



Section 223 Panel Hearing and Consideration of Submissions

Wednesday, 29 July 2020

Location

Virtual Meeting

Panel Members

Cr Brett Tessari - Mayor

Cr Geoff Ellis – Deputy Mayor

Cr Bruce Kent

Cr Pamela Rothfield

Cr Julian Brown

Cr Stephen Fullarton

Cr Michael Whelan

Cr Clare Le Serve

Cr Les Larke



Budget Submissions

Budget Report, Special Meeting of Council – 29 July 2020

Draft Budget Submissions Submitters

No	Submitter
1	Mark Jamieson – Chairman of Phillip Island Golf Club
2	Graham Jolly
3	Lorraine Muir – President of Bass Coast Regional Aquatic Centre
4	Graham Jolly
5	Meryl and Hartley Tobin
6	Janne and Bill Morrison
7	Graham Jolly
8	Trevor Brown
9	Grantville Business and Community Association
10	Tim Herring and Tenby Point Residents Association
11	Danni Luna
12	Corinella Foreshore Reserve Committee of Management
13	Kevin Griffin Bass Coast Ratepayers and Residents Association
14	Frank Schoonevedt
15	Mike Fincher
16	Andrea Bolch
17	Graham Jolly
18	Linda Marston - Island Voice
19	Graham Jolly
20	<i>Submission Withdrawn by Submitter</i>
21	Graham Jolly
22	Graham Jolly

**Draft Budget Submissions
Submitters**

No	Submitter
23	Graham Jolly
24	Jessica Harrison - Housing Matters Committee
25	Phil Wright
26	Phil Dressing - Smiths Beachcomber Association
27	Ron Day
28	Rhyll Community Association
29	Elizabeth Sparkes
30	Jane Gardner
31	Graham Jolly



Draft Budget Submissions
Summary of Submissions

Summary of Submission

No	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Officer Comment
1	Mark Jamieson Chairman Phillip Island Golf Club	<p>The PIGC is seeking funding to improve the clubs energy efficiency including a large roofed pergola, frame work for indoor/outdoor blinds.</p> <p>The funding request of \$20,000 is for materials only as they have skilled members of the club to do the construction.</p> <p>The pergola is needed is to increase energy efficiency and achieve financial sustainability with increased useability.</p> <p>PIGC have previously applied for a grant in 2019 through Building Stronger Communities through Russell Broadbent's office, however the grant application was unsuccessful.</p>	<p>Grant funding of \$20,000 will be included in the 2020/21 Budget, providing financial assistance to the Phillip Island Golf Club to help purchase materials for the installation of a club pergola.</p>
2	Graham Jolly	<p>Submission requests further information to be displayed (and in detailed response to this submission) in the budget document for the following projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordable Housing Initiative - \$130,000. 2. Fast-track of a number of strategic initiatives and capital works in order to stimulate the local economy. What will be fast tracked, where are the Capital Works Program shown and what is the allocated expense? 3. Bass coast Dinosaur Trail Master plan - \$250,000. 4. Public realm improvement plans, Cowes - \$250,000. 5. Gap Road feasibility assessment and plan - \$100,000. 6. Strategic Positioning of Wonthaggi to support its growth - \$40,000. 7. Wonthaggi Secondary College Senior Campus Structure plan - \$100,000. 8. Rhyll Jetty Activity Area precinct plan - \$30,000. 9. Land purchases and various building works - \$10,930,000. 10. Aquatics planning and design - \$3,080,000. 11. Cowes Cultural and Community Centre Redevelopment (Phase one) - \$4,000,000 of borrowings. 12. Wonthaggi Guide Park - \$1,150,000. 13. Phillip Island Transfer Station - \$250,000. 14. Climate Change Action - \$500,000. 15. Anderson Road Boat Ramp east Car park Upgrade, Cowes - \$380,000. 16. Dalyston Netball Courts and Toilet Pavilion Upgrade - \$500,000. <p>The 16 projects listed have combined expenditure of \$21,690,000. However the – Fast-track of a number of strategic initiatives and Capital Works in order to stimulate the local economy project or projects, has no revenue expense allocated on page 2. Why.</p> <p>In addition, please confirm the difference between the Rates and Charges figure as shown on page 5 of \$64.59m, Page 38 \$64.59m and Page 41 \$63.542m.</p>	<p>The executive summary aims to highlight key projects and initiatives and does not provide a comprehensive list of all projects to be completed by Council during 2020/21. The reference to fast tracked projects as a result of COVID-19 includes projects which have been prioritised for inclusion in the Draft Budget in response to COVID-19, providing a recovery program to help stimulate the local economy. These projects include some of those listed within the executive summary and include both operating and capital projects such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destination Gippsland Funding \$30,000 - Strategic Positioning of Wonthaggi to support its growth \$40,000 - Bass Coast Dinosaur Trail Masterplan \$250,000 - Affordable Housing Initiative \$130,000 - Aquatics Feasibility Study \$75,000 - Public Realm Improvements Cowes \$250,000 - Growth Area Alignment \$ 100,000 - Shovel ready Designs for Sport & Recreation Reserves \$ 100,000 - Gap Road Feasibility Assessment and Plan \$100,000 <p>The value outlined for land purchases and building works is detailed in pages 57-59 of the budget document. This value will be updated in line with changes made to the final budget document as a result of budget submissions.</p> <p>The rates and charges figure in the income statement (Page 5& 38) represents the rates and charges raised in 2020/21. The rates and charges figure in the cash flow statement represents estimated cash that will be received during the year. These amounts will differ due to our estimated debtor balances at the beginning and end of the financial year.</p>

3	Lorraine Muir President Bass Coast Regional Aquatic Centre	Submission commends Council on their inclusion of aquatic planning and design in the 2020/21 budget. The submitter has included her budget submission from the 2019/20 year which outlines the shortcomings of the current facility and support provided from various members of the community. Given that these conditions have not changed, the submitter requests that this detail be considered throughout the continued aquatics decision making process.	Thank you very much for the Bass Coast regional aquatic centre working group letter of support, for the inclusion of aquatics planning and design in the draft 2020/2021 budget. The money allocated in the 2020/2021 budget is for Councils to commence feasibility and design works for the Bass Coast and Phillip Island Aquatic and Leisure facilities.
4	Graham Jolly	<p>Submission on Waste with the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why does the garbage charges shown in the budget document not match the Contract variation report put to Council on 17 June? 2. I request the Waste Contracts charge to be costed based on the Tonnage collected and NOT the number of properties. The current Waste contractor to provide Tonnage details. 3. I request adjustments to the budget for all waste collection to reflect the new negotiated contract agreed cost. 4. I request the State Government Landfill Levy be separated on the rates notice as this charge is a Statutory charge set by the State Government and is paid to the State Government similar to how the Fire Service Levy charge is shown. 5. I request the Environmental Monitoring of Landfill sites charge be shown as a separate charge on the rates notice as this charge is a necessary charge brought about by the Victorian Environment Protection Authority. 6. I request monthly waste disposal Tonnage collection details be recorded and bar graphed by council and for the details to be presented to an Ordinary Council meeting as part of the Quarterly Financial Report. 7. I request waste education allowance funds to be included in the budget to provide for a yearly bus to transport interested ratepayers (by appointment) once a year to visit all sites council uses as per the Waste Contract to dispose of Landfill waste, Green waste and recycle waste. An education leaflet could then be handed out with advice about the various sites and the effects of waste to the Bass Coast Shire and its people. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The garbage charge included in the proposed 2020/21 budget both the cost of the waste contract and additional waste related costs incurred while providing this service. This includes operation of transfer stations, new waste capital projects and the ongoing aftercare, rehabilitation and maintenance of open and closed landfill sites. The contract variation put forward in June 2020 was for the waste contract only. The proposed 2020/21 Budget includes a provision for these anticipated contract variations. 2. The waste contract charge is calculated based on the cost of waste services provided to council. This includes services such as tonnage kerbside collection, vehicle operations and maintenance and staff costs. Calculating the waste charge based on collected tonnage would require an investment in the current technology held on waste trucks. Our current waste contract has a number of years to run so contract variations such as this would need to wait until this time. As the garbage charge is calculated at the beginning of a financial year, future tonnage collections per household would need to be estimated. This process would increase the cost to council of providing waste services, therefore impacting the total waste charge. 3. The current waste negotiations have been considered as part of the Draft 2020/21 budget waste charges. 4&5. The separation of Landfill Levy and Environmental Monitoring fees is not a legislative requirement and therefore our software has not been programmed to provide this split. In order to provide this detailed information on rates notices it would be at an additional cost to Council and would need to be investigated with the software provider. 6. Waste tonnage reporting is not currently included in the scope of our Quarterly Financial Report. The waste team will report to Council on waste tonnage matters throughout the year as required. 7. We currently provide a waste education allowance which focuses on providing information to the community on kerbside collection, waste minimisation, litter prevention and the benefits of best practice to maximise resource recovery and minimise littering. The waste education program provides education assistance to schools, kindergartens and community groups throughout Bass Coast. Education materials on our waste services are provided to the community, these can be accessed through Council's website or by contacting a member of the Waste Services team. Educational tours would provide additional cost to Council and due to Occupational health and safety restrictions, tours would only be able to access public areas of transfer stations.
5	Meryl and Hartley Tobin	<p>Requesting that in order to ensure the GMH Proving Ground site is protected in perpetuity, it needs an overlay over it. Please take urgent action on this and include costing of it by amending the Draft Budget.</p> <p>Most of the Grantville Grass Tree Forest is on land under a work authority for sand mining. The mine site is adjacent to the Grantville Nature Conservation Reserve (GNCR). Though most of the remaining part of the forest is in the GNCR, it is also part of the sand mine's buffer zone as it is adjacent to the mine site. While this means its flora cannot be touched, it also means it cannot be accessed until the end of the life of the sand mine and any subsequent revegetation of the</p>	Council fully supports the community's concerns that there is an urgent need for protection of the important and rare remnant natural bush located on site. Council has advocated to, and commenced discussions with representatives from, State Government and Federal Government regarding the protection of the remnant vegetation and threatened species within the Holden Proving Ground site at Lang Lang.

