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### PRELIMINARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Alloc.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | 2 mins Commence 8.00am | Appointment of Chair  
Cr Ken Ong, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne | IMAP Executive Officer |
| 2.   | 2 mins | Apologies  
Ms Tracey Slatter, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip  
Mr Vince Punaro, Regional Director, Metro NW Region, VicRoads | Chair |
| 3.   | 1 min | Members Interest  
Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act | Chair |

### ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Alloc.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.   | 2 mins Commence 8.05am | Confirmation of Minutes (Attachment 1)  
Recommendation  
4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the draft minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 40 held on 27 November 2015 as an accurate record. | Chair |
| 5.   | 5 mins Commence 8.07am | Confirmation of Minutes (Attachment 2)  
Recommendation  
5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the draft minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum No. 18 held on 28 January 2016 as an accurate record. | Chair |
| 6.   | 5 mins Commence 8.12am | Business Arising (Attachment 3)  
Recommendation  
6.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the actions undertaken in response to Business Arising from the previous minutes.  
Correspondence:  
Inward:  
3a Letter from CEO Moreland City Council confirming funds for the Urban Manufacturing project  
3b Email from R Thomas, City of Yarra - LGA submission for information  
3c Email from Dr L Crabtree - update on CLT project  
3d Letter from Myer Foundation - EoI for Capacity Building grant unsuccessful  
Outward:  
3e Email from Executive Officer to Mr Nick Foa, Interim CEO Visit Victoria – follow up to Executive Forum meeting | IMAP Executive Officer |
| 7.   | 8 mins Commence 8.17am | Financial Report (Attachment 4)  
Recommendation  
7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:  
a. Approve changes to the current year’s budget as a result of the Executive Forum’s deliberations; and  
b. Approve changes to the IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan as a result of the Executive Forum’s deliberations  
c. Receive the IMAP Financial Report for the six months ending 31 December 2015. | IMAP Executive Officer |
8. IMAP Communication and Governance *(Attachment 5)*  
**Recommendation**  
8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.  

**Publicity:**  
**Public Notice**  
Three related articles published in the Herald Sun:  
- Herald Sun Jan 27 2016 – Car congestion tax to give cyclists priority in inner Melbourne livability blueprint  
- Herald Sun – Jan 27 2016 - Melbourne advised to impose congestion tax to cut traffic – report on the World Cities Summit in Singapore  
- Herald Sun-Jan 28 2016 – Stop bashing our motorists

9. Progress Report *(Attachment 6)*  
**Recommendation**  
9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the IMAP Progress Report for February 2016.

10. IMAP Review *(Attachment 7)*  
**Recommendation**  
10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the current work being undertaken to finalise the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2015-2025.

11. Action 5.5 Infrastructure Development - Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study *(Attachment 8)*  
**Recommendation**  
11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee notes the revised methodology and budget proposal for the IMAP Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study project as resolved by the Executive Forum at the January 2016 meeting.

12. Action 2.2 Wayfinding Signage *(Attachment 9)*  
**Recommendation**  
12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the current work being undertaken on the wayfinding signage project and the Draft Melbourne Visitor Master Style Guide

13. Action 7.2 Supporting Creative Industries – Urban Manufacturing project *(Attachment10)*  
**Recommendation**  
13.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to;  
   a. Accept the final Phase 1 report  
   b. **To be advised** [Note the Project Steering Committee’s advice, to be tabled at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting, will advise on how best to continue the project, given that the outcome of the ARC linkage grant application will not be known until June 2016 ]
CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Meeting to be closed in accordance with Sections 89 (2) (d, e, f, h) of the Local Government Act (1989)

Public and Associate Members can be excluded for these items – Chairman to advise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Allot.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 14.  | 20 mins     | Inner City Framework *(Attachment 11)*  
Presentation by the Metropolitan Planning Authority  
Recommendation  
14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:  
a. **Note** the preparation of the *Inner City Framework* and the intention for the document to be a companion piece to the refreshed *Plan Melbourne*.  
b. **Note** that Councils have been consulted on the *Inner City Framework*. | Jane Monk, MPA  
Emily Mottram, MPA |
| 15.  | 20 mins     | Regional Management Forum Projects: Integrated Delivery Models and Measures of Liveability *(Attachment 12)*  
Presentation by the RMF Project Manager  
Recommendation  
15.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee:  
a. Notes the progress of the two RMF priority projects; Integrated Delivery Model and Measures of Liveability; and  
b. Provides feedback to the RMF Project Manager on the current drafts. | David Webster, DTF  
Javiera Almeida Maturana, RMF, DTF  
Ian Butterworth, DHHS |

OTHER BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Allot.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16.  | 5 mins      | Any other business  
Close | Chair |

**Next Meeting**  
Friday 27 May 2016 (8.00am)  
City of Stonnington, Council Chamber, Malvern Town Hall
## ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Attachment No</th>
<th>Attachment Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Attachment 1</td>
<td>DRAFT Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting No. 39 held on 28 August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td>DRAFT Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum No 18 held on 28 January 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.      | Attachment 3  | **Business Arising**  
Attachment 3a: Letter from CEO Moreland City Council confirming funds for the Urban Manufacturing project  
Attachment 3b: Email from R Thomas, City of Yarra with a copy of the Councils LGA submission for information  
Attachment 3c: Email from Dr L Crabtree with update on CLT project  
Attachment 3d: Letter from Myer Foundation advising EoI for Capacity Building grants was unsuccessful  
Attachment 3e: Email from Executive Officer to Nick Foa, Interim CEO Visit Victoria |
| 7.      | Attachment 4  | **Inward:**  
Attachment 4a: IMAP Operating and Capital Works statement for the 6 months to 31 December 2015  
Attachment 4b: IMAP Budget and Expenditure by Project  
Attachment 4c: Revised IMAP Three year Implementation Plan  
Attachment 5: IMAP Communications and Governance report  
Attachment 5a: Public Notice – Draft IMAP  |
| 9.      | Attachment 7  | IMAP Review progress report  |
| 10.     | Attachment 8  | Action 5.5 Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study progress report  
Attachment 8a: Project Plan  |
| 11.     | Attachment 9  | Action 2.2 Wayfinding Signage progress report  
Attachment 9a: Project Budget  |
| 12.     | Attachment 10 | Action 7.2 Urban Manufacturing progress report  
Attachment 10a: Snapshot of the final Phase 1 report  |
| 14.     | Attachment 11 | CONFIDENTIAL - Inner City Framework briefing  |
| 15.     | Attachment 12 | CONFIDENTIAL - RMF projects briefing  
Attachment 12a: Measures of Liveability Summary  
Attachment 12b: Integrated Delivery Model Summary pages |
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
‘Making Melbourne More Liveable’

DRAFT Minutes
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Implementation Committee

Meeting No 40
8.00 am – 10.00 am Friday 27 November 2015
City of Yarra
Meeting Room 1, Richmond Town Hall

Attendance:
Committee Members
Cr Roberto Colanzi, Mayor, City of Yarra (Chair)
Cr Bernadene Voss, Mayor, City of Port Phillip – left 9.20am
Cr Cameron McDonald, Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
Cr Claude Ullin, Mayor, City of Stonnington
Cr Ken Ong, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne
Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
Ms Tracey Slatter, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
Mr Geoff Lawler, Director City Planning & Infrastructure, City of Melbourne

Associate Partner Representatives
Mr Adrian Salmon, Assistant Director Statutory Approvals, State Planning Services, DELWP
Mr David Teague, Director Transport and Planning, VicRoads – for Vince Punaro
Mr Steve Booth, Director Metro Business Engagement, DEDJTR
Ms Jane Monk, Director Inner City, Metropolitan Planning Authority

IMAP
Elissa McElroy, IMAP Executive Officer

Guests
Cr Tini Athanasopoulos, City of Stonnington
Cr Jim Athanasopoulos, City of Stonnington
Ms Francesca Valmorbida, Manager Economic & Cultural Development, City of Stonnington
Mr Dale Stewart, Senior Recreation Planner, City of Melbourne
Dr Belinda Robson, Senior Policy Advisor, City of Yarra

IMAP Champions
Mr Peter Sagar, Interim Manager City Growth, City of Port Phillip
Ms Kelly Martini, Coordinator Corporate & Community Planning, City of Stonnington

Preliminaries

1. Appointment of Chair

1.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to appoint Cr Roberto Colanzi as the Chair of the Meeting.

MOVED MS SLATTER / Cr McDonald
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

2. Apologies and Introductions

2.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the following apologies:
Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra  
Mr Rod Anderson, Strategy and Partnerships Regional Manager - Port Phillip, DELWP  
Mr Nick Beckingsale, Director Transport System Planning, Transport Pol & Plan Div, DEDJTR  
Mr Vince Punaro, Regional Director, Metro NW Region, VicRoads  
Ms Linda Weatherson, Director Community Development, City of Melbourne  
Cr Bernadene Voss, Mayor, City of Port Phillip – for leaving early  

MOVED  MR ROBERTS / Cr McDonald  
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED  

Cr Colanzi welcomed the new Mayors on the committee and acknowledged the traditional owners of the land.

3. **Members Interest** - Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act.  
   - Mr Lawler declared a conflict of interest in relation to item 5.1 “Urban Manufacturing” due to his advisory roles with the University of Melbourne

### ITEMS

4. **Confirmation of Minutes**  
4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **confirm** the minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 38 held on 29 May 2015 as an accurate record.  

MOVED  MR WALLS / Cr Ong  
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED  

*Action: Executive Officer to note correction to Visit Victoria on page 4*

5. **Ratification of Out of Committee decisions**  
   (Attachment 2)  

Mr Lawler left the room (8.11am)  

5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **ratify** the following decision regarding the Urban Manufacturing project (Action 7.2) made out of committee:  

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:  
   a. approve the agreement between the IMAP Councils and the University of Melbourne; and  
   b. approve the CEOs to sign on behalf of the IMAP Councils  

MOVED  MR ROBERTS / Cr McDonald  
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED  

5.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **ratify** the following decision regarding the Urban Manufacturing project (Action 7.2) made out of committee:  

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:  
   a. accept the draft Phase 1 report and agree to a revised integration of Phase 2 and 3.  
   b. endorse the continuation of the Urban Manufacturing Project and instructs the Steering Committee to apply for ARC Linkage grant funding in September 2015 in line with the original IMAP resolution of matched funding  
   c. accept the Steering Committees recommendation to request Moreland Council as a partner in the project, subject to an MoU being signed between IMAP and the City of Moreland.  

MOVED  CR ONG / Cr McDonald  
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED  

5.3 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **ratify** the following decision made out of committee:
That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the Confidential Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No 38 held on 29 May 2015.

MOVED MR WALLS / Mr Roberts
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Mr Lawler returned to the meeting (8.14am)

6. Business Arising

The Executive Officer noted the correspondence attached which was part of the Urban Manufacturing project application for an ARC Linkage grant. The letters advise the funding support available from project partners, and Dr Day’s email advised the application had been submitted.

Letters advising of the Growing Green Guide’s success at the Premiers Sustainability Awards were also noted.

6.1 The IMAP Implementation Committee moves a vote of thanks to staff on the Growing Green Guide project for their contribution to the success of this project.

MOVED MS SLATTER / Mr Lawler
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

6.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the actions undertaken in response to business arising from the previous minutes.

MOVED MR ROBERTS / Cr Ong
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

7. Financial Report

The Executive Officer noted:
- the accounts show the carry forward from the previous year. Invoicing councils for the current year contributions was undertaken in the second quarter.
- the CSIRO accrual still affects the accounts however the Executive Officer noted the data has recently been received and was being checked for completeness.

