and the Bellarine are popular and strong tourism destinations that are well supported by industry, Local Government and the community.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES (CONT’D)

Whilst some destinations have felt the need to be RV friendly branded in an attempt to generate profile, this is not a strategy needed or supported by industry in Geelong.

Considering the current capacity to cater for RV’s in the municipality, Geelong should be promoted and regarded as welcoming the RV sector.

Geelong can further enhance its reputation as being a welcoming city to RV users by providing better RV parking facilities within the city and by providing a welcome pack of information at Visitor Information Centres that details overnight camping options and the experiences and facilities that encourage overnight visitation.

**Capacity**

There are 26 Commercial Caravan Parks (Holiday Parks) located within the City of Greater Geelong. Three of these parks are located very close to the CAA (located in the Barwon Valley area). These three centrally located parks have 110 sites available (powered and non-powered). These standard sites accommodate vehicles up to 9 metres (30ft). Of these parks 30 sites are designed for the large RVs. Prices are approximately $30 per night. Cheaper for non-powered and chain member discounts. All of these three parks have dump points (grey and black water discharge).

Sites are available all year with the exception of a ‘few days’ per year when the parks are completely booked out. Even then they can recommend other parks that are available in the region (not close to city).

**Environmental Implications**

The cost to Council to manage the environment impact from RV users staying overnight will be considerable.

The issues of garbage and waste water disposal (grey and black water) and the provision of toilets (cleaning) will need to be budgeted for on a full cost recovery basis.

It is the dumping of garbage and waste water that has lead to many of the conflicts between RV users and local communities throughout Australia.

The City of Melbourne and Townsville City Council have recently been very active in policing illegal RV camping and have extended the hours of bylaws offices to enforce the law and move illegal campers in to commercial caravan parks.

**Financial Implications**

The establishment cost to provide an overnight RV park that meets the legislative requirements to address environmental, health and safety and registration standards would total many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The industry benchmark used to establish a compliant site is $10,000 per site. Thus a small site capable of taking up to 20 RV’s is estimated to have an establishment cost of at least $200,000.

Further to this an annual budget would be required to manage and maintain the site. It should also be noted that the economic contribution by individual self-contained RV’s is minimal with their major cost being the purchase of fuel and supermarket supplies. By comparison to other sectors of tourism, RV’s are considered to be low yield particularly when the real cost of service delivery to support the sector is taken into consideration.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES (CONT’D)

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

Competitive Neutrality Principles (CNP’s)

The CNP’s are designed to prevent unfair competition between government (Local, State, Federal) and privately owned businesses by ensuring that all government bodies involved in the delivery of services within the same competitive market as private operators (in this case the provisions of overnight camping services for self-contained RV’s) do so on fair and equal terms with those private operators.

Council is required to appropriately apply the CNP’s and should adopt what is known as a full cost attribution model in determining the cost of providing that service.

This means that Council must charge a price for the service that reflects the actual cost incurred as well as those costs that the Council would have incurred if it were a private operator.

It should be noted that if Council fails to comply with the above principles the option of a legal challenge from the commercial parks and their peak industry body is highly likely.

Alignment to City Plan

Aligns with the “Growing Our Economy” Strategic Direction in the priority area of Greater Geelong as a leading city for tourism.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

This report has been prepared in consultation with the Tourism Manager, City of Greater Geelong, who is also the Executive Director of Geelong Otway Tourism.

Geelong Otway Tourism in partnership with the Victorian Tourism Industry Council has been active and vocal as an industry based partnership advocating for commercial parks as the most appropriate location for RV’s to stay overnight in the region.

No other officer involved in preparing the report has a conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment

The City of Greater Geelong will be at potential risk of legal action initiated by the commercial parks if the City fails to comply with competitive neutrality and national competition principles.

If Geelong doesn’t address parking issues and does not promote itself as a destination that welcomes the RV sector then Geelong will be bypassed by RV users and be known as an RV unfriendly destination. This risk and opportunities are understood by the tourism industry.

Social Considerations

Not all RV owners can afford to stay in Commercial parks and will thus continue to stay overnight in residential streets or public open space.
7. RECREATION VEHICLES (RV’S) ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES (CONT’D)

Human Rights Charter

The Human Rights Charter has been considered in the preparation of this report.

Consultation and Communication

Following the consideration and the adoption (or otherwise) of the recommendations in this report, further communication with Geelong Otway Tourism will be required to initiate both a regional (G21) and state wide (VTIC) consideration of the issues raised in this report.

A media release will outline Council resolution and the reasoning being the action taken.
RV Friendly Town Review

City of Greater Geelong

Date: October 2013
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Overview

- Twenty-six (26) listed caravan/holiday parks within the City of Greater Geelong Region;
- Listed parks cater for Road Vehicles (RV) ranging in size from six metres to twenty metres long;
- There are over 1700 sites available in the CoGG region catering for RV’s, caravans and campers;
- Three dump sites are available in the CoGG region;
  - Available to registered and non-registered guests of the respective parks;
- All waste dump points are easily accessible via major highways;
- Short Term Parking options were explored with eight possible locations drawn on.
Caravan Parks within City of Greater Geelong

Within the CoGG region, there are a total of twenty six listed caravan parks, six of which are inside the City of Greater Geelong (as seen listed below and in Appendix 1).

- Dylene Caravan Park
- Riverglen Holiday Park
- Bellarine Bayside Holiday Parks
- Geelong Riverview Tourist Park
- Barwon Heads Caravan Park
- Geelong Surf Coast Hwy Holiday Park
- BIG4 Beacon Resort
- Breamlea Caravan Park
- Swan Bay Holiday Park
- St Leonards Caravan Park
- Moolap Caravan Park
- Ocean Grove Riverview Family Caravan Park
- Sands Caravan Park
- Queenscliff Tourist Park
- BIG4 Bellarine Holiday Park
- Wynndeane Holiday Resort
- Pelican Shores BIG4 Geelong Holiday Park
- City Southside Caravan Park
- Springs Caravan Park
- Barwon River Tourist Park
- Fairhaven Family Holiday Park
- El Dorado Tourist Park
- Ocean Grove Holiday Park
- Collendina Holiday Park
- Springs Holiday Park
- Sheerwood Village Caravan Park

These holiday and tourist parks cater for RV’s of all sizes, ranging from six metres right up to twenty metres long in some caravan parks, as shown in Appendix 2.

Holiday and tourist parks within the CoGG region are able to comfortably accommodate a large amount of RV and caravan visitors. There are over 1700 individual RV, caravanning and camping sites available in the region (sites include un-powered, powered and en suites).
Dump Points within Geelong Region

Within the Geelong region, there are three well placed dump points managed and owned by three major caravan parks (see Appendix 3). Although privately managed and owned, it is important to note all three of these dump points are readily accessible to both registered and non-registered guests of the caravan park.

Non-registered guests are allowed full access to these dump points at a fee, no known dump points in the CoGG region are restricted to registered guests of a caravan park.

Dump Points within the Geelong region are:

- El Dorado Tourist Park
  - 360 Ballarat Road, Geelong 3221
- Pelican Shores – BIG4 Geelong Holiday Park
  - 300 Clifton Avenue, Leopold 3224
- BIG4 Beacon Resort
  - 78 Bellarine Highway, Queenscliff 3225

A Council dump point is being provided at Deppeler Park (Seagull Paddock) and will be available within six months.

All dump points within the Geelong region are located on and around major highways and tourist routes.

Dump Point 1

Located at Eldorado Tourist Park on the outskirts of Geelong, Dump Point 1 caters perfectly for those travelling inland or to the coast. Dump Point 1 offers relief to those travelling the major routes M1 and C118 which lead to such major destinations as the Great Ocean Road region, Geelong, The Bellarine and the Goldfields region including the likes of Ballarat.

Dump Point 2

Located off a major route, B140, at Pelican Shores – BIG4 Geelong Holiday Park in Leopold, Dump Point 2 provides relief to those visitors travelling towards, or returning from, The Bellarine, notably the Portarlington, St Leonards and Drysdale areas.

Dump Point 3

Located on the Bellarine Highway, B110, Dump Point 3 is situated at BIG4 Beacon Resort, Queenscliff. With Queenscliff connected to various other regions via major land and sea routes, Dump Point 3 proves to be perfectly located to accommodate a vast array of RV travellers.

Such a central position provides relief to travellers coming from Geelong and beyond, the Great Ocean Road, Sorrento and the Mornington Peninsula region.
Suggested Temporary RV Parking
Potential short-term parking options for RV drivers are shown in Appendix 4. Positioning of potential short-term parking was derived on the basis of surrounding location features (including attractions, current car parking availability and walking distance to shopping precincts) and accessibility (ease of navigation to location).

Option 1
- Within walking distance to:
  - Eastern Beach Reserve
  - Geelong Botanical Gardens
  - Bollard Walk
  - Picturesque views of the bay
  - Barbeques and picnic areas
  - Public Toilets
- Easily located and navigated to following the Scenic Route of the Geelong Waterfront
- Ample parking available

Option 2
- Within walking distance to:
  - Eastern Beach Reserve
  - Geelong Waterfront
  - Geelong Botanical Gardens
  - Bollard Walk
  - Picturesque views of the bay
  - Royal Geelong Yacht Club
  - Cunningham Pier
  - Central Geelong Shopping District
  - Restaurants and Cafés
  - Steampacket Garden
  - Barbeques and picnic areas
  - Public Toilets
- Easily located and navigated to following the Scenic Route of the Geelong Waterfront
- Ample parking available
Option 3

- Within walking distance to:
  - Geelong Waterfront
  - Bollard Walk
  - Picturesque views of the bay
  - Royal Geelong Yacht Club
  - Cunningham Pier
  - Central Geelong Shopping District
  - Restaurants and Cafés
  - Steampacket Garden
  - Barbeques and picnic areas
  - Public Toilets
- Easily located and navigated to following the Scenic Route of the Geelong Waterfront
- Easily located and navigated to from Moorabool Street
- Current parking available

Option 4

- Within walking distance to:
  - Johnstone Park
  - Geelong’s Art and Cultural Precinct
  - Geelong Peace Memorial
  - Geelong Railway Station
  - Central Geelong Shopping District
  - Restaurants and Cafés
  - Geelong Waterfront
- Easily located and navigated to from Moorabool Street and Gheringhap Street

Option 5

- Convert a couple of bus parking bays into RV friendly short-term parking
- Within walking distance to:
  - Geelong Waterfront
  - Visitor Information Centres
  - Cunningham Pier
  - Steampacket Garden
  - Johnstone Park
  - Geelong’s Art and Cultural Precinct
  - Geelong Peace Memorial
  - Geelong Railway Station
  - Central Geelong Shopping District
  - Restaurants and Cafés
  - Geelong Waterfront
- Easily located and navigated to from Moorabool Street, Gheringhap Street and Geelong Waterfront Scenic Route
Option 6
- Within walking distance to:
  - Barwon River
  - Park and recreation areas
  - Three caravan parks
- Close to major convenience stores
- Easily located and navigated to from Moorabool Street

Option 7
- Within walking distance to:
  - Currently already a car park space
  - Beaches
  - Fishing spots
  - Caravan park
  - Barwon Heads shopping strip: Hitchcock Avenue
  - Park and recreation areas
  - Restaurants and cafes
  - Convenience stores
- Close to major convenience stores
- Easily located and navigated due to locality next to connecting bridge
Resources

• Maximum RV Length accepted:

• Listing of Geelong Bellarine Caravan Parks
  o  Geelong Otway Tourism Member Database

• Dump Points within the Geelong and Bellarine region
  o  http://www.sanidumps.com/sanidumps_au.php?id=121
Appendix 1 - Caravan Parks and Dump Points within CoGG Region
## Appendix 2 - Geelong and Bellarine Caravan Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Town</th>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>RV Max Size</th>
<th>Van Power</th>
<th>Van Un-Power</th>
<th>Camp Power</th>
<th>Camp Un-Power</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BARWON HEADS</td>
<td>Barwon Heads Caravan Park</td>
<td>7.92m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATESFORD</td>
<td>El Dorado Tourist Park</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>Geelong Riverview Tourist Park</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>Barwon River Tourist Park</td>
<td>12.19m</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>Riverglen Holiday Park</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>Sheerwood Village Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT</td>
<td>City Southside Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAMLEA</td>
<td>Breamlea Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEOPOLD</td>
<td>Sands Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEOPOLD</td>
<td>Pelican Shores BIG4 Geelong Holiday Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCUS HILL</td>
<td>BIG4 Bellarine Holiday Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moolap</td>
<td>Moolap Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT DUNEED</td>
<td>Geelong Surf Coast Hwy Holiday Park</td>
<td>9.14m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN GROVE</td>
<td>Ocean Grove Holiday Park</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN GROVE</td>
<td>Riverview Family Caravan Park</td>
<td>8m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN GROVE</td>
<td>Collendina Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN GROVE</td>
<td>Wynndean Holiday Resort</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN GROVE</td>
<td>Wynndean Holiday Resort</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTARLINGTON</td>
<td>Dylene Caravan Park</td>
<td>8m</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTARLINGTON</td>
<td>Fairhaven Family Holiday Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSCLIFF</td>
<td>BIG4 Beacon Resort Holiday Park &amp; Motel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSCLIFF</td>
<td>Queenscliff Tourist Parks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENSCLIFF</td>
<td>Springs Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST LEONARDS</td>
<td>St Leonards Caravan Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST LEONARDS</td>
<td>Bellarine Bayside Holiday Parks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAN BAY</td>
<td>Swan Bay Holiday Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 1708
Appendix 3 - Dump Points within CoGG Region
Appendix 4 – Options 1-5 - Suggested Short-Term Parks Central Geelong/Waterfront
Appendix 4 – Option 6 - Suggested Short-Term Parking Belmont
Appendix 4 – Option 7 - Suggested Short-Term Parking Barwon Heads
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**General Manager:** Jenny McMahon  
**Index Reference**  
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**Subject:** G21 Health and Wellbeing Pillar

**Purpose**

The purpose of the G21 Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 is to identify a small number of agreed priority issues that are common for each of the five municipalities. This will strengthen the region’s capacity to address complex issues that impact on health and wellbeing. A copy of the plan is attached (see Appendix 1).

**Summary**

- The aim of the G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 is to improve the health and wellbeing of communities throughout the G21 region.
- The plan represents a new collaboration in public health & wellbeing planning across the five municipalities.
- The plan seeks to strengthen the ongoing effort to address some of the more complex and entrenched issues underlying public health and wellbeing across the region.
- The plan will enhance G21 Councils’ ability to partner with service providers, other sectors and government departments.
- Council’s health and wellbeing priorities are identified in the Regional Plan with two of these recognised as regional priorities.

Cr Fisher moved, Cr Farrell seconded -

That Council supports the G21 Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17.

Carried.

**Background**

The Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 (the Act) requires that all Councils develop a Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan (MPHWP) to protect and promote public health and wellbeing.

In developing MPHWPs, Councils have been encouraged by State Government to consider how they and their partners can implement or support interventions that respond to the needs of local communities and, in particular, vulnerable population groups.

The State Government is supportive of regional health planning processes. A number of local governments have undertaken regional health planning processes along Primary Care Partnership boundaries. The boundary of the Primary Care Partnership for Geelong aligns with the G21 boundary.

In 2012 the five municipalities in the G21 region agreed to collaborate on the 2013-17 public health and wellbeing planning process.
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A common planning framework was developed and used by each Council. Through local and regional consultation processes three common priorities arose across the region. These priorities form the basis of the regional plan. In addition each local Council has a number of priorities relevant to the needs of their Council areas. The Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan supports delivery of local MPHWP.

Discussion

In each municipality, Councils reviewed and analysed local:

• Population data and projections;

• Community feedback on public health issues arising from recent Council Plan consultation session, and specific local consultations;

• Outcomes from the previous MPHWP plans; and

• Stakeholder feedback regarding current and emerging priorities

These led to the development of Councils MPHWP. Common priorities and themes across the five Councils MPHWP led to the identification of three regional priorities. The strategic action areas which the G21 Health and Wellbeing Pillar will lead the implementation and evaluation of are:

• Physical activity;

• Community connectedness / social inclusion;

• The evidence base;

The Department of Health supports regional health planning processes. For Council the Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan forms an agreed support strategy for common issues across the region. Actions in the Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan have been developed to support the implementation of Councils MPHWP.

Council is being asked to support the Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan following this process, along with all other local governments in the region. The G21 Board will be presented with the outcomes of Council decision making processes at their October meeting 2013.

Environmental Implications

No negative impacts are anticipated from the successful delivery of this plan.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications for Council, however any future requirements will be the subject of Council budget deliberations.

No impact to budget.
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Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications


The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 is not a statutory requirement but it does form an agreed support strategy for common issues across the region including physical activity, social connectedness and inclusion, and evidence based policy and practice.

Alignment to City Plan

The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 is aligned to City Plan 2013-17 and actions contained within the plan for the City of Greater Geelong have been taken from either City Plan 2013-17 or the Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-2017.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest relative to the advice provided in the report.

Risk Assessment

There are no risks associated with implementing the recommendations contained in the report.

Social Considerations

The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 reinforces Council's commitment to addressing the social determinants of health by working at multiple levels across the organisation and beyond to achieve sustainable improvements in health outcomes for the community.

Human Rights Charter

The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-17 outlines a set of guiding principles that were used to underpin the proposed planning framework. It captures the need to specifically address fundamental inequities.

Consultation and Communication

The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-2017 has been informed by a series of stakeholder consultations involving more than 500 participants across the region and an online community survey (264 respondents). The consultation sessions and the community survey generated approximately 2,450 individual ideas and comments.
HEALTH AND WELLBEING PLAN
2013 – 2017

HEALTH & WELLBEING PILLAR

G21 is an alliance of the government, industry and community organisations working to improve people’s lives in the Geelong region.
GEELONG REGION ALLIANCE (G21) IS A FORMAL ALLIANCE OF GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS AND COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS WORKING TOGETHER TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF PEOPLE WITHIN THE GEELONG REGION ACROSS FIVE MUNICIPALITIES — COLAC OTWAY, GOLDEN PLAINS, GREATER GEELONG, QUEENSCLIFFE AND SURF COAST.

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOQ</td>
<td>Borough of Queenscliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Colac Otway Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGG</td>
<td>City of Greater Geelong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G21</td>
<td>G21 Region Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Golden Plains Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWB</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDM</td>
<td>Integrated Chronic Disease Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHP</td>
<td>Integrated Health Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAV</td>
<td>Municipal Association of Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPHWB</td>
<td>Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Service Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Surf Coast Shire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDOH</td>
<td>Social Determinants of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIA</td>
<td>Planning Institute of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In 2012 the five councils of the G21 Region:
- Borough of Queenscliffe
- Colac Otway Shire
- Golden Plains Shire
- City of Greater Geelong
- Surf Coast Shire

Agreed to collaborate on planning for regional health and wellbeing. Each Council identified its own priorities and working together, then developed three common regional priorities. Each Council has a municipal public health & wellbeing plan in accordance with the requirements under the Victorian Public Health & Wellbeing Act. Each Council has also identified common priorities, and aligned local action that has become the basis of the G21 Health & Wellbeing Plan.

Both local and regional planning has consulted with many individuals and organisations, many of which will be involved in the implementation of the strategic priorities. A planning framework based on systems thinking has been developed that is consistent with state, national and international policy and practices, and reflects the essential elements (enablers) of governance & leadership; partnership; evidence focus; finance & resources; workforce development; and community capacity. These underpin future HWB outcomes and the G21 health and wellbeing plan provides a common basis for ongoing, collaborative work and will support partners during 2013-17.