		<p>site. Please take action to rectify this situation and save, arguably, one of the top sites in the whole of Australia for the iconic Grass Tree.</p>	<p>A meeting with Councillors, Council officers and budget submitters will be organised soon to discuss Council's ongoing advocacy and direction.</p> <p>Amending the Bass Coast Planning Scheme to include the land in an overlay is an option available to Council. However, the purpose of an overlay would be to guide, not necessarily prohibit further development of the site. After careful consideration, Council believes the commencement of a Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA) process to apply an overlay to the site is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time - In the absence of interim controls, a PSA process would take two years and during this period the site would not be afforded a higher level of protection. • Cost - An amendment process would cost Council approximately \$400,000 and not guarantee it would be approved by the Minister. • Process - Should vegetation removal be proposed on the site a planning permit would be required to be decided by Council. The application of an additional overlay would only provide marginal additional protection. <p>In summary, whilst an amendment to the planning scheme would offer some additional protection for the site, the current planning controls, in particular the requirement for Council to permit any vegetation removal provide an appropriate level of protection within the planning scheme as it stands.</p> <p>Ultimately, the State Government, through the Minister for Planning, has the power to intervene and protect the site. This would be the quickest and the most efficient way to achieve the outcomes being sought. Council will continue to partner with the community to seek appropriate planning controls and adequate protections for the site through collaborative representation to the State Government.</p> <p>A recommendation will be considered by Council at the August Council Meeting requesting the Minister for Planning to include recognition of the significance of the former Holden Proving Ground site within the draft Statement of Planning Policy.</p>
6	Janne and Bill Morrison	<p>Requesting the provision of urgent overlay protection to be put in place on the Holden Proving Ground site to ensure flora and fauna in this corridor remains protected. This protection is required as it is part of the Distinctive Areas and Landscapes which is so important and valuable to the Bass Coast. Please also consider providing protection is the distinctive Grantville Grass Tree Forest which is on a buffer zone adjacent to the sand extraction site.</p>	<p>Council fully supports the community's concerns that there is an urgent need for protection of the important and rare remnant natural bush located on site. Council has advocated to, and commenced discussions with representatives from, State Government and Federal Government regarding the protection of the remnant vegetation and threatened species within the Holden Proving Ground site at Lang Lang.</p> <p>A meeting with Councillors, Council officers and budget submitters will be organised soon to discuss Council's ongoing advocacy and direction.</p> <p>Amending the Bass Coast Planning Scheme to include the land in an overlay is an option available to Council. However, the purpose of an overlay would be to guide, not necessarily</p>

			<p>prohibit further development of the site. After careful consideration, Council believes the commencement of a Planning Scheme Amendment (PSA) process to apply an overlay to the site is not recommended for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time - In the absence of interim controls, an PSA process would take two years and during this period the site would not be afforded a higher level of protection. • Cost - An amendment process would cost Council approximately \$400,000 and not guarantee it would be approved by the Minister. • Process - Should vegetation removal be proposed on the site a planning permit would be required to be decided by Council. The application of an additional overlay would only provide marginal additional protection. <p>In summary, whilst an amendment to the planning scheme would offer some additional protection for the site, the current planning controls, in particular the requirement for Council to permit any vegetation removal provide an appropriate level of protection within the planning scheme as it stands.</p> <p>Ultimately, the State Government, through the Minister for Planning, has the power to intervene and protect the site. This would be the quickest and the most efficient way to achieve the outcomes being sought. Council will continue to partner with the community to seek appropriate planning controls and adequate protections for the site through collaborative representation to the State Government.</p> <p>A recommendation will be considered by Council at the August Council Meeting requesting the Minister for Planning to include recognition of the significance of the former Holden Proving Ground site within the draft Statement of Planning Policy.</p>
7	Graham Jolly	<p>This submission refers to the Quarter 3 capital works report presented to Council in May which indicated potential projects identified as requiring carryover to the 2020/21 financial year. Mr Jolly has the following specific questions on this report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request the Manager of Governance of the Bass Coast Shire Council to quantify Sections 95 and 96 of the Local Government Act 2020 in the interest of all ratepayers including why ratepayers were not informed of the 2019-20 budget being revised. 2. Request for Section 95 (c) of the Local Government Act 2020 as understood by council to be interpreted. 3. Request the Manager of Governance of the Bass Coast Shire Council to quantify and explain why the Deferred, Carryover and Multi-Year projects Councillors approved (20 May 2020 Ordinary Council Meeting) to be moved into a new budget year being the following budget year 2020-21 are not shown as an attachment listing with all financial details as part of the draft budget 2020-21. 4. Request the Deferred, Carryover and Multi-Year Projects listed in the Third Quarter Financial Report (31 March 2020) be included into the budget 2020-21 as an attached appendix spreadsheet showing full detail, which include financial 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council can confirm that the 2019/20 budget was not revised during the third quarter reporting cycle. The capital project summary provided is a forecast of the predicted year end position of those projects listed, at a point in time. As these changes do not impact the declared rates and charges, borrowings or impact funding for other services, they therefore do not trigger a need for community engagement under Section 95(c) of the <i>Local Government Act 2020</i>. 2. Section 95 (c) of the <i>Local Government Act 2020</i> is understood and will be applied where required 3. Where a carryover from the 2019/20 is required, an allocation of the unused funding is transferred to a carryover reserve. This carryover reserve is then utilised during the following year (2020/21) meaning that our 2020/21 budget does not require an allocation to cover the costs of completing projects approved as part of prior year budgets. 4. Forecasts are subject to change as the financial year progresses and therefore carryovers to the 2020/2021 financial year can only be finalised once processing of the full financial year is complete.

		sources and in some cases where projects are work in progress the outstanding financial remaining budget allowance.	
8	Trevor Brown	<p>Variety of Questions on the budget document as follows:</p> <p>1) Heading – “New Funding” This item lists several projects being allocated funding and they total \$920,000.00 of expenditure. All of this expenditure is to be used on the creation of plans in relation to these projects. There is in fact no substance or actual work to be undertaken. My questions on this item are: - a) how much of this expenditure is internal and how much is outsourced? b) While it is essential to be making plans for future capital works, why, in this trying and difficult year are these funds and resources not being allocated towards the completion of current projects? c) Why not increase the support projects like Affordable Housing and/or business support? It would seem to me that putting the creation of plans, which may or may not go ahead, off for twelve months, at this particular, time would not damage their future development. Dare I mention these funds could be used to push through protection for the GM testing site currently very much in the news?</p> <p>2) Heading – “Investment in Capital Projects” The figure recorded in the Budget is 27 97 Million. However the items listed only add to 19.67 Million. This leaves an unexplained amount of 8.3 Million or in fact approximately 30% of the total amount to be expended. This is a significant percentage and a significant amount not explained. I cannot see that there would be sufficient small value items, of capital expenditure, to account for this lack of detail.</p> <p>3) Heading – “More Specific Items” This list totals 9.86 Million of the 27.97 Million to be expended and records items as small as 250 Thousand. Therefore the budget papers, in fact, show details of, capital expenditure, totalling 9.86 Million or approximately 33% of the total spend. My question is why is there not detail of a significant portion of the remaining two thirds of the capital expenditure budgeted for?</p> <p>4) Heading – “Complete Council’s Core System Implementation” This shows an amount of 1.65 Million to be expended in this budget. It is also stated that this project began September 2016. Therefore this will be the fifth year of its life and service. My questions are: a) what is the total spend on this Core System? b) What is the system’s foreseeable life? c) Where is it shown on previous budgets? d) Is this the final payment? e) What is the ongoing maintenance cost?</p> <p>5) Heading – “Council Rates” The budget indicates that the Council has been able to keep the rate increase to the State Government required 2% However later in the budget papers it is stated that the actual rate increase across the board is 3.3%. Which would seem to be a little ambiguous? I am having difficulty understanding the figure of 3.3% the budget papers state that the Council has used revised property valuations in order to calculate its rateable remuneration. This revaluation is on average 4%. However for residential properties it is 3.6%</p>	<p>1. New funding – Council’s long term capital works program needs to be informed by robust forward looking strategic planning, including preliminary or concept designs, community engagement and structure plans relating to precincts in the urban areas of the Shire.</p> <p>a. The budget allocations are for costs associated with outsourcing this work. This will be complemented by the use of professional ‘in-house’ Council staff.</p> <p>b. The proposed budget contains a record allocation of \$28 million for capital works. This will be increased via a forecast change to reflect carry over capital projects from 2019/20 that were incomplete or delayed during the first quarter in 2020/21.</p> <p>c. Council’s long term capital works program needs to be informed by robust forward looking strategic planning. If this is not done properly we could expect to have sub optimal capital program execution and delivery outcomes.</p> <p>2. The following projects were excluded from this summary:</p> <p>a. Aquatics design - \$3.075 million</p> <p>b. Land improvements projects (as listed in Appendix 3) - \$2.983 million</p> <p>c. Dalyston netball court and toilet pavilion upgrade - \$500,000</p> <p>d. Waste management infrastructure projects (as listed in Appendix 3) - \$1.6 million.</p> <p>e. Other minor building projects - \$250,000</p> <p>3. Full details of the proposed capital expenditure budget are provided in Appendix 3 of the Proposed Budget. Highlights of the capital budget are extracted and reported in Section 1 of the Budget document.</p> <p>4. Council’s Core System Implementation.</p> <p>a) Current forecast is \$5.574m, including the funding proposed in the 2020/21 budget. This funding includes a mix of consultancy implementation fees, annual service and license fees and staff resources to support the project.</p> <p>b) At least 5 further years, noting a significant benefit of the selected system is that two major upgrades to system functionality are included twice per year as part of the annual service and license fees.</p> <p>c) This has been shown through the IT and Business Systems budget.</p>

