



**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING OF THE HINDMARSH SHIRE COUNCIL
HELD AT THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, NHILL ON WEDNESDAY 7 JUNE 2017,
COMMENCING AT 3:00PM**

AGENDA

1. Acknowledgement of the Indigenous Community and Opening Prayer

2. Apologies

3. Confirmation of Minutes

4. Declaration of Interests

5. Public Question Time

6. Correspondence

7. Assembly of Councillors

7.1 Record of Assembly

8. Planning Permit Reports

- 8.1 Amendment to Planning Permit 1478-15
- 8.2 Amendment to Planning Permit 1475-15

9. Reports Requiring a Decision

- 9.1 Naming of an unnamed government road reserve – Zanker Reserve Road
- 9.2 Local Government Performance Reporting – Six month update
- 9.3 Business Assistance Grants Program – 2017/18 Review
- 9.4 Business Assistance Grants Program – 2016/17 Remaining Funds
- 9.5 Hindmarsh Tourism
- 9.6 Community Action Grants Program – 2016/17 Review

10. Special Committees

- 10.1 Yurunga Homestead Committee

11. Late Reports

No report

12. Other Business

No report

13. Confidential Matters

- 13.1 Waste Management Contracts:
 - Contract No. 2014/15-03 – Kerbside Waste Collection
 - Contract No. 2014/15-04 – Kerbside Recyclables Collection
 - Contract No. 2014/15-05 – Transfer of waste to Dooen landfill

14. Meeting Close

Present: Crs. D. Nelson (Mayor), R. Lowe (Deputy Mayor), D. Colbert, T. Schneider, R. Gersch, R. Ismay

In Attendance:

Greg Wood, (Chief Executive Officer), Anne Champness (Director Corporate and Community Services), Adrian Gasperoni (Director Infrastructure Services), Taegan Salt (Executive Assistant),

1 - 8.2: Peter Jewell (Town Planner), Pamela Cannell (Planning Administrative Officer).

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY AND OPENING PRAYER

Cr Nelson opened the meeting at 3:00pm by acknowledging the Indigenous Community and offering the opening prayer.

2. APOLOGIES

Nil

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Wednesday 17 May 2017 in the Council Chamber, Nhill as circulated to Councillors be taken as read and confirmed.

MOVED: CRS R. Lowe/T. Schneider

That the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Wednesday 17 May 2017 in the Council Chamber, Nhill as circulated to Councillors be taken as read and confirmed.

CARRIED

Attachment: 1

4. DECLARATION BY COUNCILLORS OR OFFICERS OF ANY DIRECT OR INDIRECT INTEREST IN ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA.

- Direct; or
- Indirect interest
 - a) by close association;
 - b) that is an indirect financial interest;
 - c) because of conflicting duties;
 - d) because of receipt of an applicable gift;
 - e) as a consequence of becoming an interested party; or
 - f) because of an impact on residential amenity.

Declaration of direct or indirect interest must also be advised by Councillors at the commencement of discussion of the specific item.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

6. CORRESPONDENCE

6.1 GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE

No correspondence

7. ASSEMBLY OF COUNCILLORS

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services

Attachment: 2

Introduction:

The attached Assembly of Councillors Record is presented as an attachment to the Council agenda for the information of Councillors and recorded at the Council meeting as required under s80A Local Government Act 1989.

Options:

1. That Council accept the Assembly of Councillors Records as presented.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council accept the Assembly of Councillors Records as presented.

MOVED: CRS R. Gersch/R. Lowe

That Council accept the Assembly of Councillors Records as presented.

CARRIED

Attachment: 2

8. PLANNING PERMITS

MOVED: CRS T. Schneider/R. Lowe

Suspend standing order.

CARRIED

MOVED: CRS T. Schneider/R. Ismay

Resume standing orders.

CARRIED

8.1 AMENDMENT REQUEST FOR PLANNING PERMIT 1478-15

Responsible Officer: Director Infrastructure Services
File: Planning – Amendment – 1478-15
Attachment: 14

Background:

Council at its meeting of 19 October 2015 considered an application for the construction and use of a duck farm facility at 85 G Dahlenburg Road, Nhill. Six objections were received. Council at the meeting determined:

“That Council issue a Notice of Determination to Grant a Planning Permit for Application 1478-15 to allow duck sheds and associated buildings and structures including a dwelling and the removal of native vegetation on CA80B Parish of Winiam (85 G Dahlenburg Road, Nhill) subject to the following conditions ..”

Subsequently, objectors lodged an Application for Review with the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT). VCAT directed a Compulsory Conference (i.e. mediation) for the 19 February 2016. A full merits hearing was listed for three days commencing on 9 May 2016 if the Compulsory Conference was unsuccessful.

At the Compulsory Conference, the permit applicant and objector appellants agreed with additional conditions to the Council decision. The additional conditions included:

- the relocation of the two eastern sheds to minimise the effect on native vegetation;
- additional details of the proposed dwelling;
- that no waste from the site be deposited within 5 kilometres of the facility;
- an acoustic report be prepared prior to the commencement of the use and again three months after the use commences; if there is any non-compliance with noise standards then recommendations will be made and these are to be acted upon;
- that planting in the landscaping areas be of an indigenous species;
- a complaints protocol must be displayed at the entrance to the site; and
- that the use not cause detriment to the surrounding area.

Construction of the duck sheds commenced in late 2016. In January 2017 Council received complaints from local parties that the duck sheds were not being constructed with colourbond. This material was specified in the Environmental Management Plan and appeared on the endorsed plans. As well other discrepancies with the planning permit were raised. Subsequently Council wrote to the permit holder, Luv-a-Duck, asking for a response to these queries. The permit holder then applied for an amendment to the planning permit seeking various changes. These changes included using zincalume instead of colorbond for the duck shed roofs.

The amendment to the planning permit was placed on public notice. All the parties originally notified of the application, as well as objectors, have been notified of the amendment request. To date, six objections have been received.

The permit holder continued with building works and has since placed ducks in the sheds. Council has been requested by two parties to take enforcement action against the permit holder. Enforcement action has not been taken, as there is currently an amendment request before Council. In these circumstances VCAT very rarely issues stop Orders and typically only does so if ongoing high degrees of nuisance or detriment are being caused. There is no apparent detriment being caused to the local environment that can be associated with the changes being sought. Accordingly, the prospects of achieving anything meaningful by undertaking enforcement action are poor and are considered misdirected given the importance of assessing the merits of the amendment request.

An enforcement action has been lodged with VCAT by the planning consultant acting for one of the objectors. At the time of writing the matter has not been set for a Directions Hearing.

Amendment request:

The permit holder has sought an amendment to the permit. This includes the following:

- Amend the endorsed plan to reflect the current roof material and colour of the duck sheds to be zincalume.
- A corresponding change is sought to Section 2.2.3 of the Environmental Management Plan so that the roof material is specified as zincalume.
- Amend the endorsed plan to show a truck wash.
- Amend the wording of Condition 24 to include the words 'unless otherwise approved by the Responsible Authority'. Condition 24 relates to the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the site.
- Amend the EMP to reflect the correct date as per condition 24 (i.e. August 2015).

Several objectors have raised concerns that the provisions of Condition 3 have not been satisfied. This condition requires a 5m landscaping strip along the site perimeter. The condition also specifies that this planting must be indigenous. The objectors have claimed that not all of the planting is 'indigenous'.