### COLLABORATIVE PLANNING FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL HEALTH AND WELLBEING

#### CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough of Queenscliffe</th>
<th>City of Greater Geelong</th>
<th>Colac Otway Shire</th>
<th>Golden Plains Shire</th>
<th>Surf Coast Shire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOROUGH OF QUEENSCLIFFE</strong></td>
<td><strong>CITY OF GREATER GEELONG</strong></td>
<td><strong>COLAC OTWAY SHIRE</strong></td>
<td><strong>GOLDEN PLAINS SHIRE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SURF COAST SHIRE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OUR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

1. Improve the opportunities for increased access and uptake of physical activity
2. Strengthen our advocacy for increased community connectedness and social inclusion
3. Collaborate on building our evidence based planning and practice

#### HOW

- Governance & leadership
- Information systems (Evidence focus)
- Workforce development
- Community Capacity (Equity & engagement)

#### WHERE

- **LOCAL ACTION PLANS**
  - COGG
  - BOQ
  - COS
  - GPS
  - SCS

#### WHAT

- **IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW**
  - Progress towards a region-wide physical activity strategy
  - Work with partners & connect with health promotion, health literacy, ICDM and service coordination
  - Advocate for increased accessibility for people of all abilities in built & natural environments
  - Advocate for improved amenities & safer public spaces
  - Community wide supports to connect to service coordination & chronic disease management
  - Workforce/professional development with PIA/MAV about environmental design
  - Develop resource information & local community leaders
  - Collaborate on social marketing strategy & directory development

- **PHYSICAL ACTIVITY**
  - Support the Addressing Disadvantage project through policy, evidence and funding
  - Investigate regional governance models
  - Strengthen regional volunteering profile and strategy
  - Support key strategies in: family violence strategy, public transport, growth plan

- **COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS & SOCIAL INCLUSION**
  - Update community data profile
  - Commission systematic reviews for identified priorities
  - Integrate child – adolescent data sets into region wide profile
  - Create HWB web based clearinghouse, regional fact sheets & workforce development tools
  - Promote gender and diversity lens across member organisations
  - Develop core set of HWB indicators for evaluation over life of strategy

**G21 Region HWB plan implementation & summary of actions**
G21 has been operating since 2002, as a forum to discuss issues across interest groups and municipalities resulting in better coordinated research, consultation and planning. G21 is also the Strategic Planning Committee for the region and is responsible for leading the development and implementation of the region’s strategic plan. This approach has resulted in many positives for our communities and has seen G21 held up at all levels of government as an exemplar model for planning and coordination.

The G21 Region Plan continues to inform planning across the region, and in particular the objective that seeks to strengthen communities and support healthy lifestyles through a range of pillar-led projects as well as local strategies provides a coherence and context for collaborative health and wellbeing planning. G21 is organised through a set of pillars, one being Health & Wellbeing, which is responsible for the development and delivery of this regional health and wellbeing plan for 2013–17.

The G21 Health & Wellbeing (HWB) Pillar’s vision is that communities in the G21 region experience the highest quality of life achievable through accessibility, participation, innovation and vibrant, collaborative relationships.

There are four strategic directions to guide their progress:

- Understand populations, planning & impacts of change
- Connect people, communities and services
- Build healthy, resilient and innovative communities
- Strengthen community infrastructure and service systems.

The G21 Region Health and Wellbeing Plan delivers a way forward for building collaborative action on a set of key priority issues, as identified through the consultation process at both the regional and local levels. The Plan supports and links to the local action plans that each of the participating councils has developed to meet the requirements as set out in the Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Act (2008). This Plan will strengthen the region’s capacity to positively impact on health and wellbeing from a whole of population perspective.

The Plan identifies three strategic action areas for which the G21 HWB Pillar will lead the implementation and evaluation. Where it is relevant and opportune, the Plan seeks to identify links to other completed or potential regional strategies such as regional growth, public transport and physical activity.

The Plan will strengthen the ongoing effort to address some of the more complex and entrenched issues underlying public health & wellbeing across the region. This will enhance Councils’ ability to partner with service providers, other sectors and government departments to maximise effort and resources.
BACKGROUND

The five municipalities in the G21 region have a record of achievement in regional planning, across a range of issues and systems, to inform and influence critical decision making for the region. Since 2006 there has been collaborative effort in identifying issues and analysing systems that impact across boundaries or jurisdictions. Local government is responsible for developing, leading and implementing local policies that influence many determinants of health. The legislative requirement under the Victorian Municipal Public Health & Wellbeing Act 2008 (the Act) is to develop and implement a municipal public health and wellbeing plan within twelve months of a general council election. The MPHWP will be submitted to the Minister in October 2013 for approval.

Each of the five municipalities in G21 has prepared its plan and considered how the plan intersects with the regional plan in order to gain a collaborative effort and advantage on the identified regional priorities.

Given the opportunity to undertake the project, the G21 HWB Pillar established a Steering Group comprising membership from the five municipalities, Barwon Medicare Local and the regional office of the Department of Health. The aim is to produce a regional strategy by identifying shared regional health and wellbeing priorities and developing local action plans through harnessing the collaboration and resources of local government, state government, statutory and community organisations and local communities to achieve the overarching goal of improving health and wellbeing of communities through the G21 Region.

The development and endorsement of a regional HWB planning framework to guide the Plan and where possible, local action plans, was foundational to facilitating Councils in their partnerships with service providers, other sectors and government departments.

BENEFITS

This is an innovative approach to HWB planning in the G21 region. There has been a robust partnership across local government, health & community services in recent years, however through this initiative a sharper focus on region-wide improvement in health & wellbeing is possible.

The benefits particularly for councils are:

• Increased joint planning between local and regional partners that addresses the complexities of the health & wellbeing system more collaboratively
• Increased evidence based planning available to consider the impact that life-stage, gender, culture, disability, GLBTI and Indigenous status has on health and wellbeing experiences and outcomes in local communities within the region
• Provision of resources, professional development and training to re-orient planning and service delivery in a more coordinated and integrated manner for each Council, based on individual assessment of good, better or best practice for each council
• Application of a continuous improvement lens for Councils to identify whether their responses to local or regional health and wellbeing issues are good, better or best on a continuum of practice and how they might shift practices and outcomes to the next level.
PROJECT GOVERNANCE

G21 has been responsible for the delivery of the project with project oversight allocated to the G21 Region HWB Plan Steering Group. The project lead was the City of Greater Geelong and with the support of the G21 Director Health and Wellbeing, the Project Control Group was formed. The consultants reported to the Project Control Group on a monthly basis.

The key deliverables for the project were:

1. Application of sound consultation practice throughout the project, with key community and stakeholder project participants
2. Development of a regional planning framework
3. Identification of a set of health and wellbeing priorities
4. Development of a regional strategy informed by evidence-based interventions
5. Development of strategies or actions that build the capacity of organisations and communities to plan, lead, deliver and evaluate population health and wellbeing outcomes
6. Development of a set of five municipal local action plans
7. Development of a communication strategy

The project formally commenced in December 2012 and expects to deliver the G21 Region Health & Wellbeing Plan that will includes individual local actions based on the municipal PHWBP plans developed by each council and endorsed by October 2013.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology selected to undertake the consultation phase of the project was based on a nominal group process because it provided an opportunity to engage multiple organisations across a range of communities to develop shared perspectives about the communities in question. It was expected that this process would generate a sense of shared responsibility in order to set the momentum and conditions under which partnerships would benefit and identifying priorities in common would increase collaboration. The consultation process occurred in place-based sessions.

A series of stakeholder consultations was conducted involving more than 500 participants across the five council sponsored sessions and one regional forum. Council officers through their local communications and networks invited participants to local stakeholder sessions. A set of participatory activities was conducted which introduced the context and impetus for the development of a G21 health and wellbeing plan followed by a presentation from local leadership on the specific issues for their particular council.

Given the planning context and using a nominal group process, participants were asked to consider the current needs of their population, identify priorities for the local MPHWP during the next four years. Lists of priorities were generated individually (4-5 priorities per 20-40 participants) and then refined in small groups (usually 8-12 groups of 3 per session) to identify three top priorities from the broader list.

Representatives from each group reported back on the key priorities for each small group and any redundancies across groups were identified and removed. This generated a set of about 15 priority areas across the full group. Priority areas were posted on a noticeboard and each participant invited to identify by voting which priority from the full list they felt should be the focus of the broader plan.

To this stage each individual had identified their full list of priorities, discussed and honed these in small groups, discussed and further refined as a large group and finally, voted to place the core list into a clear, score-driven list of highest perceived priorities.
Small groups of three people worked on a priority with usually 3–5 priorities identified, and in some cases, where a large number of votes was received for one priority more than one group was set up. Approximately 160 small group discussions occurred. Participants moved into groups representing the priority they felt most important. Focusing on the priority, participants then commented on the current system capacity performance.

Using the key enablers as outlined in the G21 HWB planning framework that are:
- leadership and governance;
- financing and resource allocation;
- information systems;
- partnerships;
- workforce development; and
- community capacity (engagement & equity).

A subsequent activity asked participants to consider the future scenario; what they would want the plan to deliver at the end of the four year planning cycle and to again, describe this in detail based on the key enablers. Results from each session were fed back to the full group of participants for final reflections and comments.

Each of the priority mapping sheets were subsequently analysed by identifying agreed priorities across the full range of consultation sessions and clearer pictures of the current systems elements across the full G21 region were generated. The consultation sessions (502 participants) and an online community survey generated approximately 2,450 individual ideas and comments.

In conjunction with the local evidence under analysis by councils and the results from an online survey (264 respondents), the complete lists of priorities then informed the Project Steering Group in its selection of three key priorities using the following set of inclusion criteria:
- Is this priority identified as a need in the G21 region, supported by evidence?
- Is there sufficient commitment to work on priority across member agencies through shared planning, implementation and evaluation?
- What capacity exists to implement shared initiatives to address this priority focusing on preventative system interventions?
- Does it have potential to reduce health inequalities?
- Can the priority link with G21 strategic directions/strategies, Regional Management Forum priorities and Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan priorities?
- What is the capacity to leverage off other local/regional/state/national initiatives to enhance overall impact?
- Is there potential to achieve a level of immediate results and long term improvement?

The next step was to produce an evidence summary on the top two priorities being:
- physical activity; and
- community connectedness/social inclusion.

A third priority was resolved to be a process priority rather than an issue or determinant based priority, however the Steering Group considered the strategic importance of building a strong evidence base as critical to strengthening the system and understanding any improvement in the G21 region’s future health and wellbeing. Further details on the findings and evidence summaries are included in the appendices.
LEGISLATIVE, POLICY AND PLANNING CONTEXTS

VICTORIAN CONTEXT

The current Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2011–15 (State Plan) defines public health as:

‘Public health is what we, as a society, do collectively to assure the conditions in which people can be healthy. Public health focuses on prevention, promotion and protection rather than on treatment, on populations rather than individuals, and on the factors and behaviour that cause illness and injury.’

(2013:9)

The Victorian Municipal Public Health & Wellbeing Act 2008 (the Act) requires that each Council develop and implement a municipal public health and wellbeing plan (MPHWP) within twelve months of a general council election. When approving the MPHWP, Council is expected to have regard to the Council Plan as well as other relevant legislation such as the Climate Change Act 2010 and Tobacco Act 1987.

The MPHWP also takes account of associated Council policy that impacts on the social, economic, natural and built environments as they affect community health and wellbeing.

The State Plan is one in a suite of relevant plans and frameworks that govern health reform in Victoria such as the Victorian Health Priorities Framework 2012–2022 and the Rural and Regional Health Plan 2012. At the state level it is expected that any population health based planning will take into account the statewide priorities for both health conditions and health issues that are outlined in the Primary Care Partnership Program Logic 2013–17 (Final consultation draft 22 May 2013).

Through the Victorian Department of Health there is also the Primary Care Partnership (PCP) model that focuses on integrated health promotion planning and service system improvement for chronic disease.

Another key Victorian health policy direction is about ‘Building the Victorian Prevention System’ about which the Department of Health states:

“(it) is redesigning its approach to preventive health to slow the growth of lifestyle-related chronic disease in Victoria. Reducing the chronic disease burden and maximising health and wellbeing requires a consistent, long term approach - not quick fixes.”

The PCP is integral to the delivery of a collaborative effort to integrate planning across sectors and tiers of government, and across the health and wellness continuum. The orientation towards a prevention system for Victoria has been at the forefront of both policy and service development and given that G21 is the signatory on the PCP service agreement for the Barwon region, the PCP role in integrated health promotion, service coordination and client and community empowerment will be critical to the effective implementation of the G21 Region HWB Plan.
AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

In Australia there is also a range of strategic policy reforms being administered through legislative reform and a set of Health Partnership Agreements with their corresponding national health agencies. One national body integral to this work is the Australian National Preventive Health Agency that is overseeing major investments in policy and program changes to impact more on priority areas such as tobacco, alcohol consumption, healthy eating and physical activity.

One of the major investments through the National Preventive Health Partnership Agreement is the initiative, known locally as Healthy Together Geelong. This also relates to the Victorian policy and program initiative mentioned earlier, Building the Prevention System.

The release of the National Primary Care Strategy and the emergence of the national primary care planning organisational structure, Medicare Locals are also acknowledged as contributing to the development of robust population health based evidence.

There is broad agreement in the key policy and position statements that strengthening municipal planning in public health and population health will significantly reduce the expenditure burden on health care in the long term nationally. Subsequently an emphasis on preventive health is behind the redirection and the imperative to collaborate on complex problems that determine or strongly influence national health and wellbeing outcomes.

INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

Throughout the material reviewed it was reinforced that ‘health-planning efforts must focus on the creation of structures and processes that actively work to dismantle existing health inequalities and create economic, political, and social equality’ (Schulz & Northridge, 2004). This appears to be the fundamental premise for most of the strategic and policy directions being generated in those countries often viewed as leaders in public health planning such as the United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway and Canada.

Some key points to note about contemporary public health analysis and planning are:

• Leadership in public health thinking emphasises that it is complex, ongoing, and costly to undertake what is required, yet it is more costly not to act.
• Defining the intervention or action appears to be increasingly based on assumptions about population equity and the impacts of health inequalities on equity.
• Equality, across and for all, of a population is a core value and dealing with inequities is a commitment that most countries adhere to and acknowledge the direct relationship of reducing inequalities to building healthier communities.
• Escalating costs of health care continue to drive change in health promotion & preventive health, as well as pursue ways to improve primary health care per se.

The level of complexity refers directly to increasingly urbanized and globalised futures where the impacts of change require new strategies across sets of problems rather than developing a single-issue focus or strategy. Whilst there is still absolute need and support for addressing disease through prevention and amelioration of chronic conditions, it is counterbalanced in all key examples by the need to develop a preventive system to deal more proactively and from a population perspective.

This raises the challenge to build capability, what the Swedish model refers to as public health competency in order to positively impact on longer-term change. Whilst there are no common measures, most examples propose professional development, partnership development, organisational systems re-orientation and leadership as the enabling factors.

Whilst there are multiple frameworks operating in public health planning environments, internationally or within Australia, very few have been required to be as collaborative as proposed in this project.

The role and responsibilities of local government and regional bodies to cooperate to achieve this is clearly articulated, however there is less evidence that it has been implemented effectively or that over time, has been able to demonstrate positive impacts.
KEY ELEMENTS OF PLANNING FRAMEWORKS

Systems thinking

Public health planning frameworks and processes provide the tools to share common understanding of current health challenges, and develop cohesive responses to them.

The steering group for the project had already identified that a systems-oriented approach to problem solving views ‘problems’ as part of a wider, dynamic system (WHO 2009).

Across a number of frameworks reviewed, the key factors for effective sustainable frameworks were: the adoption of a whole of systems approach embedding plans across the broader municipal policy landscape; collaborative planning with broad community consultation; acknowledging and encouraging cross sectoral action; supporting local government to facilitate and enable from a position of strong participatory leadership; and, data driven decision making to ensure latest intelligence informs decisions.

Within the broader sector, notably health services and more recently, in population health policy, there has been uptake of the WHO systems building blocks framework in public health planning, and specifically in the Victorian State plans and as the underpinning framework of the Healthy Together Communities Victoria model.

There is a range of different frameworks that provide varying levels of support to identify key priorities and develop strategic action. Critical to these is the flexibility to be adaptable to specific local context and place based needs. A second important success factor is the provision for consultation in the use of these frameworks.

The current Public Health Outcomes Framework developed in the United Kingdom has an explicit outcomes focus establishing an unequivocal position about reducing health inequities and by focusing on “how well we live, not only how long”, so improving life expectancy at the same time, reducing the difference in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy between communities are the two, and only, high level outcomes. It is just under implementation at this time so impacts are yet to be assessed.

The Victorian Healthcare Association in collaboration with Monash University and the Victorian Department of Health jointly developed a population-based health planning framework to assist health planners in their efforts with local public health planning. Again, the rationale for public health improvement is squarely set in the need to reduce social and health inequities.

Other key documents that have clearly informed the State Plan, are the WHO health systems framework, the evaluation of the Victorian Environments for Health framework and proposed paradigms of a new public health – all of which contribute to a more innovative planning process that addresses complex problems that determine health and wellbeing, affect sustainable social and economic conditions and can accommodate multiple players learning and collaborating on shared goals.

The WHO health systems framework and the State Plan together provide a clearly organised set of common elements. When complemented with the key public engagement principles, the selected frameworks were assessed against the key principles and key elements that underpin a systems approach.

A SYSTEMS-ORIENTED, MULTILEVEL FRAMEWORK HAS THE ABILITY TO INFLUENCE ENVIRONMENTAL, CULTURAL AND SOCIAL FACTORS THROUGH INTEGRATED POLICIES, PARTNERSHIPS AND ACTIONS.

(Huang et al. 2009; Foresight 2007)
Key elements for effective population based health planning

The key elements for effective population health planning described under the Victorian Government’s State Health and Wellbeing Plan capture the intention of the G21 Region HWB Planning Framework. They are:

• A focus on the health of the community
• Consideration of the environments that impact on health and wellbeing: social, economic, built/physical, and natural
• A comprehensive mix of interventions delivered in multiple settings
• Investment and commitment to:
  - Leadership
  - Partnership - collaboration across sectors
  - Community engagement and participation
  - Evidence focus - demonstrating accountability for health outcomes
  - Workforce capacity
  - Resource allocation

Guiding principles

Although the best practice principles identified by the Grattan Institute for contemporary and sustainable planning focussed on city and urban planning and are somewhat generic in nature, they provide a strong, clear set of core principles when developing a specific population based planning framework for health and wellbeing to guide the G21 Region HWB Plan.

The principles outlined are that:

• Residents must be involved in decisions
• Usually a trigger emerges to give impetus for will to have sustained change/improvement
• Collaboration must be across government, business, community and civic organisations - building alliances
• Changing governance structures does not, of itself, result in success
• Long-term consistency in the strategic direction must survive political cycles and leadership
• Regional collaboration is essential for effective decision making on reforms

More specifically to health and wellbeing planning, the steering group determined that a set of guiding principles was required to underpin the proposed framework, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH &amp; WELLBEING PLANNING PRINCIPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create the vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address fundamental inequities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deal with complexities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reorient leaders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actively engage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Map and measure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPING A HWB PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Key considerations
In developing a framework for the G21 planning context, a range of examples consistently highlighted some common drivers as critical for an effective and sustainable framework such as:

- Adopt a systems approach and embed it in evidence-led decision making
- Shift the mental (conceptual) model to collaborative planning processes, not unilateral consultation
- Develop and sustain participatory processes that involve key stakeholders in all phases
- Acknowledge the need for cross-sectoral action and shared measures
- Redesign the role of local government to be more of a facilitator/enabler, and stronger leader rather than independent decision maker
- Establish data driven knowledge to inform decisions and deliver transparency and accountability in performance

A range of public health planning frameworks reviewed demonstrated that there is a level of strategic readiness through policy and strategy settings, however the level of operational readiness necessary to implement accordingly is much less evident. It appears that in other jurisdictions or countries, despite appearing to be more progressive, are equally caught between the policy settings being and the reality of implementation to achieve optimal outcomes.

All Councils have had experience with the ‘Environments for Health’ framework to guide MPHWP development. This framework was introduced in 2001 and evaluated in 2006.

The ‘Environments for Health’ framework has been found to change the way local government thought about health and the partnerships needed to effectively work on complex and inter-related issues in local places. Having effective health and wellbeing outcomes for communities required aligning organisational capability with the expanded scope of public health and wellbeing.