		<p>Therefore Residential properties rated on adjusted valuations of plus 3.6% at an increased rate of 2% would in fact be subject to a rate increase of 5%. How do you explain this in terms of the budget papers? Further to this the comparison of total rate revenue between 2019/20 and 2020/21 shown on page 51 of the budget papers shows an increase of 4%</p> <p>6) Heading – “Income Statement – Employee Costs” Why are employee costs, without a staff increase, budgeted to increase by 7.1% during the 2021/22 financial year, when the budget papers clearly state that increases to staff remuneration is to be maintained at 1.8% per annum until June 2022? This item of expenditure remains fairly constant from 2019/20 to 2020/21 and some adjustment during 2021/22 could be justified as a catch up for some staff who have foregone increases during the 2020/21 year but. not 7.1%</p>	<p>d) The proposed budget in 2020/21 is expected to be the final project implementation cost. Annual service and license fees are ongoing operating expenses in future years.</p> <p>e) This information is considered commercial in confidence, noting the annual service and license fees formed part of the awarded contract following a competitive public tender and evaluation process. The implementation of this system has already resulted in process efficiencies and ongoing costs are offset by reduced costs of managing legacy systems.</p> <p>5. Council rates will increase by an average of 2.0 % in 2020/21. The 3.3% increase in Council’s rate revenue is due to growth in the rating base as land is developed and new property assessments are created. During 2019/20 Council increased the number of rateable assessments from 31,534 to 32,115 (581 or 1.8% increase).</p> <p>6. Council officers have applied stringent labour cost containment measures during 2019/20 and as part of the 2020/21 budget setting process. This has resulted in the forecast 2019/20 labour budget being reduced by \$1.833 million compared to the original budget and the 2020/21 budget reduced by \$1.763 million compared to original projections. As Council rolls out an expanded capital works program and leverages a number of capital stimulus grants that form part of the Federal and State’s contribution to the COVID-19 recovery it is unrealistic to maintain this level of labour underspend. The projected 2021/22 labour budget while 7.1% higher is still \$270,000 less than the projected levels in the previous year’s budget. Senior Council officers have also foregone their salary increments in 2020/21.</p>
9	Grantville Business and Community Association	<p>Project 1 -Pathway Grantville Walking Track Request consideration to continue the foot track from Grantville to Corinella Rd. We are looking at getting a continuation of the existing walking track that starts at Pioneer Bay and ends at Maru Koala Park (service Road) to go up to the Corinella Turnoff where it will join the track going to the Bass Valley Primary School. This walking track is 6th on the priority list with the Council. In order for delivery of this pathway a feasibility study and detailed design would need to be completed to get the project shovel ready for funding. This planning work is scheduled in Council’s long-term financial plan, but not for a couple of years. There is collective support for this trail and request the funding be provided for a feasibility study \$25,000.</p> <p>Project 2 - Grantville Amphitheatre Shelter Request funding for preliminary costings and designs for the Grantville Amphitheatre Shelter so that the project is shovel ready when further funding becomes available. This shelter is a much needed community asset, providing for improved shelter and event space. Request \$25,000</p> <p>Project 3 - Community Development Worker for Grantville Request the appointment of a Community Development worker to the Grantville District as part of the Working For Victoria initiative. This position would help to rebuild the community, reconnect township relationships and business support networks following impacts of COVID-19..</p>	<p><u>Project 1:</u> Funding for this project has not been provided within the 2020/21 budget. The Grantville Walking trail remains on our priority list and funding for feasibility and design is included in the outer years of Council’s long term financial plan.</p> <p><u>Project2:</u> In response to your submission, funding of \$25,000 has been provided in the 2020/21 Budget to develop a scope and design for the Grantville Amphitheatre Shelter.</p> <p><u>Project 3.</u> In early August, a Westernport Ward Community Planning Officer will be commencing and located part time at the Grantville Transaction Centre. The role is permanent and 0.6FTE, meaning three days per working week. This is part of Council’s commitment to placed based connections with the community, with similar roles having been recruited to for Bunurong and Island Wards also.</p> <p>In addition, Council is currently recruiting community facility and community building officers through the Working for Victoria Program. One dedicated six month ‘facility’ position will be provided to each of the Bass Valley Community Centre and Corinella Community Centre. The roles are to assist with administration supports throughout COVID-19. In addition, Council is recruiting to ‘building’ support positions to provide each Centre with much needed building and grounds maintenance assistance. Whilst neither are located in Grantville, both represent the interests of the broader Westernport Ward.</p>

			<p>Council's Investment and Visitor Economy Team is in the process of recruiting nine new staff to support local communities. The first one started on 20 July with the rest expected to come on line by early August. The positions include concierge roles, supporting business operators who want to invest or develop an existing business in the shire. It also includes four staff to support Business and Tourism Associations across the shire connect with their members, build Association membership and support business operators directly. The four will work as a team but each Association will have a staff member nominated as their primary contact. Additionally, two staff to support Event operators to prepare for running events in a post COVID-19 environment</p>
10	<p>Tim Herring and Tenby Point Residents Association</p>	<p>Submission requests: 1. Council to plant appropriate plants and shrubs in the four blocks in Tenby Point owned by Council. 2. Re-establishing manna gums for a future koala coastal corridor connecting the mouth of the Bass River with Lang Lang (or part of this potential corridor) 3. Replacement of the Tenby Point noticeboard at the bus stop in Argent Road adjacent to Guy Road (the old one is in bad repair).</p>	<p><u>Project 1:</u> In response to your submission, \$10,000 has been provided in the 2020/21 Budget in order to purchase plants, to fund planting preparation and mulching.</p> <p><u>Project 2:</u> Thank you for your suggestion of re-establishing manna gums for a Koala coastal corridor connecting Bass River with Lang Lang. This is a substantial project which would span across multiple financial years and has not been funded in the 2020/21 budget. As part of Council's Biodiversity Biolinks plan, we are continuing to work on connecting remnant patches of land and water through weeding and revegetation to allow animals to move from Bass to Lang Lang.</p> <p><u>Project 3:</u> In response to your submission, \$2,000 has been provided in the 2020/21 Budget in order to renew the Tenby Point noticeboard.</p>

11	Danny Luna	<p>The proposed 2020/21 Council waste service charge is based on a flawed model which includes expenditure and revenue for items that have no relevance to the service provided. When these items are removed from the model, the charge is significantly lower than that proposed in the budget.</p> <p>The garbage charge is levied by Council on each rateable and non-rateable assessment that receive a waste collection service. The purpose of the charge is to recoup the costs of providing a waste collection and disposal service for kerbside collection and disposal of refuse. Not all rateable properties are levied the garbage charge (e.g. vacant land, some farm-land and land that is not within the collection zones). This reinforces the fact that the garbage charge is levied for a specific purpose i.e. the collection and disposal of waste that is generated from within the levied property. In contrast general services are funded from rate revenue and a wide range of other revenue sources. It follows that only those items of expenditure and income relevant to calculating the charge should be allocated to this specific service. Yet there are other items of expenditure and revenue that seem to have no relevance to the service that have been included in the calculation of the garbage charge.</p> <p>A comparison between the Council garbage charge calculation model and an alternate model proposed by the submitter has highlighted the following differences and concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public litter bins – Inclusion of the costs of collecting and disposing of waste from public bins seems to have no logical connection to the kerbside waste collection charge. This waste is not generated by individual tenements for which the charge is levied but is generated by ratepayers and visitors to commercial areas, parks and beaches etc. and should be funded from other revenue sources such as rates. 2. Transfer stations – These stations operate for the disposal of waste (other than that included in the garbage charge) generated by the general public, which can include ratepayers and visitors as long as they pay the appropriate fee. None of the kerbside waste that is collected from the red, green and yellow bins makes its way into the transfer stations. It goes directly into landfill, recycling or composting streams and therefore the cost and revenue from transfer station operations should not be included in the waste charge. 3. Environmental compliance (monitoring of landfill sites) – Following the approval by Council of a contract variation for environmental monitoring at the Grantville, Wonthaggi and Rhyll landfill sites and for this variation to be accommodated within the garbage charge, the costs associated with environmental monitoring at Rhyll and Wonthaggi landfills are disputed as these sites have been closed for a number of years and are no longer processing landfill waste. These costs should be funded through rates or other sources of revenue. 4. Cowes recycling bank. The inclusion of costs and revenue of operating this facility have no connection to the kerbside waste collection service or charge. 5. Green waste amnesty. This service is available to everyone including ratepayers, owners of land that don't pay the garbage charge and visitors. It should not be funded exclusively by those who pay the garbage charge given the broader community benefit. 6. Landfill levy rates. The Victorian Government as part of its COVID-19 response has deferred the planned increase to landfill levy rates for the first six months of the 202/21 financial year. This suggests that the financial impact of the expected 	<p>Local authorities in Victoria have regulatory power to raise service rates or annual service charges conferred on them by <i>Section 162</i> of the <i>Local Government Act 1989</i> which states that:</p> <p>(1) A Council may declare a service rate or an annual service charge or any combination of such a rate and charge for any of the following services –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The provision of a water supply b) The collection and disposal of refuse c) The provision of sewage services d) Any other prescribed service <p>(2) A service rate or service charge may be declared on the basis of any criteria specified by the Council in the rate or charge.</p> <p>Bass Coast Shire Council has had a waste service charge in place for a number of years and this charge is as the submitter points out levied on all rateable and non-rateable property assessments that receive a waste collection service. The waste service charge is not levied on properties that fall outside the collection area or on vacant land assessments.</p> <p>Council has been using a cost recovery model that attributes all waste related charges (net of revenue) to users of the kerbside waste collection and disposal service. This includes costs associated with the collection and disposal of waste from public litter bins, net operational costs of the transfer stations, environmental monitoring at its open and closed sites, costs associated with recyclables collections, the cost of the green waste amnesty and waste education, landfill levies and capital costs incurred on landfill operations and the development of transfer station facilities. The submitter believes this model is flawed as it includes costs other than the direct collection and disposal costs of household waste.</p> <p>Analysis of changes in the waste service charge over the last 10 years are set out in Table 1 below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1528 1375 2686 1921"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">TABLE 1 – ANALYSIS OF WASTE CHARGE INCREASES AT BASS COAST</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Financial Year</th> <th>Waste charge(\$)</th> <th>Increase (%)</th> <th>Reasons</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2011/12</td> <td>274</td> <td>1.1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012/13</td> <td>284</td> <td>3.6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013/14</td> <td>284</td> <td>0.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014/15</td> <td>307</td> <td>8.1</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/16</td> <td>319</td> <td>2.6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/17</td> <td>327</td> <td>2.5</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	TABLE 1 – ANALYSIS OF WASTE CHARGE INCREASES AT BASS COAST				Financial Year	Waste charge(\$)	Increase (%)	Reasons	2011/12	274	1.1		2012/13	284	3.6		2013/14	284	0.0		2014/15	307	8.1		2015/16	319	2.6		2016/17	327	2.5	
TABLE 1 – ANALYSIS OF WASTE CHARGE INCREASES AT BASS COAST																																			
Financial Year	Waste charge(\$)	Increase (%)	Reasons																																
2011/12	274	1.1																																	
2012/13	284	3.6																																	
2013/14	284	0.0																																	
2014/15	307	8.1																																	
2015/16	319	2.6																																	
2016/17	327	2.5																																	

30% annual increase in the levy will be halved to 15% effective across the full year. The proposed budget shows an increase in landfill levy costs of 46% for the 2020/21 financial year compared to the forecast actual for 2019/20. Has the levy increase deferral been accounted for in the budget and garbage charge calculation model and if so how is the large increase in budgeted costs explained.