Questions/Comments

Cr Ong commented on the funding in the current year for projects not yet started. He noted “the last mile’ freight project being undertaken by CoM could be picked up by IMAP councils in the freight project; and asked whether other councils have projects being undertaken that could be linked to the IMAP group.

Ms Slatter suggested CEOs take a look at the current program and what is in the long term plan to see if any high priority projects should get started sooner.

7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee requests the Executive Forum meet to examine current projects and high priorities in the Draft Plan and consider what should be in the budgeted activities and report back.

MOVED MS SLATTER / Mr Wall
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

7.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to receive the IMAP Financial Report for the three months ending 30 September 2015.

MOVED CR ONG / Mr Roberts
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Action: The Executive Officer to arrange a meeting of the Executive Forum on budget matters

8. IMAP Communication and Governance

The Executive Officer noted the media releases for the Premier’s Sustainability Award and the Social Housing Forum. She tabled a further news article on the recreation facility study for information (refer item 12).

8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper
## Progress Report

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the IMAP Progress Report for November 2015.

**MOVED MR WALL / Cr Voss**
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

## IMAP Review

The Executive Officer advised the first of five council briefings was completed; she noted the Performance Indicators had been extensively reviewed since the previous meeting, and the timeline for plan approval was April/May 2016.

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the current work being undertaken to finalise the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2015-2025:

**MOVED CR McDONALD / Ms Slatter**
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

## Action 11 Regional Tourism: Report on Destination Management Plan Proposal

Ms Francesca Valmorbida, Manager Economic & Cultural Development, CoS attended for this item. She advised the Tourism Working Group recommended the IMAP councils undertake the Destination Management Plan subject to conditions. She also endorsed the meeting with Visit Victoria to clarify their new role.

### Questions/Comments

- Mr Lawler noted the CoM additional funding was not yet confirmed but that it will be available.
- Visit Victoria seems to focus on regional tourism; as evidenced by around 80% of the recent Tourism Awards going to regional activities. Is tourism a focus in metro Melbourne?
- Noted the correspondence from the CEO Visit Victoria to match funding for this project.
- The Executive Officer advised the recommended conditions on the Committee’s approval would require around half of the expected $200K cost of the project to be funded by local governments before it went ahead.

### Action

11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **provide** $50,000 towards the development of a Destination Management Plan by Destination Melbourne Ltd (DML) in 2016-17 from the existing IMAP Tourism fund; **subject to:**

- At least five other (non IMAP) Melbourne councils also agreeing to support this initiative financially.
- City of Melbourne confirming an additional $10,000 to the initiative from the Business and Tourism Melbourne branch’s budget.
- Consideration by DML of an IMAP TWG representative being included on the consultant selection panel.
- IMAP’s Tourism Working Group being satisfied that Tourism Victoria/Visit Victoria is providing an appropriate level of matched funds.

**MOVED CR ULLIN / Mr Wall**
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

### Actions:
- The Executive Officer to advise Destination Melbourne Ltd of the Destination Management Plan Proposal decision.
- The Executive Officer to follow up arrangements for the meeting for the Executive Forum with the CEO Visit Victoria and Steve Booth.

## Action 5.5 Infrastructure Development - Joint planning study for the provision of active and passive recreation spaces

Mr Dale Stewart, Senior Recreation Planner, CoM attended for this item. Mr Stewart noted that he had received one quote for the work at an amount which exceeds CoM’s Request for Quote protocols, requiring a review of the approach. The RfQ had required a breakdown into 2 parts which were not well distinguished in the quote. A further request to cost Part A – a smaller section of the total job (including 3
initial tasks around information collection and current loads on assets) was received today at between $90-$100K which could be proceeded with to initiate the project. The request for SRV funding of up to $50K had been lodged.

Mr Stewart proposed convening a meeting of IMAP and SRV representatives to discuss a potential funding model for commencing Part A and to clarify how we would then proceed with Part B.

Questions/Comments

- Ms Monk advised some information may already be available through the Open Space Strategy and that the IMAP councils may not be getting their moneys' worth through this RfQ response. Need to determine if the Brief is asking too much or whether the consultant is taking advantage.
  - Mr Stewart noted the need to share the quote information with other parties to assess it; and that there still is a gap in the response relating to analysis of playing fields, load levels, sustainability of the turf surfaces etc.
- Mr Lawler asked if there was time pressure to commence this work and noted the Executive Forum (EF) meeting could specifically consider how we fund this project.
  - Mr Stewart said SRV would advise what we can and cannot do before a March decision. It required further discussion with all parties and more certainty about contributions from each party.
- Mr Roberts agreed the EF could consider the Brief and using IMAP funds for this project.
- Can we seek additional funding from SRV?
- There is not enough information to make a decision.
- Ms Monk noted it was a great project and that all would save funds by undertaking the combined study; however we need to ensure we don’t pay more than we have to for information that we already have.
- It was generally agreed this was a good project that we could all benefit from.
- A good approach is to clearly define what the problem is that we are trying to solve. If the brief is too broad, the response will be as well.

12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves that:
   a. The Working Party reconvene to establish certainty around the project; and
   b. The Working Group prepares a report to the Executive Forum which clarifies the Brief and identifies what we are trying to achieve.

MOVED MR LAWLER / Mr Roberts
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Action: The Executive Officer to arrange a report to the Executive Forum from the Action 5.5 Recreation Facilities project Working Group

13. IMAP Three year Implementation Plan
The Executive Officer noted she had tabled an update of the funding model indicating an amount for the Recreation Facility proposal below the line. She pointed out that funding in the current year’s budget under Action 5.5 could be utilised to commence this project and that the balance (depending on the total funds required) may be able to be covered by existing funds should the Committee wish to commit them on this project.

She noted the recommendation was to continue IMAP’s funding next year on the same basis as the current year.

Questions/Discussion
The Committee noted the timing and funding of particular projects would be confirmed by the Executive Forum.

13.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. Note this update on progress on the Inner Melbourne Action Plan; and
   b. Approve the updated IMAP Three year Implementation Plan, and any changes to the current year’s budget
   c. Approve the request for each of the IMAP partner Councils to make provision for funding in the 2016-17 budget as follows:
      - IMAP Annual Contribution: $35,000 per Council in line with the current year
      - IMAP Annual Tourism Contribution: $20,000 per Council in line with the current year
      - IMAP Share of Operational Costs: $40,000 per Council (Estimate – to be confirmed)
      - Total $95,000 per IMAP Council
MOVED: MR LAWLER / Cr Voss
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Action: Executive Forum to review Three Year Implementation Plan

Dr Belinda Robson, Senior Policy Advisor, CoY attended for this item. Dr Robson thanked the Committee for their support and briefly reviewed the outcomes of the facilitated discussion on the role of local government in social and affordable housing, which attracted around 90 attendees. She noted the forum showcased areas where local government has successfully facilitated work in social housing. The Ministers were unable to attend, however ministerial and DHS staff attended. The forum also came before the Plan Melbourne refresh paper was released. Key points were:
- Local government isn’t going to create change in this sector, but can be an innovator, trialling ideas that could be scaled up elsewhere
- Local and state government working together can achieve more - Local government is more in touch with their communities
- The challenge is to sell ‘affordable housing for key workers’ and ‘key infrastructure’ as opposed to ‘social housing’. Change the conversation.

Questions/Discussion
- Cr Ong noted a lack of developers attending, limited government support, and queried where it is leading. He asked what solutions had come out of the discussion. Were we advocating to the Minister to develop affordable housing for key workers?
  o Dr Robson noted recommendations were not expected from the forum as Local Governments have a range of opinions in this area. The event was an advocacy and educative event – people were satisfied with the level of information and education they gained.

- Cr Ullin noted nothing much had changed in 5-6 years. He observed nothing much will move until there is funding from other sources and suggested that was what local government should be pushing. An aging population and a lack of Federal/State action asks for this discussion to be kick started again. He agreed advocacy is the way to go.

- Mr Booth advised a range of developers have some appetite for involvement in social housing, who may look at this in a more creative way. However they remain nervous about new models. His department is about creating jobs and opportunity – which could be through revamping tired housing stock, working collectively in new ways to drive the sector. He noted he was happy to explore this further to activate initiatives in this area.

- Cr Ong advised
  o CoM working with private industry players on affordable housing/shared equity model. Industry came up with the ideas. The tender requires a percentage to be affordable models for key workers.
  o Debated inclusionary zoning and decided not to do this.
  o Council owned land requires developers to come up with a percentage of affordable housing.
  o Housing agencies also doing this work as no one is building affordable housing. Some examples of combined housing types have been problematic.

- It is appropriate for the IMAP councils to look at this as they have the greatest density. We should drive this and do what we can, but also put up a strong argument to state government
- Ms Monk noted housing may have now moved a bit from being a ‘them’ problem to an ‘us’ problem. Plan Melbourne identifies this as a problem. Retaining our 6% of housing requires 500 units pa to keep up. MPA working on how to make this commercial. Local government can be the innovator, set up demonstrations, be champions for this issue.

- Mr Wall noted different localised issues in Maribyrnong. The quality of the housing stock is a problem, with a lot of substandard homes sitting empty. Accountability and responsibility of State Government is the problem. His council is nervous about stepping into areas which might suggest they want to be financially involved. If the state can’t do the work themselves, then the stock will continue to sit there. With consolidation of property, the private sector could be interested.

The 8 minute film from the Housing Forum was shown to the committee at this point.

- The Committee needs to think about this carefully. Consider the advocacy position to put to state and federal government on social housing.
- Cr McDonald said everyone knows the problem – is there a different way?
Mr Lawler noted Mr Booth’s suggestion is a potential different channel for advocacy – to industry directly. If CoMar have the data on under-utilised, ineffective public housing property, and can show that existing stock is not being dealt with, then we can advocate on this.

Mr Booth noted this could be a major private sector investment opportunity to leverage off government.

Ms Slatter noted the will to invest in doing this is essential, but warned that if the state gives up the land to developers then it is gone in perpetuity.

Cr Ong suggested that advocacy to government should include unmanaged sites in the mix. Private industry and social housing bodies should be able to use it.

The committee agreed that this matter should be on the agenda for the next meeting in February and be noted as an action.

14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note this Housing Forum report.

MOVED CR ULLIN / Cr McDonald
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Cr Voss left the meeting at 9.25am
Action: The Executive Officer to add Affordable Housing discussion to the February agenda.

15 OTHER BUSINESS

Ms Monk circulated a copy of the RMF’s Integrated Delivery Model for Inner Melbourne to the Committee. She advised this project was nearing completion and that it would be useful for the Committee to have a presentation on the project at the next meeting. The project aims to identify how we could work to get better integrated facilities. It addresses the difficulties in the coordination and integration between state and local government and proposes a useful model to explore further.

The Committee agreed this item be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

Action: The Executive Officer to invite the RMF Project Manager to provide an update presentation on the RMF projects at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.30am

Next Meeting:
Friday 26 February 2016 (8.00am)
City of Melbourne – Council Meeting Room

IMAP Implementation Committee Meeting 27 November 2015 – Endorsement of Minutes

Chairperson: Cr Colanzi __________________________ Date ________________
RESOLUTIONS

1.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to appoint Cr Roberto Colanzi as the Chair of the Meeting.

2.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the following apologies:
   - Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
   - Mr Rod Anderson, Strategy and Partnerships Regional Manager - Port Phillip, DELWP
   - Mr Nick Beckingsale, Director Transport System Planning, Transport Pol & Plan Div, DEDJTR
   - Mr Vince Punaro, Regional Director, Metro NW Region, VicRoads
   - Ms Linda Weatherston, Director Community Development, City of Melbourne
   - Cr Bernadene Voss, Mayor, City of Port Phillip – for leaving early

4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 38 held on 29 May 2015 as an accurate record.