Advice has been provided by the permit holder on this matter. The landscaping was planted prior to the construction of the sheds. It is now well established and has been inspected on several occasions. The permit holder contracted the Hindmarsh Landcare Network to install the landscaping. The Chairman of the Hindmarsh Landcare Network, Clifford Unger has provided advice that:

- *the species planted on 26 September comprised indigenous species and species growing in the local area; and*

- *the species included Acacia app. Iteaphylla and Pendula and Eucalyptus app. Platypus, Torquata, Microcarpa, Salmonphloia, Camaldulensis and Incrassata.*

In order to remove any ambiguity noting the objectors concerns, the permit holder has request that condition 3 be amended so that references to planting are altered such that the condition reads in part: '*The landscaping plan must detail predominately indigenous planting ...*' and '*The planting carried out on the site must be predominately indigenous species ...*'.

Several of the objector's have also made complaints that condition 5 has not been followed. This condition requires an acoustic compliance report be prepared prior to the works starting (to set a noise 'base') and twelve months after the facility is fully operational. The condition references the '*nearest sensitive receptor*' with regards the preparation of the report. This could be considered a dwelling which appears presently unoccupied approximately 1km south of the duck sheds.

There is some ambiguity in the way the permit condition is written in that it could be construed that the noise testing must be done at the nearest sensitive receptor or alternatively that the noise impacts must relate to potential noise impacts at the nearest sensitive receptor.

The acoustic compliance report has been submitted to Council with the 'logger' to collect noise readings having been placed near the southern boundary of the property (i.e. approximately 100m south of the sheds). The acoustic engineer in response to queries advised Council that positioning the logger much closer to the sheds would provide more stringent noise requirements. As well the logger being on the subject site would be far more secure and readings could be done without the need to seek access to private property.

As a consequence of the objector's concerns the permit holder has sought an amendment to condition 5 to delete the words 'at the nearest sensitive receptor'. The deletion of these words will not alter the intent or requirements of the condition that is that noise from the duck farm must comply with the relative EPA requirements.

Assessment:

The changes sought by the permit holder are detailed above. The amendment request has attracted six objections. The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:

- the permit conditions were agreed at a VCAT mediation, the permit holder should abide by this agreement;
- the use of zincalume on the roofing will cause glare;
- the truck wash was not shown on the plans it could cause adverse environmental outcomes;
- the sheds are elevated above ground level and will impact upon the amenity of the area;
- the various amendments proposed by the permit holder will adversely impact the adjacent fauna and flora reserve;
- the acoustic engineering report was not carried out in accordance with the relevant permit condition;
- stormwater drainage could be exacerbated by the variations in building height; and
- the landscaping that has been planted is not entirely of an indigenous type.

Consultants on behalf of the permit holder have provided a response to these matters. The matters under dispute for convenience can be divided into seven headings.

Roofing of the sheds:

There is currently an inconsistency in the EMP with regards the roofing material. Condition 24 of the Permit states:

The proposal will be operated in accordance with the Environmental Management Plan as prepared by Scolexia, dated August 2015.

Section 2.2.3 of the approved EMP states:

External finishes of the shed will exhibit low visual intrusion. The shed walls and roof are to be finished in green colour bond. The roof finishing is zinalume. Energy consumption, fan usage and animal welfare have been considered in selecting the roof surface.

The amendment request seeks to remove this ambiguity by having a consistent description of the roof materials. The reasons for seeking the change have been given by the permit holder's planning consultant and animal health consultant (i.e. Scolexia), these include:

- zinalume has a significantly lower 'solar absorbance' than green colorbond. In hot sunny weather, the internal temperature a shed finished in green colorbond may be up to 15° C warmer than one finished in zinalume;
- the welfare of poultry, including ducks is affected by high temperatures. The 'Model Code of Practice for the Welfare of Animals: Domestic Poultry 4th Edition' requires facilities to ensure temperatures not to exceed 33° C;
- the duck farm is located in an area where days of extreme high temperatures occur. This requires the operator to employ all available measures to mitigate the impact of high temperatures on the welfare of the ducks; and
- such measures includes using a roofing material with the lowest possible solar absorbance. For that reason, zinalume is the most common material used for roofing poultry sheds.

In relation to the choice of roofing materials a check of Council records going back to 2010 indicates that colorbond has not been required on any other farm. Council has no policy or development control which requires 'muted' tones on farm shedding (i.e. suggesting colorbond type treatments). There are numerous farm sheds in the locality that are constructed of zinalume. The other duck sheds in the Shire are constructed of zinalume.

The subject site is located in a relatively sparsely populated area. The nearest dwelling is 1km away. The nearest other dwelling appears to be 1.8km's from the sheds and this dwelling has an extensive garden area, which screens views to the sheds.

Predominately views of the sheds are from the west, south and east. Views from the north are obscured by the adjacent Winiam East reserve.

The duck sheds have a relatively low profile even allowing for the raised position due to the sloping land. The roof has a modest pitch. At present the sheds are visible from approximately 1km distance due to the open nature of surrounding farmland. It is anticipated that the perimeter landscaping will provide screening but this landscaping will take approximately 8-10 years to reach a height whereby total screening occurs (assuming growth rates of approximately 0.8m per year).

Some degree of glare is inevitable but this will depend upon the position of the sun and the viewing position. The nature of zinalume is such that there is a degree of oxidation. This will lessen the extent of glare over time so that the sheds will have a dull patina. On recent inspections of the site during sunny periods there was no glare from the sheds.

Given the site context, animal welfare elements, the low profile of the buildings, the landscaping prospects and the lack of any policies or controls requiring muted tones there is a compelling case to amend the permit to unambiguously state that the sheds have zincalume roofing.

Elevation of the western sheds:

The permit holder has advised that sheds 3 and 4 (the western sheds) are raised at the western end 3.35m above ground level. The eastern end of the sheds is cut into the site by 300mm. The height variation relative to ground level is due to the slope of the land. The shed floor has to remain level. The fill has been taken from the dam onsite. The sheds are single level. The applicant has advised that it is not practical to cut the eastern side of the sheds further into the ground due to drainage issues.

The raised position of the sheds needs to be considered in the site context. The sheds do not sit on a rise where they would be silhouetted against the skyline rather they are set into rising ground. The sheds are set well in from side boundaries and from public roads. There are no dwellings nearby. The property has a 5m wide landscaping strip around the site perimeter which in a relatively short period should provide screening of the buildings.

The sheds will be visible from public areas (i.e. predominately Winiam East Road) but at the closest point this is 700m. At this distance the extra height afforded by the fill for the western sheds will largely be indistinguishable from the height of the eastern sheds. Accordingly there is no obvious detriment caused by the raised position of the western sheds.

Truck Wash:

The permit holder has advised in relation to the truck wash that:

- the truck wash is an essential biosecurity measure for the use authorised by the Permit;
- Council's Environmental Health Officer inspected the truck wash on 31 January 2017 and deemed the quantity of water to be used is insufficient to travel any distance; and
- safe chemicals will be employed and relatively low quantities of water will be used.

Condition 30 of the Permit requires the operation to be consistent with the 'Farm Biosecurity Manual for the Duck Meat Industry' (Biosecurity Manual). The chapter titled 'Level 1 - Routine Biosecurity Procedures', standard 2.5.5 of the Biosecurity Manual states:

All vehicles taken into production area/s need to be washed and disinfected prior to entry.