7. Capital expenditure. The calculation of the charge includes a rolling capital expenditure charge of \$2.068 million which includes \$1.75 million relating to the capital costs of the Phillip Island transfer Station which has no relevance to this service as highlighted in 2 above. No details have been provided to date on the capital expenditure that the remaining \$318,000 relates to.

8. Allocation of costs. It would appear that every dollar of expenditure and revenue for waste services included in the proposed budget has been included in the calculation of the garbage charge even though as set out above, there are items included that have no logical connection to the service.

9. Apportionment of costs. Even where certain types of revenue and expenditure appear relevant to the garbage charge, the budget and garbage charge calculation model seems to indicate that all of these costs are attributable to the waste that goes into the red, green and yellow bins. The management of waste generated from other areas (e.g. public litter bins and transfer stations) seems to attract no EPA levies, staff costs, capital costs etc. The cost apportionment model needs to be reviewed whereby costs are apportioned to all relevant cost centres according to function and activity levels and not just lumped into the garbage charge.

10. Entire costs. It's not clear if some costs are spread across more than one area in the model. For example recycling costs of \$1.97 million, is this exclusively for collecting kerbside recyclables or does it include recyclables from public bins.

11. Bass Coast Waste Management Strategy. The budget refers to this strategy as a way to divert kerbside waste from landfill. Some points from this strategy are:

a. One of the outcomes is to have kerbside waste fees imposed to be proportional to total waste generated.

b. Item 6.5 provides information about waste that is collected and disposed of, other than that generated by ratepayers who are levied the garbage charge. This reinforces the point that the cost of waste management is not equitably apportioned on the polluter pays principle.

Other issue noted. Declaration of 2019/20 Rate sand Charges. The resolution passed at the Ordinary Council Meeting dated 19 June 2019, seems to include an error in that the declaration is not for the 2019/20 financial year but instead for the 2018/19 financial year. The same error seems to have occurred for the declaration of all the differential rates.

Conclusion

Any model that Council proposes to recover over \$13 million in charges from a specific category of properties needs to be legislatively compliant, logically structured, accurately costed and transparently implemented. The submitter does not believe the current model meets all these criteria. There is a risk that its use can have detrimental effects on Council and ratepayers as discussed below.

1. Fair Go Rates System. The Fair Go Rates System is designed to place limits on rate increases from year to year. If no waste costs are funded from rate revenue in the proposed budget one could form the view that costs are being transferred from one area in the budget that is subject to capping (rates) to another area of the budget that is not subject to capping (the garbage charge).

2017/18	374	14.4	Introduction of 3 bin system and FOGO
2018/19	412	10.2	Recycling crisis
2019/20	449	9.0	Impact of compaction levy and reduced revenue from gate charges
2020/21	496	10.5	PI transfer station, recycling costs, landfill levy, environmental monitoring

As the above table shows there have been a number of external shocks that have impacted the cost of providing the waste service over the last four years as well as some service improvements including the introduction of a 3 bin service with FOGO and the proposed development of a transfer station on Phillip Island. There does not appear to have been a change in the model used for determining the waste charges as alluded to in the submission.

In relation to the specific points of concern highlighted in the submission:

1. Public litter bins. Collection and disposal of this litter has a direct nexus to the cost of providing waste services and provides improved amenity to residents and businesses who live in or operate in urban locations in the Shire that have access to the waste collection service.
2. Transfer stations. The transfer station service is a fundamental part of Council's suite of waste management services and it is appropriate to recover the net costs of operating and providing for new or enhanced facilities from ratepayers. Ratepayers who use these services and do not pay the waste service charge are required to pay the gate fees as advertised at the transfer stations for the relevant waste streams. Council's transfer stations offer a number of waste disposal options for the community, including but not limited to the disposal of white goods, mattresses, hard waste, has bottles as well as recyclables and residual waste which may not be supported by kerbside collection. A failure to provide a convenient and accessible transfer station service could increase illegal dumping and pollution of our pristine environment.
3. Environmental compliance. Environmental monitoring and reporting is an Environment Protection Authority (EPA) requirement for both closed and operating landfills and is implemented to protect and reduce harm to the environment and human health associated with past, current and future landfill practices. The closed landfills are a historical legacy of providing waste services by disposing of waste generated by the community to landfill. As a consequence of this practice the closed landfills are still considered a risk to the environment and human health by the EPA. The EPA requires that Council undertake ongoing aftercare of its former landfills. It is therefore appropriate that environmental monitoring at closed landfills is included in the garbage levy.
4. Cowes recycling bank. The costs associated with this service are directly related to Council's waste service.

2. Distortion of the rates and charges burden. Council has adopted the wealth tax principle in forming its rating structure. This principle holds that ratepayers with more valuable properties pay more in rates than those with lower valued properties. A higher garbage charge shifts rates and charges from higher valued properties to lower valued properties which is inconsistent with the wealth tax principle.

3. Good governance. The submitter is not aware of Council ever reviewing or formally approving the current garbage charge calculation model particularly since the introduction of rate capping. If not it would be appropriate to do so as part of good governance practice.

The submitter requests that Council:

- a. Supports the arguments put forward in the submission and levies a garbage charge of no more than \$376 in the 2020/21 financial year.
- b. Reviews the garbage charge calculation model to ensure it meets the needs of all stakeholders and
- c. Makes the findings of any review and adopted model publicly available.

5. Green waste amnesty. The green waste amnesty and other activities associated with educating the public on waste are a direct waste service cost.
6. Landfill levy rates. The proposed 2020/21 budget has taken into account the 6 month deferral of the landfill levy increase. The full cost of the landfill levy increase will be reflected in the 2021/22 budget.
7. Capital expenditure. The rolling four year average forward capital expenditure cost is \$2.318 million rather than the \$2.068 million that was used in the waste charge calculation. \$1.75 million, of which \$1.5 million has been recovered, relates to the cost of constructing a new transfer station facility on Phillip Island. Council has funded the cost of acquiring the land on which the proposed transfer station will be constructed from its discretionary financial reserves. The transfer station will provide significant amenity to the mainly residential and commercial ratepayers who will use it rather than travelling to Grantville to dispose of waste materials. The other \$568,000 cost recovery relates to costs associated with the construction of Cell 8 at Grantville and necessary waste infrastructure upgrades to meet EPA requirements and improve recycling services at the Inverloch, Wonthaggi and Cowes transfer stations.
8. Allocation of costs. The cost recovery model attributes the total cost of Council's waste service to users of the kerbside waste collection service.
9. Apportionment of costs. The cost recovery model attributes the total cost of Council's waste service to users of the kerbside waste collection service.
10. Entire costs. As indicated above the model recovers all of Council's waste service costs from users of the kerbside collection service.
11. Bass Coast Waste Management Strategy – Council's Waste Management Strategy (WMS) has been developed as part of the commitment Bass Coast has made to provide sustainable solutions for the collection, disposal and resource recovery from waste generated within the community. The WMS identifies strategic outcomes to be achieved and suggested options to work towards achieving those outcomes.

Declaration of 2019/20 Rates and Charges. We acknowledge that parts of the resolution referenced the incorrect financial year. We will note this in the Council report when we seek adoption of the 2020/21 budget.

Conclusion

1. Fair Go Rates System. We note that Victorian councils have been subject to rate capping since the commencement of the 2016/17 financial year. As outlined in Table 1 there have been a number of changes in the external environment over which councils have no control since the introduction of rate capping. These would have precipitated a request for a rate cap variation to the Essential Services Commission (ESC) which we believe would not have been withheld. In addition a number of significant service improvements that directly or indirectly benefit residential and commercial ratepayers have been introduced. These include the introduction of a three bin system and FOGO and the proposed development of a new transfer station on Phillip Island.
2. Distortion of the rates burden. It is correct that the use of fixed Service charges and Municipal charges are inconsistent with the wealth tax principle. Bass Coast levies a waste service charge but does not levy a municipal charge.

3. Good governance. The cost recovery model used to determine the waste charge has been consistently applied for the last 10 years. Council approves the model used to determine the waste charge through adoption of the budget.

Submitter's requests

- a. Council notes the arguments put forward by the submitter in relation reducing the garbage charge from \$496 to \$376 in the 2020/21 financial year. Council is satisfied that the costs that are recovered through the waste service charge provide direct or indirect benefits to the ratepayers who are levied these charges. Further to this Council has benchmarked its waste service charges with charges raised by other municipalities for like services. This is summarised in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2 - COUNCIL WASTE CHARGE COMPARISONS		
Council	Waste Charge - 20/21	Notes
Bass Coast	\$496.00	3 Bin Service
Frankston	\$549.20	\$399 (120 l bin) plus \$150.20 (Green waste)
Cardinia	\$417.70	\$294.70 (garbage) plus \$123.20 (Green waste)
Baw Baw	\$517.00	\$392 (garbage) plus \$75 (Green waste) plus \$50 (recycling)
Boroondara	\$560.00	\$447 (120 l bin) plus \$113 (Env. Levy)
Bayside	\$502.95	\$322.34 (140 l bin) plus \$99.10 (Green) plus \$81.51 (recycling)
La Trobe	\$375.00	\$225 (120 l bin) plus \$77 (recycling) plus \$50 (green) plus \$23 (landfill levy)
Wellington	\$293.92 (no green or recyclables)	\$222.00 (garbage), \$55.00 (waste infrastructure charge \$16.92 (EPA levy)

Council has also benchmarked the performance of its waste management function with other Gippsland councils based on waste diversion rates from landfill. These have been sourced from the MyCouncil website and are summarised on Table 3 below. This demonstrates that the waste management function provided by Bass Coast Shire Council is providing vastly superior service outcomes compared to those of other large rural Gippsland shires.