5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to ratify the following decision regarding the Urban Manufacturing project (Action 7.2) made out of committee:
   - That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
     a. approve the agreement between the IMAP Councils and the University of Melbourne; and
     b. approve the CEOs to sign on behalf of the IMAP Councils

5.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to ratify the following decision regarding the Urban Manufacturing project (Action 7.2) made out of committee:
   - That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
     a. accept the draft Phase 1 report and agree to a revised integration of Phase 2 and 3.
     b. endorse the continuation of the Urban Manufacturing Project and instructs the Steering Committee to apply for ARC Linkage grant funding in September 2015 in line with the original IMAP resolution of matched funding.
     c. accept the Steering Committees recommendation to request Moreland Council as a partner in the project, subject to an MoU being signed between IMAP and the City of Moreland.

5.3 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to ratify the following decision made out of committee:
   - That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the Confidential Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No 38 held on 29 May 2015.

6.1 The IMAP Implementation Committee moves a vote of thanks to staff on the Growing Green Guide project for their contribution to the success of this project.

6.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the actions undertaken in response to business arising from the previous minutes.

7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee requests the Executive Forum to meet to examine current projects and high priorities in the Draft Plan and consider what should be in the budgeted activities and report back.

7.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to receive the IMAP Financial Report for the three months ending 30 September 2015.

8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the IMAP Progress Report for November 2015.

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the current work being undertaken to finalise the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2015-2025:

11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to provide $50,000 towards the development of a Destination Management Plan by Destination Melbourne Ltd (DML) in 2016-17 from the existing IMAP Tourism fund: subject to:
   a. At least five other (non IMAP) Melbourne councils also agreeing to support this initiative financially
   b. City of Melbourne confirming an additional $10,000 to the initiative from the Business and Tourism Melbourne branch’s budget
   c. Consideration by DML of an IMAP TWG representative being included on the consultant selection panel
   d. The Melbourne Destination Management Plan Brief requiring consideration of all current sub-region Destination Management Plans and participating Council Tourism Strategies
   e. IMAP’s Tourism Working Group being satisfied that Tourism Victoria/Visit Victoria is providing an appropriate level of matched funds.

12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves that:
   a. The Working Party reconvene to establish certainty around the project; and
   b. The Working Group prepare a report to the Executive Forum which clarifies the Brief and identifies what we are trying to achieve.

13.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. Note this update on progress on the Inner Melbourne Action Plan; and
   b. Approve the updated IMAP Three year Implementation Plan, and any changes to the current year’s budget
   c. Approve the request for each of the IMAP partner Councils to make provision for funding in the 2016-17 budget as follows:
     - IMAP Annual Contribution: $35,000 per Council in line with the current year
     - IMAP Annual Tourism Contribution: $20,000 per Council in line with the current year
     - IMAP Share of Operational Costs: $40,000 per Council (Estimate – to be confirmed)
     Total $95,000 per IMAP Council

14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note this Housing Forum report.
## ACTIONS PUBLIC RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Minutes</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to note correction to Visit Victoria on page 4</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finance report</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to arrange a meeting of the Executive Forum on budget matters</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tourism</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to advise Destination Melbourne Ltd of the Destination Management Plan Proposal decision. The Executive Officer to follow up arrangements for the meeting for the Executive Forum with the CEO Visit Victoria and Steve Booth.</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Action 5.5</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to arrange a report to the Executive Forum from the Action 5.5 Recreation Facilities project Working Group</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Imp Plan</td>
<td>Executive Forum</td>
<td>Executive Forum to review Three Year Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Dec/Jan ’16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Housing</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to add Affordable Housing discussion to the February agenda.</td>
<td>Feb ’16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other Bus</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to invite the RMF Project Manager to provide an update presentation on the RMF projects at the next meeting.</td>
<td>Feb ’16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum

Meeting No 18
10.00am – 12.30pm Thursday 28 January 2016

Council Meeting Room, Level 2, Town Hall Administration Building
City of Melbourne, Swanston Street

Attendance:
IMAP Executive Forum
Mr Stephen Wall – Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council (Chair)
Mr Geoff Lawler – Director City Operations, City of Melbourne
Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath – Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
Mr Warren Roberts – Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
Ms Tracey Slatter – Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip – from 11.07am

IMAP
Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer

Guests
Mr Nick Foa, CEO Visit Victoria
Mr Steve Booth, Director Metro Business Engagement, DEDJTR
Ms Fran Kerlin, City Activation & Strategic Partnerships – Tourism, City of Melbourne
Ms Helen Hardwick, Program Manager Tourism Policy, City of Melbourne
Ms Virginia Miller, City Business Officer – Industry, Investment & Research, City of Port Phillip
Ms Sheri Peters, City Business Officer - Tourism Industry Development, Marketing & Communications, City of Port Phillip
Mr Stuart Draffin, General Manager Planning & Amenity, City of Stonnington
Ms Sofia Anapliotis, Urban Designer, Wyndham City
Mr Dean Rochfort, Director Sustainable Development, Wyndham City
Mr Graham Porteous, Manager Recreation & Libraries, City of Melbourne – for Dale Stewart
Ms Gail Hall, Coordinator Green Infrastructure, City of Melbourne

PRELIMINARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appointment of Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to appoint Mr Stephen Wall as the Chair of the Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tracey Slatter, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip – for late arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Members Interest – Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Lawler declared a conflict of interest in relation to item 7 due to his advisory roles with the University of Melbourne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Vaidyanath advised she was to be a future Board member of DML but had not yet started in the role.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEMS

4  Visit Victoria and promoting Inner Melbourne

Nick Foa, Interim CEO, Visit Victoria and Steve Booth DEDJTR attended for this item. Mr Foa noted:

- The 6 month review of the Visitor economy completed in February 2015 identified the shift in visitor interests from Promotion to Lifestyle opportunities. Victoria’s growth statistics have been doing well but no longer have a distinct competitive advantage to other states.

- State Government launched new logos and Visit Victoria structure as the way forward:
  - Policy, legislation and supply side stayed with government departments – DEDJTR under John Dalton
  - Anything consumer orientated and demand driven was moved to Visit Victoria (VV).

- Tourism Victoria & Board remains a statutory entity, with legislation still undergoing change to enable the new structure, vesting responsibilities in VV in the interim.

- Three different structures of entity will be brought together into a new company structure for Visit Victoria, limited by guarantee. Board to be chaired by Sir Rod Eddington. Organisation of around 120 staff will be formed from existing staff, operating collectively with greater synergies.

- VV now responsible for event procurement and product marketing of Melbourne and the regions, dedicated to tourism and providing focus for all travellers (including cruise ships, nature tourism etc.) The Regional tourism campaign “Wander Victoria” is nearing its release. VV bids for appropriations from state government. The Major Events Fund sits outside this.

- VV seeking to appoint CEO, shortlisting in February.

- The Melbourne visitor wants immersion, to find locally acclaimed experiences, visiting suburbs of Melbourne is a particular focus. VV have confirmed a recent contract with Airbnb (has best concentration of bed numbers outside the CBD), & looking to move visitors out from the grid. If you see a Melbourne advert it is in the wrong spot. VV promoting third party endorsements with overseas celebrities/travel writers taken to the ‘coolest suburbs in the world’. Some examples were given.

Questions/Comments

- **Relationship with Regional Tourist Boards?**
  - Part of the Wander campaign. Guaranteed 3 years funding.

- **How will Local Government best interact with Visit Victoria?**
  - Mr Foa noted he wrote to all Regional Tourist Boards – **he will forward this correspondence to the IMAP Councils as well.**

- **How will CoM MoU’s over funding with the current large entities work going forward with the new entity?**
  - Mr Foa will write to the IMAP councils about this. He noted the need to refresh relationships, and noted he has only corresponded with Ben Rimmer to date.

- **Destination Melbourne?**
  - Mr Foa noted DML has not been rolled in, as it is more at the execution end, and he encouraged VV and local governments to continue to fund DML while it is sorted out. The proposed Destination Management Plan for Melbourne is about the visitor experience and the offer/product as opposed to some of the big picture stuff VV involved with (eg Myki refresh). Need to stay the course and see what transpires! VV will be on the Steering group with the IMAP Councils. If the experience for the visitor is not adding up to the message, it needs to be looked at.

- **Inner Melbourne (the IMAP region) has a different flavour to elsewhere. What relationship is VV looking at?**
  - Have not done an engagement model for local government. Would like to meet with IMAP semi regularly. Campaign for Melbourne based on building on the lifestyle segment. Next campaign is to market to visiting friends and family, students.
- The visitor experience is coming from the Cities. They create the experience. Include Yarra trams etc. We want those connections to continue. 80% of visitors come to the IMAP suburbs. Critical areas.
- **DML Destination Management Plan – what matched funding is proposed from VV?**
  - An apportionment commitment has been made from VV
- **DML is not a formal Tourist Board. Will it receive funding to market Melbourne?**
  - VV will undertake the marketing effort to make visitors want to come here; create the interest. DML will deliver when they arrive.
  
  VV will keep IMAP in the loop regarding the new CEO and will arrange introductions in due course.

The Chair thanked Mr Nick Foa for meeting with the IMAP Executive Forum. The discussion concluded at 11.00am. Mr Foa and Mr Booth left the meeting.

_Action: Executive Officer to follow up with Mr Foa regarding RTB correspondence to IMAP CEOs_

### 5 Action 2.2 Wayfinding signage project – future options

Helen Hardwick, CoM attended to present this item. Dean Rochfort and Sofia Anapliotis attended from Wyndham City, partners in this project.

Mr Rochfort noted the recent briefing of his Executive by IMAP and PTV staff and advised is Executive continue to be happy to “piggy back” on the work of this group and to stay involved.

Ms Hardwick noted the aspiration for the Master Style Guide is to cover all of Melbourne, using Wyndham to check applicability in outer suburbs. She provided an update on what the Steering Group is proposing for 2016:

1. Following the edit of the **Master Style Guide**, all committee members will consult own organisations, and amendments will be finalised for adoption by Councils/PTV/Tourism Victoria.

2. Two industrial designers, using TfL and IMAP’s demonstration project experience, have developed a **new sign prototype**. Looking at lower costs & maintenance, increase environment performance and develop an expanded suite. Aim is to improve accessibility and embed technology to assist with mobility/language/sight etc.
   - Tested prototype in 3 locations, surveyed 450 people to gain feedback on height/placement/font and to see if people use physical signs.
   - CoM aim to move to fabrication in 2016, with 20 signs in 2 pilot sites, creating a journey, and will share user testing pre and post installation with the IMAP councils to see if the signs make a difference.
   - Aim is to make it seamless for people to move around the city.

 *(Ms Slatter arrived at 11.07am)*

3. **Base map** - a single base map for the metro area is an aspiration following TfL’s example.
   - SGS has looked at business cases by other cities with an integrated system and one map base. Benefit cost up to $5 for every $1 invested.
   - PTV contact is supportive and suggested it could be used for the large metro projects initially. Need to clarify design, maintenance and data ownership aspects first.