The permit holder advises that in order for this standard to be observed it is necessary to include a truck wash at the site. The truck wash is positioned centrally in the facility. The truck wash is connected to a series of table drains. Truck wash areas are a feature associated with other duck farms. The lack of a truck wash on the plans originally considered by Council appears to have been an oversight on behalf of the permit applicant. The inclusion of the truck wash is a desirable addition to the facility and accords with the Biosecurity Manual associated with the sites EMP. There are no obvious external implications associated with this inclusion.

Rewording the EMP:

The permit holder has sought a wording of Condition 24 to include the words 'unless otherwise approved by the Responsible Authority'. Condition 24 relates to the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the site. This change is considered reasonable and allows changes to the EMP where they can be justified. A degree of flexibility is considered sensible given that there may be changes to the operations, practices or new technology. Such changes cannot however result in a 'transformation' of the EMP. Many similar permit conditions have a similar degree of flexibility.

Planting:

The permit holder as outlined above has sought to reword Condition 3 such that it refers to 'predominately indigenous planting'. Inspections have been undertaken at various times of the planting. The landscaping is in three rows and has a width of approximately 5m. It extends around the perimeter of the site. The plants are now well established and generally show vigorous growth. The planting was undertaken by the Hindmarsh Landcare Network a body with considerable experience in indigenous plantings and plantings that are suited to the site context.

The planting is expected to provide screening of the facility in the medium term. The change in wording to predominately indigenous planting recognizes the nature of the planting. Council does not insist on indigenous planting on other sites and does not have an approved planting list.

Position of Acoustic testing equipment:

As detailed above, condition 5 of the permit relates to acoustic testing to determine whether the duck sheds will create any unacceptable noise. The testing has to be done prior to the commencement of the works and twelve months after the sheds become operational. The 'pre' development testing has been done. The acoustic engineer placed the 'logger' on the southern boundary of the site not at the nearest sensitive receptor.

The nearest dwelling is 1 km from the sheds. Inspections of other duck operations and on the subject site after ducks were placed in sheds 1 and 2 indicated no perceptible noise from the animals at a distance of 10m - 20m.

The acoustic engineer has outlined the reasons for installing the logger on the property. Typically noise readings are taken at property boundaries of the 'host' site. The inclusion of the term 'nearest sensitive receptor' in the permit condition was added at the VCAT mediation hearing. It may be derived from permit conditions that relate to wind farms. The noise generated from wind farm turbines including low frequency noise is very different to that applied to other potential noise sources. The height of the wind turbines and sound waves also require a different approach to where recordings are made.

The rewording of the condition to delete references to the nearest sensitive receptor will not diminish the noise standards required. In fact by placing the logger closer to the noise source it is likely to result in more stringent standards. The change in the wording also has significant practical advantages in that the acoustic engineer does not have to gain access to private land and there can be an appropriate testing environment established (i.e. the logger equipment can be monitored). The change proposed is considered a sensible one that will remove ambiguities associated with the wording and one that will provide for higher acoustic requirements.

Drainage:

Objections have been raised as to the potential drainage implications of the proposal. The variations sought by the amendment request have been considered and there are no drainage concerns given the table drains and retarding basin proposed onsite. Stormwater from the sheds as required by condition 12 will be collected in water tanks. It will be used on site for a variety of purposes including cleaning, 'fogging' of the sheds and for watering where necessary of the landscaping areas. Condition 10 and 11 require that any storm water runoff be retained on site. There are no changes proposed to these conditions.

Summary:

It is never ideal when permit conditions that were agreed at a VCAT mediation hearing are sought to be altered. There will be instances when such permit conditions can be made more effective and practical. The changes proposed by the permit holder are considered to be reasonable and will provide for a more effective management and regulatory regime. The clarification of wording as it relates to the roofing material has obvious animal welfare benefits. Other changes to the wording of conditions will also bring more clarity to the responsibilities of the permit holder. The changes proposed are considered reasonable and will have no obvious external detriment to the broader landscape, local environment or amenity of the area.

Conflict of Interest:

Under section 80c of the Local Government Act 1989 officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible – Adrian Gasperoni, Director Infrastructure Services

In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no disclosable interests in this report.

Author – Peter Jewell, Town Planner

In providing this advice as the Author, I have no disclosable interests in this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council allows an application to amend Planning Permit 1478-15; this permit allows a duck facility at 85 G Dahlenburg Road, Nhill. The changes to the permit are as follows:

- ***Amend the endorsed plan to reflect the current roof material and colour of the duck sheds to be zincalume.***
- ***A corresponding change is made to Section 2.2.3 of the Environmental Management Plan so that the roof material is specified as zincalume.***
- ***Amend the endorsed plan to show a truck wash.***
- ***Amend Condition 3 so that it refers to ‘The permit holder The landscaping plan must detail predominately indigenous plantings within the landscaping strip. All planting carried out on the site must be predominately indigenous species to the satisfaction of the responsible Authority.’ (The underlining indicates the words to be added).***
- ***Amend Condition 5 so that the expression ‘at the nearest sensitive receptor’ is deleted.***
- ***Amend the wording of Condition 24 to include the words ‘unless otherwise approved by the Responsible Authority’. Condition 24 relates to the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the site.***
- ***Amend the EMP to reflect the correct date as per condition 24 (i.e. August 2015).***

MOVED: CRS D. Colbert/R. Ismay

That Council allows an application to amend Planning Permit 1478-15; this permit allows a duck facility at 85 G Dahlenburg Road, Nhill. The changes to the permit are as follows:

- ***Amend the endorsed plan to reflect the current roof material and colour of the duck sheds to be zincalume.***
- ***A corresponding change is made to Section 2.2.3 of the Environmental Management Plan so that the roof material is specified as zincalume.***
- ***Amend the endorsed plan to show a truck wash.***
- ***Amend Condition 3 so that it refers to ‘The permit holder The landscaping plan must detail predominately indigenous plantings within the landscaping strip. All planting carried out on the site must be predominately indigenous species to the***

satisfaction of the responsible Authority.' (The underlining indicates the words to be added).

- *Amend Condition 5 so that the expression 'at the nearest sensitive receptor' is deleted.*
- *Amend the wording of Condition 24 to include the words 'unless otherwise approved by the Responsible Authority'. Condition 24 relates to the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the site.*
- *Amend the EMP to reflect the correct date as per condition 24 (i.e. August 2015).*

CARRIED

Attachment: 14

Roy Costa, Roy Costa Planning and Development spoke on behalf of the objectors.
Wes Dean, spoke as an objector
Andrew McBride, Livestock Manager spoke on behalf of the applicant

8.2 AMENDMENT TO PLANNING PERMIT 1475-15

Responsible Officer:	Director Infrastructure Services
File:	Planning – Permits – 1475-15
Assessment:	143380
Attachment:	3
Applicant:	Mark Shearwood
Owner:	Mark Shearwood
Subject Land:	Lot 10, PS 000624 (34 Leahy Street, Nhill)
Proposal:	Amend plans for Planning Permit allowing a second dwelling
Zoning & Overlays:	General Residential Zone (GRZ) Environmental Significance Overlay (Schedule 6)

Summary:

The permit holder has sought an amendment of the above permit. The application was approved at Council's meeting of the 18 March 2015. More recently the permit applicant has been granted an extension of the permit.

The subject site is located on the northeast corner of Leahy Street and Langford Street, Nhill. The site is presently developed with a single storey dwelling with frontage to Leahy Street. Along the side boundary to Langford Street was previously a single garage and a small shed. The garage structure has since been removed. The garage had dimensions of 6.5m x 17m and was setback 3.5m from the Langford Street frontage. The garage was setback approximately 600mm from the southern boundary, and was of a corrugated steel construction.