As indicated earlier, the State Plan identifies the use of a systems approach, using building blocks of governance and leadership, information systems, financing and resource allocation, partnerships and workforce development. The WHO ‘Systems Thinking for Health Systems Strengthening’ has a set of building blocks that are similar. They address service delivery, financing, health information systems, leadership and governance, access to essential medicines and health workforce.

Relationship with other health promotion planning and reporting requirements
This diagram represents the relationship with the broader Integrated Health Promotion planning and reporting that will occur through G21. Whilst there is one plan and one report required for the region-wide priorities, health service providers and councils will report on other activity as required.

Settings and systems approaches: a balance of people, place and systems
It is important to demonstrate that the strategy incorporates actions that has a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People focus</th>
<th>Relate directly to residents either as groups or individuals with specific needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place based approach</td>
<td>Interact with people in the environments where they live, work and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems strength</td>
<td>Build and sustain prevention system across sectors, interests and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aim of the G21 Region HWB Planning Framework is to:
- facilitate a collaborative effort to municipal HWB planning for the communities in the G21 region
- enable a regional strategy to address identified priorities
- align local action plans to govern municipal level priorities and interventions, and
- develop evidence-based knowledge through planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes in both regional and local settings

UNDERSTANDING THE FRAMEWORK’S DIMENSIONS

There are six dimensions to the framework. Each dimension cascades through to arrive at the point of strategy implementation and review. For each dimension critical strategic questions are generated to inform the type, scale and relevance of the response.

With community at the centre, the four environments for health are considered and priorities set. The key enablers are then analysed to assess the level of governance & leadership; information systems; finance & resource allocation; partnerships; workforce development; and community capacity.

This leads to the building of a region wide strategy based on identified priorities, resources and commitment. See below for detailed description.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>General population of defined boundary, recognising specific needs for individuals, places or cohorts that may be understood as sub-populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environments for Health</td>
<td>Evidence clearly indicates the critical relationship between environment and health, be it the built, social, economic and natural environments in which we live, and their current or potential capacity to impact on health and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Evidence-based knowledge about issues, conditions or settings that require remediation, modification or transformation to meet overall goal of good health &amp; wellbeing outcomes for all. Sourced through local data as well as state and national priorities currently identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Enablers</td>
<td>Organisational elements that are often referred to as building blocks in frameworks. Enablers by nature strengthen and sustain the system in its effectiveness, efficiency, quality and relevance. The key enablers proposed are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Governance &amp; leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information systems (evidence focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financing &amp; resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workforce development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>A blueprint of decisions and propositions that sets out objectives and goals, and plans for achieving these goals, underpinned by guiding principles to ground the work to be achieved. It indicates the organisational resources it seeks, and the contribution it plans to make to achieve the desired outcomes proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td>A structured process of evaluation, established from the outset of the project, occurring throughout (monitoring) and specifically concluded to assess against a range of criteria (process, impact and outcome) that measures effectively of stated objectives and purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See below for the relationship between the framework’s dimensions, strategic focus and relevant phase of the planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>STRATEGIC QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PLANNING CYCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>How can everyone in our community experience good health &amp; wellbeing outcomes?</td>
<td>PRE-PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTS</td>
<td>What contributes or depletes our health &amp; wellbeing in our environments?</td>
<td>REGIONAL &amp; MUNICIPAL SCAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which are the settings in our community that matter most?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITIES</td>
<td>What are the critical concerns we have about our community’s health &amp; wellbeing?</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What type of intervention is needed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY ENABLERS</td>
<td>Which elements or factors are present and enabled in our community to address our priorities?</td>
<td>PLANNING DECISIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY</td>
<td>How well is health &amp; wellbeing integrated into broader planning across Council and with our key partners for our community?</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW</td>
<td>What has been achieved with the regional planning framework supporting collaboration on regional priorities?</td>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key enablers
The following key enablers are adapted from a range of sources including WHO health systems strengthening framework; the Victorian ‘Guide to public health and wellbeing planning’; and general health equity literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY ENABLERS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; leadership</td>
<td>Leadership and governance involves ensuring strategic policy frameworks exist and are combined with effective oversight, coalition building, the provision of appropriate regulations and incentives, attention to system-design, and accountability. Leadership involves highest levels or representation in an organisation and across any governance structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems (evidence focus)</td>
<td>A well-functioning health information system is one that ensures the production, analysis, dissemination and use of reliable and timely information on health determinants, health system performance and health status. There is demonstrated uptake of evidence in decision making at policy, strategy, program, intervention and activity levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing and resource allocation</td>
<td>A system that based on data, priorities and evidence-based interventions allocates funds for health and wellbeing related services and programs, as well as analyses how other resource allocations impact either positively or negatively on desired health and wellbeing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Health and wellbeing interventions are primarily delivered through collaborative relationships and formal arrangements that demonstrate a cross sectoral and integrated approach across the four environments for health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce development</td>
<td>Establishing capacity to develop and sustain a more integrated practice to health and wellbeing planning as described, requiring an inter-professional approach with planners to contribute to the regional preventive health workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity</td>
<td>An engaged, inclusive approach to building community understanding of the inter-related issues, needs and experiences and the current or desired assets needed in the community to improve health and wellbeing outcomes for everyone. Includes community plans, public engagement policy and transparency in decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The G21 HWB Pillar’s vision is that communities in the G21 region experience the highest quality of life achievable through accessibility, participation, innovation and vibrant, collaborative relationships.

Throughout the consultation and review processes, in excess of 2450 ideas and suggestions about what matters to, and potential improvements for, the region’s health and wellbeing were provided. Reflecting on the state level priorities and the emergent issues for individual municipalities, the G21 HWB Plan identifies three specific priorities for action over the next four years.

The first step was to capture the layers and interdependencies of action that were identified for each priority in order to remain focussed on an outcome-based approach and to be clear about the regional level response to the identified priority. So, using a ‘The Theory of Change’ statement (Robinson, 2012) that highlights the layers and links, the following statements set the G21 HWB position.

For the identified three priorities to be effectively improved over the next four years, we need to link our thinking and initiate concurrent action with other pillars and member agencies. The following represents the context for creating change strategies that include people; place; and systems that will determine our success.

**Priority 1: Physical Activity**

*If* we extended the G21 Physical Activity Strategy to include the whole region over the life of the strategy and to link with key health and wellbeing plans across the region...

*And if* we improved public amenity and building design to facilitate increased physical activity...

*And if* we told people about where we have made it safe for them to access and use our natural and built environments more for physical activity...

*And if* we provided useful, current information to the community where they live, work and play about the links between physical activity, health and wellbeing and available resources...

*Then* we would have increased levels of physical activity across our population and evidence of which environments provided the most preferred opportunities to a range of groups in our community.

**Priority 2: Community Connectedness/Social Inclusion**

*If* we introduced new approaches to our community organisational leadership by developing a partnerships policy (pledge) that expressly commits to addressing social inclusion as a health & wellbeing priority...

*And if* we strengthened the capacity of local government to engage, collaborate with and respond to expressed needs of communities of interest...

*And if* we developed a G21 policy on ‘collective impact’ across two other key pillars being Education, Employment & Training and Economic Development to work with Health & Wellbeing...

*And if* we improved the level of corporate and public recognition and support given to volunteering by promoting its value in key public strategies and plans...

*Then* we would capture the economic, social and educational benefits in delivering on shared action involving the community directly with key organisations and businesses, and an innovative way to communicate the importance of our ‘collective impact’ story about community connectedness and social inclusion to key decision and policy makers.

**Priority 3: The Evidence Base**

*If* a ‘collective impact’ approach is developed to shared goals, building shared knowledge, utilising a shared technology and agreeing to have shared evaluation and accountability that includes community voices...

*And if* we present contextualised evidence that informs broader planning processes about key populations, specific needs or places identified to be marginalized or vulnerable...

*And if* we ensure that a range of evidence is widely accessible, as are relevant training resources, about social, economic, environmental and cultural impacts on community health and wellbeing...

*And if* we developed a robust review and evaluation strategy to measure our progress...

*Then* we will have a secure, highly reliable and credible evidence base and the broadest range of well-informed stakeholders understanding and accounting for their role in the health and wellbeing status across the region.
## G21 Region HWB Plan Outline

The following table describes the overall structure of the Plan for the next four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>OUR GOAL</th>
<th>Improve health and wellbeing of communities in the G21 region by identifying shared regional health and wellbeing priorities and implementing a G21 region HWB strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>OUR PARTNERS</td>
<td>Borough of Queenscliffe (BoQ) Colac Otway Shire (COS) City of Greater Geelong (CGGG) Golden Plains Shire (GPS) Surf Coast Shire (SCS) G21 Pillars and key service provider networks Statutory bodies Health services Community service organisations Community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUR STRATEGIC PRIORITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Improve the opportunities for increased access and uptake of physical activity 2 Strengthen our advocacy for increased community connectedness and social inclusion 3 Collaborate on building our evidence based planning and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>PEOPLE FOCUS &amp; PLACE-BASED APPROACH SYSTEMS STRENGTHENING</td>
<td>Governance &amp; leadership Information systems (Evidence focus) Finance &amp; resource allocation Partnerships Workforce development Community Capacity (Equity &amp; engagement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHERE</td>
<td>LOCAL ACTION PLANS</td>
<td>COGG BOQ COS GPS SCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING AND REVIEW</td>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY • Progress towards a region-wide physical activity strategy • Work with partners &amp; connect with health promotion, health literacy, ICDM and service coordination • Advocate for increased accessibility for people of all abilities in built &amp; natural environments • Advocate for improved amenities &amp; safer public spaces • Community wide supports to connect to service coordination &amp; chronic disease management • Workforce/professional development with PIA/MAV about environmental design • Develop resource information &amp; local community leaders • Collaborate on social marketing strategy &amp; directory development COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION • Support the Addressing Disadvantage project through policy, evidence and funding • Investigate regional governance models • Strengthen regional volunteering profile and strategy • Support key strategies ie: family violence strategy, public transport, growth plan EVIDENCE BASED PLANNING &amp; PRACTICE • Update community data profile • Commission systematic reviews for identified priorities • Integrate child – adolescent data sets into region wide profile • Create HWB web based clearinghouse, regional fact sheets &amp; workforce development tools • Promote gender and diversity lens across member organisations • Develop core set of HWB Indicators for evaluation over life of strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G21 Region HWB plan implementation & summary of actions

- •
- •
G21 Region Public Health and Wellbeing Plan

The following table shows the relationship with municipal public health plan local priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOLDEN PLAINS</th>
<th>COLAC OTWAY SHIRE</th>
<th>CITY OF GREATER GEELONG</th>
<th>QUEENSCLIFFE</th>
<th>SURF COAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy built environment.</td>
<td>Decrease significant levels of disadvantage in early years.</td>
<td>Social inclusion and community connectedness.</td>
<td>Advocating access to services.</td>
<td>Service accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to local education and employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Increase levels of physical activity.</td>
<td>Reducing harm from alcohol drugs and problem gambling.</td>
<td>Facilitating the best start in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected communities.</td>
<td>Protect through public &amp; environmental health.</td>
<td>Reducing tobacco use.</td>
<td>Protect &amp; promote the health of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to transport.</td>
<td>Support healthy eating and food security.</td>
<td>Improving how we do business in health &amp; wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health.</td>
<td>Support mental health &amp; connectedness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of violence against women and children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support healthy behaviours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce harm from alcohol &amp; other drugs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G21 Region Public Health & Wellbeing Plan

Our vision is that communities in the G21 region experience the highest quality of life achievable through accessibility, participation, innovation and vibrant, collaborative relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</th>
<th>HWB EVIDENCE BASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harness the combined interest in pillar priorities through existing planned actions across key G21 pillars (Environment; Sport &amp; Recreation; Transport) to improve access and levels of physical activity and progress towards a region wide physical activity strategy.</td>
<td>Investigate regional models of community governance that could strengthen inclusive behaviours, policies and practices.</td>
<td>Update and promote the G21 Region HWB Profile including a collation and promotion of agreed indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with service providers to connect their action in integrated health promotion, health literacy, chronic disease management and service coordination to focus on increased physical activity.</td>
<td>Support key strategies that can positively impact on social inclusion such as the G21 regional family violence strategy; the G21 public transport plan; and the G21 regional growth plan.</td>
<td>Introduce a gender and diversity lens through organisation audit tools, policy &amp; professional development and induction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for, and engage in the development of Access G21 and associated tools that will guide priority setting and implementation in the built and natural environments in local places to increase social and economic participation for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>Strengthen key relationships to support an advocacy role in community groups and organisations collaborating on shared interests.</td>
<td>Introduce a continuum of data collection from AEDI through to the Geelong Project by developing a data set for 8 – 12 year old children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate professional development seminars in collaboration with PIA/MAV on urban design and workplace design; strategic planning and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) that supports place based physical activity and health.</td>
<td>Promote the principles of the IAP2 community engagement participation spectrum with councils and support Councils in their community engagement strategies.</td>
<td>Build a shared understanding about the experiences of young people and their families and their views about what is needed and how is should happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for improved amenities that will increase physical activity (bike paths, trails) through safer public spaces and encourage more vulnerable population groups to increase their incidental activity.</td>
<td>Establish a cross pillar mechanism with high-level independent regional leader and oversee pooled resources, beyond political cycles, international and national connections to develop policy on ‘collective impact’ and progressing the work of the Disadvantage Taskforce.</td>
<td>Provide a HWB web platform for sharing information, research, project activities, including hosting of workforce development tools for LGA access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop local resource information that promotes physical activity in natural environments with local community champions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Produce a set of facts sheets on identified determinants &amp; issues relating to population groups or place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Priorities Legend:
- Physical Activity
- Community Connectedness/Social Inclusion
- Evidence based planning
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PRIORITY 1: IMPROVE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCREASED ACCESS AND UPTAKE OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

THIS MATTERS BECAUSE

Physical inactivity places a significant burden on community health, with inactivity directly contributing to one fifth of heart disease cases, and 16,000 premature deaths per year, representing 6.6% of the global burden of disease in Victoria. Local governments are well placed to influence physical activity within the community as they are locally focused, can provide locally oriented solutions, and have a legislated mandate over the social and built environment of their communities.

The majority of physical activity promotion strategies for local government focus on built environment, regulatory intervention, or community engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR THEORY OF CHANGE IS</th>
<th>OUR PRIORITY ACTIONS WILL BE</th>
<th>WE WILL SEE PROGRESS WHEN</th>
<th>WE WILL WORK WITH</th>
<th>POTENTIAL G21 RELATED STRATEGY OR PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we extended the G21 Physical Activity Strategy to include the whole region over the life of the strategy and to link with key health and wellbeing plans across the region...</td>
<td>1.1 Harness the combined interest in pillar priorities through existing planned actions across key G21 pillars (Environment; Sport &amp; Recreation; Transport) to improve access and levels of physical activity and progress towards a region wide physical activity strategy.</td>
<td>• Evidence in identified plans &amp; pillar projects across pillars  • Each council signed up to Physical Activity strategy</td>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Pillar</td>
<td>Physical Activity Strategy Public Transport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we improved public amenity and building design to facilitate increased physical activity...</td>
<td>1.2 Work with service providers to connect their action in integrated health promotion, health literacy, chronic disease management and service coordination to focus on increased physical activity.</td>
<td>• Number of service providers with physical activity as high priority</td>
<td>Healthy Together Geelong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we told people about where we have made it safe for them to access and use our natural and built environments more for physical activity...</td>
<td>1.3 Advocate for, and engage in the development of Access G21 and associated tools that will guide priority setting and implementation in the built and natural environments in local places to increase social and economic participation for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>• Establishment of funding for implementation of model and integration of model across participating councils</td>
<td>Healthy Together Geelong</td>
<td>Regional Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we provided useful, current information to the community where they live, work and play about the links between physical activity, health and wellbeing and available resources...</td>
<td>1.4 Facilitate professional development seminars in collaboration with PIA/MAV on urban design and workplace design; strategic planning and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) that supports place based physical activity and health.</td>
<td>• Design, delivery &amp; feedback on seminar program over 2 year period</td>
<td>LGAs</td>
<td>Healthy Together Geelong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Then we would have increased levels of physical activity across our population and evidence of which environments provided the most preferred opportunities to a range of groups in our community.
## PRIORITY 2: STRENGTHEN OUR ADVOCACY FOR INCREASED COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

### THIS MATTERS BECAUSE

Community connectedness refers to interaction that a person has with others in their community and the community as a whole, whereas social inclusion recognises that others are excluded from the opportunities they need to create the life they want. Local Governments are best placed within communities to deliver and coordinate localised solutions.

Common strategies for social inclusion and community connectedness refer to building capacity and awareness, targeting disadvantaged groups, and addressing negative attitudes and social stigma.

Our progress will be assessed against these external indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR THEORY OF CHANGE IS</th>
<th>OUR PRIORITY ACTIONS WILL BE</th>
<th>WE WILL SEE PROGRESS WHEN</th>
<th>OUR LEAD PARTNERS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL G21 RELATED STRATEGY OR PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If we introduced new approaches to our community organisational leadership by developing a partnerships policy (pledge) that expressly commits to addressing social inclusion as a health &amp; wellbeing priority...</td>
<td>2.1 Investigate regional models of community governance that could strengthen inclusive behaviours, policies and practices</td>
<td>• New models introduced and trialled</td>
<td>LGAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Support key strategies that can positively impact on social inclusion such as the G21 regional family violence strategy; the G21 public transport plan; and the G21 regional growth plan</td>
<td>• Evidence – Community Indicators Victoria and Vic Health data for transport and family violence</td>
<td>G21 Pillars</td>
<td>Regional Family Violence Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social inclusion indicators &amp; growth plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And if we strengthened the capacity of local government to engage, collaborate with and respond to expressed needs of communities of interest...</td>
<td>2.3 Strengthen key relationships to support an advocacy role in community groups and organisations collaborating on shared interests</td>
<td>G21 Pillars</td>
<td>Climate Resilient Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Case studies of effective policy development and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And if we developed a G21 policy on ‘collective impact’ across two other key pillars being Education, Employment &amp; Training and Economic Development to work with Health &amp; Wellbeing...</td>
<td>2.4 Promote the principles of the IAP2 community engagement participation spectrum with councils and support Councils in their community engagement strategies</td>
<td>LGAs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support councils in their plan, implementation &amp; review of relevant services and programs is evident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And if we improved the level of corporate and public recognition and support given to volunteering by promoting its value in key public strategies and plans...</td>
<td>2.6 Promote the establishment of a volunteering strategy as part of each G21 stakeholder’s strategic and health &amp; wellbeing plan and advocate for accountability indicators to be incorporated in those key plans</td>
<td>HWB Pillar</td>
<td>Physical Activity Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of volunteering as integrated element in plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross pillar volunteer development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Targets set to achieve over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And if we improved the level of corporate and public recognition and support given to volunteering by promoting its value in key public strategies and plans...</td>
<td>2.7 Support the development of shared tools and processes for people interested in volunteering to become volunteers</td>
<td>HWB Pillar</td>
<td>Health &amp; Community Services Workforce Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of collaboration in resources that support volunteer recruitment and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Then** we would capture the economic, social and educational benefits in delivering on shared action involving the community directly with key organisations and businesses, and an innovative way to communicate the importance of our ‘collective impact’ story about community connectedness and social inclusion to key decision and policy makers.
PRIORITY 3: COLLABORATE ON BUILDING OUR EVIDENCE BASED PLANNING & PRACTICE