TABLE 3 – GIPPSLAND COUNCILS - WASTE DIVERSION FROM LANDFILL COMPARISONS

Council	Waste Diversion Rate
Bass Coast	74.77%
Baw Baw	53.15%
South Gippsland	52.10%
Wellington	35.71%
East Gippsland	51.45%

- b. Council has been provided with the model used for recovering waste service costs from ratepayers and is satisfied that these costs provide direct or indirect benefits to the ratepayers who are levied these charges.
- c. As part of the Section 223 process to consult on the proposed Budget, all budget submissions will be made available (with contact details redacted for privacy) to the public. Council also publishes a summary of the budget submission and its response in an attachment to the Budget Adoption report.

12	Corinella Foreshore Reserve Committee of Management	<p>Following presentation at Community Connection session in March 2020: Request that a connecting pathway be built on Rotunda Hill to connect the existing pathway which currently ends at the top of the hill, around the picnic area and across to the public toilets. This would prevent foot traffic having to walk across the grass or roadway to access the public toilets. Preferably, lighting would also be provided on this path for those boaters/anglers whom access the toilets at night. Additionally, create an indent into the Rotunda picnic reserve area on The Esplanade to create 5 new vehicle-only parking bays. This would provide safer and more accessible parking options to those who wish to use the Rotunda and picnic facilities or take a walk around the foreshore area.</p> <p>In order to complete these works, The Corinella Foreshore Reserve Committee of Management request \$52,854 be allocated to this project by BCSC. (Reference is given to \$30,000 unspent grant from 2019)</p>	<p>In response to your budget submission, funding has been provided in the 2020/21 Budget to connect the existing pathway on The Rotunda Hill to the public toilets and to complete 5 new vehicle-only parking bays on the Esplanade. \$26,400 has been provided in the 2020/21 Budget and a further \$30,000 is available from grants received for Corinella foreshore projects during 2019/20. This grant will be carried over for use in on this project during 2020/21.</p>
----	---	--	---

13	Kevin Griffin Bass Coast Ratepayers and Residents Association	<p>Overview With current inflation rates of 2.2% as set by Reserve Bank of Australia, an increase in total rates and charges by 4.5% is disappointing. Is it Council's intention to continue pursuing similar massive budget increases, which are well in excess of the prevailing inflation rate, into the future? BCRRA welcomes the economic stimulus and community assistance provided in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 6: Liveability. Disappointment is raised for the reduction in roads budget from \$12.6M in 2019/20 to \$4.5M in 2020/21. Footpaths is also noted to drop by 60% down to \$1M from forecast \$2.5M in 2019/20. There are no major initiatives for roads indicated in the 2020/21 year. Council's 2017-21 plan recognises that the community wants safer roads and pedestrian access. BCRRA commends the motion to increase annual footpath spend to \$300K per annum, however this is still inadequate. BCRRA requests that Council revise the allocation for new footpaths to an amount of \$900K for 2020-21 and to budget for increased funding for new footpaths to an amount equivalent to 2% of the annual budget by no later than 2025.</p> <p>Capital Projects & KPI Reporting BCRRA requests that all details (including project plans and scope of works) available to Council Officers or Councillors in relation to the projects listed in the budget submission (page 5) be made publicly available. If Council is unwilling to make such reports available, BCRRA requests Council explain its reasons. KPI Reporting for Pro BCRRA requests that Council introduce and publish monthly reports showing the following project status information: 1. Total number of projects currently underway in current financial year 2. The name and project number for each project 3. The number of projects less than 50% complete 4. The number of projects between 51%-80% complete 5. The number of projects 100% complete. 6. Graphical representation of these results including prior month comparison. 7. YTD forecast and actual expenditure along with the variance between the two. Please provide explanation if Council is not prepared to produce these reports publicly.</p> <p>Financial Sustainability BCRRA requests a full public explanation from Council as to reasons and causes that led to the variances between: 2018-19 Budget \$808K Surplus, 2018-19 Actual deficit of \$9.55M and the 2018-19 \$3.2M deficit as shown in the 2019/20 Budget.</p> <p>Core System Implementation BCRRA request that Council provide the community with a full explanation as to what went wrong with this project and why the community should have confidence that earlier issues will not reoccur in future.</p> <p>Live Streaming BCRRA requests that each Councillor who is considering re-contesting for a position as councillor, now publicly declare whether or not they will support the continuation of live-streaming beyond the current trial period. If not, please provide explanation of why.</p> <p>Budget and Operating Result Please provide further explanation to note 6.10 so that it is meaningful to the average reader.</p>	<p>1. Rates and charges increase of 4.5% - Rates and charges are expected to increase by 5.1 % (\$3.19 million) in 2020/21 compared to the 2019/20 budget. This is due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The 2.0% increase in average rates in accordance with the rate cap (\$973K) A further 2.0% increase in rates that is attributable to a 1.8% growth in the number of new properties (valuation increase of 2.0%) (\$950K) A 10.5% increase in the waste service charge. (\$1.3 million). This is attributable to a number of factors including increased recycling costs, increased environmental monitoring costs, increased capital expenditure including the proposed new Phillip Island waste transfer station and an increase in the State government landfill levy. <p>2. Council notes and thanks the BCRRA for their support for the economic stimulus and community assistance measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the commencement of live- streaming of Council meetings.</p> <p>3. In response to your submission, the 2020/21 budget for the footpaths GAP program has been increased by \$176,267. This brings the total of 2020/21 budget for new and expanding pathways to \$967,000. Once including the \$220,000 of footpath renewal, there is a total of \$1,011,000 included for footpath spend in the 2020/21 Budget. The proposed budget for new and expanding footpaths over the next 4 years up to 2024/25 exceeds 2% of the value of the total capital works program. In the 2024/2025 financial year, budget spend on new and expansion projects equates to \$2.492 million, which is higher than 2% of combined operating and capital expenditure.</p> <p>4. Capital Projects. Funding has been provided in the proposed budget for a range of different projects that cross over into different disciplines, (engineering, strategic and statutory planning, major projects, waste management, climate change and recreation). Council has as part of its increased focus on Business Transformation developed a standard project management framework aimed at improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Council's delivery of major projects and place management initiatives. Council is unable to release details of project plans, scopes, Gant charts and project plans as requested as this information is operational in nature and not for public consumption.</p> <p>5. KPI Reporting for Projects. Council currently provides the community with a detailed quarterly capital works report that reports on financial performance to budget at an individual project level. Council acknowledges and thanks the BCRRA for their request for improved high level aggregate information on the capital projects portfolio and officers will investigate the implementation of improved KPI reporting for Projects as proposed by the BCRRA.</p> <p>6. Financial Sustainability. Council's 2018/19 financial results were impacted the recognition of a large one-off non-cash charge of \$5.2 million for landfill amortisation and a \$2.4 million contribution for the Highball facility that was developed at the new Wonthaggi Secondary School which is not a Council asset. Council is forecasting an improvement compared to budget of \$1 million in its 2019/20 underlying surplus. This has been driven by ongoing cost containment and discipline over its labour costs which are projected to be \$1.8 million less than originally budgeted.</p> <p>7. Core System Implementation – The project has taken longer to implement than originally planned due to a combination of factors including product availability and project resourcing. Significant progress has been made with a number of major modules actively being used and a clear plan for completion in the 2020/21 financial year.</p>
----	---	--	--

	<p>Garbage Charges Why does the budget show garbage charge increasing by 10.85% at 8.2 and 8.86% in 18.7? Why does the budget show the garbage charge increasing more than double the inflation rate over the next three years? What are the component items that make up this charge and why are they not shown individually in the budget document? BCRRA requests that Council amend the way the garbage charge is reported so as to detail each and all component items individually.</p> <p>Borrowings How does Council justify the 16% interest costs show in in this budget? What timeframe is envisaged for these borrowings to be repaid in full?</p> <p>Grant funding What is the explanation for why your grant funding is steadily decreasing over the next three years 2020-2024. What steps is Council taking to reverse this decline?</p> <p>CEO Expenditure Delegation BCRRA does not agree with the recent decision of Council to reinstate the \$1M expenditure authorisation to CEO as this risks revisiting the high levels of community dissatisfaction with BCSC.</p> <p>Media Policies BCRRA requests that BCSC rescinded the new media policies or at least change them to clearly allow Councillors to express reasonable criticism of Council decisions and policies.</p>	<p>8. Live Streaming – Council notes the strong support by the BCRRA for the continuation of live streaming of Council meetings.</p> <p>9. Reconciliation with Budgeted Operating Result – Note 6.10 presents the detail held in the comprehensive income statement by service rather than by revenue and expense class. This note is presented as required by Local Government Victoria. To aid with transparency, we have included the effects of internal recharges so total income and expenses can be reconciled directly to the comprehensive income statement as shown on page 38 of the budget document.</p> <p>10. Garbage Charges. Council uses a cost recovery model to calculate the waste service charge. These costs have increased due to an increased capital cost recovery linked to the new Phillip Island transfer station facility, increased recycling charges linked to the market conditions in the waste sector, higher environmental monitoring costs and an increase in the State government landfill levy. The garbage charge has increased at a higher rate than the 8.86% increase in waste management expenses due to an increase in capital expenditure cost recoveries.</p> <p>11. Borrowings. Council is proposing to increase its borrowings to \$20.12 million in 2020/21. This is a year on year increase of 30.8 %. The cost of servicing these borrowings (interest) is projected to fall to be \$317K which is \$412K less than the 19/20 budget and \$161K less than the 19/20 forecast. Most of the new borrowings relate to a concessional loan that Council has been able to obtain from the State for the construction of the Cowes Cultural and Community Centre.</p> <p>12. Grant Funding. Following Council decision to exit the provision of Aged and Disability services from January 2020, the related grant receipts have ceased along with the associated expenditure. In 2018/19 Council received \$2.4 million in relation to Aged and Disability services. 2019/20 Forecast includes the receipt of \$1.1 million in grant funding which will not be received in 2020/21. In addition, during 2019/20 we received \$2.8 million in non-recurrent capital grant funding for roads projects which we do not currently expect to receive during 2020/21.</p> <p>Future reliance on uncertain grant funding as part of our long term capital program has been reduced. While we will continue to actively advocate for grant funding, with reduced reliance on uncertain capital grants in years 2-4 of the SRP allow for community projects to progress regardless of whether Bass Coast Shire is successful in their grant application in future years.</p> <p>13. CEO Expenditure Delegation. It is important to note that the increase in the level of the CEO’s expenditure delegation to \$1 million only relates to budgeted capital and/or operational expenditure. This increase has also been informed by benchmarking with other councils, surveys with individual Councillors and the need for the organisation to streamline its procurement practices.</p> <p>14. Council notes BCRRA’s request. The Media Engagement and Social Media Policies have been adopted by Council. The policies cannot be rescinded as they have been implemented/acted upon; however, any changes to the policies can be made through a future resolution of Council.</p>
--	--	---