The planning permit allows construction of a second dwelling in the northern portion of the site. The second dwelling as approved was to occupy a similar area to the garage.

No changes are proposed to the existing dwelling that fronts Leahy Street. The new approved dwelling is single storey and has an east west alignment. It has a setback of 3.8m from the front boundary (to Langford Street), 1.6m from the north boundary and 1.3m from the east boundary. A new dividing fence is proposed to separate the new and existing dwelling.

The amendment request seeks changes to vary the plans for the new second dwelling. It is proposed to have a north south alignment. The main building alignment is setback 9.4m from the frontage, 3.3m from the north boundary and 5.7m from the east boundary. The driveway for the dwelling is proposed to be located adjacent the north boundary (as approved it is located further to the south). The proposed open space for the second dwelling is located to the east of the building. There are no changes proposed for the existing dwelling.

The proposed dwelling has increased setbacks from the north, east and west boundaries. It is a smaller dwelling than has been approved. The private open space position is to the east which is superior to the approved plan which was it to the south of the dwelling. There are no differences with respect to the existing dwelling. The amending plans are considered superior to the approved plans in respect to internal and external amenity considerations. The proposal achieves a good standard of compliance with the ResCode standards.

The Hindmarsh Planning Scheme encourages a diverse supply of housing and a good standard of residential accommodation. The proposal is consistent with these planning objectives.

Notification & Referral of Application:

Pursuant to Sections 52 and 55 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 (the Act), notice of the application must be given to the community and referred to stipulated authorities.

Community:

Notice of the amendment request was not given as the proposal represents a smaller 'footprint' with regards setbacks to adjoining properties. It remains a single storey building.

Authorities:

Pursuant to Section 52 of the Act, notice of this application was not referred to any authorities, as the proposal is not subject to any relevant controls.

Pursuant to Section 55 of the Act, notice of this application was not required.

Strategic, Statutory and Procedural Requirements:

The proposal is inconsistent with the State Planning Policy Framework and the Local Planning Policy Framework, including the Municipal Strategic Statement and local planning policies.

Report to Council:

The Town Planner advises that all obligations of Council (strategic, statutory and procedural) have been addressed and discharged in this planning application.

Processing Times:

The application for an amendment was received on 18 April 2017. The report is being presented to the Council meeting of 7 June 2017. The statutory processing time requirements of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 have been satisfied.

Conflict of Interest:

Under section 80c of the Local Government Act 1989 officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible – Adrian Gasperoni, Director Infrastructure Services

In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no disclosable interests in this report.

Author – Peter Jewell, Town Planner

In providing this advice as the Author, I have no disclosable interests in this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approves amending plans for Planning Permit 1475-15 to erect a second dwelling at Lot 10, PS 000624 (34 Leahy Street, Nhill).

MOVED: CRS R. Gersch/R. Lowe

That Council approves amending plans for Planning Permit 1475-15 to erect a second dwelling at Lot 10, PS 000624 (34 Leahy Street, Nhill).

CARRIED

Attachment: 3

9. REPORTS REQUIRING A DECISION

9.1 NAMING OF AN UNNAMED GOVERNMENT ROAD RESERVE – ZANKER RESERVE ROAD

Responsible Officer: Director of Infrastructure Services

Introduction:

Council has received a request to name an unnamed government road reserve near the eastern boundary of our shire within an area more commonly known amongst the local community members as Peppers Plain. The proposal is to name the road Zanker Reserve Road.

Discussion:

The road is aligned in an east-west orientation between the G Starick Road and Geodetic Road which coincidentally forms the western boundary of our shire.

The road is currently unnamed, however the road is commonly known to local residents as Reserve Road. Records will show that since 1896, properties either side of this road has been owned members of the Zanker family.

Procedures and principles for naming, renaming and adjusting the boundaries of geographic features, localities and roads are set out in the Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010 Version 2 (in accordance with Part 2 of the Geographic Place Names Act 1998). In naming a road, Council must act in accordance with these guidelines and ensure the proposal conforms to its various naming principles and procedures. Importantly, road authorities must seek the Registrar's approval for the proposed road name prior to publishing a gazette notice.

Formal proposal process:

→ Step 1 Check information

Check all necessary information has been provided by the party proposing the name.

→ Step 2 Apply the principles

Upon selection of a new name and/or boundaries, municipal councils should check that the proposal conforms to all of the principles outlined in Sections 1.8 and 4.1 of these guidelines.

Principles detailed in section 4.1:

Principle 4(A) AS/NZS 4819:2011 Rural and urban addressing

Except where provisions are already made in these guidelines, the naming of a road must conform to the provisions of AS/NZS 4819:2011 Rural and urban addressing. The standard outlines how to derive datum points and how address numbers are assigned.

Principle 4(B) Extent: road course, start and end points

Any proposal to name or rename a road needs to clearly indicate the extent to which the name will apply. The extent of a road is considered to be its start and end points, and the course (including bends, divided carriageway sections and curves) of the road between these two points. A road name must not be applied in a way that is ambiguous or could cause confusion for road users.

Principle 4(C) Addresses and numbering

Addresses and numbering must comply with AS/NZS 4819:2011 Rural and urban addressing.

Principle 4(D) Road types

All roads must have a road type assigned that suitably describes the road's characteristics. The road type must be selected from the list of acceptable road types provided in Appendix 1 of the guidelines (which supersedes any list of road types published in AS/NZS 4819).

Principle 4(E) Unacceptable road names

Use of the definite article 'the' is not acceptable for sole use as a road name (e.g. it is not acceptable to name a road The Avenue). Road types are not to be used in the formation of a road name, for example Back Street Road or Boulevard Street. The use of numerals is not acceptable for a road name, either in full alphabetised or numeric format (i.e. neither Four, Fourth, 4 nor 4th are acceptable).

Procedure detailed in section 1.8:

Council is required to consult with the public on any naming proposal. The level and form of consultation can vary depending on the naming proposal.

Procedure

There are two types of community groups to consult with regarding a naming, renaming or boundary change proposal:

- the immediate community, which includes residents, ratepayers and businesses within the immediate area directly affected by the proposal; and
- the extended community, which includes residents, ratepayers and businesses surrounding the area directly affected by the proposal; any visitor groups to the area; and government or non-government organisations with an interest in or who service the area.

As a minimum, when a proposed naming, renaming or boundary change will affect current addresses, the naming authority must contact the immediate community in writing (by letter or email). Letters must be sent to the ratepayers of the properties and where the ratepayers are not the owner-occupiers; letters must also be sent to the residents and/or the business occupants.

If a proposal will not affect current addresses the naming authority must consult with the public by advertising the proposal in local or statewide newspapers. The naming authority can also promote the proposal to the immediate and extended community on a website, through letters, newsletters or magazines, email contact lists and public notices.

Communication through letter or advertising must outline the following information:

- the location and extent of the feature, locality or road proposed to be named, renamed or have boundaries changed (with a map and written description – to reduce advertising costs the public can be referred to a website and council office to view these details);
- the reason the particular name and/or new boundaries have been chosen for the proposal;
- an invitation for public feedback with a closing date 30 days from the date of the letter and/or advertisement (whichever is later); and
- (if the proposal is accepted by the naming authority and approved by the Registrar) an indication that Australia Post may continue to record and recognise the old address for a period of six to 12 months to ensure a smooth transition from the old address to the new address (the letter should also indicate that Australia Post may not guarantee the delivery of incorrectly addressed mail and advise customers to use their official address).