THIS MATTERS BECAUSE

Across the G21 region, the need for an integrated approach to building the evidence about our community’s health & wellbeing has been widely recognised. In the absence of a shared understanding of the population’s needs, discrete community experiences and subsequent impacts on health and wellbeing, there has been a lack of baseline data to inform planning across a range of health determinants. This continues to diminish our collaborative capacity to join up planning processes, inform our responses and scrutinise our progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR THEORY OF CHANGE IS</th>
<th>OUR PRIORITY ACTIONS WILL BE</th>
<th>WE WILL SEE PROGRESS WHEN</th>
<th>OUR LEAD PARTNERS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL G21 RELATED STRATEGY OR PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a ‘collective impact’ approach is developed to shared goals, building shared knowledge, utilising a shared technology and agreeing to have shared evaluation and accountability that includes community voices...</td>
<td>3.1 Update and promote the G21 Region HWB Profile including a collection and promotion of agreed indicators</td>
<td>Completed and set of agreed indicators implemented</td>
<td>HWB Pillar</td>
<td>Regional Profile Update Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we present contextualised evidence that informs broader planning processes about key populations, specific needs or places identified to be marginalized or vulnerable...</td>
<td>3.2 Introduce a gender and diversity lens through organisation audit tools, policy &amp; professional development and induction</td>
<td>Women’s Health Victoria tools implemented in use in the majority of organisations</td>
<td>Women’s Health Barwon SWR</td>
<td>Access G21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we ensure that a range of evidence is widely accessible, as are relevant training resources, about social, economic, environmental and cultural impacts on community health and wellbeing...</td>
<td>3.3 Introduce a continuum of data collection from AEDI through to the Geelong Project by developing a data set for 8 – 12 year old children</td>
<td>Complementary data set established and project embedded across key pillars with G21 members</td>
<td>Education Pillar</td>
<td>Service Coordination &amp; Chronic Disease Management Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And if we developed a robust review and evaluation strategy to measure our progress...</td>
<td>3.4 Build a shared understanding about the experiences of young people and their families and their views about what is needed and how it should happen</td>
<td>Partner project established and underway</td>
<td>Education Pillar</td>
<td>Regional Education &amp; Training Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then we will have a secure, highly reliable and credible evidence base and the broadest range of well-informed stakeholders understanding and accounting for their role in the health and wellbeing status across the region.</td>
<td>3.5 Provide a HWB web platform for sharing information, research, project activities, including hosting of workforce development tools for LGA access</td>
<td>Established and utilization monitored</td>
<td>Physical Activity Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then we will have a secure, highly reliable and credible evidence base and the broadest range of well-informed stakeholders understanding and accounting for their role in the health and wellbeing status across the region.</td>
<td>3.6 Produce a set of facts sheets on identified determinants &amp; issues relating to population groups or place</td>
<td>Established and annually updated</td>
<td>Service Coordination &amp; Chronic Disease Management Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then we will have a secure, highly reliable and credible evidence base and the broadest range of well-informed stakeholders understanding and accounting for their role in the health and wellbeing status across the region.</td>
<td>3.7 Develop and implement an evaluation strategy for life of the Plan based on annual reviews</td>
<td>Reviewed methodology providing evidence on progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G21 REGION HEALTH AND WELLBEING PLAN 21
**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Harness the combined interest in pillar priorities through existing planned actions across key G21 pillars (Environment; Sport &amp; Recreation; Transport) to improve access and levels of physical activity and progress towards a region wide physical activity strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Work with service providers to connect their action in integrated health promotion, health literacy, chronic disease management and service coordination to focus on increased physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Advocate for, and engage in the development of Access G21 and associated tools that will guide priority setting and implementation in the built and natural environments in local places to increase social and economic participation for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Facilitate professional development seminars in collaboration with PIA/MAV on urban design and workplace design; strategic planning and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) that supports place based physical activity and health.</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Advocate for improved amenities that will increase physical activity (bike paths, trails) through safer public spaces and encourage more vulnerable population groups to increase their incidental activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Develop local resource information that promotes physical activity in natural environments with local community champions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Coordinate whole of population social marketing strategy &amp; update a region wide directory that links physical activity projects being delivered and service provider information and referral through bi-annual G21 member meetings.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS/SOCIAL INCLUSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Investigate regional models of community governance that could strengthen inclusive behaviours, policies and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Support key strategies that can positively impact on social inclusion such as the G21 regional family violence strategy; the G21 public transport plan; and the G21 regional growth plan</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Strengthen key relationships to support an advocacy role in community groups and organisations collaborating on shared interests</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Promote the adoption of the IAP2 community engagement participation spectrum across all councils</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Establish a cross pillar mechanism with high-level independent regional leader and oversee pooled resources, beyond political cycles, international and national connections to develop policy on ‘collective impact’ and progressing the work of the Disadvantage Taskforce</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Promote the establishment of a volunteering strategy as part of each G21 stakeholder’s strategic and health &amp; wellbeing plan and advocate for accountability indicators to be incorporated in those key plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Support the development of shared tools and processes for people interested in volunteering to become volunteers</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE EVIDENCE BASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Update and promote the G21 Region HWB Profile including a collation and promotion of agreed indicators</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Introduce a gender and diversity lens through organisation audit tools, policy &amp; professional development and induction</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Introduce a continuum of data collection from AEDI through to the Geelong Project by developing a data set for 8 – 12 year old children</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Collaborate to collectively understand the experiences of young people and their families and their views about what is needed and how is should happen</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Produce a set of facts sheets on identified determinants &amp; issues relating to population groups or place</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Develop and implement an evaluation strategy for life of the Plan based on annual reviews</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The benefits of establishing and implementing a region wide HWB Plan is that it provides opportunities for the five participating councils to seek support on priorities and any emergent issues at the regional level. Being well informed by the G21 HWB regular updates will be provided to the G21 Board and pillar partners and will include any evidence based advocacy positions it may seek the Board to consider.

The leadership group will meet with the HWB Pillar Executive every six months to monitor and interpret the progress against the plan. Each action group will have an appointed Convenor.
## INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>RELATED CIV</th>
<th>G21 PROGRESS INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY 1</strong> IMPROVE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCREASED ACCESS AND UPTAKE OF PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Harness the combined interest in pillar priorities through existing planned actions across key G21 pillars (Environment; Sport &amp; Recreation; Transport) to improve access and levels of physical activity and progress towards a region wide physical activity strategy</td>
<td>Sustainable built &amp; natural environments</td>
<td>Transport accessibility</td>
<td>Dedicated walking and cycling trails</td>
<td>Evidence in identified plans &amp; pillar projects across pillars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culturally rich &amp; vibrant communities</td>
<td>Open Space Leisure &amp; recreation</td>
<td>Access to areas of public open space</td>
<td>Each council signed up to Physical Activity strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to participate in sporting &amp; recreational activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Work with service providers to connect their action in integrated health promotion, health literacy, chronic disease management and service coordination to focus on increased physical activity</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Personal health &amp; wellbeing</td>
<td>Subjective wellbeing Adequate physical exercise</td>
<td>Number of service providers with physical activity as high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Advocate for, and engage in the development of Access G21 and associated tools that will guide priority setting and implementation in the built and natural environments in local places to increase social and economic participation for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Community connectedness</td>
<td>Feeling part of the community</td>
<td>Establishment of funding for implementation of model and integration of model across participating councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Facilitate professional development seminars in collaboration with PIA/MAV on urban design and workplace design; strategic planning and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) that supports place based physical activity and health</td>
<td>Sustainable built &amp; natural environments</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Access to areas of open public space Appearance of public space Crime Perceptions of safety</td>
<td>Design, delivery &amp; feedback on seminar program over 2 year period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Personal &amp; community safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Advocate for improved amenities that will increase physical activity (bike paths, trails) through safer public spaces and encourage more vulnerable population groups to increase their incidental activity</td>
<td>Sustainable built &amp; natural environments</td>
<td>Transport accessibility</td>
<td>Dedicated walking and cycling trails Roads and footpaths School walkability</td>
<td>Evidence of cross pillar initiatives and place based data about public space and access by vulnerable groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Develop local resource information that promotes physical activity in natural environments with local community champions</td>
<td>Sustainable built &amp; natural environments</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Access to areas of open public space Appearance of public space</td>
<td>Action based research project funded and conducted in a minimum of 5 communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Coordinate whole of population social marketing strategy &amp; update a region wide directory that links physical activity projects being delivered and service provider information and referral through bi-annual G21 member meetings</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Service Accessibility</td>
<td>Access to services</td>
<td>Evidence of collaborative planning &amp; action between pillars to produce strategy, directory &amp; updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRIORITY 2: STRENGTHEN OUR ADVOCACY FOR INCREASED COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS AND SOCIAL INCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>RELATED CIV INDICATOR</th>
<th>G21 PROGRESS INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Investigate regional models of community governance that could strengthen inclusive behaviours, policies and practices</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen Engagement</td>
<td>Community Connectedness</td>
<td>Opportunity to have a say on important issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Support key strategies that can positively impact on social inclusion such as the G21 regional family violence strategy; the G21 public transport plan; and the G21 regional growth plan</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Personal &amp; community safety</td>
<td>Service Accessibility</td>
<td>Feeling part of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Strengthen key relationships to support an advocacy role in community groups and organisations collaborating on shared interests</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen Engagement</td>
<td>Membership of local community organisations &amp; decision making bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Promote the adoption of the IAP2 community engagement participation spectrum across all councils</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen Engagement</td>
<td>Opportunity to have a say on important issues</td>
<td>Adoption by Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Establish a cross pillar mechanism with high-level independent regional leader and oversee pooled resources, beyond political cycles, international and national connections to develop policy on ‘collective impact’ and progressing the work of the Disadvantage Taskforce</td>
<td>Dynamic resilient local economies</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Income and wealth</td>
<td>Local employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Promote the establishment of a volunteering strategy as part of each G21 stakeholder’s strategic and health &amp; wellbeing plan and advocate for accountability indicators to be incorporated in those key plans</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Community Connectedness</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Evidence of volunteering as integrated element in plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Support the development of shared tools and processes for people interested in volunteering to become volunteers</td>
<td>Healthy, safe &amp; inclusive communities</td>
<td>Community Connectedness</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Evidence of collaboration in resources that support volunteer recruitment/retention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRIORITY 3 COLLABORATE ON BUILDING OUR EVIDENCE BASED PLANNING & PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>POLICY AREA</th>
<th>RELATED CIV</th>
<th>G21 PROGRESS INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Update and promote the G21 Region HWB Profile including a collation and promotion of agreed indicators</td>
<td>Culturally rich &amp; diverse communities</td>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
<td>Community acceptance of diverse cultures</td>
<td>Completed profile and set of agreed indicators commissioned for life of plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Introduce a gender and diversity lens through organisation audit tools, policy &amp; professional development and induction</td>
<td>Culturally rich &amp; diverse communities</td>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
<td>Community acceptance of diverse cultures</td>
<td>Women's Health audit tools circulated to member agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Introduce a continuum of data collection from AEDI through to the Geelong Project by developing a data set for 8 – 12 year old children</td>
<td>Healthy, safe and inclusive communities</td>
<td>Early Childhood Personal health &amp; wellbeing</td>
<td>AEDI Child health assessments</td>
<td>Complementary data set established and project embedded across key pillars with G21 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Collaborate to collectively understand the experiences of young people and their families and their views about what is needed and how is should happen</td>
<td>Healthy, safe and inclusive communities</td>
<td>Personal health &amp; wellbeing Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Subjective wellbeing Destination of school leavers Apprenticeship &amp; vocational training enrolments School retention</td>
<td>Potential partner project established and underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Provide a HWB web platform for sharing information, research, project activities, including hosting of workforce development tools for LGA access</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen engagement</td>
<td>Opportunity to have a say on important issues</td>
<td>Established and utilization monitored through web based evidence Evaluation – workforce development against 10 competencies (WHO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Produce a set of facts sheets on identified determinants &amp; issues relating to population groups or place</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen engagement</td>
<td>Opportunity to have a say on important issues</td>
<td>Established and annual updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Develop and implement an evaluation strategy for life of the Plan based on annual reviews</td>
<td>Democratic &amp; engaged communities</td>
<td>Citizen engagement</td>
<td>Opportunity to have a say on important issues</td>
<td>Review methodology provides for evidence informed action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPORT STRATEGY

The Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2011/15 clearly highlights the centrality of local government municipal public health and wellbeing plans to the building of a prevention system at the local level. It also recognises that local government needs to strengthen its partnerships with other service providers in order to identify key priorities, collaborate on shared interventions and evaluate openly and appropriately the interventions implemented as a result of this planning re-orientation.

In developing the G21 HWB Plan it was acknowledged that the knowledge, capacity and confidence about how to strengthen the prevention system across the G21 region would be critical to its future effectiveness.

Through this planning process a range of potential resources and tools have been identified and will form an electronically based training package specific to the G21 councils. The range of training resources and education tools for Councils to access will support staff orientation and development; strengthen opportunities across council programs and services to collaborate; and guide key partnerships to plan, deliver and monitor what are often complex interventions to improve health and wellbeing outcomes for their communities.

There will be an opportunity for the training resources to be integrated as a learning management system through the proposed website supported by the G21 HWB Pillar in the near future. In the interim, the resources will be provided to each Council in an electronic format for their consideration and internal application by October 2013.

Planned resources to include:

- Introductory module on population health based planning
- 'I' Stories about population health and local government’s role – a short series of interviews with leaders in population health planning
- Web based links to related resources including
  - integrated health promotion
  - population based health planning
  - public health policy and plans
  - community engagement and participation
  - inclusive planning practices that consider the impact that life-stage, gender, culture, disability, GLBTI and Indigenous status has on health and wellbeing experiences and outcomes in local communities
- Electronic versions of the tools used in the planning process

The application of a capability audit tool that will support Councils in their continuous improvement against the key enablers in the G21 HWB planning framework will specifically identify their current capability according to the key enablers (as identified in the G21 HWB planning framework) in light of their local or regional health and wellbeing issues. It will self-assess the council’s practices to be good, better or best in order to identify which require improvement and where resources may be allocated.
### LOCAL ACTION PLANS

**BOROUGH OF QUEENSCLIFFE**

The listed actions are drawn from the Council Plan 2013/17 and/or Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013/17 that have been identified for Council and that also align with the region wide priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>HWB EVIDENCE BASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate access to a range of sport and recreation activities</td>
<td>Encourage and recognise volunteers</td>
<td>Advocate to other levels of Government on issues of key concern to the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local clubs and community organisations</td>
<td>Promote shared use of community facilities Foster partnerships with community organisations, business, our municipal neighbours and other levels of Government</td>
<td>Research and understand the demographic trends and likely future changes in population and lifestyle and the implications for the ongoing sustainability of the local economy, and community organisations &amp; volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate/promote ways to improve information sharing between community clubs and organisations Investigate and develop an effective welcoming procedure for new residents</td>
<td>Hold a ‘population change’ summit Review and understand the outcomes of the ‘population change’ summit Implement actions derived from the ‘population change’ summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and encourage the sharing of resources and innovative governance structures between community clubs and organisations</td>
<td>Improve the coordination and quality of early years services through facilitating an Early Years Memorandum of Understanding between relevant local community organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase residents’ access to information</td>
<td>Undertake an annual review of demographic trends and opportunities and issues impacting on the delivery of early years services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support older residents and people with disabilities to access services and live independently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLAC OTWAY SHIRE

The listed actions are drawn from the Council Plan 2013/17 and/or Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013/17 that have been identified for Council and that also align with the region wide priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>HWB EVIDENCE BASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supportive environments and services to encourage a more active lifestyle</td>
<td>Increase the level of participation by older people in decision making around their needs</td>
<td>Undertake planning and implement practices that promote positive health and wellbeing outcomes for whole of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a regional strategy that will promote and increase physical activity rates</td>
<td>Decrease the level of disadvantage and vulnerability of children in their early years</td>
<td>Plan for improving the quality of life for older people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategy that will specifically promote walkability and cycling</td>
<td>Develop a region wide strategy to support our communities public transport needs</td>
<td>Identify and document a plan to promote early years development within children from 0 – 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote active service opportunities for older people</td>
<td>Hold regular forums or exhibitions with local multicultural and indigenous groups and others who may experience social isolation or inclusion</td>
<td>Work with existing agencies to better understand data and services that support victims of domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for people of all abilities to participate in physical activities</td>
<td>Support local efforts to engage more people in community volunteering and citizenship activities, such as volunteer groups, churches, service clubs, and professional or political associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide built environments that support active transport</td>
<td>Provide diversity training for staff to ensure appropriate sensitivity and awareness in service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities for people to meet and participate together in local healthy activities</td>
<td>Provide a local web-based platform to connect local communities and stakeholders to transport, health, and community information and conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the principles of Healthy Parks Healthy People</td>
<td>Provide leadership across communities to prevent violence against women by promoting gender equity and equal and respectful relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a local web-based platform to connect local communities and stakeholders to transport, health, and community information and conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The listed actions are drawn from the City Plan 2013/17 and/or the Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013/17 that have been identified for Council and that also align with the region wide priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>HWB EVIDENCE BASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council will work to increase participation in physical activity by supporting populations to increase active travel, sport and active recreation.</td>
<td>Develop and support initiatives that increase opportunities for social participation, study, employment, volunteerism, civic engagement and access to supportive networks.</td>
<td>Provide place based support to build communities in identified areas vulnerable to poor health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement Healthy Together Geelong health promotion initiatives, policies and programs to support more active and healthy environments (early years services, schools, workplaces and the wider community)</td>
<td>Support participation in social activities that bring people together, such as those run by community groups, sport clubs or art groups</td>
<td>Support Council and urban planners to enhance 'Healthy by Design' principles into existing and future urban growth areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and support implementation of the Geelong Region Physical Activity Strategy</td>
<td>Develop and support initiatives that promote community safety in line with the City of Greater Geelong Community Safety Statement.</td>
<td>Review local planning approaches to strengthen community facilities in each neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use ‘Healthy by Design’ principles to support active living in existing and future growth areas</td>
<td>Strengthen Council’s connection with the community by increasing staff awareness of different groups’ needs and barriers to participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop an Open Space Strategy to accommodate all ages and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an integrated transport plan that includes provision for walking and cycling and priorities the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in council transport decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build partnerships at a regional and local level to work together towards addressing local barriers to active living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with sports clubs to encourage and facilitate the implementation of health promoting policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use sport and active recreation settings to improve the wellbeing of residents (e.g. increasing participation among newly arrived communities, volunteer skill development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOLDEN PLAINS SHIRE

The listed actions are drawn from the Council Plan 2013/17 and/or Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013/17 that have been identified for Council and that also align with the region wide priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>HWB EVIDENCE BASED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop a Physical Activity Strategy | Create healthy built environments which address and acknowledge how people interact with each other, how they move around, and how they use a place by a whole of Council approach to urban and rural planning that promotes liveability, access to essential services, recreation, cultural and community activities | Build a local picture to establish an evidence base to identify local participation rates in both structured and non-structured physical activities, which will inform:  
  • local need  
  • open space and facility provision  
  • future funding requirements  
  • identify key partnerships |
| Suitably designed, maintained and accessible paths and trails network through programs in partnership that support the community to be physically active (structured & unstructured). Specifically looking at programs which support:  
  • Older Adults  
  • Children  
  • Youth  
  • Women | Connected paths and trails networks that encourage community participation, active travel and safe movement around townships via the implementation of recommendations in the Path and Trails Strategy which focus on creating links between townships and community facilities and paths within urban and rural areas | Build the local picture – establish an evidence base |
| Recreation and active participation opportunities that provide for population groups and changing demographics within the Shire | Improved physical access to the built environment via new public infrastructure design processes for streetscapes, footpaths, buildings and public open spaces are universally accessible | |

LOCAL ACTION PLANS
The listed actions are drawn from the Council Plan 2013/17 and/or Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013/17 that have been identified for Council and that also align with the region wide priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1</th>
<th>PRIORITY 2</th>
<th>PRIORITY 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>COMMUNITY CONNECTEDNESS &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION</td>
<td>HWB EVIDENCE BASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase participation in physical activities</td>
<td>Build community and organisational capacity to achieve better outcomes for children</td>
<td>To build organisational capacity to plan, lead, deliver and evaluate population health and wellbeing outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build community and organisational capacity to achieve better outcomes for youth</td>
<td>Understand changing community demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build community and organisational capacity to achieve better outcomes for older people</td>
<td>Planning for and maximising use of infrastructure for health and wellbeing outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the level of planning, monitoring and evaluation that individual Councils and service providers will be engaged in throughout the designated period, the evaluation of the plan comprises three parts:

- Externally controlled indicators that are identified as relevant to actions in the plan and the results are in the public domain
- Commissioning of a specific set of indicators that potentially 'tells a story' about the multiple levels of impact and inform about their compound effect
- Reflective practice using on results based accountability to assess and evaluate performance

The data sets that are established and managed by Community Indicators Victoria through the McCaughey Centre has been nominated as the most applicable set of externally controlled indicators. The range of indicators available will be refined during the initial implementation phase and in most cases councils are also choosing to engage with CIV data given its accessibility.