**Questions/Comments**
- Mr Lawler noted CoM is pushing on. The next aspect is adoption of the Guide. What is important for your Councils if asked to formally adopt? What needs to be done to make this happen?
- It still builds on the original wayfinding project, refreshes concept. Cost maintenance and installation were challenges and Stonnington remains interested in those aspects. Would report to Council as an evolving IMAP project.
- If IMAP wants to proactively create change, it will require funding.
- Yarra philosophically support standardised system. Don't agree is a continuation of the original project, as rapidly moving to social media; signs not a major issue.
- Signs not a big issue in Maribyrnong, but would want to see relevant logo used in locations
- Approval by IMAP is sufficient for Councils to pick this up as policy
- Synergy with PTV and PTV endorsing the Guide is important before it is given the OK by the IMAP councils.
- The Executive Officer noted the need for a clear project launch and handover, so that Councils pick up and maintain any new infrastructure. A strong Communications Plan to close out the project is required.
- A challenge in Stonnington would be the prototype size and where it is located in the public realm, how it fits into the urban design context. It would be very dominant in already constricted streets, and add to congestion in the streetscape. Too big an element for us. Retailers see signs as blocking their windows. If the first couple of signs are created as a “pilot” approach, it is easier to then maintain a roll out. Important to have a pilot in each of the cities to help validate the approach.
- North Melbourne could have similar problems.
- The rollout is where there is an opportunity for IMAP to seek a contractor or run a joint procurement tender, including Wyndham, to gain economies. Worth investigating whether any federal funding and cost sharing opportunities exist.

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolve to:

a. note progress on finalising the Melbourne Visitor Signage Master Style Guide;

b. support work on piloting the new wayfinding sign designs within the City of Melbourne, and testing/validating the signs within other IMAP Councils;

c. support the broader application of standardised wayfinding signage infrastructure installation across metro Melbourne by:
   (i) supporting preparation of a further report identifying the implications and costs of establishing and maintaining a wayfinding map base in collaboration with VicMaps. (Timing of investigation and report tbc); and
   (ii) investigating State Government support to roll out or advocate for standardised wayfinding signage across the metro area (bearing in mind Visit Victoria, PTV and VicRoads are parties to this project, and the Destination Management Plan being undertaken through Destination Melbourne Ltd. will identify key visitor attractions requiring improved promotion to achieve best economic value).

d. thank the Steering Committee for all their work to date.

MOVED: MR ROBERTS/ Ms Vaidyanath
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

6 Action 5.5 Social Infrastructure – Recreation facilities project: clarification of project plan and budget

Graham Porteous, CoM attended for this item and briefly advised of the changes proposed.

Questions/Comments
The Executive Forum agreed that the Project Plan is a smarter approach. Work done in Stage 1 would have its own value. Stage 2 is a bit dependent on the funding request from SRV. It was noted that the MPA are also involved in Stage 1 - and the question was asked as to whether they have been approached for a funding contribution to Stage 1. It was felt that Stage 2 should be revisited if SRV funding was not approved.

The CEOs noted that they would speak with the MPA’s CEO and/or Director regarding funding. The Executive Officer is to arrange a meeting.

6.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to:

a. Approve the revised Project Plan for undertaking the IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study

b. Approve the funding proposal for this project as set out in Table 1 of this report; subject to a review of funding arrangements for Stage 2 should SRV funding not be approved.

c. Approve the appointment of a Project Officer on short term contract based at the City of Melbourne to undertake Stage 1 of the project

d. Approve and authorise:
   i. the involvement of key staff in this project from across the IMAP councils
ii. the timely provision of all data relating to seasonal usage (clubs and casual users), management, maintenance, capacity and cost of active sport and recreation facilities owned and managed by the Councils within the IMAP region

iii. access and use of the councils’ GIS systems for data collation and data sharing

e. Explore opportunities for a financial contribution to Stage I of the project from the MPA.

MOVED: MR ROBERTS / Ms Slatter
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Action: Executive Officer to arrange a meeting with the MPA and a couple of CEOs to represent IMAP

7 Funding Proposal – Update to the Growing Green Guide

Gail Hall, City of Melbourne attended for this item and tabled a short report regarding the request from the University of Melbourne to partner in an EoI for HIA funding to update the Growing Green Guide website and incorporate new research findings. She noted the deadline was the next day.

(Geoff Lawler declared an interest and left the meeting at 11.43am.)

Ms Hall noted it was 2 years since the website went live. If successful the project would:

- Update the guide, and develop a new immersive website
- Develop tools so designers can use the information in more tangible ways
- Incorporate the latest research.

She suggested a $50K outlay by the IMAP councils would access $250K and an updated guide, where the work would be undertaken by others on our behalf.

The IP sits with the state government.

Questions/Comments

What is the benefit to the IMAP councils? Is our job done here? A national database is of less interest to IMAP than to others. Our contribution is disproportionate to the value we would gain.

- Ms Hall noted the Guide enables Councils to develop Policy in this space. Helps us to get policy approved. The ability to influence is less when we don't have a seat at the table.

We have done the innovative thing, it now has its own life, we have gained our benefit and it’s time to let it go. IMAP fully supports the next stage and is excited to see it gain a larger significance.

Is that going to happen anyway, the way policies are moving in this area? While we approve the idea in principle, IMAP can support it in-kind with staff expertise. Maybe we could consider a funding contribution subject to confirmation from other sources? Provide letters of support? Has the University looked to national sources for funding?

It was agreed the IMAP councils would offer to provide a letter of support.

(The Executive Officer has since been advised a letter of support was not required for the Expression of Interest stage).

(Geoff Lawler returned to the meeting 11.55 am)

8 IMAP 2015/16 budget and Three Year Implementation Plan – discussion on reallocation of funding

The Executive Officer tabled a copy of the Three Year Implementation Plan as it is currently approved. She noted the need to allocate funding for the Recreation Project as per the Forum’s previous approval, and sought the Forum’s advice on those projects which have allocations which are not currently going ahead.

Questions/Comments

Agree the funding for those projects not currently proceeding should be combined into a High Priority Fund, to:

- create a buffer for the IMAP account
- reduce chances for having to ask for additional support, and
- support IMAP's ability to pay for new projects.

The current budget could be improved with a forecast to 30 June so that expected savings can be identified.

Those projects currently not commenced would be reassessed in future budget years.
All projects not commenced need to be reviewed in light of the new plan anyway.

8.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to **recommend** a review of the 2015/16 budget and the Three Year Implementation Plan to:


b. Hold over/not start all funded Committee projects that have not been commenced; and that all funding for these projects be held for Priority Projects yet to be determined under the new plan.

c. Review all projects not funded in light of the new plan in due course.

**MOVED: MR ROBERTS / Ms Slatter**
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

9. **Items for the next IMAP Implementation Committee**

The Executive Forum members agreed:

- the Recreation Project Plan be provided for noting by the IMAP Implementation Committee
- an update report be provided on the Wayfinding Signage project
- budget changes agreed by the Executive Forum be noted as part of the Committee’s Finance report
- the discussion on Affordable Housing be deferred to a later meeting.

10. **Other business: DML Destination Management Plan and Funding**

   - Ms Vaidyanath declared that she had been nominated to the Board of DML but was yet to be inducted to take up the position.

   The Executive Forum expressed concern at a marketing plan that can exclude municipalities that don’t pay. The plan would be ineffective if it does not cover the full area. The project scope has been modified to reflect funding however, it was agreed if compromised, Visit Victoria should be approached to provide more funds to ensure it goes forward.

   Their contribution is small for something as significant as this. Councils involved in the project may need to assist to shape the scope to meet our needs. It is unclear what product DML will gain if they don’t reach the amount they need.

   The Executive Forum asked for an update from DML at their next meeting, and how they will coordinate with Visit Victoria.

   **Action: Executive Officer to invite the CEO DML to the next meeting of the Executive Forum.**

**RESOLUTIONS**

1.1 The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to appoint Mr Stephen Wall as the Chair of the Meeting.

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to:

a. note progress on finalising the Melbourne Visitor Signage Master Style Guide;

b. support work on piloting the new wayfinding sign designs within the City of Melbourne, and testing/validating the signs within other IMAP councils;

c. support the broader application of standardised wayfinding signage infrastructure installation across metro Melbourne by:

   (iii) supporting preparation of a further report identifying the implications and costs of establishing and maintaining a wayfinding map base in collaboration with VicMaps (Timing of investigation and report tbc); and

   (iv) investigating State Government support to roll out or advocate for standardised wayfinding signage across the metro area (bearing in mind Visit Victoria, PTV and VicRoads are parties to this project, and the Destination Management Plan being undertaken through Destination Melbourne Ltd. will identify key visitor attractions requiring improved promotion to achieve best economic value).

d. thank the Steering Committee for all their work to date.

6.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to:

a. **Approve** the revised Project Plan for undertaking the IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study

b. **Approve** the funding proposal for this project as set out in Table 1 of this report; **subject to** a review of funding arrangements for Stage 2 should SRV funding not be approved.

c. **Approve** the appointment of a Project Officer on short term contract based at the City of Melbourne to undertake Stage 1 of the project

d. **Approve and authorise:**

   i. the involvement of key staff in this project from across the IMAP councils

   ii. the timely provision of all data relating to seasonal usage (clubs and casual users), management,
maintenance, capacity and cost of active sport and recreation facilities owned and managed by the Councils within the IMAP region

iii. access and use of the councils' GIS systems for data collation and data sharing

e. Explore opportunities for a financial contribution to Stage I of the project from the MPA.

8.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolves to recommend a review of the 2015/16 budget and the Three Year Implementation Plan to:

a. Make provision for the Recreation Facilities project to provide $40K in 2015/16 and $50K in 2016/17.

b. Hold over/not start all funded Committee projects that have not been commenced; and all funding for these be held for Priority Projects yet to be determined under the new plan – Refer Attachment 1

c. Review all projects not funded in light of the new plan in due course

ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Visit Victoria</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to follow up with Mr Foa regarding RTB correspondence to IMAP CEOs</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Action 5.5 Recreation facilities</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to arrange a meeting with the MPA and a couple of CEOs to represent IMAP</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 DML Mgt plan</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to invite the CEO DML to the next meeting of the Executive Forum.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-16 (Year 10)</th>
<th>2016-17 (Year 11)</th>
<th>2017-18 (Year 12)</th>
<th>2018-19 (Year 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Contribution ($35K each)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Tourism Contribution ($20K each)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Map licensing fees</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Website, Catering, Admin exps</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Annual Report design/print</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>IMAP GIS support</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Website hosting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>IMAP Review Project</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funding approved Feb 2015 (C/Fwd $24,873+ funding $15k)</td>
<td>39,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Wayfinding signs</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Visitor Signs Master Style Guide (C/Fwd $45,440 + Wyndham contribution $20K)</td>
<td>65,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Affordable Housing: Yarra forum</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funds approved May 2015</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Infrastructure development: Recreation Facilities project</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funds approved Exec Forum Jan 2016</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Support Creative Businesses: Urban Manufacturing</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Balance of funds provided for initial work</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Environmentally Sustainable Design - commercial buildings:</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Factsheets budget balance</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop ESD Factsheets</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>ESD Policies advocacy budget - for factsheets use (C/Fwd $10K - committed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Green Demonstration Projects</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Green Roof initiatives (balance C/Fwd $207 - ongoing costs)</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Regional Tourism Strategy</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Destination Management Plan (DML): funded from Carry Fwd $50K-set aside for 2016-17 project</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Strategy implementation ($55259+ balance C/Fwd $6723 current year)</td>
<td>58,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Destination Management Plan (DML): funded from Carry Fwd $50K-set aside for 2016-17 project</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Strategy implementation ($55259+ balance C/Fwd $6723 current year)</td>
<td>58,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMITTED - FUNDED - Reallocated for future projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAP</th>
<th>Priority Projects Fund</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>For reallocation to priority projects under the new plan</th>
<th>140,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>585,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-309,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance of IMAP Account</td>
<td>433,066</td>
<td>123,394</td>
<td>66,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Balance of IMAP Account</td>
<td>123,394</td>
<td>66,344</td>
<td>216,044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the funding calculation does not include Operational Costs of $40,000 per council in 2015-16.
### IMAP Implementation Committee