→ Step 3 Consult with Indigenous communities n/a

→ Step 4 Consult with emergency response and other stakeholders

As the proposal adheres to the principles of the guidelines, there is no need for consultation with emergency response and other service providers.

→ Step 5 Consult with the public

The immediate community including residents, ratepayers and businesses must be consulted on proposals that will affect their address.

→ Step 6 Council consideration

Once the above steps have been undertaken a report must be prepared on the proposal.

The report must include:

- discussion of how the proposal conforms to principles in Sections 1.8 and 4.1 of the guidelines; and
- discussion of and response to any objections/comments received during the consultation period(s).

Any party who responded to the proposal must be advised of Council's decision.

Upon completion of these steps, Council can lodge the proposal with the Office of Geographic Names (OGN). Upon receiving a proposal to name or rename a road, the OGN will upload details of the proposal on the Proposals webpage at www.dse.vic.gov.au/namingplaces. If the Registrar deems that the proposal conforms to the guidelines the OGN will proceed to gazette the proposal. Once the proposal has been gazetted, the Registrar will enter the details of the new road name into VICNAMES. The gazettal date will be recorded as the official date of registration.

The proposal to formally name the unnamed government road reserve Zanker Reserve, the road meets all the requirements of the Guidelines for Geographic Names 2010 Version 2.

It is anticipated that no formal objections will be received from the community.

Options:

Council can choose to leave the road unnamed, proceed to formally change the name of the road to Zanker Reserve Road or name the road another name in accordance with the guidelines.

Link to Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 2.1: An actively engaged community.

Financial Implications:

Minor costs associated with advertising and signage will be covered within the budget.

Risk Management Implications:

There are none to consider.

Conflict of Interest:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible and Author: Adrian Gasperoni, Director Infrastructure Services

In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible and Author, I have no interests to disclose.

Communications Strategy:

The community will be informed about the proposal through an advertisement in the Rainbow/Jeparit Argus and letters to affected ratepayers.

RECOMMENDATION:

That

- 1. Council proceeds to name the unnamed road reserve aligned east to west from G Starick Road and Geodetic Road "Zanker Reserve Road".*
- 2. Council consults the community about its intent through advertisements in the Rainbow/Jeparit Argus as well as letters to affected ratepayers.*
- 3. In the absence of any formal objection within a 30 day period, Council proceeds with lodging of the formal proposal to name the road through the Office of Geographic Names.*
- 4. Any objections received be heard and resolved at a further Council meeting.*

MOVED: CRS R. Ismay/R. Lowe

That

- 1. Council notify the intent to name the unnamed road reserve aligned east to west from G Starick Road and Geodetic Road "Zanker Reserve Road".*
- 2. Council consults the community about its intent through advertisements in the Rainbow/Jeparit Argus as well as letters to affected ratepayers.*
- 3. In the absence of any formal objection within a 30 day period, Council proceeds with lodging of the formal proposal to name the road through the Office of Geographic Names.*
- 4. Any objections received be heard and resolved at a further Council meeting.*

CARRIED

Break: 4:09pm
Returned: 4:20pm

9.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE REPORTING – SIX MONTH UPDATE

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services
Attachment Number: 4

Introduction:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a Local Government Performance Reporting update on the six months from July to December 2016.

Discussion:

The Performance Reporting Framework was introduced in 2014 to ensure that all councils are measuring and reporting on their performance in a consistent way.

The primary objecting of the Framework is to provide comprehensive performance information that meets the needs of a number of audiences.

Council is required to prepare six-monthly reports of indicators measuring the results against financial and non-financial performance.

Options

Council can note the report.

Link to Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 4.6: An organisation that takes its risk management responsibilities seriously and embeds a culture of risk management throughout the organisation.

Financial Implications:

Nil.

Risk Management Implications:

Management of risks will minimise Council's exposure to adverse financial impacts, improve effectiveness and generate efficiencies.

Conflict of Interest:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible: Anne Champness, Director Corporate & Community Services
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

Author: Monica Revell, Finance & Customer Services Manager
In providing this advice as the Author, I have no interests to disclose.

Communications Strategy:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council receives the Local Government Performance Reporting data for the six month period to December 2016.

MOVED: CRS T. Schneider/R. Ismay

That the Council receives the Local Government Performance Reporting data for the six month period to December 2016.

CARRIED

Attachment: 4

9.3 BUSINESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM – 2017/18 REVIEW

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community Services

Attachment: 5-8

Introduction:

This report is to provide Council with a review of the 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants Program (BAGP) and to seek recommendations on proposed improvements to the 2017/18 financial year grant program. .

Discussion:

In its first year of existence, the Business Assistance Grant Program (BAGP) has received wide and positive feedback from across the Shire. Funded through Council's 2016/17 Annual Budget, the BAGP has provided necessary motivation to small businesses across the shire to proceed with the next stage of their business operations, whether it be starting a new business, growing an existing business through staff development, expanding operations into a neighbouring town or improving the exterior of their business.

Over the 2016/17 year, eighteen (18) applications were received with funding requests totalling \$45,677.50 over the four funding categories. Through two rounds of funding, \$25,212.72 of grants were awarded to small business across the Shire (\$27,537.50 were awarded but not all grants taken up by recipients).

Table1: 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants Program Overview

Category	Number of Applicants 2016/17	Total Amount Requested 2016/17	Total Amount Awarded 2016/17
Start Up	2	\$6,000	\$3,000
Business growth	3	\$7,350	\$2,350
Expansion / relocation	1	\$3,000	\$3,000
Streetscapes	12	\$29,327.50	\$19,187.50
TOTAL	18	\$45,677.50	\$27,537.50

Table2: 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants Program Overview by funding round

Category	Number of Applicants Rd 1	Total Amount Requested Rd 1	Number of Applicants Rd 2	Total Amount Requested Rd 2
Start Up	2	\$6,000	0	\$0
Business growth	2	\$5,000	1	\$2,350

Expansion / relocation	1	\$3,000	0	\$0
Streetscapes	10	\$23,327.50	2	\$ 6,000
TOTAL	15	\$37,327.50	3	\$8,350

As Table 2 suggests, Round 1 was significantly more popular than Round 2 in the first year of the grant program. It is assumed this is a consequence of heavy promotion throughout Council's budget process and to local businesses, which had great anticipation of the program.

The BAGP had many successful outcomes, including the widely popular streetscapes category. All four categories provided businesses with the incentive to complete projects that they had been delaying due to financial and/or time restrictions. The program provided a positive connection and established relationships with new businesses, and built upon existing relationships with established businesses.

Although the BAGP was a successful program, it also had many challenges including components of the grant application and in particular the risk assessment plan that were deterrents for business owners to apply for funds. Another challenge revolved around the permits required for projects in the streetscapes category and the additional time required completing projects in their entirety with permit application processes.

Overall, the 2016-17 Business Assistance Grant Program was a great introduction for Council and business to collaborate on meaningful projects that add value to the ongoing operation and sustainability of small business in the shire.

2017-18 Business Assistance Grants Program

In reviewing the previous year's program, the following amendments are proposed for the improvement and refinement of the 2017-18 Business Assistance Grant Program.

- Merge Business Growth and Relocation / Expansion categories into one (Business Growth);
- Include the development of websites or upgrading websites to include an e-commerce component in Start-up and Business Growth categories;
- Modify Risk Assessment to a more simplified version (attachment 8).