The opportunity to commission a specific set of indicators will improve the rigour of a regional evidence base and will communicate both the bigger picture in the cross impacts and inter-dependencies of a range of determinants impacting on health and wellbeing, as well as measuring change resulting from the actions proposed to address key priorities over the life of the plan.

The following table is provided to consider both what is learned and then how, with whom and where to communicate the lessons and progress for each of the priorities.

There is a set of queries to guide the reflective practice through the implementation. Using the Results Based Accountability (RBA) process, these are:

- Did we do what we said we would do? (Quantity & effort)
- Did we do it well? (Quality)
- Did what we did make a difference? (Effectiveness)

In addition to this, the following questions would facilitate the evidence based approach that the G21 HWB Pillar is seeking to develop by determining audience, type of evidence and accountability on progress. Potential questions are:

- Who is interested in the findings?
- What is the source/base of evidence?
- What are the indicators or measures?
- Who is responsible for leading this?
- When?
1. EVIDENCE

The following information is a compilation of snapshot information drawn from municipal web sites, Vic Health Indicators Survey 2012 and extracts from id profiles.

G21 Region and local profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE AGE GROUP (YEARS)</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>GREATER MELB %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babies and pre-schoolers (0 to 4)</td>
<td>17,510</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schoolers (5 to 11)</td>
<td>24,368</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schoolers (12 to 17)</td>
<td>22,472</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education &amp; independence (18 to 24)</td>
<td>23,778</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young workforce (25 to 34)</td>
<td>31,890</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and homebuilders (35 to 49)</td>
<td>58,095</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older workers &amp; pre-retirees (50 to 59)</td>
<td>37,433</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69)</td>
<td>30,660</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (70 to 84)</td>
<td>26,325</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly aged (85 and over)</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total population</strong></td>
<td><strong>278,893</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The G21 region’s estimated population at the start of 2012 was 298,853. During the year the population will exceed 300,000. Population forecasts prepared by Department of Planning and Community Development indicate that most of the growth in the G21 region to 2026 will occur in the Surf Coast and Golden Plains Shires, with the City of Greater Geelong also contributing a significant proportion to the future growth.

Across the G21 region approximately rates are as follows:

- Surf Coast – East (3.0% pa)
- South Barwon-Inner (2.6% pa)
- Golden Plains – South East (2.3% pa)
- Greater Geelong - Pt B (Bellarine Peninsula - 1.7% pa)
- Greater Geelong - Pt C (1.3% pa).

This growth reflects the attractiveness of the region and planned growth in the City of Greater Geelong’s Armstrong Creek urban growth area. Although not mentioned above, Colac-Otway is expected to have marginal growth, while Queenscliff is not expected to experience much increase from its current population.

An ageing population

An important feature of the overall projected population growth is the anticipated ageing of the population, with the region expected to have a significantly older population than the Victorian and Australian average. The G21 region’s population over 65 is expected to make up 26.9% in 2031, compared with Victoria being 23.8%, and nationally, 21.3%. Between 2006 and 2026, the number of people in the G21 region aged 60 and over is projected to nearly double, from 55,113 in 2006 to 99,787 in 2026. By 2026 it is expected that those aged 60+ will increase to 28.1% (up from 20.4% in 2006) and those aged 0 to 19 will increase by 15,453 persons (from 71,641 in 2006 to 87,094 in 2026). It is projected that there will be a slight decrease in the proportion of 0 to 19 year olds between 2006 and 2026, from 26.5% of the population to 24.5% whilst those aged 20 to 59, will increase by 25,162 (from 143,234 in 2006 to 168,396 in 2026). The population percentage in this age cohort will drop from 53.0% in 2006 to 47.4% in 2026.
The Borough of Queenscliffe is located approximately 105 kilometres southwest of Melbourne and 35 kilometres east of Geelong. The Borough comprises small seaside towns of Queenscliff and Point Lonsdale and is the smallest local government area in Victoria (10.83 square kilometres). The Borough has a permanent population of around 3,054 and up to 12,000 in peak holiday times. Many property owners only holiday or live part-time in the Borough. The 53% of private dwellings unoccupied during the 2011 census is indicative of the large temporary population.

One of the Borough’s main service deliveries is health and community services as a high percentage per population (43.1%) of residents are aged over 60. Tourism accounts for 45% of the local economy. The Borough has a lower proportion of pre-schoolers and a higher proportion of people at post retirement age than Greater Melbourne.

Residents of the Borough of Queenscliffe gave their wellbeing an average score of 81.5 that is significantly higher than the state average of 77.5. They were significantly more likely to have purchased alcohol in the previous week (52.1%), compared with the state average (36.3%). However, those who purchased alcohol at licensed premises spent significantly less ($22) than the state average ($45).

Of all Victorians, Queenscliffe residents were the most likely to visit green space regularly. More than three-quarters of residents (79.3%) had visited green space at least weekly in the previous three months, compared with the Victorian average (50.7%). Most residents of Queenscliffe felt safe walking alone in their local area at night; 93.5% reported that they felt safe or very safe, which is significantly more than the state average (70.3%). Queenscliffe residents were significantly more likely to volunteer at least once a month (62.1% – the highest result in the state) and to report any type of citizen engagement in the previous 12 months (66.1%), compared with the state averages (34.3% and 50.5% respectively). Compared with the Victorian average (63.6%), a significantly higher proportion of Queenscliffe residents (77.6%) attended arts activities or events in the previous three months.
City of Greater Geelong

With a population of over 215,000 people, the City of Greater Geelong is Victoria’s largest regional centre. Located some 75 kilometers from the Melbourne CBD, the municipality covers square 1,245kms, comprising country, coastal and suburban areas. Total residential dwellings are estimated at 95,962 across more than 50 suburbs and townsships. A high proportion of the project growth will occur in new ‘greenfield’ growth areas identified for development, most notably Armstrong Creek, as well as other suburban expansions. The city is a major centre for investment with over 15,000 businesses and a highly skilled labour force of 91,930 (2006 Census estimate).

As part of the local effort towards developing a consistent approach in dealing with population health issues, the City of Greater Geelong has committed to enhance healthy lifestyle behaviours, through support and opportunities for participation in lifestyle education programs and leisure activity options for the Geelong community. The City of Greater Geelong is focused to:

- assist and encourage the community and business sectors to make informed nutritious choices
- improve the physical health and wellbeing developmental outcomes for children Implement relevant recommendations and strategies contained within Council’s Municipal Early Years Plan
- encourage older residents to remain physically active as long as possible
- support initiatives that reduces obesity and overweight in the general population
- encourage participation in physical activity by people of all ages and abilities.

According to the VicHealth indicators summary, the City had an average wellbeing score consistent with the Victorian average; 78.4 out of 100, compared with the state average of 77.5. More than two-thirds of Greater Geelong residents (68.4%) shared a meal with their families at least five days a week, which was similar to the Victorian average (66.3%).

Residents of Greater Geelong were significantly more likely (98.7%) to feel safe or very safe walking alone in their local area during the day compared with the Victorian average (97.0%). More than half of Greater Geelong residents (52.2%) had visited green space at least weekly in the previous three months. Consistent with state averages, more than one-third of Greater Geelong residents (34.0%) volunteered at least once per month and almost half (48.9%) reported some type of citizen engagement in the previous 12 months. Most residents (71.2%) in Greater Geelong supported a ban on smoking in outside dining areas. This was in line with the Victorian average of 69.8%.

Colac Otway Shire

In 2031, the population of Colac Otway Shire is forecast to be 25,120. In 2006, the most populous age group in Colac Otway Shire was 10–14 year olds, with 1,562 persons. In 2021 the most populous forecast age group will be 35–39 year olds, with 1,529 persons. The number of people aged under 15 is forecast to increase by 217 (5.2%), representing a rise in the proportion of the population to 19.4%. The number of people aged over 65 is expected to increase by 1,190 (34.2%), and represent 20.5% of the population by 2021. The age group that is forecast to have the largest proportional increase (relative to its population size) by 2021 is 70–74 year olds, who are forecast to increase by 53.3% to 1,242 persons.

The main changes in household type between 2006 and 2021 are forecast to be:

- The largest increase is forecast to be in Lone person households, which will increase by 523 households, comprising 29.7% of all households, compared to 27.5% in 2006.
- ‘Group’ households are forecast to decrease by 5 households, to comprise 2.2% of all households in 2021, compared to 2.5% in 2006.

Residents of Colac-Otway Shire reported significantly greater wellbeing than the Victorian average. Residents gave their wellbeing an average score of 80.5 out of 100, compared with the state average of 77.5. Compared with the Victorian average (36.3%), a significantly greater proportion of Colac-Otway residents purchased alcohol in the previous week (48.7%). However, those who purchased packaged liquor ($38) or alcohol from licensed premises ($36) did not spend significantly more than state averages ($45 for both).

Colac-Otway residents were significantly less likely to feel rushed or pressed for time (31.9%) or that a lack of time prevented time with family and friends (19.0%), compared with Victorian averages (41.3% and 27.4% respectively). Compared with the state average (32.6%), residents of Colac-Otway were significantly less likely to spend seven hours or more sitting on an average weekday (23.5%).

Colac-Otway residents were significantly more likely to volunteer at least once a month (50.1%) and to report some type of citizen engagement in the previous 12 months (67.8%), compared with Victorian averages (34.3% and 50.5% respectively). While a significantly lower proportion of Colac-Otway residents had internet access at home (80.9%), compared with the Victorian average (88.8%), there was no significant difference in their use of social networking to organise spending time with friends and family (Colac-Otway 28.4%; Victorian average 35.1%).
Golden Plains Shire

In 2031, the population of Golden Plains Shire is forecast to be 27,577, an increase of 10,565 persons (62.10%) from 2006. This represents an average annual growth rate of 1.95%. In 2006, the most populous age group in Golden Plains Shire was 10–14 year olds, with 1,496 persons. In 2021 the most populous forecast age group will continue to be 10–14 year olds, with 1,769 persons. The number of people aged under 15 is forecast to increase by 940 (23.3%), representing a rise in the proportion of the population to 22.0%. The number of people aged over 65 is expected to increase by 1,690 (113.1%), and represent 14.1% of the population by 2021. The age group forecast to have the largest proportional increase (relative to its population size) by 2021 is 85 and over year olds, who are forecast to increase by 194.9% to 289 persons.

In 2006, the dominant household type in Golden Plains Shire was Couple families with dependents, which accounted for 41.5% of all households. The main changes in household type between 2006 and 2021 are forecast to be:

- The largest increase is forecast to be in Lone person households, which will increase by 687 households, comprising 19.1% of all households, compared to 15.2% in 2006.
- Couple families with dependents are forecast to increase by 589 households, to comprise 36.7% of all households in 2021, compared to 41.5% in 2006.

The proportion of Golden Plains residents who purchased alcohol in the previous week (42.0%) was not significantly different from the state average (36.3%). However, those who purchased packaged liquor and those who purchased alcohol from licensed premises spent significantly less ($35 and $20 respectively) than the Victorian average (both $45). A significantly greater proportion of Golden Plains residents shared a meal with their families at least five days a week (73.7%), compared with the state average (66.3%).

Compared with the Victorian average (32.6%), residents of Golden Plains were significantly less likely to spend seven hours or more sitting on an average weekday (24.9%). Most residents of Golden Plains Shire felt safe walking in their local area alone at night; 85.4% reported that they felt safe or very safe, which was significantly more than the state average (70.3%).

Compared with the Victorian average (63.6%), residents were significantly less likely to have attended arts activities or events in the previous three months (53.6%). However, there was no significant difference in the proportion of residents who made or created their own art or crafts in that same timeframe (40.1%), compared with the Victorian average (34.9%).
Surf Coast Shire

The Shire’s age structure highlights a larger than Victorian average proportion of ‘primary schoolers’ and ‘Parents and homebuilders’ (35 to 49 year olds), ‘Older workers & pre-retirees’ and ‘Empty nesters and retirees’. There is a smaller proportion of ‘tertiary independent’ and ‘young workforce’ (18–34 year olds).

Surf Coast Shire experienced strong population growth between 2006 and 2011, with the Shire’s population forecast to increase to 44,101 in 2013. It is one of only four regional municipalities forecast with average annual growth rates over 2.0% between 2011 and 2013 in Victoria. The growth drivers include a large number of baby boomers entering retirement age and relocating to the coast; the improved access with opening of Geelong Ring Road; and the limited development capacity in other Victorian coastal areas within 2 hours of Melbourne such as the Mornington Peninsula. Over the last ten years Surf Coast Shire has experienced growth in all age groups. This is due to the attraction for young families with the coast lifestyle and access to services, as well as retirees. The main changes in household type between 2006 and 2021 are forecast to be: ‘Couples without dependents’ to increase by 2,180 households, comprising 35.6% of all households; and ‘Other families’ to increase by 45 households, to comprise 1.0% of all households in 2021, compared to 1.1% in 2006.

Traditional population counts only capture part of the story for Surf Coast Shire. Over half of Council’s services are impacted by part time populations, with seasonal holiday population peaks being just one of many part time populations. Others include: non-resident ratepayers; weekenders; seasonal workers, day trippers, school year residents and event populations. The number of people on an age pension, disability support pension and carers payment have increased whilst those on supporting parenting payment numbers have decreased.

Residents of Surf Coast Shire reported significantly greater wellbeing scores with an average of 80.2 compared with the Victorian average of 77.5. They were significantly more likely to have purchased alcohol in the previous week (47.9%), compared with the state average (36.3%) and have a higher proportion of residents who run out or could not afford food than other municipalities in the G21 region.

A significantly greater proportion of Surf Coast residents (74.7%) had visited green space at least weekly in the previous three months, compared with the Victorian average (50.7%). Most residents of Surf Coast Shire felt safe or very safe walking in their local area alone both during the day (99.8%) and at night (88.7%). These figures were significantly higher than the Victorian averages of 97.0% (day) and 70.3% (night).

Surf Coast residents were significantly more likely to volunteer at least once a month (43.7%) and to report some type of citizen engagement in the previous 12 months (69.3%), compared with state averages (34.3% and 50.5% respectively). Compared with the Victorian average (63.6%), a significantly higher proportion of Surf Coast residents (74.1%) attended arts activities or events in the previous three months.

Residents were also significantly more likely to make their own art or crafts; 48.0% reported making or creating art or crafts in the previous three months, compared with the state average (34.9%).
2. CONSULTATION SESSIONS – FINDINGS SUMMARY

Consultation Data
There are three key sets of data compiled through this planning process:

- Concept mapping that established and prioritised the key themes
- Interactive stakeholder sessions that identified local and regional priorities
- Online survey that scoped perceptions about community health and wellbeing aligned with the four environments of health

The key findings are summarised for each of these activities and more detailed discussion can be found in the documents prepared for the G21 PHWB Strategy Steering Group.

Concept Mapping
A concept-mapping workshop with the Steering Group was scheduled to prepare a set of common themes to guide developing a set of regional public health and wellbeing priorities. The stated purpose of the workshop was to: ‘conceptualise and prioritise what the G21 Regional Public Health and Wellbeing Plan should look to achieve in the next four years’.

The results were processed through specialised software that generates clusters of concepts and indicates any relationships between them. The proximity or correlation of some concepts can illustrate complex dependencies and may indicate a set of systems that are inter-related. Participants were asked to generate ideas (brainstorm) in response to the following seeding statement: What should the G21 Regional Public Health and Wellbeing Plan look to achieve by the end of four years?

Using a five-point scale, the importance of each brainstormed statement and how consistently this currently occurred was rated according to the following questions:

- How important is this statement as an aspect of what the Regional Public Health and Wellbeing Plan should look to achieve at the end of four years?
- In your personal experience of services and the population in the G21 region, to what extent is this statement currently met?
- How feasible is it that this statement will be achieved to a significant extent within four years?

### APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST SIGNIFICANT GAPS BETWEEN CURRENT AND DESIRED STATES</th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>MOST FEASIBLE</th>
<th>RESPONSE IN STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational quality development (including workforce)</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>G21 priorities are recognised in each Council Plan</td>
<td>See Priority 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good practice in implementation</td>
<td>A clearer picture of what is required to plan for well-being in the G21 region</td>
<td>A shared understanding of the population in the G21 region and their health and wellbeing needs</td>
<td>See Priority 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment, leadership and systems for common action</td>
<td>Measurable improvements in what we do</td>
<td>A clearer picture of what is required to plan for well-being in the G21 region</td>
<td>See Priority 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurable outcomes</td>
<td>A shared set of priorities and actions to improve health and wellbeing</td>
<td>Interaction with other G21 pillars &amp; their strategies to create shared benefit and added value</td>
<td>See Priority 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A shared understanding of the population in the G21 region and their health and wellbeing needs</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>See Priority 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial stakeholder engagement

The primary methodology to determine the local and regional level priorities was through six initial stakeholder consultation sessions during which participants undertook a series of exercises to identify, consider and select priorities as described.