#### Business Arising

**26 February 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (25 May 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Action 6.3 IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Arrange preparation of a submission to the Department of Justice on changes to the definitions; meeting with the Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (28 February 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Action 3.5 Thru traffic – freight study Mr Haining/Ms Dallas MaribyrnongCC</td>
<td>Mr Haining/Ms Dallas MaribyrnongCC to convene technical experts from across the IMAP Councils to investigate extensions to current freight studies and report back.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (30 May 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Other Bus CoM - Manager City Research (Austin Ley)</td>
<td>Convene a Working Group of the IMAP Councils with City of Melbourne’s Manager City Research (Austin Ley) to examine sharing the costs and benefits of establishing an IMAP CLUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (28 November 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Action 9.4 GGG Coordinator Green Infrastructure CoM</td>
<td>The Coordinator Green Infrastructure, City of Melbourne to identify appropriate staff to attend the Policy Reference group and report back on issues raised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (28 August 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 DML presentation IMAP Executive Officer/Steve Booth</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to make arrangements with Steve Booth and the Council CEO’s/senior executives to meet with the interim CEO Visit Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 IMAP Review/ Draft plan IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to arrange for: 1. the IMAP Councils to be briefed on the Draft plan and 2. external comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Action 11 Tourism working group</td>
<td>Tourism working group to arrange renewal of the Schedule to the Agreement with DML to include a further year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (27 November 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Minutes IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to note correction to Visit Victoria on page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Finance Report IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to arrange a meeting of the Executive Forum on budget matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Tourism IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>1. The Executive Officer to advise Destination Melbourne Ltd of the Destination Management Plan Proposal decision. 2. The Executive Officer to follow up arrangements for the meeting for the Executive Forum with the CEO Visit Victoria and Steve Booth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Recreation study IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>The Executive Officer to arrange a report to the Executive Forum from the Action 5.5 Recreation Facilities project. Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 3 Year Imp Plan Exec Forum</td>
<td>Executive Forum to review Three Year Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Housing IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to add Affordable Housing discussion to the February agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Report prepared by Elissa McElroy IMAP Executive Officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to invite the RMF Project Manager to provide an update presentation on the RMF projects at the next meeting</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Completed - refer item 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to follow up with Mr Foa regarding RTB correspondence to IMAP CEOs</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to arrange a meeting with the MPA and a couple of CEOs to represent IMAP</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer to invite the CEO DML to the next meeting of the Executive Forum.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correspondence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Regarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inward:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Letter - CEO Moreland Council</td>
<td>Funding contribution for IMAP Urban Manufacturing project (Action 7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Email – City of Yarra</td>
<td>LGA submission for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c Email – Dr Crabtree, UnivWSydney</td>
<td>Update on Community Land trust project (Action 5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d Letter – Myer Foundation</td>
<td>Advising EOI for capacity building grant unsuccessful (Action 9.4 GGG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outward:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Email – Interim CEO Visit Victoria (Not attached) Key Stakeholders – IMAP Review</td>
<td>Follow up from Executive Forum discussion (Action 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising Draft IMAP available for comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the actions undertaken in response to business arising from the previous minutes.
Dear Tracey,

**RE: IMAP URBAN MANUFACTURING - REQUEST FOR MORELAND CITY COUNCIL PROJECT PARTNERSHIP AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 27 October 2015 seeking Moreland City Councils participation in and financial support for the Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage, Phase 2 component of the IMAP project.

I am very pleased to let you know that Council, through its Strategic Planning and Economic Development branches have allocated a *once off* $10,000 financial contribution, and 3 years (for the duration of the project) of *in kind* support from across both branches.

Moreland recently reviewed our industrial land supply and drafted a new Moreland Industrial Land Strategy 2015 (MILS). The research we undertook to prepare the MILS indicated that small scale manufacturing is one of the growth industry sectors for Moreland. The MILS protects a number of concentrations of industrial land for long term retention.

Moreland’s participation in the IMAP Urban Manufacturing Project, ARC Linkage will assist Council to better understand the future growth prospects and needs of the small scale manufacturing industry with an interest in inner urban locations like Brunswick. We anticipate that this project will help facilitate Council to position the municipality to maximise the opportunities to support and grow this sector.

Formal notification was sent last week to the ARC and the University of Melbourne informing them of our support.

Yours sincerely,

Nerina Di Lorenzo  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

181/1/2015
Elissa McElroy

From: Thomas, Rhys [Rhys.Thomas@yarracity.vic.gov.au]
Sent: Friday, 18 December 2015 3:11 PM
To: local.government@delwp.vic.gov.au
Cc: info@lgpro.com; inquiries@mav.asn.au; ISMMF Secretariat; Elissa McElroy; vlga@vlga.org.au
Subject: Submission to the Local Government Act Review

Local Government Act Review Secretariat
c/- Local Government Victoria

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Department of Environment, Land Water and Planning’s December 2015 discussion paper as the first stage in the review of the Local Government Act 1989.

Please find the City of Yarra’s submission attached.

For any further information about this submission, please contact me directly at rhys.thomas@yarracity.vic.gov.au or 9205 5302.

Yours Sincerely,

Rhys Thomas
Senior Governance Advisor
Yarra City Council

(03) 9205 5302
rhys.thomas@yarracity.vic.gov.au
PO Box 168 Richmond 3121

cc: Inner Melbourne Action Plan Implementation Committee
    Inner South Metropolitan Mayors’ Forum
    Local Government Professionals Inc.
    Municipal Association of Victoria
    Victorian Local Governance Association
Dear all,

As we approach the end of the year, it is time for an update on the Community Land Trust research project. Despite a rocky year, the team has been in the field and subsequently met to discuss the tasks from here. Having discussed the case studies’ current status, we are proposing the following course of action to move things along.

We think the Lorne, Castlemaine and Nubeena case studies are best approached as indicative scenarios for potential CLT development. As such, we are proposing to write up the case study contexts (location, housing market, local demographics, local housing issues, etc.), organisational backgrounds, and housing aims/objectives to the extent possible. We will then outline the factors CLT housing activities in each case would have to take into account given those conditions. Based on the fieldwork and discussions with the case study organisations, we do not feel that those case studies are yet at a point where legal or financial modelling would be accurate or productive, so are proposing this work as a relevant response to the case studies’ various contexts and issues, and as a way to assist the case studies’ progress in this space.

Excitingly, the Melbourne case study (St Kilda Community Housing) has secured supplementary funding to undertake legal and financial modelling, and has established a Technical Reference Group to oversee and coordinate that work. As such, we do not want this project to duplicate or interfere with the work of the Reference Group. We are proposing that our team oversee and coordinate a focus group on a proposed CLT model amongst the general public – that is, potential buyers into such a scheme – to identify target households’ understanding, concerns, and interest. This will both ascertain market parameters and update earlier research by AHURI on householder interest in shared equity.

Regarding work on a lending document, discussions to date have indicated that lenders will want to modify or develop their own mortgage instruments. Lenders are more interested in a risk management framework within which to do that, than in a template mortgage document. As such, we intend to coordinate a series of discussions with lenders in the new year to establish the parameters that a risk management document would need to address, and draw up a document accordingly.

Meanwhile, material has been drafted for the Australian CLT Companion, considering Retirement Villages legislation, Residential Parks legislation, and Community vs Company Title. This material will be finalised in the new year.

If you can provide any feedback, comments, queries or endorsements of our proposed course of action, that would be greatly appreciated.

Lastly, I would like to thank you all for your patience with the delays to the work this year. I look forward to the work picking up in 2016.

Kind regards
Louise

Dr Louise Crabtree | Senior Research Fellow
Institute for Culture and Society
P: 02 9685 9646 | M: 0420 946 186
25 January 2016

Ms Elissa McElroy  
IMAP Executive Officer  
City of Stonnington - on behalf of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan partner councils  
PO Box 21  
Prahran VIC 3181

Dear Ms McElroy,

Thank you for submitting an Expression of Interest to the Capacity Building Stream of The Myer Foundation’s Sustainability and Environment Program for 2015/16.

The decision of The Myer Foundation to direct a proportion of funds towards support for organisational capacity building to enhance organisational impact and effectiveness is vindicated by the interest shown in the Expression of Interest process. The Capacity Building Stream has received many more Expressions of Interest from eligible organisations than can be supported.

Unfortunately on this occasion your organisation’s Expression of Interest has not been shortlisted for the next stage of the selection process.

Details of the organisations supported through the Sustainability and Environment Capacity Building Stream 2015/16 will be posted on our website in July 2016.

On behalf of the Directors of The Myer Foundation, I thank you for the consideration and time invested in your organisation’s submission.

We wish you every success in the future.

Yours sincerely,

Leonard Vary  
Chief Executive Officer
Hi Nick,

Many thanks for attending the meeting with the Senior Executives of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan partner Councils last week.

It was good to hear about the changes proposed at Visit Victoria and how the new structure now fits with the State Government activities.

In writing up my notes on the meeting, I noted your comment that you would send correspondence to the IMAP Executives that you had sent to the Regional Tourist Boards. Certainly this would be helpful to the IMAP Councils, and would provide further clarity.

We also look forward to hearing more regarding the recruitment for the new CEO and would welcome the opportunity to meet with the successful candidate in due course.

Thanks again for your presentation and best wishes for your continuing work with Visit Victoria.

Kind regards,

Elissa

Elissa McElroy

IMAP Executive Officer | Inner Melbourne Action Plan
T: 8290 1110 | M: 0404 248 450 | F: 8290 1105 | emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
‘Making Melbourne More Liveable’

Officer Location: CITY OF STONNINGTON
PO Box 21 Prahran, Victoria 3181
www.imap.vic.gov.au

Please consider the environment before printing this email
## Financial Report for the 3 Months ending 30 September 2015

### Background

1. The IMAP financial position was last noted at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting held on 27 November 2015.

2. Retained Earnings carried forward from the 2014-15 financial year totalled **$433,067** (excluding GST). $60,222 of this total is the surplus in the tourism projects account.

3. On 28 January 2016, the IMAP Executive Forum reviewed the Three Year Implementation Plan as requested by the Committee and considered an allocation of funds for the Action 5.5 Recreation Facilities Study which impacts on both the current year and next years budget. It was agreed the balance of funding for those projects which had not yet commenced would be consolidated into a Priority Projects Fund for reallocation to new priorities under the new Inner Melbourne Action Plan, once approved.
   - Changes recommended by the IMAP Executive Forum to the current years budget are included on Attachment 4b.
   - Refer Attachment 4c for the revised Three Year Implementation Plan recommended by the IMAP Executive Forum.

### Income

3. Income indicates the Carry Forward of $433,067 during the first quarter. The IMAP councils have also been invoiced in the second quarter.