Minor amendments to the application form based on feedback from 2016-17 applicants are also proposed. The amendments are around the language used and providing more information on sections that are 'grant specific', such as the in-kind contribution and budget tables. The amended funding guidelines, category breakdown, application form and risk assessment plan are provided as attachments 5, 6, 7 and 8.

It is proposed that two rounds of applications per year will continue as per the following details:

Round of Funding	Application to be submitted to Council	Applications assessed by Council
Round 1	Friday 28 July 2017	Wednesday 16 August 2017
Round 2	Friday 23 February 2018	Wednesday 21 March 2018

As per the 2016-17 program, a cap of \$3,000 of financial contribution will apply to the amount of

assistance provided by Council through the Business Assistance Grants Program. There are no restrictions on the amount of non-cash items an applicant can apply for. Cash items include promotion on Council's Facebook page and assistance with developing a media release for promoting the project's completion.

Applications will be reviewed and recommendations to Council made bi-annually, based on the following eligibility criteria:

<p>Why? 30%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explain the demonstrated need for the project. - How will the project improve the business operations and economic situation?
<p>What? 30%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a brief summary of what you are going to do. - Complete and submit a Risk Assessment for the project - Provide detail on how Hindmarsh Shire Council's contribution will be recognised and acknowledged.
<p>How? 40%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide quotes/ information on specific item(s) funds will be used to purchase. - Provide the organisations banking details and evidence that the organisation can complete the project on time and to budget. - Complete the budget and in-kind contribution templates. - How will your projects success be measured? (including number of employment opportunities gained)
<p>Finally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete eligibility and submissions checklist.

Grant recipients will be required to sign a grant acceptance agreement, outlining the conditions of the grant. Recipients will also be required to provide evidence of payment of approved expenses to facilitate reimbursement and prepare a grant acquittal report.

The Business Assistance Grant Program has been developed through research into best practice models both locally and interstate from a wide variety of local government authorities, as well as utilising the learnings from Council's Community Action Grants Program for a local context.

Link to Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 2.1: Well-maintained physical assets and infrastructure to meet community and organisational needs.

Strategic Objective 3.1: A strong rural economy and thriving towns

Financial Implications:

An allocation of \$20,000 has been included in the draft 2017-18 Annual Budget.

Risk Management Implications:

An initial risk assessment has been completed during the development of the grants program. Grant recipients will undertake their own risk management.

Conflict of interest:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible: Anne Champness, Director Corporate & Community Services
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

Author: Katherine Colbert, Economic Development Coordinator
In providing this advice as the Author, I have no interests to disclose.

Communication strategy:

The Business Assistance Grants Program will be promoted through the following channels:

- Community Information Sessions
- Council's Facebook Page
- Council's website
- Media release distribution
- E-marketing to local businesses

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council endorses the following changes to be implemented in the 2017/18 Business Assistance Grants Program:

- ***Merge Business Growth and Relocation / Expansion categories to one (Business Growth); and***
- ***Include the development of websites or upgrading websites to include an e-commerce component in Start-up and Business Growth; and***
- ***Modifying Risk Assessment to a more simplified version.***

MOVED: CRS R. Gersch/T. Schneider

That Council endorses the following changes to be implemented in the 2017/18 Business Assistance Grants Program:

- ***Merge Business Growth and Relocation / Expansion categories to one (Business Growth); and***
- ***Include the development of websites or upgrading websites to include an e-commerce component in Start-up and Business Growth; and***
- ***Modifying Risk Assessment to a more simplified version.***

CARRIED

Attachment: 5-8

9.4 BUSINESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS PROGRAM – 2016/17 REMAINING FUNDS

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community Services

Introduction:

This report seeks Council approval to allocate the remaining funds of the 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants Program (BAGP) budget to projects in Dimboola, Jeparit, Nhill and Rainbow.

Discussion:

Funded through Council's 2016/17 Annual Budget, the Business Assistance Grant Program (BAGP) has provided assistance to small businesses across the Shire to proceed with the next stage of their business operations, whether it be starting a new business, growing an existing business through staff development, expanding operations into a neighbouring town or improving the exterior of their business.

Overall, the 2016/17 Business Assistance Grant Program was a great introduction for Council and business to collaborate on meaningful projects that add value to the ongoing operation and sustainability of small business in the shire.

Over the 2016/17 year, eighteen (18) applications totalling \$45,677.50 were received over the four funding categories. Through the two funding rounds, \$27,537.50 of grants were awarded to small business across the Shire.

A budget of \$20,000 was originally allocated to the 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants in the 2016/17 Council Budget. An additional \$18,183 was reallocated by Council in 2016 from a previous project that did not proceed. Of the available \$38,183, a total of \$25,212.72 has been allocated to successful grant applications, advertising and incidentals such as hall hire for the grant information sessions held in 2016 (not all grant recipients chose to proceed with their projects).

As a result, \$12,970.28 remains unallocated from the 2016/17 Business Assistance Grants Program budget for the current financial year. Due to the demand for funding and success of the streetscapes category in the grants program, it is proposed that the remaining funds be divided between streetscapes project within each of the towns as per the following details.

Dimboola

This financial contribution would be used towards new street furniture and would see the replacement of one current cement and timber seat. This project would be completed in consultation with the Dimboola Town Committee as to the location of the seat for priority replacement. There are currently 14 cement base and timber slat seats in Dimboola's business district and it is proposed that two of these be replaced. Estimated cost per seat \$1,775 (excl. GST), plus delivery (\$420 for 2) and installation – total **\$3970**

Alternatively, the remaining funds could be utilised on aesthetic improvements at the Riverside Holiday Park (RHP). The newly formed RHP Advisory Committee, has nominated the following works be considered for funding in the near future: cementing the path to the new camp kitchen and installing a set of steps, or the purchase of paint for the exterior refurbishment of the ensuites.

Jeparit

The Jeparit Town Committee has identified and instigated a streetscape project for Broadway and Roy Street. Council's Community Development Project Engineer and Community

Development Officer have been assisting with this project. Allocated funds would be utilised to replace a timber picnic table located on Roy Street in front of the Jeparit Supermarket and replace it with pavers at the height of the footpath and to plant a new appropriate tree.

Estimated cost for the picnic table is **\$3,000.00** (excl. GST, including delivery and installation).

Nhill

The financial contribution would be used towards the completion of the Commercial Hotel car park project that has been held over from the previously completed Hindmarsh Open Spaces project in 2016. Funds have been carried forward for this project and the additional funds will be allocated to the purchase and planting of appropriate mature trees to provide shade for the car park, which is a popular parking place for local residents, workers and visitors alike.

It is proposed that this project will receive an allocation of **\$3,000**.

Rainbow

A long standing project identified and instigated by the Rainbow Town Committee has been the establishment of new Rainbow town entry signs. This project will see the installation of new town entry signs and would be a collaborative effort between the Rainbow Town Committee and Council. A budget of \$10,000 has been allocated by Council in the 2016/17 budget for this project.

It is proposed that this project receive an allocation of **\$3,000**, reducing the Town Committee's own financial contribution towards this project.

Link to Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 2.1: Well-maintained physical assets and infrastructure to meet community and organisational needs.

Strategic Objective 3.1: A strong rural economy and thriving towns

Financial Implications:

A budget of \$38,183 was allocated during the 2016/17 budget process for the Business Assistance Grants program and it is intended that the funds as outlined in this report will be spent in June 2017, with minimal carry forwards required as they are either in the planning or pre-commencement stage. The larger project of the Rainbow Town Entry sign may require funds to be carried forward to ensure the appropriate consultation and planning has been completed.