The range of priorities identified in each location were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PRIORITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bannockburn (GPS)</td>
<td>Physical activity, Urban design, Service accessibility, Place based issues for rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colac (CDS)</td>
<td>Community development action models, Mental health/connectedness, Physical activity, Nutrition/ Food security, Supporting healthy behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G21 Regional Forum (RF)</td>
<td>Social determinants, Community capacity, Evidence based planning &amp; practice, Education &amp; employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong (COGG)</td>
<td>Community connectedness, Access &amp; equity, Local data &amp; evaluation, Growth, integrated planning &amp; impact of change, Community experiences, capacity &amp; engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenscliffe (BOQ)</td>
<td>Planning for a changing population, Community connectedness, Social inclusion, Safety, Transport between &amp; within communities, Young People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torquay (SC)</td>
<td>Access to services for rural communities, Local opportunities, Healthy &amp; engaged communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the councils incorporated this information into their MPHWB planning. It provided a basis on which to test local input and perceptions against the population-based data where possible. This process facilitated a way for councils to quickly respond to both perceived needs by integrating some issues into other planning processes as appropriate, i.e.: public transport and regional growth plans. The comparative assessment of the current scenario against preferred future provided a range of diverse actions that would decrease the gap between current and future, most of which has been included in the support strategy. The following tables set out a summary of the findings on which the identified priorities for action in this plan were based.
PRIORITY 1: PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Under this theme participants described the current situation as comprising traditional sports and sports clubs (GPS) as well as walking groups, rail trails (GPS). Identified gaps included a lack of transport and swimming facilities and a high-risk reliance on volunteer support (GPS). Other opportunities identified including leisure networks and facilities such as fitness centres (COS). Participants described the potential for a plan to deliver increased numbers in traditional sports, targeted programs to increase female participation, efforts to address inclusion, equity and diversity and to encourage volunteer involvement (GPS). They also described the need to provide accessible and safe spaces for walking tracks and parks and providing funding support to access sporting clubs (COS). A further emphasis was improved delivery of active transport (COS) and connections with the public transport strategy to make this effective (COGG).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance &amp; Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Currently described as volunteer led with support from the shire and Leisure Networks (GPS). Other leaders include Council, DHS, neighbourhood houses, community hubs and sporting clubs (COS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; Resources</strong></td>
<td>Finance and resources identified from the AFL, philanthropy and trusts, differing levels of government and Barwon Health (GPS). Other sources of finance included rates, CSO and Vic Health (COS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>Existing partners included G21 and PCPs (GPS), Vic Health, Leisure Networks, community hubs, Rotary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>Existing information systems identified included the Internet, Vic Health data and LGA data (GPS), Colac participants identified community feedback and participation rates including surveys and ABS data. Deakin University was identified as undertaking evaluation (COS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Development</strong></td>
<td>Some support for training clubs and coaching (COS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Capacity</strong></td>
<td>Access and distribution to opportunities for physical activity was considered inequitable across the shire (GPS). Inequities in spending were identified (COS) and that cost of equipment and uniforms, memberships were a major barrier (COS) leading to inequity for people from disadvantaged populations (COS, COGG). Current engagement includes outreach to rural communities networks and via clubs and associations (COS) along with programming in facilities advertised through various media (COS).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This theme related to the range of dispersed and isolated communities (GPS, Q), and diverse populations (e.g. early years and older persons) (BOQ), engaging new and long-term residents (BOQ), and establishing strong township connections (GPS). Some groups identified less than optimal communication between groups, and difficulty accessing existing quality resources (BOQ) as well as challenges with seasonal population change (BOQ) and the provision of a range of facilities and hubs for people to congregate and connect (GPS). Under this theme mental health and connectedness was identified as a key related theme (COS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance &amp; Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Plans in place for education and community health (GPS) and that there was some connectivity across plans (GPS). Gaps identified between consultation and participatory decision-making (GPS) and community groups acting in silos (BOQ). Local government identified as a key leader (BOQ) along with local business (BOQ) although the responsibility sits with specific individuals (BOQ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance &amp; Resources</strong></td>
<td>Community grants (GPS) and finance community plans by council important streams of finance and resources (GPS). Other resources include community buses (BOQ) and people/volunteers (GPS, Q). Other sources of finance identified include fines, rates and fees (BOQ). Mental health and connectedness funding for adult, youth and children’s mental health identified state and philanthropic funding as well as private health insurance (CDS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships</strong></td>
<td>Existing partnerships identified under this theme include HWB forums (GPS), PCPs (GPS), local businesses (BOQ), and the MAV (GPS). Specific to mental health and connectedness were GPs, councillors, other health workers and men’s sheds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>Current information systems identified under this theme include community newsletters (GPS), websites and social media (GPS) and word of mouth (GPS, Q). Information packs were identified as part of the current system (BOQ) along with specific data sources including the census (BOQ), G21 data (BOQ) and school and community groups (BOQ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Development</strong></td>
<td>Participants described the current situation as including transport and recreation (GPS) and training and co-ordination of volunteers (GPS). Other workforce development identified included students (BOQ) and teachers (BOQ) along with council staff (BOQ), service providers and business operators (BOQ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Capacity</strong></td>
<td>The current situation raises equity issues for growth pockets (GPS) and for younger populations (BOQ) with particular reference to young mothers (BOQ). A focus on tourism (Q, SC) and the transient nature of populations (Q, SC) was identified as having implications for equity (BOQ). Minority (COS) and low educational attainment (CDS) were identified as challenges to equity as was the tension between social and emergency service provision (BOQ). Engagement around this theme currently occurred through volunteers (BOQ), community leaders (BOQ) sporting clubs (BOQ) and community bodies (BOQ) through vehicles such as community forums (BOQ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRIORITY 3: EVIDENCE BASED PLANNING & PRACTICE

This information was compiled from the Regional Stakeholder Forum where it was rated as the number one priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>Governance and leadership growing in terms of the numbers involved, but a lack of structured leadership</td>
<td>Government and Deakin University to be incorporated into the governance structure, as well as G21, identified as leaders in evidence based practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Resources</td>
<td>Finance problematic, with resources directed to planning beyond what capacity would allow in terms of delivery Planning seen as 'health risk focussed' and influenced by integrated health promotion priorities</td>
<td>Finance and resources arrangements ensure that the provision of evidence is a pre-requisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>G21 a key partner, as is the disability service provider network, GRAND. Information available largely focussed on individuals, rather than organisations although some work towards a ‘systematic approach’ to planning and practice</td>
<td>Partnerships involves all stakeholders, where possible, who commit to better sharing of data Additional partners including multicultural/indigenous organisations and increased dialogue between authorities (such as the police) and the local community (RF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>Information available was largely focussed on individuals, rather than organisations</td>
<td>Formal systems proposed for the exchange and sharing of information, and existing formal data more uniformly used (census, DDH, pop health etc) with improved collection of outcomes based data measurement underway Use of technologies and crowd sourcing via social media to strengthen dialogue and to increase engagement (RF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>An investment in professional development, and an aim to commit to evaluation and disseminate information between organisations Organisational support available to develop the workforce</td>
<td>Investment made in workforce development that increases both the availability of evidence and workforce capacity to understand and integrate these practices A particular focus on workforce capacity to understand basic analytic and research skills, and provide a learning platform/system to adapt to more integrated planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Capacity</td>
<td>Some increased use of electronic communications as a way to identify and baseline regional equity issues</td>
<td>Equity and engagement encouraged through free exchange or low cost information sharing, acknowledging information privacy principles where appropriate Evidence of excluded groups engaged and accessing resources with increased awareness of resources and support available (RF) Developed measures of success that rely less on biomedical outcomes and increased use of social media and the internet (COS). Delivery of integrated and shared data that is up to date and representative of the community (place based) and its infrastructure and facilities in qualitative and quantitative ways and supplements existing data such as the census (SC). Support for seniors to develop IT skills and utilising evidence based IT were identified as desired outcomes (RF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ON-LINE SURVEY FINDINGS

The community-based on line survey, launched on Wednesday 3 April 2013, provided a baseline for community perceptions about community health and wellbeing issues, priorities and strategies for the G21 region. The on line access closed on Monday 20 May 2013 with 264 respondents having completed the survey. A paper version of the survey was provided to each Council for general distribution from Council offices. None were received.

Approximately 58.5% of respondents were aged between 25-49 years and a further 36.2% were aged between 50-69 years. Other age cohorts were not significantly represented. Sixty-nine suburbs were identified from across the G21 region and very few respondents identified from other cultural backgrounds or status. The majority indicated that they had post secondary levels of education attainment.

General responses

Most identified their understanding of health and wellbeing as ‘enjoying a state of physical health, mental health and emotional wellbeing’. The top three responses to key ranking questions (in order) were:

Those who most contribute to my health and wellbeing:
- Self
- Family and friends
- Health services

Two other responses highlighted:
- Work colleagues/workplace
- Pets (specifically) dogs

The priorities that would improve my community’s health and wellbeing:
- Access to healthy food and water
- Ability to be physically active
- Access to health services

Also highlighted:
- Physical activity facilities – bike paths, walking tracks and swimming pools.
- Other areas that would be a priority for improving community health and wellbeing:
- Youth and early years
- Community participation in local area planning, design & infrastructure including transport

The concerns about my community’s health and wellbeing:
- Alcohol abuse
- Illicit drug use
- Smoking/tobacco control

Also highlighted:
- Mental health issues
- Obesity
Environments for health: priority-setting responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
<th>BUILT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority 1</td>
<td>Pollution &amp; vegetation loss</td>
<td>Access to public &amp; community transport</td>
<td>Local employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 2</td>
<td>Access to parks, reserves and open spaces</td>
<td>Social isolation experienced by some residents</td>
<td>Pedestrian safety &amp; wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority 3</td>
<td>Effective recycling in the community</td>
<td>Incidence of family violence</td>
<td>Access to affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Locally grown food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The natural environment issues affecting health and wellbeing:
- Pollution & vegetation loss;
- Access to parks, reserves & open spaces;
- Effective recycling in the community with other issues highlighted:
  - Global warming/climate change; and
  - Water.

The social environment issues affecting health and wellbeing:
- Access to affordable & nutritious food;
- Social isolation experienced by some residents;
- Incidence of family violence with other issues highlighted:
  - Community connectedness; and
  - Access for people with disability.

The built environment issues affecting health and wellbeing:
- Access to public & community transport;
- Pedestrian safety & wellbeing; and
- Access to affordable housing with other issues highlighting
  - planning for open space; and
  - community infrastructure that supports physical activity.

The economic environment issues affecting health and wellbeing:
- Availability of local employment opportunities;
- Availability of local education & training;
- Availability of locally grown food; and other issues highlighted:
  - clear shift from traditional manufacturing base to a more diverse and contemporary business enterprises; and
  - inclusion issues for marginalised individuals or groups.
3. EVIDENCE SUMMARIES OF BEST PRACTICE INTERVENTIONS FOR IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

The Steering Group confirmed three priorities in July 2013 having considered the local priorities, stakeholder findings and discussion about related strategies.

To fully assess the level of intervention (action) that could be developed, an evidence summary was compiled for both Physical Activity and Community Connectedness/ Social Inclusion.

In developing evidence summaries for use by G21 and councils, the research focussed on a review of evidence in the peer reviewed literature and existing key evidence summaries for each of these priorities. The question supporting these evidence summaries was:

What is the most effective thing that local government can do to address this priority?

The evidence summaries used a 5-step process as described below:

1. Understanding evidence needs: consultation and topic generation

   Topics for the evidence summaries have been developed through a range of consultations with each of the municipalities in G21 and via regional forum.

2. Systematic searching and selection of studies

   Searches were undertaken in two ways;
   1. for reviews of the peer reviewed literature; and,
   2. a search of existing evidence summaries in the grey literature.

   The results of these searches will form a ‘data corpus’ that will be the basis for the evidence synthesis described in the following steps.

2.1 Reviews in the peer review literature

   For each priority area a search was undertaken using the PubMed search facility.

   The search terms and exclusions used were as follows:
   • The priority term itself (e.g. social inclusion): use additional search terms where they were indicated (for example the physical activity search may include sedentary behaviour, incidental activity and active transport)
   • Local government or municipal or place based approach
   • This was limited to review studies
   • Where a large number of hits are returned a further filter of ‘health’ will be applied
   • The reviews included in the evidence summary will be limited to those published between June 2008 and June 2013 (i.e. 5 years)

2.2 Search of existing evidence summaries in the grey literature

   For each priority area a search was undertaken using the Google search facility.

   The search terms and exclusions used were as follows:
   • The priority term itself (e.g. social inclusion): use additional search terms where they were indicated (for example the physical activity search may include sedentary behaviour, incidental activity and active transport)
   • Local government or municipal or place based approach
   • Limit to documents published in Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States using the ‘site: ’ search limiter
   • Where a large number of hits are returned a further filter of ‘health’ will be applied
   • The reviews included in the evidence summary will be limited to those published between June 2008 and June 2013 (i.e. 5 years)

3. Assessing strength of evidence

   No exclusion of any studies on the basis of study quality rating using the PRISMA rating tool whereby the following ratings was applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY OF EVIDENCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Review of randomised controlled trials with blinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quasi experimental designs (including comparison populations but without randomisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Qualitative studies without comparison communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Synthesising findings (success factors and common themes/critical insights)

A series of tables were developed that summarised the reviews and synthesised the findings according to the needs of the G21 Steering Group. The tables provide descriptions for each of the reviews identified in search strategies 2.1 and 2.2 according to the following criteria:

- Meaning of the term
- Populations involved in studies
- Age groups
- Socio-economic status
- Locality
- Identity/ other identifier
- Urban/ rural/ remote status
- Gender
- Interventions – what are the different types
- Comparison groups used
- Outcomes measured
- Indicators: process, impact & outcomes
- Timelines – time over which the studies operated
- Additional lens/ questions/ thematic areas to report on:
  - Key messages against each of the building blocks within each summary
    - Governance and Leadership
    - Information and intelligence
    - Finances and Resources
    - Partnerships and Networks
    - Workforce Development
  - What evidence is there of the significance for intervening in this priority?
  - What are the different courses of action (different types of intervention)?
  - What is the evidence to support a particular level of intervention?

- What is the relationship between economic development/ education and success in the achievement in health?
- Use the environments for health template as another lens in this process
  - Social
  - Natural
  - Built
  - Economic
- Role of local government
- Best practice for prevention in this area
- Evidence of reduction of health inequalities
- Evidence of links with other strategic directions
- Evidence of leverage of other initiatives
- Timing of results (immediate effects versus long term improvement)

5. Reporting, dissemination and evaluation

The evidence synthesis described above will create 5–10 meta tables of information based on each priority. A two-page summary that describes what this evidence base can offer local government in the form of direct advice in addressing each priority was produced.

The structure of the evidence summaries contained the following sub-headings:

- Priority area
- Summary panel
- Meaning of the terms
- Why is this priority important?
- Description of the state of evidence
- Key lessons for local government
- Principles for best practice in addressing this priority
- References
Physical Activity

This is a summary of relevant peer reviewed and broader literature describing local government strategies for impacting on physical activity. The review addresses the following question:

What is the most effective thing local government can do to address physical activity?

**KEY POINTS**

- Physical activity is often defined in terms of community participation in active transport, and participation in active community events.
- Local governments are well placed within communities to deliver and coordinate local solutions.
- Common strategies for physical activity promotion include development of bike/walk paths, open spaces, community events, and land zoning regulations.

**BEST PRACTICE FEATURES**

- Identify achievable strategies
- Focus on long-term goals
- Educate the community on the benefits of physical activity
- Extensive partnerships which pool resources and reduce duplication
- Collect data both pre and post intervention to allow for thorough evaluation of program outcomes
- Acknowledge needs and barriers within diverse and at-risk community groups

Meaning of the term

Physical activity is typically presented as the degree of community engagement with active transport and leisure activities, specifically walking and cycling, or active use of open community spaces such as schools or parks.

**Why is this priority important?**

Physical inactivity places a significant burden on community health, with inactivity directly contributing to one fifth of heart disease cases, and 16,000 premature deaths per year, representing 6.6% of the global burden of disease in Victoria.

Local governments are well placed to influence physical activity within the community as they are locally focused, can provide locally oriented solutions, and have a legislated mandate over the social and built environment of their communities.

Given the natural turnover of built infrastructure, local governments are also well placed to use their regulatory powers to ensure that areas of new or refurbished built environment are more conducive to physical activity.

**Description of the state of evidence**

The majority of physical activity promotion strategies for local government focus on built environment, regulatory intervention, or community engagement.

Commonly suggested strategies included the development of walk/bike tracks, and active transport routes. Both the availability and quality of available tracks (e.g. use of GPS technology, high traffic volumes and poor lighting) significantly impact active transport. Improving these factors may be an effective way to leverage other council priorities, such as community safety.

Regulatory intervention was discussed as a secondary method for developing the built environment for physical activity opportunities. Requirements can be written into land zoning regulations requiring developers to include open spaces and active transport routes in new areas. Regulating for greater active transport options also reduces traffic levels and vehicle emissions, and may further council objectives to those ends.

There are also significant opportunities to engage communities in physical activity through direct engagement (i.e. sporting events). It was widely noted that community events centered around physical activity not only afford a direct opportunity for activity, but also draw significant numbers of people into the area from outside the immediate locality, contributing to economic development.

The current body of evidence mostly discusses policy options at a qualitative level. There is little quantitative evidence to support some policy options over others in terms of measured outcomes such as health behaviors or biological indicators.
Key lessons for local government
Community education on the benefits of increased activity is a significant factor in engaging community members with activity promotion efforts. Similarly, the set of norms that the community holds around physical activity also influence participation.\(^6\)

It is critical for local government to form broad networks and partnerships in order to pool resources and avoid duplication of effort.\(^5\) In health promotion areas related to lifestyle, messages may conflict with those of well-financed and highly active private interests, so physical activity promotion efforts need to be as cost-effective as possible.

Collection of evidence (both pre and post intervention) for future evaluation is an integral part of understanding which interventions have the greatest impact.\(^5\)

Principles for best practice in addressing Physical Activity
Best practice, according to the reviewed literature features 6 components. Local governments must: 1) identify achievable strategies around improvement of the built environment, regulatory strategies and community engagement. Strategies should 2) focus on long-term goals, and 3) educate the community on the benefits of physical activity. These strategies should be backed by: 4) extensive partnerships which pool resources and reduce duplication, and 5) collect data both pre and post intervention to allow for thorough evaluation of program outcomes. Strategies must also 6) acknowledge needs and barriers within diverse and at-risk community groups.

References:
5. Be Active Western Australia. Increasing Physical Activity in Local Government Communities – An Integrated Approach. [online publication]: Government of Western Australia; 2010. 4 p.
Community Connectedness/Social Inclusion

This is a summary of relevant peer-reviewed and broader literature describing local government strategies for improving community connectedness and social inclusion.

KEY POINTS

- Community connectedness refers to interaction that a person has with others in their community and the community as a whole. Whereas social inclusion recognizes that many Victorians are excluded from the opportunities they need order to create the life they want.
- Local governments are best placed within communities to deliver and coordinate localized solutions.
- Common strategies for social inclusion and community connectedness refer to building capacity and awareness, targeting disadvantaged groups, and addressing negative attitudes and social stigma.

BEST PRACTICE FEATURES

- Evidence-based interventions
- Contextualized interventions
- Local government should tackle problems through innovation, not crisis intervention
- Social Inclusion builds capacity
- Strengthen social networks, particularly among older populations
- Involve disadvantaged groups in decision-making processes and related research

Meaning of the terms

A socially inclusive society is defined as one where all people feel valued, their differences are respected, and their basic needs are met so they can live with dignity. Community connectedness is the measure of how people come together and interact. It refers to an individual’s engagement in an interactive web of key relationships within a community. These interrelationships have particular physical and social structures that are affected by broad economic and political forces.

Why is this priority important?

The importance of understanding ‘social capital’ has become increasingly apparent in recent years. Social capital represents the benefits of informal sociability, cohesiveness and connection to the community and its social institutions. Research shows links between social connectedness and the performance of the economy and positive outcomes for individual health and wellbeing.

Local governments are strategically well placed to influence social inclusion and connectedness within the community as they are locally situated, they can provide locally oriented solutions, as well as influence the legislative mandate over the social and built environments in their communities.

Description of the state of evidence

There is clearly a lack of high-quality evidence available in the peer-reviewed literature, however a set of clear messages are communicated:

- Community capacity needs to be strengthened to improve social inclusion and connectedness
- Social inclusion helps to build capacity among individuals
- Those at greatest risk of exclusion are disadvantaged groups, such as those with mental illness, disability, Indigenous Australians.
- Disadvantaged groups need to be targeted, as well as included in decision-making processes and any related research. This, in turn, enhances self-esteem and self-resilience.

The vast majority of the current body of evidence discusses policy options at a qualitative level. There is little quantitative evidence to support some policy claims over others, in terms of measured outcomes such as general health or quality of life indicators.

Key lessons for Local Government

Improved community awareness, social networks and professional training are critical to the future success of community connectedness and social inclusiveness.

By leading and supporting the development of liveable communities with better access to housing, infrastructure, education, jobs and services and increased opportunities for participation, this is likely to strengthen a community to become a place where people want to live, work and raise families.

More specifically, governments should aim to tackle social problems through innovation and are focused on key disadvantaged groups. Such as people living with various illness, over-65s, and minority groups.

It is also important for Local government to form broad networks and partnerships in order to reach disadvantaged groups and maximise their opportunities to input into decisions that directly affect them.

References

4. Be Active Western Australia 2010. Increasing physical activity in local government communities – an integrated approach. Govt. of Western Australia.
G21 is an alliance of the government, industry and community organisations working to improve people's lives in the Geelong region.

G21 HWB Plan produced by Anne Somervile, the drawing board in collaboration with Professor Steven Allender, Deakin University.

Design by haildesign.com.au
9. GEELONG MAJOR EVENTS COMMITTEE - APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL REPRESENTATIVE

Portfolio: Tourism & Major Events – Cr Nelson
Source Projects, Recreation and Central Geelong / Events, Central Geelong & Waterfront
General Manager: Dean Frost
Index Reference Subject: Events / Geelong Major Events
Subject: Council Governance / Boards / Geelong Major Events Committee

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to have Council appoint an external representative to Geelong Major Events (GME) Committee.