4. **Total Income** for the 6 month period to 31 December 2015:

   **2800 Sundry Income:**
   - Retained Earnings carried forward from 2014-15 $433,067
   - IMAP Councils Annual Tourism contribution (5 Councils) $100,000
   - **TOTAL OPERATING INCOME** $708,067

### Expenditure

5. **Total Expenditure for** the 6 month period to 31 December 2015:

   **4104 Postage and Courier**
   - IMAP Postage Aug $76
   - Postage Sept $127
   - Postage Oct $97
   - Postage Nov $72
   - Postage Dec $129
   - Couriers: Agendas Aug $305
   - Couriers: Dec $340
   - **TOTAL** $1,146

   **4108 Stationery**
   - IMAP Stationery $85

   **4142 Local travel**
   - IMAP Travel expenses $30

   **4150 Consulting Fees**
IMAP Review Completion Stage 2 $3,640
IMAP Review Completion Stage 3 $6,500
IMAP website Host Collabforge $3,216
IMAP GIS Host GroundTruth $7,200
IMAP Annual Report $3,100
IMAP AR Summary $2,500
Action 5.2 Housing Forum Yarra Film Contractor $2,000
Action 7.2 Housing Forum Speaker fee/travel $2,500
Action 9.4 Urban Manufacturing Project Phase 1 $20,000
Action 9.4 Distributed Energy (CSIRO Accrual) ($80,000)
Action 2.2 Distributed Energy - Final Payment $80,000
Action 2.2 Wayfinding MSG - Traffinity Payment 2 of 2 $8,000
Action 2.2 Wayfinding Prototype Testing $23,027 $81,683

4180 Training Conferences
Premiers Sustainability awards $180

4211 Staff catering
IMAP Catering: IMAP $195
IMAP Catering: IMAP $85
IMAP Catering TBC $72 $352

4255 Vehicle Tollways
IMAP Tolls $30

TOTAL EXPENDITURE $83,506

Operating Profit / (Loss) $624,561

NET SURPLUS $624,561

6. Refer to Attachment 4b to see total expenditure against project budgets to date.

Recommendation

7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. Approve changes to the current year’s budget as a result of the Executive Forum’s deliberations; and
   b. Approve changes to the IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan as a result of the Executive Forums deliberations
## CURRENT MONTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Committed</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Unmatched Purchase Orders</th>
<th>Actuals</th>
<th>Total Committed</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2110 - Government Grants - Operating</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Subsidies - Operating</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800 - Sundry Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>533,067</td>
<td>533,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>533,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2810 - Contract Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708,067</td>
<td>708,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708,067</td>
<td>708,067</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104 - Postage &amp; Couriers</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-409</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 - Stationery - General</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4142 - Local Travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4150 - Consulting Fees</td>
<td>111,026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-111,026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,683</td>
<td>81,683</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-81,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4180 - Training/Conferences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>111,495</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-111,435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83,124</td>
<td>83,124</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-82,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211 - Staff Catering</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4255 - Vehicle Tollways</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, Services and Maintenance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>111,567</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-111,508</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-83,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Profit / (Loss)

-111,495

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Committed</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Profit / (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>624,561</td>
<td>624,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Surplus / (Deficit)

-111,495

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Committed</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus / (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>624,561</td>
<td>624,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMAP Projects: Expenditure against Budget 2015-16

### Expenditure for the 6 months ending 31 December 2015

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Contribution ($35K each)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Tourism Contribution ($20K each)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Map Licence fees</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-700</td>
<td>-700</td>
<td>-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>-700</strong></td>
<td><strong>-700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Website catering &amp; admin expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Annual Report design and print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> GIS Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Website Hosting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Update website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> IMAP Review Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,873</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>10,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Wayfinding signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,440</td>
<td>31,026</td>
<td>31,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Affordable Housing - Housing Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Infrastructure Development - Recreation facilities project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Support Creative Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Environmentally Sustainable Design - commercial buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Green Demonstration Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Regional Tourism Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,741</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Nov 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Nov 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,392</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAP</strong> Priority Projects Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>585,782</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,505</strong></td>
<td><strong>362,277</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-310,082</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>191,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opening Balance of IMAP Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Balance of IMAP Account</strong></td>
<td>433,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>433,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Closing Balance of IMAP Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2015-16</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance of IMAP Account</strong></td>
<td>122,984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>624,561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the funding calculation does not include Operational Costs of $40,000 per council in 2015/16.
### IMAP Projects Budget - Three Year Implementation Plan - 5 IMAP Councils (excl GST)

**Funding Model as revised by the IMAP Executive Forum on 28 February 2016**

#### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-16 (Year 10)</th>
<th>2016-17 (Year 11)</th>
<th>2017-18 (Year 12)</th>
<th>2018-19 (Year 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Contribution ($35K each)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils Annual Tourism Contribution ($20K each)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Map licensing fees</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>275,700</td>
<td>275,700</td>
<td>275,700</td>
<td>275,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FUNDED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2015-16 (Year 10)</th>
<th>2016-17 (Year 11)</th>
<th>2017-18 (Year 12)</th>
<th>2018-19 (Year 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website, Catering, Admin exps</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Annual Report design/print</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>IMAP GIS support</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Website hosting</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Annual costs</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Update website</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Awaits approval of new plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>IMAP Review Project</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funding approved Feb 2015 (C/Fwd $24,873+ funding $15k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wayfinding signs</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Visitor Signs Master Style Guide (C/Fwd $45,440 +Wyndham contribution $20K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing: Yarra forum</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funds approved May 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure develop: Recreation Facilities project</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Funds approved Exec Forum Jan 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Creative Businesses: Urban Manufacturing</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Balance of funds provided for initial work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UM Project costs $300K: $90K from IMAP. Subject to matched funds CC/ARC Linkage.</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>UM Project costs $300K: $90K from IMAP. Subject to matched funds CC/ARC Linkage.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmentally Sustainable Design - commercial buildings: Develop ESD Factsheets</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Factsheets budget balance</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>ESD Policies advocacy budget - for factsheets use (C/Fwd $10K - committed)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Demonstration Projects</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Green Roof initiatives (balance C/Fwd $207 - ongoing costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Unimelb ARC grant contribution Year 3 of 3 (Committed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly completed</td>
<td>Distributed Energy Map (CSIRO) - accrued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Tourism Strategy</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Destination Management Plan (DML) - funded from Carry Fwd$50K-set aside for 2016-17 project</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Strategy implementation ($52259+ balance C/Fwd $6723 current year)</td>
<td>58,983</td>
<td>50,827</td>
<td>49,352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COMMITTED - FUNDED - Reallocated for future projects

| IMAP | Priority projects Fund                                     | Current                   | For reallocation to priority projects under the new plan - Exec Forum Jan 2016 | 140,000            | 107,500            |

#### Total Annual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening Balance of IMAP Account</strong></td>
<td>433,066</td>
<td>123,394</td>
<td>66,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance of IMAP Account</strong></td>
<td>123,394</td>
<td>66,344</td>
<td>216,044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the funding calculation does not include Operational Costs of $40,000 per council in 2015-16.
IMAP Implementation Committee

Progress Report

IMAP Communications and Governance

Purpose

1 To advise the IMAP Implementation Committee of the progress of IMAP Communications and Governance during the last 3 month period.

Governance

2 IMAP Review: Since November, work on the draft plan has included:

a. Briefings of the 5 IMAP Councils and the Regional Management Forum during November/December 2015

b. Providing written responses to two councillor enquiries on the plan as a result of briefings

c. Meeting of the working group in December to finalise the consultation approach

d. Meeting with the RMF Project Manager regarding a response to the RMF

e. Finalising the Public Notice (3 February 2016 - The Age) and website entries across the 5 Council websites; establishing linkages to the Connect Stonnington website to consolidate enquiries and submissions. (Went live 27 January 2016.)

f. Social media entries have also notified the public about the plan – customised by each Council

g. Sent letters to key stakeholders advising them on the consultation period.
   • Three news articles by the Herald Sun during the period relate to the IMAP review.
   • At 1 February, the Draft Plan on the City of Stonnington website had received 160 aware visits (i.e. stayed on for at least 5 mins) and 39 downloads of the document.
   • Four written responses have been received as at 19 February.

Refer Item 10 / Attachment 7 - IMAP Review update

Communications

3 During the last 3 months the following activities have involved the Executive Officer and others in IMAP communications:

- Action 2.2 Wayfinding Signage Master Style Guide
  - 10 December / 4 February - meetings of the Project Steering group
  - 10 December – budget meeting with the Project Team Leader and Wyndham representative
  - 27 January – briefing the Wyndham City executive management team
  - 28 January – discussion on the project’s strategic direction with the IMAP Executive Forum
  - 12 February – design workshop on visitor sign design
  - February – Master Style Guide editing underway – refer item 12 / Attachment 10

- Action 5.5 Community Infrastructure – Recreation Facilities Study
  - 2 December - Project team meeting on the SRV application. Received letters of support from the CoS, CoPP, CoM and MPA.
  - 9 December – Project team meeting on the Project Plan revision
Established Basecamp file sharing for the project

23 December – meeting with University geomatics researcher on spatial data analysis and with the Project team leader to finalise the project plan for the Executive Forum

28 January - Executive Forum considered report, revised project plan, budget and position description for the project – refer item 11 / Attachment 8

IMAP executives met with the MPA regarding project funding for stage 1.

- **Action 7.2 Support Creative Businesses (Urban Manufacturing)**
  - Phase 1 report completed – refer item 13 / Attachment 10
  - 29 January - V Miller, project team leader briefed CoS Managers & Coordinators Planning & Amenity division on the project
  - 19 February - Urban Manufacturing Steering Group meeting considered responses to ARC Linkage grant peer reviewer comments
  - Moreland Council invoiced for their funding contribution

- **Other**
  - Advised CEO DML about the decision of the IMAP Implementation Committee regarding the Destination Management Plan. Discussion on the review of the Tourist map.
  - Updated IMAP logo and letterhead etc – new CoS logo now included
  - 28 January - arranged IMAP Executive Forum at the City of Melbourne, including meeting with Nick Foa, Interim CEO of Visit Victoria
  - 18 December/27 January – ongoing meetings with representatives of MPA and RMF
  - 8 January – submitted EoI to Myer Foundation for Capacity Grant funding – unsuccessful

The IMAP Executive Officer was on leave for approximately 4 weeks during the quarter.

**Recommendation**

4. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.

**Attachments:**

5a Public Notice for The Age – 3 February 2016
CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT INNER MELBOURNE ACTION PLAN 2015-2025

The Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) proposes strategies where the five inner Melbourne Councils can work together on joint policy and projects to address city growth and achieve a more liveable city.

Comments are invited on the draft plan by 29 February 2016.

The City of Stonnington is coordinating all comments on behalf of the five partner Councils; the cities of Stonnington, Melbourne, Yarra, Port Phillip and Maribyrnong.

Copies of the Draft Plan and details for making a submission can be found at connectstonnington.vic.gov.au/IMAP or by visiting any of the five Council websites to access this link.

Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Making Melbourne More Liveable

STONNINGTON CITY COUNCIL
MELBOURNE CITY COUNCIL
YARRA CITY COUNCIL
PORT PHILLIP CITY COUNCIL
MARIBYRNONG CITY COUNCIL
IMAP Progress Report
February 2016

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) identifies 57 actions within 11 regional strategies to help build the inner Melbourne region to embody creativity, liveability, prosperity and sustainability across a range of diverse neighbourhoods.

The following Actions have been COMPLETED:

Action 1.1 Inner Melbourne Statement of Significance
Action 2.2 Co-ordinated pedestrian and public transport Signage – Wayfinding signs
Action 2.3 Bicycle Network Legibility – Priority Bicycle Network Report
Action 2.4 Walking links and pedestrian priority areas - Greenlight project
Action 3.3 Regional Parking Management - Report on Parking; Car sharing
Action 3.5 Reduced through traffic – Development of a Through Traffic model
Action 5.2 Affordable Housing - Needs Website (May 08); planning overlay, Australian CLT Manual
Action 5.3 Integrating Public Housing Estates – Collaborative framework report
Action 6.3 Activity Centres - Cumulative Impact Assessment tools; Local planning amendments
Action 7.7 Universities and Regional Development – Student placement processes, publication
Action 9.1 Regional Sustainability Targets – Audit of IMAP Councils
Action 9.2 Environmental Sustainable Design (Part) – design of 15 Sustainable Design Factsheets
Action 9.3 Water Sensitive Urban Design - Model Guidelines and Local Planning Amendment approvals
Action 9.4 Green Demonstration projects (Part) - Water Sensitive Cities Report
Action 9.4 Green Demonstration projects (Part) – Distributed Energy mapping
Action 9.6 Use of Recycled Water in Open Space – Technical Notes
Action 11.1 Inner Melbourne Map – Inner Melbourne Visitor Map (extended to Footscray), Volunteer Families, Skybus videos
Action 11.2 Regional Tourism Program – Research & Itineraries, Conference sponsorship

Other Achievements

The Growing Green Guide (Action 9.4) has:

- Won the education category of the 2015 Premier's Sustainability Awards, and was a finalist in the Government category; and
• Won the ‘research and communication’ category in the Victorian branch of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (AILA) awards, in November 2014.