14	Frank Schooneveldt	<p>1. It is a great time to borrow money and we have a huge opportunity to address the infrastructure issues in the Bass Coast: footpaths, roads and drainage, community facilities. This would also create jobs. Are forward estimates adequate to fund infrastructure needs?</p> <p>2. Why do we stick to the rate cap when so far 30 per cent of the other councils have not stuck to the same rate cap?</p> <p>3. Why was our rating system not reviewed following the submission made to Victorian Government?</p> <p>4. Why don't we borrow money to fix the footpaths in the Bass Coast Shire and thereby create local jobs?</p> <p>5. Why do we give a discount of 20 per cent to farms on their rates?</p>	<p>1. Is the Budget and Forward Estimates adequate to fund Infrastructure Needs</p> <p>It is not financially feasible to fund roads and drainage upgrades across the urban settlements in the Shire without community agreement for Council imposition of Special Charge rate schemes to fund these upgrades.</p> <p>2. Why do we stick to the rate cap when 30 per cent of other councils have not stuck to the rate cap</p> <p>Bass Coast has increased its rates by the maximum level of 2.0 per cent prescribed by the rate cap. The other councils (30 per cent) have frozen their rates or increased them by less than 2.0 per cent. Submissions for Increases in excess of 2.0 per cent need to be sent to the Essential Services Commission (ESC) for review and approval.</p> <p>3. Why have we not reviewed the rating system</p> <p>Council commenced a review of the rating system including the differential rates for different property types in the first quarter of 2020. The escalation of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 required Council to refocus on the more pressing immediate needs of its community. Council agreed to cancel this review at the April Council Meeting and apply related savings to the community and business grants program that was set up as a Council response to the pandemic.</p> <p>4. Why don't we borrow money to fix the footpaths in the Bass Coast shire and create local jobs</p> <p>While interest rates are at record lows an unprecedented level of investment is required for a large scale investment in footpaths (to bring them up to the standard in metropolitan councils). This will result in Council carrying substantially more debt than is permissible under State Government prudential guidelines.</p> <p>5. Why do we give a discount to farmers on their rates</p> <p>Bass Coast Shire Council agreed to providing farmers with an effective discount on their rates following a review of the rating strategy in 2016. Farm rate differential discounts are common in the Victorian local government sector and the level of discount provided by Bass Coast is in line with the average across the sector. Farmers could also argue that they play a key land management role that indirectly supports the local economy and tourism sector in particular.</p>
15	Mike Fincher	Request to allocate funds to fix storm water drainage issues experienced at the address provided.	Council has allocated funding in 20/21 to permanently resolve the McKenzie St drainage issue.
16	Andrea Bolch	Is there any funding in the Draft Budget for 2020/21 to address and/or repair the significant erosion that has occurred along the Kilcunda coastline?	<p>Council has initiatives to respond to erosion near the Lionel Rose car park area of the foreshore and rail trail reserves. These include:</p> <p>1. Short-term Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has completed designs and is currently seeking approvals to relocate a section of the rail trail pathway further landward within the rail trail reserve. This shorter-term, potentially temporary response may be implemented should erosion continue and require closure of the pathway. • Council currently has funds allocated to deliver these works if required. <p>2. Longer-term Response</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During 2020/21 Council will undertake an options analysis investigation which will help inform the longer-term direction for the rail trail and other coastal assets at the location. This investigation will investigate coastal processes and other factors influencing erosion at the site, and provide recommendations to respond to erosion. Amongst all options this project will consider techniques to protect the rail trail and the option to relocate of a section of the pathway further landward as a longer-term measure. • In June 2020, DELWP issued confirmation that Council will receive a grant to deliver some of the potential higher priority recommendations of the investigation.
17	Graham Jolly	<p>Requests that the following KPI's be included in quarterly financial reports, including fourth quarter financial report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The total number of projects to be shown as a start point. 2. Projects % 0 to 10. 3. Projects % 11 to 50. 4. Projects % 51 to 85. 5. Projects % 86 to 99. 6. Projects % 100. Completed and fully expensed. 	<p>Council currently provides the community with a detailed quarterly capital works report that reports on financial performance to budget at an individual project level. Council acknowledges and thanks Mr. Jolly for his request for improved high level aggregate information on the capital projects portfolio and officers will investigate the possible implementation of improved KPI reporting for capital projects.</p>
18	Linda Marston - Island Voice	<p>Island Voice is greatly concerned by the increase by the 10.85% in garbage and waste fees, especially as this follows an increase of more than 11% last year. An increase of \$40 per tonne for recycling has not been applied by other comparable councils, so why Bass Coast? We have already experienced several increases in the first three years of our 10 year contract. We believe the landfill emission monitoring contracts increases in price show that waste management is poorly understood and lacking management expertise.</p> <p>Why is the Garbage charge shown as increasing 10.85% at section 8.2 and shown as only 8.86% change in waste management expenses in section 18.7?</p> <p>The allocation to climate change actions of \$500,000 is not enough given the declared climate emergency. Please could council identify how this money will progress Climate action?</p> <p>The Shire's COVID response is commended. Many ratepayers may need ongoing assistance and Island Voice asks that Council displays compassion in its hardship policy.</p> <p>Please provide further information on the following highlighted projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. \$130,000 for affordable housing. Is this funding aimed at improving existing properties or providing increased short term emergency accommodation? ML 2. Strategic Positioning of Wonthaggi \$40,000. What is being positioned, who is involved and what benefit will this bring? ML 3. Public Realm Improvement Plans, Cowes \$250,000. How do these plans differ from the Cowes Activity Centre Plan which is already complete? What improvements are you referring to? DP 4. Wonthaggi Secondary College Senior Campus Structure Plan \$100,000. Should this not be a cost for the education department? If this is related to the old school site, please clarify in the budget document. <p>Island voice wishes to seek assurance from Council that Grants will be sought over the coming years to try and mitigate the level of debt required for multi-generational loan drawdowns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Can the budget include effects on ratepayers average annual bill 6. Please include a unique identifier with each project so these can be referred to throughout the project lifecycle. 7. The current level of funding (\$4.5 million) for roads, it will take decades to properly make all roads across the Shire. We have experienced roads being 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council uses a cost recovery model to calculate the waste service charge. These costs have increased due to an increased capital cost recovery linked to the new Phillip Island transfer station facility, increased recycling charges linked to the market conditions in the waste sector, higher environmental monitoring costs and an increase in the State government landfill levy. The garbage charge has increased at a higher rate than the 8.86% increase in waste management expenses due to an increase in capital expenditure cost recoveries. 2. The Climate Change Climate Change Action Plan (the Plan) 2020-21 budget will deliver actions from the Plan as approved by Council. The Plan will support the community, businesses and the agricultural sector to take their own action in response to climate change through a number of initiatives. 3. We thank Island Voice for their support provided towards the COVID-19 response package. Council's hardship policy was revised in May 2020 in response to COVID-19 to provide relief for those community members experiencing financial hardship as a result of the pandemic. 4. Further information on the projects highlighted in your submission are provided below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Affordable Housing</u> The funding highlighted in the 2020/21 Draft Budget is to undertake the important strategic work required to identify suitable public land and the development of a Shire wide housing strategy. This critical planning piece will then assist Council to work more closely with partner agencies and all levels of government in seeking funding to deliver much needed affordable and accessible housing options across the Shire. <u>Strategic Positioning of Wonthaggi</u> Strategic Positioning of Wonthaggi is an aspirational strategic branding project, devised to increase the awareness and interest in Bass Coast's Regional Township. It will have broad appeal to target audiences including potential new residents, visitors, businesses and investors. <u>Public Realm Improvement Plan</u>