Summary
• GME Committee was established as a Council Advisory Committee in 1998, and formalised under Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1989 in October 1999.
• GME Committee has overseen significant developments in the growth of existing events and the announcement of international and national events to be staged in Geelong including the Australian International Airshow, Festival of Sails, Pako Festa, Australian Masters Games and the largest event ever staged in Geelong, the 2010 UCI Road Cycling World Championships.
• GME Committee supported events stimulate substantial economic activity within the municipality (estimated to be up to $65.9 million for 2012/2013 from local and non-local sources and the equivalent 527 full-time jobs) and provide social links within our community.
• There are a maximum of ten positions on the GME Committee. External members comprise four of those positions.
• Caroline Moore resigned from the GME Committee resulting in a vacant external member term commencing November 2013 and expiring April 2016.
• Following public advertisements, eight (8) applications were received. A selection panel (comprising the Acting Mayor, the GME Chair, the Chief Executive Officer and an incumbent external committee member) reviewed applications and make a recommendation to Council regarding the appointment of an external committee member.

Cr Nelson moved, Cr Fisher seconded -
That Council:
1) appoint Dean Anglin as an external representative to the Geelong Major Events Committee for the remainder of the four-year term concluding April 2016.
2) thank the other applicants for their interest in participating on the Geelong Major Events Committee.

Carried.
9. GEELONG MAJOR EVENTS COMMITTEE - APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL REPRESENTATIVE (CONT’D)

Background

GME Committee was established as a Council Advisory Committee in 1998 and formalised under Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1989 in October 1999. The GME Committee Terms of Reference provide that the committee has been formed to co-ordinate the attraction, support and funding of events on behalf of the City.

GME Committee Terms of Reference also provides for the appointment of four external representatives from the business/media/arts or events community for a term of up to four years. In addition to the external representation, the GME Committee membership also includes:

- The Mayor and up to three other councillors appointed by Council
- The Chief Executive Officer
- The Executive Director of Geelong Otway Tourism

Caroline Moore (external representative) resigned from the GME Committee. This has resulted in a vacancy from November 2013, expiring April 2016.

Discussion

Following the advertisements communicating the requirement to fill the vacant external representative positions on GME Committee, eight (8) applications were received in total.

External representation on GME Committee is considered to be essential as it enables the committee to draw upon expertise and networks beyond Council. Specifically, experience relevant to the business, arts, events or media communities are seen as important.

All applications were reviewed by the selection panel consisting of the Acting Mayor, Chair of GME Committee, Chief Executive Officer and external member Julie Stefanoff. After careful consideration, the panel determined that Dean Anglin would best bring the required experience and specialist expertise to GME Committee.

Dean has strong media and business experience, existing contacts particularly in the sporting industry and the local business community, as well as sports management skills.

Environmental Implications

There are no environmental implications arising from this report.

Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report as no remuneration is paid to external representative positions on GME Committee.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

There is no policy, legal or statutory implications arising from this report. The appointment process is within the framework of the GME Terms of Reference and the Council Instrument of Delegation to GME.
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Alignment to City Plan

In the City Plan 2013-2017, Council has identified Growing Our Economy as one of its four key strategic objectives. City Plan tells us that one of the important priorities in this area is to see Greater Geelong as a leading city for tourism, arts, culture and events. The GME Strategy is identified in City Plan as being a key strategy that will assist Council in delivering Growing Our Economy priorities.

In addition, City Plan identifies its key partnerships in this area as including events related groups such as Victorian Major Events Company, Victorian Events Industry Council, along with event owners and operators. These key relationships are maintained and enhanced through the actions of the GME committee.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No officer involved in the preparation of this report has any direct or indirect interest

Risk Assessment

Staggered appointment durations were established in 2008 to minimise the risk of losing extensive expertise from the Committee at one time. Two incumbent external members have terms expiring in April 2014 and the two newest appointed external members will have terms expiring in April 2016 (which includes this appointment).

External representatives are fully briefed on their role on GME Committee thus ensuring that they each understand their roles and responsibilities. Information is also provided to external representatives regarding their obligations regarding declarations of Direct or Indirect Interest.

Social Considerations

The inclusion of external representatives on GME Committee supports and enhances the social benefit that events bring to the community.

Human Rights Charter

There are no human rights implications arising from this report.

Consultation and Communication

The appointment of a new external representative to the GME Committee will be communicated to key stakeholders and the media. The unsuccessful candidates are notified in writing thanking them for their application and interest in the GME committee.
Cr Heagney declared a Direct Interest in Agenda Item 10 – Plaques and Memorial Policy in that she is a member of the Board of the Geelong Cemeteries Trust and left the meeting room at 8.11pm prior to discussion of the item.

10. PLAQUES AND MEMORIAL POLICY

**Portfolio:** Governance - Cr Harwood (Acting Mayor)

**Source:** Corporate Services - Administration and Governance

**General Manager:** Jeff Wall

**Index Reference:** Subject: Policy Development

**Purpose**

To update the Plaques and Memorial policy to provide clarity on the application and authorisation process.

**Summary**

- Council receives requests from members of the public and organisations for the installation of a plaque or memorial to commemorate an event or structure, recognise an entity (such as a club or service organisation) or in memory of a person significant to the history of the locality.
- Plaques may be installed by council to commemorate the opening of a new or refurbished facility or to celebrate an event which may be of historical significance now or in the future.
- The existing policy has been reviewed and some procedural information has been removed and developed into an organisational procedure that deals with both external and internal requests for plaques and memorials.

Cr Macdonald moved, Cr Richards seconded -

That Council approves the updated – Plaques and Memorials Policy CPL40.9.

Carried.

**Background**

The purpose of this policy is to provide a framework for the installation of plaques and memorials by Council or initiated by the community.

The policy does not cover signage or display boards of a temporary nature for promoting forthcoming events.

**Discussion**

Plaques or memorials are important in recognising an event, structure, entity (such as a club or service organisation) or in memory of a person significant to the history of the locality.

The policy states Council’s intent to minimise the incidence of plaques and memorials, restrict criteria to events and persons of outstanding significance whilst ensuring that environmental impacts are kept to a minimum.

Changes to the Plaques and Memorials Policy include removal of any reference to procedural matters. These matters now form the basis of the Management Procedure – Plaques and Memorials.
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A form, with guidelines, has been developed to assist applicants when applying to Council for a plaque or memorial. All procedural matters are now dealt with in the Management Procedure.

Environmental Implications

There are no implications relative to the adoption of the policy. It recognises that design and placement should not intrude upon or damage the structure or natural environment. Specific applications made under the policy would be assessed in relation to the nominated site.

Financial Implications

The procedure provides for any costs to be borne by applicants or as part of the Council project.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The policy provides a framework for the installation of plaques and memorials by Council or initiated by the community.

Alignment to City Plan

How we do business - Lead by advocating and collaborating on issues important to the Greater Geelong community.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No officer involved in the preparation of the policy has a conflict of interest.

Risk Assessment

The policy recognises that design and placement should not create a public risk and that construction should require little maintenance and should be resistant to vandalism.

Social Considerations

While not encouraging a proliferation of plaques and memorials, the policy sets criteria for their placement recognising an event, structure, entity (such as a club or service organisation) or in memory of a person significant to the history of the locality, the procedure details how this will be done.

Human Rights Charter

In developing this report to Council, the subject matter has been considered to determine if it raises any human rights issues. In particular, whether the scope of any human right established by the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities is in any way limited, restricted or interfered with by the recommendations contained in this report. It is considered that the subject matter does not raise any human rights issues.

Consultation and Communication

The policy and application form will be available through Customer Service Centres and on council’s website.

All relevant departments have been involved in the development of the updated policy.
1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide a framework for the installation of all plaques or memorials whether in or on buildings, on the pavement, in parks, gardens, streets or public places. All plaques or memorials installed within the City need to conform to this policy.

Some parks or other locations already contain plaques or memorials that predate this Policy. These markers can contribute to an understanding of significant events or persons closely associated with the area’s history. An existing memorial or plaque should not, however, be taken as a precedent for future approvals.

Objectives in relation to plaques and memorials are to:

- Minimise the incidence of plaques and memorials in open space
- Restrict plaques and memorials to events or persons of outstanding significance to an area
- Minimise the risks and environmental impact of plaques and memorials

2. REFERENCES

- Guidelines for Geographic Names
- Management Procedure – Plaques and Memorials
- CoGG Public Art Strategy
- CoGG Style Guide
- Greater Geelong City Council General Local Law 2005

3. DEFINITIONS

Plaque-

- A flat tablet of metal, stone or other material which includes text or images which commemorate a person, event or historical information relative to the location or a new public artwork of significance

Memorial-
• An object established in memory of a person, association, anniversary or event and includes a monument.

Open Space-
• Open space refers to all land owned and/or managed by Council that is zoned Public Park and Recreation Zone or Public Conservation Resource Zone and is available for public access. Typically open space includes parks, gardens, trails, habitat corridors, utilities reserves, foreshores, waterways, sportsgrounds and conservation reserves. It does not include vacant municipal land zoned for other purposes.

Public Place-
• Public Place refers to road reserves, Municipal Buildings, streetscapes and other council lands that are owned and/or managed by Council.

4. COUNCIL POLICY

4.1. Existing plaques and memorials will generally be retained. If the existing site is inappropriate, maintenance costs prohibitive or the condition of the plaque or memorial is poor, those originally involved in its placement should, where practical, be consulted before re-sitting or removal. Replacement plaques or memorials of different style or form may also be considered.

4.2. Council does not encourage the installation of plaques and memorials in open space and only events or people of outstanding significance may be commemorated by a plaque or memorial. Subjects for plaques and memorials will be limited to the following:
• an individual or Association that has contributed significantly to the cultural, political or social aspects of Geelong’s development;
• an individual or Association strongly linked to the City of Greater Geelong and its history;
• a significant anniversary of an event unique to the history and development of the locality;
• historical or other information relevant to the site/location of the plaque.
• A public artwork of significance.

4.3. Recognition of significant contributions for open space infrastructure can be acknowledged by way of a small plaque mounted to the infrastructure. Funding agreements from Government agencies regularly have this as a requirement.

4.4. Plaques and memorials shall be designed in consideration of the general character of the area and sited so as not intrude upon or damage the structure or natural environment or otherwise create a public risk. Their construction should require little maintenance and should be resistant to vandalism.

4.5. While an approved plaque or memorial will be located at the designated site for a period of not less than ten years, Council maintains the right to
remove or relocate it should the site be redeveloped or significantly changed in character. Council does not guarantee the retention of any plaque or memorial..

5. QUALITY RECORDS

Quality Records shall be retained for at least the period shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record</th>
<th>Retention/Disposal Responsibility</th>
<th>Retention Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As per 4.8.6</td>
<td>Asset Manager</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Corporate Records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. ATTACHMENTS

- Plaques & Memorials Application Form.
Conditions

Subjects for plaques and memorials will be limited to the following:

- an individual or entity that has contributed significantly to the cultural, political or social aspects of Geelong’s development;
- an individual or entity strongly linked to the City of Greater Geelong and its history;
- a significant event or structure unique to the history and development of the locality;
- historical or other information relevant to the site/location of the plaque.

Installation of a memorial commemorating a person will not generally be considered within three years of the death of that person, to allow for the development of a historical perspective and for consideration of the criteria for significance.

Memorials commemorating the death of domestic animals are not permitted on public land.

Where possible, applicants are encouraged to consider methods of commemoration which supports Council’s open space management aims (eg. tree planting, seating, shade structures, inclusion of information in interpretive material, donations to aid projects/programs).

Plaques and memorials shall be designed and sited so as not intrude upon or damage the structure or natural environment or otherwise create a public risk. Their construction should require little maintenance and should be resistant to vandalism.

Council maintains the right to remove or relocate a plaque or memorial should the site be redeveloped or significantly changed in character. Council does not guarantee the retention of any plaque or memorial.

The person or group making the request is responsible for covering all costs associated with the proposed facility (e.g. park bench, fountain, etc), including production, installation and maintenance.

Proposed sites for plaques and memorials should meet Council’s planning requirements.

Applicant Details

Surname: ___________________________ First Name: ___________________________

Company Name: ____________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________

Suburb: ___________________________ Postcode: ________________________________

Phone (H): _________________________ Phone (W) _____________________________

Phone (M) __________________________ Email: ________________________________
**Memorial Plaque Details**

The wording I wish to place on the memorial/plaque is:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the installation of a memorial plaque (brief statement of significance of event or person concerned and how the proposal meets Council’s guidelines):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Location of the Memorial**

(please attach a photo or sketch of preferred location)

**Agreement and Signature**

I understand that I will be responsible for all costs associated with the design, manufacture, installation and maintenance of the plaque or memorial.

Applicant Signature (s) ____________________________ Date ________________

____________________________________________________________________  ________________

Privacy Statement:

The personal details requested on this form are being collected and will be used for the purpose of an application to place a memorial plaque. The supply of information by you is voluntary. If you cannot provide or do not wish to provide the information sought, Council officers may not be able to process your application. You may make application for access or amendment to information by contacting Council on 52725272.
Cr Heagney re-entered the meeting room at 8.13pm.

11. COUNCIL ATTENDANCE AT INTERNATIONAL GAMBLING CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio:</th>
<th>Community Safety, Education &amp; Youth – Cr Farrell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Community Services / Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager:</td>
<td>Jenny McMahon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Reference</td>
<td>Community &amp; Social Planning / Gambling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek Council endorsement for a Councillor to attend the biennial international gambling conference in New Zealand.

Summary

- The 5th International Gambling Conference will be held in Auckland New Zealand, 18 - 21 February, 2014.
- Attending the conference will provide an opportunity for Council to stay abreast of new research on issues relating to problem gambling to better inform Council’s policy and decision making in relation to gambling matters.
- More than $108 million was lost on electronic gaming machines in the City of Greater Geelong during the 2012/13 financial year. While this represents an eight percent reduction on the previous year, problem gambling remains a continuing issue for Council in its efforts to reduce harm in the community.
- The conference will provide an excellent networking opportunity for attendees and raises the potential for future collaborations. As in previous years, it is expected delegates from around the world will attend.
- In accordance with Council Policy, a report of the conference proceedings will be presented to Council.
- It is appropriate that Cr Farrell as the Community Safety Portfolio holder and the Chair of the Geelong Gambling Advisory Committee be the Council nominated representative at this conference.

Cr Farrell moved, Cr Irvine seconded -

That Council having regard to the Councillors’ Expenses and Facilities Policy authorise Cr Farrell to attend the International Gambling Conference in Auckland, New Zealand.

Carried.

Division Requested:

For: Crs Ansett, Nelson, Fisher, S Kontelj, Harwood, Macdonald, Richards, Heagney, Farrell, Irvine
Against: Nil.

Background

The 5th International Gambling Conference will be held in New Zealand from 18 to the 21 February 2014.
11. COUNCIL ATTENDANCE AT INTERNATIONAL GAMBLING CONFERENCE (CONT’D)

The conference organisers state that this is the only international gambling conference that does not accept gambling industry funding. In comparison, the Australian organisation, the National Association for Gambling Studies (NAGS), holds its gambling conference in Australia in November or December each year and has strong ties to the gaming industry.

Previous conferences have been very successful with very positive comments from participants. Cr Farrell attended the conference in 2012. A report by Cr Farrell was tabled at Council’s Ordinary Meeting on 27 March 2012.

In addition, as Chair of the City of Greater Geelong Gambling Advisory Committee, Cr Farrell has a leadership role in the promotion of problem gambling issues in the Geelong region. Cr Farrell is also a member of the Victorian Local Government Working Group on gambling (a working group of the Victorian Local Governance Association).

The City of Greater Geelong Gambling Advisory Committee has representation from gambling venues, Gamblers Help, welfare services, as well as G21, and neighbouring municipalities, and provides direction to Council in the area of problem gambling.

The Committee has provided a valuable conduit for neighbouring Councils in gaining information on the latest changes in the electronic gambling environment. Cr Farrell, as the Chair of the Committee is best placed to attend the conference and bring her learnings back to Council and the Committee.

Discussion

Council’s current Strategic Gaming Policy directs a harm minimisation approach to problem gambling. The Policy identifies activities undertaken by Council towards reducing such negative impacts including taking an advocacy role in relation to government policies; adopting a community development role in terms of engaging and informing the community on issues relating to problem gaming; and, where possible, to facilitate research into the extent and effects of problem gaming in the local community.

$108.2 million was lost by people in Geelong from gambling on Electronic Gaming Machines (EGMs) during the 2012/13 financial year. While this represents a drop of approximately 8% when compared to the previous year, it still raises concerns when one examines the figure in the light of the Commonwealth Productivity Commission Inquiry into problem gambling (2009) finding that approximately 40% of gaming losses are from problem gamblers.

This conference provides an opportunity for Council to gain new perspectives from gambling researchers, new policy approaches from overseas and examples of best practice by service providers when dealing with problem gambling.

Including the pre-conference workshops, the conference will take place over four full days (18-21 February 2014) and will include the following key note speakers:

Professor John Warren Kindt

John Kindt is an emeritus professor of business at the University of Illinois and a senior editor of the United States International Gaming Report. Prof. Kindt’s specialty research has been focused on the societal, business, and economic impacts of decriminalising gambling activities.
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Professor Gerda Reith

Professor Gerda Reith is Professor of Social Science at the University of Glasgow. Prof. Reith’s research centres on problematic forms of consumption, particularly those considered risky or ‘addictive’.

Judge Mark G. Farrell

Judge Mark G. Farrell is the Senior Justice in the Amherst, New York Criminal and Civil Court, which operates in the largest suburban jurisdiction in New York State. Judge Farrell currently operates the nation's only Gambling Treatment Court. He developed a gambling treatment protocol in the criminal justice system.

Attendees at the previous New Zealand conference numbered around 230 and came from fifteen countries across the globe – New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, United Kingdom, Australia, Japan, Sweden, Germany, Singapore, Finland, Macau, Singapore, China, Switzerland and the USA.

This provided the opportunity for increasing Council’s network and engagement with others who are working to minimise the harms caused by problem gambling.

Across the world gambling industries are changing and evolving, expanding into new markets and reaching new demographics. The emergence of sports betting and internet gambling are examples of such changes. Council has continually sought to reduce the harms caused by electronic gaming machines (pokies). It has been in a position to monitor the changes in the gaming environment due to the level of state regulation of the industry. However, much of the internet gambling in Australia is unregulated and there is little knowledge of its growth and associated loss of income to the local economy. Attendance at the conference will enable formal and informal discussions with professionals and lay people from other countries in how this emerging problem is being dealt with.

It is timely therefore for Council to send a representative to the 5th annual conference.

Environmental Implications

Not applicable.

Financial Implications

The cost of the travel and attendance at the conference is estimated at approx $2,000. These costs include early bird conference registration, travel to and from New Zealand, meals and accommodation while at the conference.

The funding for the Councillor attendance is in accordance with the City of Greater Geelong Councillors’ Expenses and Facilities policy.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

Overseas and interstate travel by Council representatives is to be undertaken within the context of Council policy which includes endorsement by Council. A report will be presented to both Council and the Gambling Advisory Committee on the conference proceedings as is required by Council policy.
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*Alignment to City Plan*

The Conference will raise ideas for minimising harm from problem gambling. This is consistence with Council's City Plan in increasing community wellbeing.

*Officer Direct or Indirect Interest*

Council Officer has no direct or indirect interest in the outcome of this report.

*Risk Assessment*

Conference attendance will contribute to Council’s body of knowledge regarding problem gambling and similarly better enable Council to respond to gambling permit applications.

*Social Considerations*

The City of Greater of Geelong has leadership role in defending the wellbeing of the municipality. The negative impacts of gambling in the community can have an enormous impact on some families and communities. Attending an international conference will offer an excellent opportunity to increase Council’s knowledge in how to best minimise the harm from problem gambling.

*Human Rights Charter*

The recommendation of this report is in line with the Human Rights Charter, particularly protection of families and children.

*Consultation and Communication*

The Community Development Department is responsible for the communication of this report in conjunction with Council’s Media Service Unit.
12. DELEGATION TO THE CEO - STEAD PARK HOCKEY PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT TENDER

Portfolio: Sport and Recreation - Cr Irvine
Corio Ward – Cr Fisher

Source: Recreation, Projects and Central Geelong / Capital Projects

General Manager: Dean Frost

Index Reference: Project: C14803 – 2013/14 Stead Park Hockey Precinct Development
Property: ID# 290839 (190-216 Princess Highway, Corio)

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek Council consent to delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the power to accept or reject tenders for the Stead Park Hockey Precinct Development, provided tenders fall within the adopted budget.