University of Western Sydney 2013 Partnership Award – for the Australian Community Land Trust (CLT) Manual

Merit Award for Regional Action in Water Sensitive Urban Design at the Stormwater Victoria Awards

IMAP Bicycle Network - Presentation at the Bike Futures 2009 Conference

Presentation to Planning Students at Melbourne University 2009 & 2010

Governance
• Annual Reports
• Goods & Services Procurement Policy and MoU
• Governance & Relationships Report
• Memorandum of Understanding – Intellectual Property
• IP Licence Agreements – ESD Factsheets, IMAP Regional Tourism Map

Communications
• IMAP Geographic Information System (GIS)
• IMAP Website and GrowingGreenGuide.org website
• Club IMAP
• Council Briefings

Advocacy
• Ministerial Briefings – Ministers Wynne, Madden, Kosky, Plibersek, Powell
• IMAP acknowledgements:
  • State Government’s Cycling Strategy
  • Interdepartmental Committee (Department of Justice)
  • Melbourne Water (WSUD)
  • Department of Transport Wayfinding Signs Guide
  • Department of Transport and VicRoads – Greenlight Project

Action 2.2 Co-ordinated pedestrian and public transport signage system

IN PROGRESS - Initially completed in 2010, this project has been reactivated, focussed on visitor signage.

In December 2012, the IMAP Implementation Committee approved participation in the Melbourne Visitor Signage project and the coordinating committee was established to guide its work. The Committee seeks to:

• Build common threads between roads, public transport, tourism, pedestrian, cycling and street directional signage systems across the inner Melbourne region.

• Shared symbols and terminology will be applied across these key signage systems; and

• Coordinated responses to signage requests by tourist attractions, precincts and major developments provided.

The Melbourne Visitor Signage coordinating committee comprises representatives of the five IMAP councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria, VicRoads and Tourism Victoria.

The committee is to build a Master Style Guide setting out agreed signing principles, guidelines and language (the ‘business rules’) to be adopted by collaborating authorities.

➢ The draft Strategy section was completed in June 2014 - drawing significantly on Legible London as an exemplar of a good wayfinding system and on its user-focused signing principles.

➢ The committee is currently working on the Implementation section.

In April 2015 Paul Street, the Program Manager of Transport for London’s Legible London wayfinding system visited for 12 days providing workshops on best practice examples, implementation processes and structures and a methodology for roll out of a comprehensive system.
Following the TfL visit, the committee structured its work into two streams:

1. Collaborative projects
   - Master Style Guide. The first draft of the guide is now completed and undergoing editing during February 2016. The guide outlines an agreed approach to content: signing principles, eligibility and selection criteria, naming conventions, symbols and arrows, placement and location criteria, and ‘gateway’ signage.
     - Signage Infrastructure Design Workshops are looking at the design issues of signs - functionality, legibility, accessibility and view from different distances. Prototype testing of a new design has been undertaken at sites in Melbourne, Port Phillip and Wyndham recently.
   - Pilot projects proposed for North Melbourne, central city, Balaclava Station and Station Pier will test the new sign design, content and placement with users: to understand their wayfinding needs and to build a robust evaluation framework.

2. Strategic approach
   - The project team are investigating:
     - the feasibility of building a single base map of metropolitan Melbourne for use by councils for wayfinding signage and other purposes; and
     - Commissioning a business case on the benefits of improved wayfinding signage in Melbourne.

The project team updated the IMAP Executive Forum on 28 January and will update the committee at their meeting in February 2016.

**Action 2.3 Bicycle Network Legibility**

IN PROGRESS – Initially completed in 2008, this project has been reactivated.

In March 2013, the IMAP Implementation Committee agreed to review and update the Priority Bicycle Network Map; to coordinate bike lane development priorities and capital projects by the 5 IMAP Councils and VicRoads across the inner Melbourne region.

Work to date has included:
- October 2013: An initial meeting of the Working Group to scope the project.
- November 2013: a workshop held in conjunction with State Government representatives started the collation of data on Council cycling initiatives, current and planned.
- February 2014: DTPLI presented to the IMAP Committee on integrating the state and local government work through a coordinated series of additional workshops to establish key cycling corridors.
- Joint workshops were held between April-June 2015 and feedback sought from the State Government on funding.
- 4 May 2015: the State Government hosted a workshop on Priority Cycling Corridors.
- The project team identified priority council cycling works for inclusion in the IMAP Review process.

**Action 2.5 Bicycle Network**

IN PROGRESS - Implementation of Priority Routes

Focus is on the high bicycle usage routes or those routes which have the potential to carry significantly increased bicycle volumes. Further reporting on progress with targeted works awaits the outcome of Action 2.3.

**Action 5.2 Affordable Housing**

COMPLETED - Stage 1: Planning mechanisms
IN PROGRESS - Stage 2: Community Land Trust Research

COMPLETED – Phase 1

- “Affordable Housing Development Models” prepared by Affordable Housing Solutions [AHS] was made available by the City of Port Phillip to the IMAP councils in March 2011 for consideration.
- Research undertaken on Community Land Trust models and their application in Australia is published in The Australian CLT Manual (refer copies held online).
- IMAP and the City of Port Phillip were awarded the University of Western Sydney 2013 Partnership Award for their involvement in this project.

IN PROGRESS – Phase 2

Key research questions of this phase relate to:

- identifying and researching appropriate financial products for the establishment of CLTs in Australia: The team will work with banks and other lending institutions to develop appropriate loan products for residents looking to buy a leasehold or shared equity interest in CLT housing
- perform in-depth case studies. This task will involve the completion of up to four in-depth case studies in a range of locations and scenarios.

Progress to date:

- February 2014: The Scope of Work for Phase 2 was reported to the IMAP Committee meeting and advice that funding raising had been successful
- November 2014: the first meeting for Phase 2 was held to discuss the next stage.
- March 2015: the UWS Partnership Agreement was finalised.
  ➢ An update on the CLT work was provided to the Committee at their meeting in May 2015 and in February 2016 (refer to correspondence).

A World Homeless Day Symposium ‘Future of Inner City Social Housing’ was held by the City of Yarra on 9 November to explore ways state and local government, as well as the private and non-government sector, can work together to increase the supply of social housing in inner Melbourne. A report on this event was considered at the November meeting.

Action 5.4 and 5.5 Social Infrastructure and Services/Infrastructure Development

IN PROGRESS - IMAP Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study project.

Following work being undertaken by the Metropolitan Planning Authority and Sport and Recreation Victoria to plan for future requirements for open space, the Committee considered a proposal at the May 2015 meeting to investigate recreation facilities and open space requirements across the IMAP region, in response to future growth.

➢ The detailed project brief was considered at the August 2015 meeting and a further report on funding implications were discussed in November 2015.
➢ An SRV grant application has been submitted for this project.
➢ The project plan and funding approval is to be confirmed at the February 2016 committee meeting.

Action 6.3 Managing Conflict in Activity Centres

IN PROGRESS A submission to address the disparity between planning and liquor licensing Definitions in the legislation with the Department Environment Land Water and Planning (DELWP) has been proposed by the IMAP Implementation Committee. An initial meeting to discuss the approach to be taken was held on 5 February 2015.
Action 7.2 Support Creative Industries

COMPLETED – Stage 1 Creative Industries

An initial meeting in December 2012 scoped this project and an inventory of current programs being undertaken by the IMAP councils was prepared and considered in September 2013. A definition of “Creative Industries” has been agreed and the need for an IMAP Creative Business policy identified. This work is now being undertaken by Creative Victoria.

IN PROGRESS – Stage 2 Urban Manufacturing

In a separate initiative, representatives of the IMAP Councils and University of Melbourne are investigating urban manufacturing in the Inner Melbourne region.

The IMAP Committee considered the initial brief and recommendations at the November 2014 and February 2015 meetings to finalise the funds, timeframe and objectives for this project.

The following approach has been proposed for this project:

- **Phase 1 (7 months)** – Existing Resources, Pilot Study, and Definition
- **Phase 2 (6 months)** - Major survey and preliminary economic analysis.
- **Phase 3 (3-5 years)** – Economic Impacts.

**PHASE 1 - PROJECT UPDATE**

- A stakeholder workshop held on 28 May 2015 identified the need to broaden the project to include Moreland Council region and explore a technological method for conducting the survey.
- The IMAP Implementation Committee approved the Agreement between IMAP and the University of Melbourne.
- The project team confirmed the information required to examine a complete picture of all three approaches – land, sector, and economic; is currently not in existence for Victoria to provide key data for the analysis of economic development in small manufacturing sectors.
- The Project Management Team and Steering Group agreed to approach Moreland Council for involvement in the project and a funding contribution; and to support the development of an online geographical mapping survey of makers across the IMAP area and surrounds to examine clusters, supply chains, customers and movement of makers over the life of the project.
- An update to the Steering Committee on 11 June 2015 identified that the Project should move straight to an application for ARC Linkage Grant funding. As a result of the impending application Phase 1 & 2 were combined to complete the online survey and ensure sufficient evidence of the research is available to report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee for endorsement and continuation of the project, prior to any application for ARC Linkage Grant funding. The draft report for Phase 1 was considered by IMAP Committee in August.

A comprehensive draft report *The Dilemma of Urban Employment Land – An Inquiry into the viability of small urban manufacturing in Inner Melbourne* outlines the findings from the analysis of existing data, inception workshop, and framing of the qualitative and quantitative studies that comprise the research. The report summarises the original project proposal and several strategic decisions modifying the scope and path of the research.

- The ARC Linkage Grant Application has now been submitted. The Maker.Melbourne website is now live and is attracting entries from local businesses.
- The final Phase 1 Report will be considered by the Committee at their February 2016 meeting.

Action 9.2 Environmentally Sustainable Design – commercial buildings

COMPLETED Stage 1 & 2

Work commenced in December 2010 to identify ESD topics to be written up in the form of Factsheets for publication. The first 10 Factsheets pack was formally launched at the City of Melbourne on 11 May 2012. The Factsheets have been licensed for re-badge and use by other Melbourne Councils.
The Working Group reported in May 2014 that the 10 original fact sheets, designed to support the SDAPP framework, have since become reference documents for the six local governments who had adopted the proposed local planning scheme amendment for ESD.

In August 2014 the working group investigated having CASBE oversee Council access to the Factsheets, to uphold standards and improve consistency. This has not eventuated.

5 additional topics were recently completed in 2016. The factsheet set now includes:

- Topics include:
  1.0 Indoor environment quality
  2.0 Energy efficiency
  2.1 Sunshading
  3.0 Water efficiency
  4.0 Stormwater management
  4.1 Site Permeability
  5.0 Building materials
  6.0 Transport
  7.0 Waste management
  8.0 Urban ecology
  8.1 Green roofs, walls and facades
  9.0 Innovation
  10.0 Construction and building management
  Melbourne’s Climate (including adaptation)
  ESD Tools

- The working group has finalised and updated all factsheets and will relaunch the series in 2016. Approximately 20 Councils across Melbourne now use the factsheets under an IMAP licence.

**Action 9.4 Green Demonstration Projects**

**IN PROGRESS - Green Roofs Research Project - Australian Research Council Linkage Grant**

In 2013 the IMAP Implementation Committee partnered in an ARC Linkage Grant with the University of Melbourne and Melbourne Water for further research on the measurable impacts of green roofs: "Mimicking natural ecosystems to improve green roof performance". The research project outcomes will provide:

- Design, monitoring and management recommendations for Green Roofs, particularly in relation to stormwater quality and quantity, temperature (building energy efficiency) and improved biodiversity.