		<p>stripped back, causing detriment to health and well-being, without being in a position to embark upon SCS to seal the road back. This is unreasonable, puts well-being of residents at risk and the option to pay for a spray seal until road build is within a couple of years should have been provided.</p> <p>8. Please clarify the (\$111,486) difference between total income in the 'Comprehensive Income Statement' and the 'Estimated Amount to be raised by all Rates and Charges' tables?</p> <p>9. Can some positive measures be included in Animal Management Performance (such as satisfaction levels of pet owners, registration compliance, successful reunions with owners and reduced incidences due to education) be provided along with the current enforcement measure of number of prosecutions per year.</p>	<p>Master planning and detail design of the Cowes Activity Centre. This includes improving access and movement within the activity centre; enhancing the quality of streets scapes and public realm spaces; continuing to encourage business investment and tourism growth; and enhancing the connection from the Jetty Triangle with the new Cultural and Community Centre.</p> <p><u>Wonthaggi Secondary College</u> This funding allocation is to commence preparation of a master plan for the former secondary college site at Wonthaggi. It will include community engagement and the compilation of supporting evidence and documentation.</p> <p>5. The average rate revenue per residential property can be found in note 7.3 of the budget document, page 31. This shows an average of \$1,504 rate revenue per residential assessment for the 2020/21 financial year.</p> <p>6. The project name is the best method in tracking a project through its lifecycle. Council notes concerns about the level of funding for roads. Council will consider requests for roads and drainage upgrades that will be funded from special rates with the proviso that these enjoy support from 70 per cent of Ratepayers who will be required to contribute to the scheme.</p> <p>7. The table "19.11 Estimated total amount to be raised by all rates and charges" does not include estimated interest. Please refer to table "19.2 Reconciliation of total rates and charges" which shows the breakdown on the Total rates as shown in the Comprehensive Income statement.</p> <p>8. Further detail on our Animal management performance can be found at www.knowyourcouncil.vic.govt.au. Annual measures recorded through this website include Animals Reclaimed from Council and Time Taken to Action Requests. During 2018/19 Bass Coast Shire had a 67.95% animal reclaim rate, well above the All Council average of 50.95%.</p>
19	Graham Jolly	<p>1. I ask and request an explanation why this Councillor group can forecast a \$2,524,000 increase Budget Surplus and a \$4,240,000 increase to the Underlying result some two years away and forecast a Capital Works Program expenditure of \$36,688,000 when the new Councillor group have not determined their draft budget which will be long after they are elected as our ratepayer representatives? Who is determining a future CWP two years away after the term of this Councillor group has ended their term as Councillors, The Administration of Council or the Councillors?</p> <p>2. How can the forecast details shown on page 30, Point 7.2 Financial resources increase by an alarming amount when we all are going through a COVID-19 virus pandemic period which already has seriously impacted on people's income and will continue to do so for quite some time, probably for years.</p> <p>3. I request the financial figures forecast on page 30 'Financial resources' be revised down to \$30,000,000 for the CWP and in doing so to adjust the Surplus and the Underlying results down as well.</p> <p>In the future my Ward Councillors along with all other Councillors in the year 2021 will determine a draft budget for 2021-22 year and set CWP expenditure the community can submit a submission to for consideration. I point out to Councillors the listing each year reported and approved for deferred projects, Carryover projects and Multi-Year projects that are moved into a forward year must be a factor in determining a forecast CWP for any year. It is my conclusion</p>	<p>1. Council is required by legislation to include a four year strategic resource plan (SRP) as part of its annual budget. The SRP includes a projected four year Statement of Capital Works. Council reviews and updates these projections each year and a new Council will review the SRP as well as Council's Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) as part of the 2021/22 budget and planning process.</p> <p>2. Funding of \$920,000 has been provided in the 2020/21 operating budget for a number of strategic planning and place management projects. The 2020/21 budget also funds the completion of the Project Phoenix (major corporate software) implementation. Expenditure budgets for 2021/22 and ongoing benefit from the removal of these costs. Revenue budgets have been based on Council increasing rates in line with the rate cap and other revenue is projected to grow in line with CPI movements. It needs to be noted that a future Council may elect to direct funding towards further non recurrent strategic projects and this could impact forward expenditure projections.</p> <p>3. The 2021/22 capital works expenditure budget has been elevated due to the planned construction of the new Cowes Community and Cultural Centre. Council has secured concessional loan funding of \$10 million from the State to part fund this major project. We note concerns about the capacity of Council to deliver an expanded capital program especially once deferred projects are considered. Council has set up a Major Projects department within the Place Making Division to help drive improved delivery of large complex projects. Other actions including streamlined procurement processes and a new</p>

		based on past reporting results Council has not got the capacity to achieve all CWP in a budget and the deferred, Carryover, Multi-Year projects. They very simply do not happen.	project management framework are expected to improve Council's capital project completion rates.
21	Graham Jolly	<p>I request the fourth Quarterly financial Report obtain a number of inclusions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The TREASURY REPORT to become a spreadsheet showing the name of the investment, when invested, investment period, maturity date, return on investment and the Cash in Bank figure. 2. All Carryover, Deferred and Multi-Year project listing with percentage complete, Budget revenue, YTD expenditure and YTD Contingency expenditure. 3. A full spreadsheet of projects numbers and Tender numbers sorted by percentage complete with YTD expenditure, YTD Contingency expenditure, Budget revenue all of which to be added to the existing presented spreadsheet. <p>Mr. Mayor you might rule this submission out of order at present it refers to the 2019-20 budget year. However my requests will apply for the budget year 2020-21 and future years. Therefore I would believe they are worthy inclusions.</p> <p>Mr. Mayor and Councillors I request the above details become mandatory quarterly inclusions when reporting for the Bass Coast Shire Council.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As part of the Investment Policy report that council adopted in March 2020 it agreed to the following details relating to its investment portfolio being reported on a quarterly basis to Council as part of the public facing Quarterly Financial Report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds invested • Counterparties • Maturity dates • Interest rates • Weighted average return • Statement to confirm compliance with the investment policy during the period. 2. Council currently includes as part of its Quarterly Financial Report a comprehensive listing of all budgeted and deferred or carry over capital projects. Financial information including budget or forecast allocations, projected carry overs, YTD expenditure and YTD variances to budget or forecast is included at an individual project level. Council allocates a budget that includes funding for potential contingencies based on risk profiles for individual capital projects and does not separately account for expenditure on contingencies. 3. Council does not report financial information from the contract database which records contract numbers. Financial information including budgets, actual expenditure and capital revenue or grants is sourced from the corporate accounting software platform.
22	Graham Jolly	<p>I request the budget paper 2020-21 include a number of inclusion and statements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Report all Statutory laws Council must abide by when determining the draft budget and budget 2020-21 and the yearly reporting. b. List by name Council Fees and Charges Policy which is reviewed annually. c. List by name Councils Investment Policy approved as of 18/3/2020 (Ordinary Council meeting H 12). d. List by name Council Procurement Policy approved as of 17/6/2020 (Ordinary council meeting H 15) and the Procurement Delegation Policy approved as of 18/3/2020 (Ordinary council meeting H 14). e. A statement Council will report all financial details showing final project costs that are greater than the budgeted financial allocation. f. A statement Council will report all financial details showing final project costs when the budget surplus is greater than 5% of the total project cost. g. A statement of Council's Best Practices for determining Project Budget allocation costs, Tenders, Project Management cost setting and Contingency cost setting methods. h. A statement Council will report all details for Contingency expenditures as YTD, Forecast, Actual and a reason the Contingency was expensed. 	<p>Council's budget document is based on the Victorian Local Government sector Model Budget which has been developed in conjunction with representatives from the peak accounting body, FINPRO, Chartered Accountants Australia New Zealand and Local Government Victoria. In relation to specific inclusions requested we can advise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is no legislative or practice requirement for Council to report on the statutory laws it must abide by when determining the draft budget and the budget 2020/21. Council is required to report financial performance every quarter but there is no requirement to spell out the relevant legal obligation as part of this report. b. While Council does not have a formal Fees and Charges policy, fees and charges are reviewed annually ahead of the adoption of the budget and are normally indexed in line with movements in inflation or changes to statutory fees that are set by the State. Council has decided this year in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to freeze fees and charges at 2019/20 levels. c. There is no requirement to reference Council's Investment Policy within the budget document. References are made to the impact of lower interest rates that are largely related to the economic settings following the onset of the pandemic. d. There is no requirement to reference Council's Procurement Policy and Procurement Delegation in the budget document. Council is required to comply with the Procurement

		<p>Would Council please explain why listed in Councils Tender File, Contract 19009 has a cost of \$725,815.18 when H 10 Ordinary Council meeting 18 September 2019 reported the total contract cost of \$640,731.98 excluding GST (10%). Why is there an increase to the contract cost?</p> <p>Would Council please explain where the Investment money comes from for each quarter of a financial year?</p>	<p>provisions of <i>Section 186 of the Local Government Act 1989</i> until the transition to the new 2020 Local Government Act in July 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Council is not required to include a statement in the budget that it will report all financial details showing final project costs that are greater than the budgeted financial allocation. Council does report financial performance on all projects including those that are deferred at an individual project level as part of its Quarterly Financial Report. f. As above, no statement is required and this information can be deduced by the reader from Council's comprehensive quarterly financial reports. g. Council's practice of providing for project management and contingency costs as part of its capital budget for individual projects enables it to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Recover direct labour costs that are associated with the delivery of capital projects from the capital budget rather than inflating the operating labour budget and potentially creating an artificially high labour cost base which could embed cost inefficiencies. ii. Manage project risk. Capital projects have a number of risk factors that manifest themselves after project commencement and the inclusion of a contingency helps mitigate the financial impact. h. As previously indicated Council does not differentiate its project budgets into separate components for project management and contingency. <p>Contract 19009 was awarded for the sum of \$640,731.98 plus GST of \$64,073.20 (total contract cost of \$704,805.10). Allowances of \$6,000 (project management) and \$44,851.24 (contingencies) were also made and disclosed within the report. This increases total funding available for the project including GST to \$755,656.42 which is more than the cost of \$725,815.18 referenced in the submission.</p> <p>Council generates its cash flow from a variety of different sources including rates, fees and charges and government grants. Funds are expended on salaries, contract payments and capital expenditure. The net excess is invested in short term investments that are made under Council's investment policy. Importantly Council does not have an even cash flow and will in some quarters draw down on its investments to fund expenditure.</p>
23	Graham Jolly	<p>Why was there an increase in capital works projects during 2019/20 financial year? The 2019/20 budget document outlined 33 projects, expanded to 131 in Q1, 136 in Q2 and 146 in Q3. What caused this increase (when carryovers were only 80) and why are project numbers not shown?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I request the budget 2020/21 show project numbers which can be referenced across to tenders and council plan 2. I request that all projects intended to be undertaken during the 2020/21 year be fully reported in the budget document and be closely aligned to those reported in Q1 report 	<p>The budget document outlines high level funding pools to be used for specific purpose. For example, \$5.8 million for Buildings and Open Space renewal program. As renewal projects are completed during the year, to increase transparency, specific projects are created for each program and reported individually as they are completed. This therefore increases the number of projects when compared to the budget document. Additional projects may also be added for emergency works required during the year, projects that have been identified that have an urgent strategic or service need or for works related to unplanned receipt of grant funding.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I request the budget 2020/21 show project numbers which can be referenced across to tenders and council plan. <p>Project numbers are an internal tool used to allow for efficient reporting from our core system. These cannot appropriately be used to track projects from Council plan through to final delivery.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. I request that all projects intended to be undertaken during the 2020/21 year be fully reported in the budget document and be closely aligned to those reported in Q1 report <p>Projects shown in the 2020/21 Budget are detailed in Appendix 3 of the document. Further details including any continued delivery of projects carried over from 2019/20 will be reported in the Q1 capital works report.</p>