Summary

- The design process for the Stead Park Hockey Precinct Development is nearing completion and Council will soon be inviting tenders for the construction of a new synthetic grass hockey pitch at the reserve.
- The construction of pitches such as these needs to be undertaken during the optimal time of the year (January to March) to ensure the likelihood of favourable weather conditions for the installation of the synthetic playing surface.
- The aim is to have a contract in place with a suitably experienced contractor prior to the end of the calendar year so that works may commence as soon as possible in 2014.

Cr Irvine moved, Cr Fisher seconded -

That Council delegate to the Chief Executive Officer its powers and functions to accept or reject a tender and sign the contract documents for the construction and associated works for a new hockey pitch at Stead Park, Corio, provided they are within budget.

Carried.

Background

The G21 Regional Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan identified the need for a second hockey pitch within the G21 region based on estimated growth and participation rates. A Master Plan was developed for Stead Park in 2009 that reinforced the site as the best site for a regional hockey venue within the G21 region.

On the back of this planning and investigation, CoGG was able to mount a strong and successful case when applying for the SRV Community Facility Funding Program 2013/14 – Major Facilities Category.

With Council’s confirmed budget allocation of $1,001,000, the projects funding was guaranteed with the State Government contribution via the SRV program.
12. DELEGATION TO THE CEO - STEAD PARK HOCKEY PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT TENDER (CONT'D)

Discussion

The Capital Projects and Contracts and Purchasing departments are finalising the necessary documentation in order to put the works out to open tender in early November 2013, with the aim of assessing and awarding the tender prior to the end of year break.

The timing for the appointment of a contractor means that it would be beneficial if the Chief Executive Officer can enter into the contracts under delegation.

If awarding of this contract is delayed it may have a major impact on project delivery, as it would mean that the availability of the limited field of highly qualified surface applicators could result in them not being booked in time for the optimum weather period for this sort of work.

Environmental Implications

Stead Park Recreation Reserve is intersected with an open stormwater drain, and as such is subject to a flooding overlay which requires approval from the Corangamite Catchment Management Authority (CCMA) to build on the proposed site. Written approval from the CCMA will therefore need to be received as part of the approval process.

Financial Implications

Council was successful in its application to the State Government earlier this year as part of the 2013/14 Community Facility Funding Program. As a result, the project budget is $1,876,000 and is funded as per the following breakdown:

| 2013/14 Council budgetary allocation | $1,001,000 |
| State Government Grants | $625,000 |
| Geelong Hockey Association contribution | $250,000 |

The State Government grant commitment is dependent on Council meeting progress milestones and opening dates. Therefore our ability to move through the tender stage under delegation will help us meet funding conditions.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

Against the above timeframes and expected milestones there may be inadequate time for Council to formally determine the outcome of the tenders in its normal capacity. This report provides the policy and legal mechanisms necessary for the CEO to award or reject tenders.

Alignment to City Plan

The construction of the 2nd hockey pitch at Stead Park is one of the key facility development upgrades identified in the Stead Park Master Plan, endorsed by Council in January 2010.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

No council officers involved in this project or report have declared a direct or indirect interest in this matter.
12. **DELEGATION TO THE CEO - STEAD PARK HOCKEY PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT TENDER (CONT'D)**

*Risk Assessment*

There will be a risk to Council’s reputation and grant funding commitments if these projects cannot be completed in line with the time requirements stipulated in the Funding Agreement between council and the State Government.

*Social Considerations*

Council’s commitment to the construction of the 2nd hockey pitch at Stead Park is in response to analysis of the current participation levels and future growth statistics of the sport in Geelong.

If Council is unable to complete this project in a timely manner then there is the potential that the opportunities for growth in 2014 could be negatively affected. It will also leave the Geelong Hockey Association in the position of not be able to bid for the opportunity to host regional and state hockey events.

*Human Rights Charter*

It is not evident or likely that this report would negatively impact any of the rights contained in the Charter of Human Rights.

*Consultation and Communication*

Public consultation during the formulation of the Stead Park Master Plan 2009 enabled council to sign off on this document, thereby satisfying the requirements for fair and reasonable public consultation to be met. There are no further communication requirements with acceptance of the proposed recommendation.

**Portfolio:** Finance – Cr S Kontelj  
**Source:** Corporate Services – Financial Services  
**General Manager:** Jeff Wall  
**Index Reference:** Financial Management \ Budget 2014-2015

**Purpose**
To approve a schedule of events, including community consultation and meetings of the Executive and Council to prepare the 2014-2015 Budget in order for Council to meet its statutory obligations.

**Summary**
- The draft Proposed Budget will be reviewed at Council briefing sessions throughout March, April and May 2014.
- A new initiative of community engagement will be instigated for the 2014-2015 Budget to assist development of community priorities.
- The Council meeting scheduled for 13 May 2014 will give public notice of the Proposed Budget and following consideration of any submissions, the timetable provides for a further meeting of Council to adopt the Budget on 24 June 2014.
- The timetable provides for a 28 day period for submissions to be reviewed regarding the Proposed Budget.
- Any delays in achieving the target dates are likely to have the impact of extending the timetable accordingly.

**Cr S Kontelj moved, Cr Richards seconded -**


Carried.

**Background**
Although the Local Government Act 1989 does not require Council to adopt a budget until the end of August, there are financial and management implications associated with not completing this exercise by 30 June. These include:

- A lack of internal control to monitor and manage the financial position of the City, ie. actual versus budget.
- The possibility of having to delay the first rate instalment if the rate notices cannot be issued by early September due to the late adoption of the budget which includes the designated property differential rates.
- Implementing any Fees & Charges pricing changes and the associated implications of achieving the budgeted income levels, etc.
13. 2014-2015 BUDGET / CITY PLAN TIMETABLE (CONT’D)

Discussion

A timetable for the preparation of the 2014-2015 Budget / City Plan has been prepared to enable the Budget to be adopted by Council on 24 June 2014.


A new initiative of community engagement will be instigated for the 2014-2015 Budget to assist development of community concepts.

Appendix 13-2 outlines the process for community engagement.

Appendix 13-3 is a draft Community Concept form, which captures details of the project. This form is to be lodged for evaluation.

A more detailed timetable is prepared for internal purposes. The 2014-2015 Budget / City Plan 2013-2017 (2014-2015 Update) process will commence with work on the preliminary tasks, and therefore commitment to the project plan and timetable is necessary from all stakeholders. Any delays in achieving identified tasks are likely to extend the timetable accordingly.

City Plan 2013-2017 (2014-2015 Update) will be informed by a series of workshops with the Councillors, Executive Management, Joint Managers Team, Joint Coordinators Team and the Community.

The Annual Budget is an important document that supports the strategic directions of Council for the next twelve months and beyond.

Key steps in the process:

- Council’s Budget is based on the City Plan which contains Council objectives and strategies.
- Community Priorities (Concepts) will be developed according to agreed budget guidelines.
- Community engagement process will assist development of Community initiatives commencing from 12 December 2013.
- Councillors will be briefed at Council Meetings throughout March, April, and May to finalise the Budget.
- Council Briefing #3 and #4 will occur prior to Easter holidays. This will allow sufficient time for community engagement as per the new initiative in relation to community priorities.
- The Council meeting scheduled for 13 May 2014 will give public notice of the Proposed Budget / City Plan. Following consideration of submissions, the timetable provides for a further meeting of Council to adopt the Budget / City Plan on 24 June 2014.
- The scheduled Council Briefing sessions will be incorporated in Councillors diaries once dates are adopted.

Environmental Implications

There are no environmental considerations associated with the recommendation.
13.  2014-2015 BUDGET / CITY PLAN TIMETABLE (CONT’D)

Financial Implications

There are possible financial implications to the City if the Annual Budget is not adopted by 24 June 2014. These include:

- A lack of internal control to monitor and manage the financial position of the City, ie. actual versus budget.
- The possibility of having to delay the first rate instalment if the rate notices cannot be issued by early September due to the late adoption of the Budget which includes the designated property differential rates.

Policy/Legal/Statutory Implications

The timetable complies with the requirements for the Local Government Act for preparation of the Budget.

Alignment to City Plan

This report ensures the City Plan and Budget are completed according to a timetable and contributes to responsible and sustainable financial management as aligned in Council’s City Plan objective on How We Do Business.

Officer Direct or Indirect Interest

There is no direct or indirect interest by Council Officers involved in the preparation of this report.

Risk Assessment

Although not required to adopt the Annual Budget until August, there are adverse implications if the process is delayed. These include:

- A lack of internal control to monitor the financial position of the City into the new financial year.
- Delays in commencing (and therefore completion) of projects identified within the Annual Budget.
- Delaying the issuing of the first rate instalment notices (due in early September) and possible breaches of the Local Government Act.

Social Considerations

There are no social considerations associated with this recommendation.

Human Rights Charter

There are no known positive or negative effects.

Consultation and Communication

The Budget / City Plan timetable provides for community consultation at the front end of the budget process and also once the draft budget is published. The new initiative of community engagement will commence in December 2013 to assist development of community priorities.
## 2014-2015 Budget Timetable Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Executive Management</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Meeting – Geelong West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thur, 12 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Meeting - Potato Shed, Drysdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 16 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Community Engagement Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Day Community Priority Submission Period Closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friday, 17 Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoVu Project Concepts (C, R &amp; D) (guidelines &amp; parameters)</td>
<td>Mon, 2 Dec 2013 to Fri, 24 Jan 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 9 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Discussion – Long Term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tue, 18 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary 2014 Revaluation Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tue, 25 Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Briefing Session (assumptions, guidelines and budget model)</td>
<td>Mon, 3 Mar 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Briefing – Budget Review Session #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 3 Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rating Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital Plan / Non Capital / Disbursements / Recurrent Increments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget input to be completed by Units (signoff by General Manager's and submit, including Employee Budget and Fees &amp; Charges)</td>
<td>Mon, 3 Mar 2014 To Fri, 21 Mar 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Holiday: Labour Day Mon, 10 March 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Briefing – Budget Review Session #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 24 Mar 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft Capital / Non Capital / Disbursements / Recurrent Increments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT Budget Review Session (review completion of budget input)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wed, 2 Apr 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Briefing – Budget Review Session #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 7 Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Briefing – Budget Review Session #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon, 14 Apr 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 April – 21 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Holidays: Easter Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 April – 21 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Holiday: Anzac Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri, 25 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Meeting to adopt Proposed 2014-2015 Budget, City Plan and Fees and Charges (28 day period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Meeting Tue, 13 May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget / City Plan Submissions Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri, 13 Jun 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Briefing – Budget Submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tue, 17 Jun 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Meeting to formally adopt Final 2014-2015 Budget / City Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Meeting Tue, 24 Jun 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-2015 Community Engagement Process

The 2014-2015 Budget Timetable provides for the provision of a new initiative of community engagement. It is planned to conduct community engagement meetings, with two meetings confirmed, one at the Geelong West Town Hall (6pm, 12 December 2013) and one at the Potato Shed in Drysdale (6pm, 16 December 2013). Provision for an additional two meetings will also be scheduled.

**Purpose of Meetings**
The Community Engagement meetings will be to outline and assist the development of community priorities.

Community concepts represent projects and initiatives to create a community asset or to fund a Council program.

A presentation will be undertaken by the CEO to outline in detail what community concepts are and explain some of the projects funded. The CEO will also advise the process for making a community priority submission and criteria for considering the submission for each of the 12 wards.

**Promotion of the Event**
City News, Community Update and the geelongaustralia website will be used to promote the community engagement meetings.

A ‘Community Concept Submission’ form will be developed and made available at customer service centres and on the web for ease of access and completion, including electronic lodgement.

**Role of the Ward Councillor**
Submissions received relating to 2014-2015 community priorities will be evaluated by the appropriate ward councillor. They will then be forwarded to Financial Services staff for the purpose of distribution to the relevant Council Officer for the scoping and detailed costing of a project concept. Project concepts will then be forwarded in the normal manner to the Executive Management Team.

The potential criteria for evaluation of submissions will include:
- Fit with City Plan and existing Council strategies.
- Preference for creation of community asset, rather than grant funding or disbursements.
- Urgency - Mandatory, Critical & High priority.
- Key Drivers – customer service, asset management, business efficiency, statutory requirement.
- Council Portfolio initiative.

**Process**
Submissions will be launched as from the public meetings in December and the submission period will be for a period of 28 days, closing in January, to then be considered by Council as part of the budget process.

Financial Services will receive and sort the submissions by ward and distribute to councillors. The Councillors will evaluate, prioritise and then authorise those submissions to be further considered and costed by Council Officers as project Concepts.
Appendix 13-3

Community Concepts

![Community Concept Form](image-url)
NOTICE OF MOTION – Cr E Kontelj

REALLOCATION OF CAPITAL FUNDS

In 2011 Council contributed funds for the Education department to construct two netball courts at Western Heights College, as part of an extensive redevelopment of the school. Under a partnership agreement Bell Park Sporting Club – Netball, based at the adjacent Council owned Hamlyn Park Reserve, were to have access for their home and away season.

As part of the described works, two bus shelters were installed for timekeepers. The existing shelters are considered sub-standard by the netball league, not allowing room for players interchange. Since their installation the glass shelters have been subject to extensive, repeated vandalism damage.

The education department are currently undertaking a redevelopment of the netball courts. It is proposed to reallocate funds identified through project savings on the below identified projects to contribute toward lowering the fencing on the east and west side to enhance the spectators experience, secondly upgrade the existing shelters to accommodate players and timekeepers, in accordance with best practice for player interchange and timekeeper function. The shelters will be constructed from robust pressed metal; the design has been installed at the Kardinia Park netball facility and proven successful since the 2010 development.

2012/2013 Project C13834 Osborne Park Improvements, included upgrade works to the existing car park and designs for future extension to the existing sporting club pavilion. This project has been completed, the identified funds are surplus, reallocation of surplus funds will assist in a quality outcome for the community.

Cr S Kontelj moved, Cr Nelson seconded –
That Council support the following reallocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowie</td>
<td>Osborne Park Improvements</td>
<td>-$5,058</td>
<td>C13834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowie</td>
<td>2013 Western Heights College Netball Courts redevelopment</td>
<td>$5,058</td>
<td>D67142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried.
NOTICE OF MOTION – Cr M Heagney

CENTRAL GEELONG ACTION PLAN - UPDATE

The Central Geelong Taskforce has reached a significant milestone regarding the development of the Central Geelong Action Plan.

During the week commencing 21 October, over 120 landowners, business owners and residents participated in Central Geelong Action Setting workshops.

This group of people should be commended not only for the time they gave, but the enthusiasm and positive attitude to the future of Central Geelong. The many ideas, thoughts and suggested actions are available on the ‘Our Central Geelong’ website (www.yoursaygeelong.com.au/our-central-geelong) and we welcome feedback and further contributions via this website until 8 November.

It is important to also recognise the efforts of the staff as part of the Central Geelong Taskforce. The timelines to have this project completed by the end of the year is very ambitious. Staff has needed to work long hours, including over weekends and the recent public holiday to facilitate the effective functioning of the workshop.

As Taskforce Special Committee Chair, I believe this should be acknowledged.

Cr Heagney moved, Cr Richards seconded -

That Council:

1) thank the community participants for their contributions in the Action Setting workshops and encourage their ongoing involvement in the revitalisation of Central Geelong;

2) acknowledges and appreciates the efforts of Central Geelong Taskforce staff in relation to the success of the Action Setting workshops.

Carried.
NOTICE OF MOTION – Cr Richards

TRAIN STATIONS IN CITY OF GREATER GEELONG

Council has two main duties to the community – to deal with issues related to council, and to advocate on behalf of its community on federal and state government issues. Public transport, and in particular, rail transport is an issue for the Victorian state government in terms of managing and administrating the rail transport system, and an issue for state and federal government in terms of capital funding for new infrastructure. The City of Greater Geelong contains several train stations that are part of the VLine network. The state government is also planning to build another train station at Waurn Ponds/Armstrong Creek.

The Regional Rail Link project, which will build new rail lines from Victorian regional cities including Geelong, involves a number of new purpose built train stations in Melbourne's west, and multi million dollar upgrades to existing stations such as Footscray. When finished in 2016, the Regional Rail Link Geelong line is expected to deliver better train services with more reliability, resulting in increased patronage on rail services between Geelong and Melbourne. Although the Regional Rail Link project does not include any upgrades for train stations in the City of Greater Geelong, there are still three years in which to address this issue. However, rail station upgrades generally have long lead in times, in terms of planning and budget.

Given the ramifications of the Regional Rail Link project and council’s role in advocating for its community, it is timely that council develops a policy position on what is required to improve all Geelong train stations, so it can be advocated to state government on behalf of the community. Issues that will need to be addressed include provision of parking, matching bus services, traffic and road works, pedestrian and cycling access, disabled access, public safety and security, and on platform amenities. Council policy positions should be developed with public consultation as the most important element. A council submissions process that is publicly advertised, and where residents can make both written and verbal submissions will establish the issues that need addressing in regard to upgrading Geelong train stations.

Cr Richards moved, Cr Macdonald seconded -

That Council conduct a public submissions process in regard to all issues involving Geelong train stations. The written submissions period is to be held in the first quarter of 2014, and to be for a period of four weeks. A Council Submissions Panel consisting of the Transport portfolio holder, and a minimum of two other Councillors, will be constituted to hear verbal submissions in the four week period following the written submissions period. A report to Council will be presented by end of May 2014.

Carried.
ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS RECORD

Portfolio: Governance – Cr Harwood (Acting Mayor)
Source: Corporate Services
General Manager: Jeff Wall

Summary

• Section 80A (2) of the Local Government Act 1989 requires the record of an Assembly of Councillors be reported to the next practicable Ordinary Meeting of Council.

• A record of Assembly of Councillors meeting(s) is attached as an Appendix to this report.

Cr Macdonald moved, Cr Ansett seconded -
That the information be received.
Carried.
# RECORD OF ASSEMBLIES OF COUNCILLORS
(Council Meeting 12 November 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assembly Details</th>
<th>Councillor Attendees</th>
<th>Officer Attendees</th>
<th>Matters Discussed</th>
<th>Conflict of Interest Disclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Disability Advisory Committee 14 October 2013 | Cr Fisher            | K Pritchard (MGR) S Muratti (OFF) C Carlyon (OFF) | • National Insurance Disability Agency  
• Simonds Stadium  
• Geelong Railway Station Upgrade  
• Geelong Visitor Access Centre  
• Step by Step Program (Volunteering Glg)  
• Street Access Committee  
• International Day of People with Disability  
• White Cane Day  
• Bus Stop Protocol  
• Broken Pipe Cap  
• Exemplar of an Accessible Building  
• Grovedale Station  
• Run Geelong  
• Geelong Show  
• Footpath Graffiti | Nil. |
• Amendment C265 – Flood Overlays in Portarlington East, Corio, Newcomb and Whittington – Consideration of Panel Report  
• Amendment C285 – Manzeene Avenue, Lara – Residential Rezoning – Consideration of Submissions  
• Statutory Planning Process Review  
• Budget Timetable 2014/2015  
• Recreational Vehicle – Issues and Opportunities  
• Planning Authority for Avalon Airport Rail Link  
• Plaques and Memorial Policy and Procedure  
• Emergency Management Three Year Strategic Plan 2014-2016  
• Capital Project Result 2012-2013  
• G21 Regional Health and Wellbeing Plan 2013-2017  
• Municipal Early Years Plan 2013-2017  
• Tender T1400015 (Contractual) | Nil. |
- Council Attendance at International Gambling Conference
- Geelong Major Events Committee – Appointment of External Representative
- Delegation to the Chief Executive Officer – Stead Park Hockey Precinct Development Tender
- Emergency Management Activity and Annual Fire Season Preparation Report 2012-2013
- Revocation of Flood Prone Area Designation of New Lots at Armstrong Creek
CLOSE OF MEETING

As there was no further business the meeting closed at 9.02pm. Tuesday, 12 November 2013.

Signed: ___________________________________________

Chairperson

Date of Confirmation: ________________________________