Allocation of funds as proposed would be in addition to any current budgets or provide a one-off investment for the purchase of street furniture.

Risk Management Implications:

A risk management plan will be completed for each project that receives a financial contribution through the re-allocated funds.

Conflict of interest:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible: Anne Champness, Director Corporate & Community Services
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

Author: Katherine Colbert, Economic Development Coordinator
In providing this advice as the Author, I have no interests to disclose.

Communication strategy:

The re-allocation of funds will be communicated directly to the Project Managers. In most cases, the project manager is either a Council officer or the respective town committee.

Each project will be communicated to the wider public through council's media channels, including:

- Council's Facebook Page
- Council's website
- Media release distribution

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approves the re-allocation of the remaining \$12,970.28 from the Business Assistance Grants Program to the following projects:

- ***Dimboola street furniture upgrade (\$3,970)***
- ***Jeparit Streetscapes Project (Roy Street and Broadway) (\$3,000)***
- ***Commercial Car Park Improvements, Nhill (\$3,000)***
- ***Rainbow Town Entry Sign (\$3,000)***

MOVED: CRS R. Lowe/T. Schneider

That Council approves the re-allocation of the remaining \$12,970.28 from the Business Assistance Grants Program to the following projects:

- ***Dimboola street furniture upgrade (\$3,970)***
- ***Jeparit Streetscapes Project (Roy Street and Broadway) (\$3,000)***
- ***Commercial Car Park Improvements, Nhill (\$3,000)***
- ***Rainbow Town Entry Sign (\$3,000)***

CARRIED

9.5 HINDMARSH TOURISM

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community Services

Introduction:

This report seeks support from Council on the future of Hindmarsh Tourism Association (HTA). Hindmarsh Tourism Association is an incorporated organisation supported by Council.

Discussion:

With the assistance of Hindmarsh Shire Council, Hindmarsh Tourism Association (HTA) was created and incorporated in 2011. HTA's mission was to promote and support the tourism industry in the Shire of Hindmarsh and Wimmera Mallee region.

The purpose of the Association was to coordinate and represent all businesses, organisations and individuals involved and interested in the tourism industry in the local area. This has been achieved through a number of projects:

- HTA Logo and slogan competition;
- Official Hindmarsh Visitor Guide;
- Town brochures;
- Member events including guest speakers and tourist attraction tours;
- Representation on the Wimmera Mallee Tourism Committee and attendance at meetings; and
- Hindmarsh Tourism video.

For a number of years, HTA gained momentum within the local and regional communities as a proactive committee promoting and supporting the tourism industry within Hindmarsh Shire. HTA met on a monthly basis, alternating between administrative and social meetings to ensure that members were actively engaged and aware of the tourism assets in each of the towns within the shire.

The last HTA meeting was held on Wednesday 13 August 2014 which was also the first meeting after the 2014 Annual General Meeting.

The executive committee positions at this time are detailed below:

Chairperson	Cr Ron Ismay
Vice Chair	Andrew Kube

No other positions were filled at this time. There were four committee members present at the meeting, with two apologies. Shortly after the meeting, Council's Community Development Officer and appointed Secretary/Treasurer for the previous year resigned from Council. At this point, the number of members decreased and engagement with business owners and tourism operators diminished. This was a result of the ongoing issues from developing individual town brochures and the development of the tourism video.

After nearly three years in recess, there have been significant changes in the tourism landscape of Hindmarsh Shire. The introduction of a dedicated Tourism Officer and the increased awareness of the economic benefits of tourism in the region have seen local tourism projected into the spotlight once again.

During this time, it has become apparent that for numerous reasons, volunteer committees continue to struggle to attract and maintain members across the shire and wider region. Contributing factors such as an ageing population, residents working longer hours and later in

life as well as altered recreational priorities have all played a part in diminishing numbers on executive and general committees.

In reviewing the sustainability of the HTA, it has been noted that re-establishing the committee has many challenges, particularly attracting adequate numbers of members from across the shire, attracting members from tourism-related businesses and organisations to the committee, as well as the capacity of volunteers to take on the executive roles.

The main drivers of the HTA in the past have also been involved in other Council Committees, such as the town committees, Nhill Aerodrome Master Plan Advisory Committee (NAMPAAC) and Wimmera Mallee Pioneer Museum.

Since the employment of a dedicated Tourism Officer at Council, significant achievements have been made contributing to the overall awareness of tourism at a local and regional level. There has been limited interaction at the 'grassroots' level of tourism in Hindmarsh due to the priority of delivering Council's funded projects and regionally significant tourism-related projects, such as Menzies Square, Wimmera River Discovery Trail (Hindmarsh Trail) Feasibility, Wimmera Mallee Pioneer Museum Strategic Plan, Riverside Holiday Park cabins, Wimmera Mallee Tourism, Wimmera Indigenous Tourism Strategy and the Grampians Region Cycling and Walking Trail Master Plan.

The completion (or near-completion) of the above-mentioned projects will allow the Tourism Officer to focus on the 'grassroots' level of tourism within the shire. This has already commenced with the development and implementation of the Events Management Guide.

The initiatives from the HTA that would become Council's responsibilities would include, but not limited to:

- Updating content and reprinting of individual town brochures;
- Updating content and reprinting of official Hindmarsh Visitor Guide (this has already occurred with previous re-prints);
- Coordination of tourist operator events, including guest speakers, industry networking opportunities and information sessions; and
- Tours of local tourist attractions.

A new initiative that has been suggested is an annual/bi-annual tourism forum to provide an opportunity for the entire community to meet and discuss tourism-related topics. This would replace the monthly administrative meetings previously held by Hindmarsh Tourism.

These initiatives would allow Council to continue and build on the relationships with tourism operators and tourism-related business owners and community organisations across the four towns in the attempt to build networks, share information and motivate tourism stakeholders in working as a team to improve the local economy through visitor dollars.

The initiatives outlined will complement Council's current focus on economic development and tourism and can be incorporated into the new financial year's work plan.

Link to Council Plan:

Strategic Objective 3.1: A strong rural economy and thriving towns

Strategic Objective 3.2: A thriving tourism industry

Financial Implications:

The Rules of Hindmarsh Tourism Association Incorporated state that, (24.1) 'In the event of the winding up or the cancellation of the incorporation of the Association, the assets of the

Association shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Act or shall be transferred to some other organisation having similar purposes as the Association'.

HTA currently has \$5,584.68 in a bank account, administered by Council Officers. By transferring these funds to Council (and subsequently closing the HTA bank account), this funding would provide twelve months of support for local tourism initiatives, coordinated by Council's Tourism Officer.

Previous Council budgets have allocated funds to support HTA. From 2018/19, budget submissions would be required to ensure adequate funding to continue local tourism initiatives to support and promote the local tourism industry, either through specific project funding or general local tourism ledger.

Risk Management Implications:

Each individual project will have a dedicated risk management plan. The risk of taking over the scope of Hindmarsh Tourism Association is limited as this is an extension of services already provided by Council through the economic development department.

Conflict of interest:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible: Anne Champness, Director Corporate & Community Services
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

Author: Katherine Colbert, Economic Development Coordinator
In providing this advice as the Author, I have no interests to disclose.

Communication strategy:

Each tourism-related project will have a specialist communications strategy.