24	Jessica Harrison - Housing Matters Committee	<p>Housing Matters</p> <p>Request that Council, as part of the 2020/21 budget:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase an investment property (appx \$385,000) in Wonthaggi CBD to be provided as Transitional Housing to provide assistance to homeless people in need. - Management of the house would be completed by welfare agency such as Salvocare Social Housing - Maintenance of house by BCSC - Furnishing of house through community donations - Rates and services to be negotiated 	<p>Council has identified \$130k in the Draft 20/21 to undertake the Bass Coast Housing Strategy which will guide the local support for affordable, emergency and social housing in Bass Coast. This comprises a Shire wide land assessment which will inform future needs in Bass Coast and Council's role in this important community issue.</p> <p>The objectives of the Bass Coast Housing Strategy will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify suitable land across the Shire for the provision of affordable, emergency and social housing • Use data and metrics specific to Bass Coast to identify the needs of the community today and into the future • Consider and recommend types of housing and program support which aligns with Bass Coast's needs • Provide recommendations on advocacy priorities relating to affordable, emergency and social housing <p>Council is committed to this essential work and subject to the approved budget, will engage with the community, our partner organisations and relevant groups throughout 2020/21 to complete the Housing Strategy.</p> <p>The Housing Matters Committee proposed initiative is a wonderful example of the local understanding of Bass Coast's housing issues and will be considered on commencement of the Strategy.</p> <p>It is critical for Council to have an adopted Strategy to undertake this work.</p> <p>Until such a time that the Housing Strategy is completed and includes the Housing Matters Committee proposal, Council will not be in a position to provide funding as requested.</p>
25	Phil Wright	<p>Utilise low interest rate loans to purchase significant strips of land on the south coast of the island over the next 10 years. This would allow Bass Coast to create some significant recreational nature trails.</p>	<p>Council thanks Mr. Wright for his thoughtful submission and vision that will deliver significantly improved public accessibility to the coastline and provide an opportunity for the development of recreational nature trails.</p> <p>Land values especially those that have ocean views on the Island are high and Council is unable to commit to or investigate funding for the acquisition of ocean front strips of land on the Island.</p> <p>Council will be developing a Property Strategy that takes into consideration the future land use needs of the whole municipality and will guide future land purchases.</p>

26	Phil Dressing - Smiths Beachcomber Association	<p>Request that some funding be set aside for some quick wins resulting from the development of a Smiths Beachcomber Masterplan. This is following the YCW Masterplan adopted in 2014 not having any recommendations implemented to date. A suggestion for this quick win would be construction of speed humps at the YCW Beach car park to improve safety in this area. Another suggestion would be a footpath from the eastern corner of the Marlin Street, Smiths Beach Road intersection to the first Smiths Beach access stairs.</p> <p>We're optimistic that the Smiths Beach Masterplan will include recommendations for a holistic and broad vision for our Estate including a potential visitor economy solution for the Island's South Coast.</p> <p>Council's purchase of private land on and around the Smiths Beach Estate for entire community benefit should also be considered in the context of a long term vision. Committing to a long term plan is critical and paramount.</p> <p>As previously highlighted, a "User Pays" program would likely fund all recommendations.</p>	<p>The delivery of YCW BBQ Shelter and Picnic area planned for 2019/20 financial year has been put on hold following community concerns for the project. As a result, Council will be looking to engage with the local community through the current Smiths Beach Masterplan project to better understand the "whole" community preference for a picnic/bbq area at Beachcomber – YCW. In years 2023-2028 of Council's long term capital works plan, there is \$1.5million allocated to the delivery of projects outlined in the YCW Activity Area Master plan including access paths, carpark upgrades and viewing platforms.</p> <p>There is also funding allocated in 2023/24 and 20204/25 for the Smiths Beach Foreshore Beachcomber Master Plan.</p>
27	Ron Day	<p>Request that funding for possible replacement of existing road speed signage and any additional signage on Council managed roads be included in the budget document read for the impending Island Road Speed Review.</p>	<p>Rural Roads Victoria will fund and implement signage changes on all roads following the review. Any Council contributions to the project will be funded through existing budgets</p>
28	Rhyll Community Association	<p>Request a raised pavement to slow traffic on the corner of Lock and Beach Roads in Rhyll. This is a busy intersection (and expected to get busier after the boat ramp is completed) for pedestrians and it has been noticed that often vehicles are travelling faster than 50kmph.</p>	<p>Funding for this project has not been provided within the 2020/21 budget. We have included this intersection as part of the local road safety improvement program for assessment and prioritisation in future years.</p>
29	Elizabeth Sparkes	<p>Are there funds put aside for footpaths on Phillip Island, in particular Cowes/Rhyll Road & Rhyll Newhaven Roads?</p>	<p>Council is currently conducting planning and design work for a path on Cowes Rhyll Road to connect from Coughlan Road to Rhyll township. Construction has commenced and further design work will be completed to connect to Rhyll in 20/21. The draft 20/21 budget also includes a footpath to connect Thompson Avenue to Mary Star of the Sea and Five Ways Path to Phillip Island Road. A path on Rhyll Newhaven Road is included in Councils aspirational pathways plan with design to commence in future years in accordance with prioritisation.</p>
30	Jane Gardner	<p>Request that funding be provided towards The Paper South Gippsland News. A weekly consideration of \$600 (12month total of \$31,200) would provide Bass Coast Shire the following online benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (800x600) dedicated digital display advertising module, video capable - Native article editorial as per submission to our Editor to accompany your advert - Monthly metrics of advert results 	<p>Thank you for your submission. Council currently utilises in house digital channels, limiting the allocated budget to advertising in print publications only. Consideration for purchasing advertising through your online platform may be provided in future years. Please liaise with our Communications Team for future opportunities.</p>

31	Graham Jolly	<p>(A) I request through the elected Councillors to show cause as to why RESERVES ACCOUNTING practices are used by the Council of the Bass Coast Shire when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Estimated budget expenses conclude to unacceptable surpluses and a progression action of the final surplus to a Capital Works Project listed in a Council budget. - Reporting a project Management cost assigned to a Capital Works Project when there is no reporting of the labour rate hourly figure and the estimated length of time the management will take place. - Reporting Contingency costs that are greater than 2% of the tender cost that when not used or partially used adds to the overall budget surplus. This is a progression method aiding in the creation of a surplus when added after a tender from an external source is accepted by council. This practice generates General Revenue. - Investing tens of millions of cash during each quarter of a budget year in term deposits and shares for up to 82 to 111 days and with shares longer to generate funds while leaving relatively low millions of council's cash in bank at the end of each quarter. - Capital Works Projects are approved by the Councillors at budget time and later are assigned to the following year's projects works listing shown as Deferred, Carryover and Multi-Year projects which adds to Reserve funds assigned to the project of council at end of year. <p>(B) I request Council provide Statutory details council must abide by when setting any Contingency percentage cost allowance for a Capital Works Project. Council has used 5% to 10% Contingency cost during the 2019-20 year. Is the high Contingency cost allowance an indication the determination of tender details process is needing review?</p> <p>(C) I request an explanation; will council continue to invest income from the 2019-20 and 2020-21 budget years at approximately the same amounts as previous without Councillor Approval?</p> <p>(D) I request an explanation as to why there are considerable numbers of Capital Works Projects that are either Deferred or Carryover projects not completed at the end of year (30 June)? These projects that are reported are causing disappointment to ratepayers and most likely the Councillors. The CEO of council has a clear duty to carry out the instructions incorporated in a budget by starting the projects at the earliest possible time. There is a clear failure of the CEO's duties.</p> <p>(E) I request an explanation through the Audit Committee why were details missing to the Treasury report for the third quarter ending 31/3/2020. The 'Interest on Maturity' and the 'Cash in Bank' were not reported. Why? Will the Treasury Investment Report be reported in the coming Annual Report 2019-20? If no, then why? Will the Deferred and Carryover Projects and Multi-Year Project listing for 2019-20 be reported in the coming Annual Report 2019-20? If no, then why?</p> <p>(F) I request the Councillor Group consider my submission and determine budget changes and future reporting changes in the interest of your ratepayers.</p> <p>(G) I request a policy named 'Duties and Reporting of an Internal Audit Committee' be determined and developed for the year 2020-21 or updated if one exists.</p> <p>(H) I request Councillors to investigate and determine future courses of action and to change Council Accounting Practice away from Reserves Accounting</p>	<p>A. It is common practice for Victorian councils to use financial reserves as a mechanism to support their financial management and forward financial planning. Reserves are utilised inter alia to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Account for unexpended tied developer contributions. b. Account for unexpended grant revenue. c. Account for deferred capital and operational projects. d. Account for specific Council funding commitments that are funded from current and/or prior year surpluses. <p>B. Council is not subject to any statutory requirements regarding the use of contingencies when setting individual project budgets. Estimates of the percentage contingency are based on officer assessments of the project's risk and/or complexity.</p> <p>C. Council has delegated authority to the CFO and/or Manager, Finance to invest surplus monies. This delegation is subject to the officers investing funds in accordance with the Council's adopted Investment Policy.</p> <p>D. Council notes that the number of capital work carry overs is currently higher than desired. There are a number of explanations for why projects may be deferred or not yet completed at the end of the financial year, such as; unplanned delays experienced due to weather, disruption to supply lines, timing of State or Federal Government grant opportunities, emergency works, reprioritisation of resources, natural events (bushfires or covid-19) and unforeseen complications experienced on delivery or contractor availability. Council officers are working on a number of actions aimed at improving capital works delivery outcomes including increased CEO delegation for budgeted projects and further financial analysis applied to the phasing of multi-year capital projects.</p> <p>E. The Treasury report in the third quarter report is consistent with the reporting requirements of the Investment Policy. Cash at bank is included in the \$27 million reported in the Balance Sheet for Cash and cash equivalents. Council does not report on deferred capital projects in its annual report. These will be identified and forecast expenditure for these included as part of the first quarter 2020/21 financial report.</p> <p>F. Council have considered this submission which does not have an impact on the budget. Council confirms that no reporting changes are currently under consideration for 2020/21.</p> <p>G. The draft Audit and Risk Committee Charter, which includes the duties and reporting requirements of the Committee, will be presented to the 19 August Council meeting.</p> <p>H. Council will continue to use financial reserves as outlined in A above as mechanism to manage unexpended revenue received and large future expenditure commitments including deferred capital projects.</p>
----	--------------	--	--