Communicating the shift of activities from Hindmarsh Tourism Association to Council will be completed by a media release distributed to local media.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council supports the winding up of the Hindmarsh Tourism Association and endorses the transfer of funds from Hindmarsh Tourism Association to Hindmarsh Shire Council and provides staff resources to carry out future projects as per the objectives of the Hindmarsh Tourism Association.

MOVED: CRS R. Gersch/R. Ismay

That Council supports the winding up of the Hindmarsh Tourism Association and endorses the transfer of funds from Hindmarsh Tourism Association to Hindmarsh Shire Council and provides staff resources to carry out future projects as per the objectives of the Hindmarsh Tourism Association.

CARRIED

9.6 COMMUNITY ACTION GRANTS PROGRAM – 2016/17 REVIEW

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate & Community Services

Attachment Number: 9 - 11

Introduction:

This report is to provide Council with a review of the 2016/17 Community Action Grants Program (CAGP) and seek support on recommendations on how to improve the grant program for the 2017/18 financial year.

Discussion:

The Community Action Grant Program has again proved popular and been utilised by a large number of community groups and organisations across the Shire, with Minor Facilities Upgrades and Small Equipment the most sought after categories for the 2016/2017 financial year.

Over the 2016/17 year, thirty-one (31) applications were received through the three funding rounds with funding requests totalling \$37,928.00. From the \$30,000 budget allocation \$29,858.00 has been allocated to clubs and organisations across the Shire.

Table1: 2016/17 Community Action Grants Program Overview

Category	Number of Applicants 2016/17	Total Amount Requested 2016/17	Total Amount Awarded 2016/17
Community Assistance	4	\$6,000.00	\$1,700.00
Event Sponsorship	7	\$5,000.00	\$3,800.00
Minor Facility Upgrade	10	\$19,332.00	\$17,162.00
Small Equipment	10	\$7,569.00	\$7,196.00
TOTAL	31	\$37,928.00	\$29,858.00

2017-18 Community Action Grants Program

In reviewing the previous year's program, a few minor changes are recommended for the improvement and refinement of the 2017-18 Community Action Grant Program.

Suggestions for improving the grant program are listed below:

- Reduce the application forms from four category specific forms to one generic application that covers all four categories.
- Modify risk assessment to a more simplified version (attachment 11)

There have been minor amendments to the application form based on feedback from the 2016-17 applicants. The amendments are around the language used and providing more information on sections that are 'grant specific', such as the in-kind contribution and budget tables. The amended funding guidelines, application form and risk assessment plan are provided as

attachments 9 and 10.

It is proposed that there will again be three funds rounds in the 2017/2018 Financial Year as outlined below;

Category	Round Closing Date 1	Round Closing Date 2	Round Closing Date 3
Community Assistance	Friday 28 July 2017		Friday 23 February 2018
Event Sponsorship	Friday 28 July 2017	Friday 27 October 2017	Friday 23 February 2018
Minor Facility Upgrades	Friday 28 July 2017		Friday 23 February 2018
Small Equipment	Friday 28 July 2017		Friday 23 February 2018
Council Meeting Date	Wednesday 16 August 2017	Wednesday 15 November 2017	Wednesday 21 March 2018

Assessment criteria will remain as in previous funding rounds:

Why? 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explain the demonstrated community need. - How will the project improve social connections and build community wellbeing? - How will the project achieve economic benefit for the community? - Has the project been identified in a Community Plan?
What? 40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a brief summary of what you are going to do. - How will your project increase community participation? - Complete and submit a Risk Assessment for any Event - Provide detail on how Hindmarsh Shire Council's contribution will be recognised and acknowledged.
How? 20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide quotes/ information on specific item(s) funds will be used to purchase. - Provide a copy of the applying organisation's most recent bank statement and banking details. - Complete the budget and in-kind contribution templates - How will your event's success be measured?
Finally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete eligibility and submissions checklist.

Grant recipients will be required to sign a grant acceptance agreement, outlining the conditions of the grant. Recipients will also be required to provide evidence of payment/ completion of their project in a completion report.

LINK TO COUNCIL PLAN:

Strategic Objective

1.1: An Actively Engaged Community

- 1.2: A range of effective and accessible services to support the health and wellbeing of our community
- 2.1: Well-maintained physical assets and infrastructure to meet community and organisational needs.
- 3.1: A strong rural economy and thriving towns

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

An allocation of \$30,000 has been made in the draft 2017-18 Annual Budget.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS:

All risks associated with each individual community project are the responsibility of each applicant to manage.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

Under section 80C of the LGA officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

Officer Responsible: Anne Champness, Director Corporate & Community Services
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

Author: Michelle Farinha, Community Development Officer
In providing this advice as the Officer Responsible, I have no interests to disclose.

COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY:

The Community Action Grants Program will be promoted through the following channels:

- Community Information Sessions
- Council's Facebook Page
- Council's website
- Media release distribution
- E-marketing to local businesses

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council endorses the following changes to be implemented in the 2017/18 Community Action Grants Program:

- ***Reduce the application forms from four category specific forms to one generic application that covers all four categories.***
- ***Modify risk assessment to a more simplified version.***

MOVED: CRS T. Schneider/R. Lowe

That Council endorses the following changes to be implemented in the 2017/18 Community Action Grants Program:

- ***Reduce the application forms from four category specific forms to one generic application that covers all four categories.***
- ***Modify risk assessment to a more simplified version.***

CARRIED

Attachment: 11

10. SPECIAL COMMITTEES

10.1 YURUNGA HOMESTEAD COMMITTEE

Responsible Officer: Director Corporate and Community Services
Attachment: 12 and 13

Introduction:

The Yurunga Homestead Committee held its Meeting on 16 March and 20 April 2017. The purpose of this report is to note the minutes from this meeting. A copy of the minutes is included as an attachment for the information of Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council note the minutes of the Yurunga Homestead Committee Meeting on 16 March and 20 April 2017.

MOVED: CRS R. Lowe/T. Schneider

That Council note the minutes of the Yurunga Homestead Committee Meeting on 16 March and 20 April 2017.

CARRIED

Attachment: 12 and 13

11. LATE REPORTS

No report

12. OTHER BUSINESS

13. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

In accordance with Section 89 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1989*, Council may close the meeting to the public if items to be discussed are deemed confidential, that is, if the items to be discussed relate to:

- (a) Personnel matters;
- (b) The personal hardship of any resident or ratepayer;
- (c) Industrial matters;
- (d) Contractual matters;
- (e) Proposed developments;
- (f) Legal advice;
- (g) Matters affecting the security of Council property;
- (h) Any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person;
- (i) a resolution to close the meeting to members of the public.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the meeting be closed in accordance with Section 89 of the Local Government Act 1989, to consider (d) contractual matters;

**13.1 Waste Management Contract:
Contract No. 2014/15-03 – Kerbside Waste Collection
Contract No. 2014/15-04 – Kerbside Recyclables Collection
Contract No. 2014/15-05 – Transfer of waste to Dooen landfill**

MOVED: CRS T. Schneider/R. Gersch

That the meeting be closed in accordance with Section 89 of the Local Government Act 1989, to consider (d) contractual matters;

**13.1 Waste Management Contract:
Contract No. 2014/15-03 – Kerbside Waste Collection
Contract No. 2014/15-04 – Kerbside Recyclables Collection
Contract No. 2014/15-05 – Transfer of waste to Dooen landfill**

CARRIED

14. MEETING CLOSE

There being no further business, Cr Nelson declared the meeting closed at 4:57pm