Dr Nick Fisher, University of Melbourne updated the IMAP Committee on their research at the February 2015 meeting.

**COMPLETED - Distributed Energy Mapping –**

The Distributed Energy project undertook an analysis of the potential for distributed energy in the IMAP area (district scale cogeneration, renewable and energy efficiencies) and developed a predictive model for managing and implementing commercially viable distributed energy systems in Melbourne.

Work focussed on:
- extracting relevant Council data for the CSIRO modelling
- engaging the relevant utilities to participate and provide data.
- meeting with representatives from CSIRO to finalise data access arrangements

Progress has been as follows:

- August 2013: The energy modelling was demonstrated at the IMAP Implementation
- October 2013 and February 2014: Workshops helped identify how the information should be delivered to stakeholders and progress was reported to the IMAP Committee.
May 2014: CSIRO representatives met with the project team to determine final changes to the mapping projection scenarios. Information on the projected growth areas was then sourced to ensure the model allows for future changes predicted across the region.

August 2014: The (nearly) Final Report was provided to the IMAP Committee. Subsequently work has progressed developing a communications strategy and action plan, and arranging for the data models to be run on council computer systems to complete the project.

- May 2015: The Communications Plan and Action Plan were approved by the IMAP Committee and are currently being implemented. The data is now available on the CoM and IMAP websites.

**Strategy 11 – Regional Tourism**

**ONGOING**

A 3 year strategy was adopted in May 2013 inclusive of a detailed Action Plan for the financial year. To date the working group has:

- Renewed licensing of the IMAP map to tourism peak bodies.
- Placed map and video material on the IMAP website for IMAP Councils to link with.
- Evaluated the Skybus Campaign, completed in August 2013
- Changed the IMAP map to include Footscray, Maribyrnong
- Undertaken joint opinion research with DML on the Official Visitor Guide and the IMAP tourist map.
- Evaluated alternatives to printing and distributing the map and options for distribution of the tourist maps.
- The IMAP Map was included in the 15,000 AIDs conference delegate’s pack

In August 2014 the project team advised an agreement was reached with DML for printing and distribution of the IMAP map through the Official Visitors Map.

The August 2015 Committee meeting approved the Action Plan proposed for 2015-16.

- In November 2015, the Committee agreed to part fund development of a Destination Management Plan for Metro Melbourne to be undertaken by DML, subject to a number of conditions.
- In January 2016 IMAP’s senior executives met with the interim CEO of Visit Victoria to further explore this proposal and requested further discussions with DML on the Plan as it develops.

**IMAP Review**

**IN PROGRESS**

The development of a new Inner Melbourne Action Plan is underway.

- In June 2014 consultants were appointed to write the plan.
- During July to October 2014 staff and councillor workshops were held and 5 half-day Reference Group workshops were facilitated under the topics: Environmental Sustainability, Economy, Communities, Transport, and Neighbourhoods and Places
- December/January 2015: A first full draft of the plan was prepared and circulated for staff comment at the 5 councils during March. Following various reviews and amendments the draft plan was presented to the IMAP Implementation Committee in August 2015 for consideration.

- Council briefings on the draft plan were held November / December 2015 and the plan was made available for public comment on 27 January. Submissions are due by 29 February 2016.
- At their meeting on 28 January 2016, the IMAP Executive Forum consolidated funding for projects that have not yet commenced so it can be reallocated to new priorities under the new plan.

The IMAP projects continue to add value, deliver stronger relationships, practical solutions and strategic directions, and influence the liveability and sustainability of the inner Melbourne region.
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Progress Report
IMAP Review – Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan

Purpose
1. To update the Committee on progress with the IMAP Review.

Background
2. At the August Committee meeting the Committee resolved to:
   - Endorse the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan; and
   - Recommend the five member Councils be briefed on the Draft Plan.

Council Briefings
3. Briefings on the Draft Inner Melbourne Action Plan have been undertaken as follows:
   - 23 November - City of Stonnington
   - 30 November - City of Yarra
   - 1 December - City of Melbourne
   - 1 December - Maribyrnong City Council
   - 4 December – Regional Management Forum
   - 8 December - City of Port Phillip

Enquiries received from a couple of councillors have been responded to.

Consultation
4. The Draft Plan was made available on the Connect Stonnington website on 27 January 2016. Content about the plan was developed on the other 4 Council websites with links to Connect Stonnington so that all submissions could be coordinated. A link was also provided on the IMAP website.
5. Social media comments have been published by the IMAP councils.
6. A public notice regarding the consultation timeframe was published in The Age on 3 February 2016. The submission period closes on 29 February.
7. Letters to key stakeholders went sent out in early February providing information on how to make a submission.
8. At the time of writing, 4 comments had been received. A number of website hits were recorded following articles in the Herald Sun published 27 and 28 January.

Next steps
9. The timeline is as follows:
   - March – Amendments to the draft plan
   - April/ May - Seek Councils' approval to the draft plan
10. Formal approval from all partner councils is required before it can be returned to the IMAP Implementation Committee for implementation.

Recommendation
11. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the current work being undertaken to finalise the draft inner Melbourne Action Plan 2015-25.
IMAP Implementation Committee

Briefing Paper

Action 5.5 Infrastructure Development

Purpose
To inform the IMAP Implementation Committee on the status of the IMAP Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study project.

BACKGROUND
1. At the November 2015 committee meeting it was resolved that:
   a) The Working party reconvene to establish certainty around the project; and
   b) The Working Party prepares a report to the Executive Forum which clarifies the Brief and identifies what we are trying to achieve.

2. At the Executive Forum held on January 28 2016, a briefing paper was presented to provide information on a revised approach for the study and to seek approval for the proposed funding model.

The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to:

a. Approve the revised Project Plan for undertaking the IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study
b. Approve the funding proposal for this project as set out in Table 1 of [the] report; subject to a review of funding arrangements for Stage 2 should SRV funding not be approved.

c. Approve the appointment of a Project Officer on short term contract based at the City of Melbourne to undertake Stage 1 of the project

d. Approve and authorise:
   i. the involvement of key staff in this project from across the IMAP councils
   ii. the timely provision of all data relating to seasonal usage (clubs and casual users), management, maintenance, capacity and cost of active sport and recreation facilities owned and managed by the Councils within the IMAP region
   iii. access and use of the councils’ GIS systems for data collation and data sharing

e. Explore opportunities for a financial contribution to Stage I of the project from the MPA.

DISCUSSION
3. The Project Plan (attached) was developed by the Working Party after the November Committee meeting, and reflects a revised approach to implement this project. The main refinement is reflected in the project being undertaken in 2 stages:

   Stage 1: project information and data collection using in-house resources;

   Stage 2: engage an appropriate consultant from a wide range of disciplines to consider the planning implications upon completion of Stage 1.

4. Stage 1 is to be funded from existing IMAP funding ($40K) for Action 5.5 with potential for a further contribution from the City of Melbourne if required.

   Senior executives of the IMAP councils have also met with MPA representatives to discuss the funding of Stage 1 of this project.

5. It is proposed that Stage 2 be funded by a combination of:
a) Sport and Recreation Victoria (SRV) grant funding ($50k if submission successful),
b) IMAP funds to the value of $50k,
c) MPA in-kind contribution of $8,900, and
d) Contributions of $10K funding and $10K in-kind contribution from each Council in the 2016/17 financial year.

This Stage 2 proposal is based on receiving the SRV funding and will need to be reviewed if SRV funding is not received.

RECOMMENDATION

6. That the IMAP Implementation Committee notes the revised methodology and budget proposal for the IMAP Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study project as resolved by the Executive Forum at the January 2016 meeting.
IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study Project Plan

Prepared: 12 January 2016

Revised: 19 Jan 2016
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Part A

1. Overview

1.1 Purpose

The project plan is the management document for the project. It is owned, maintained and used by the IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study Project Control Group to ensure the delivery of project outputs and the realisation of project outcomes.

The document should be reviewed and amended to meet changed conditions or objectives throughout the project.

1.2 Project title

IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study.

1.3 Project summary

The IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study will assess options for the future provision of sport and recreation facilities, with a focus on active outdoor spaces within a regional context for the inner region of Melbourne, as well as aquatic and indoor court facilities.

The open space will be required to provide for a range of sport and recreation opportunities and pursuits to accommodate current and projected demands by an increasing population, with the scale of population growth unprecedented across the IMAP council areas in recent and future years.

It is proposed to undertake this study in 2 stages:

Stage 1: Information Coordination and Analysis
Stage 2: Future Planning

1.4 Project initiation and background

The study is commissioned in the context of:

- the strong population growth projected for all the IMAP Councils,
- the current high utilisation of existing sports grounds and other sporting assets situated in the inner region of Melbourne,
- the general lack of capacity of most of these assets to absorb any further demand,
- the ongoing pressure to convert existing passive open spaces into active spaces, and
- the pressure to manage and maintain open space to meet the needs of the community.

2. Project description

2.1 Desired outcomes

There are six key outcomes of the study:
1. Understanding the current supply and utilisation of sport and recreation assets within the study area.

2. Collation of information informing the planning for the provision of sport and recreation assets and open space throughout the study area, including the likely changes in preferences for sports participation and sporting options over the coming decades.

3. Evidence-based analysis of the demand for sport and recreation assets within the inner region of Melbourne.

4. Agreed principles and policies for the future planning, funding and provision of sport and recreation assets within the inner region of Melbourne.

5. Agreed approach to optimising the use of existing sports assets within the inner region of Melbourne, with consideration of seasonal allocations and shared use.

6. Options for the future provision, innovation, funding models and management of sport and recreation assets within the inner region of Melbourne.

The study will also investigate the optimal governance framework for the management of sporting assets and open spaces within the inner region of Melbourne, as councils and other authorities currently have different policies, procedures and practices for managing community land. Implications and any issues associated with other local government areas that adjoin the combined IMAP area should also be identified.

2.2 Planned outputs

This project aims to develop a framework for the provision and allocation of sport and recreation assets within the inner region of Melbourne that will respond to the community sport and recreation demands of the projected increasing population. The following outputs will be delivered:

- Literature review of relevant documents, strategies and plans that inform the planning for the provision of community sport and recreation facilities in the IMAP region (including State and Council documents)

- Inventory of all sport and recreation assets and active open space available in the IMAP area, including location, land status, asset condition and components, user profiles and demographics, current use and asset capacity and development / upgrade opportunities to increase capacity

- Analyse future demographic data for the IMAP region and current sport and recreation industry data and evidence to determine implications for the provision of sport and recreation facilities

- Key findings from consultation process with IMAP Councils and other key stakeholders as identified by the Project Control Group and working groups.

- Identification of the current and future gaps in the provision of sport and recreation facilities within the IMAP region

- Recommendations as to new and upgraded sport and recreation facilities required to meet future community demand

- Preparation of a strategy and action plan for the implementation of the study findings, including prioritisation of actions, cost estimates, funding opportunities, timing and project responsibility.
- Recommended policy direction (including endorsed values and principles) for the future planning, development, and management (use and allocation) of sport and recreation assets in the IMAP region
- Recommended governance framework for the future provision and management of community sport and recreation facilities

## 2.3 Key activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action / Activity – Stage 1 Information Coordination and Analysis</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage project officer</td>
<td>Employ project officer on short term contract for the duration of stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold inception meeting with Councils and key partners</td>
<td>Hold preliminary meeting with Councils and key partners to establish priorities and first steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Project Control Group, Working Group and reference groups (as required).</td>
<td>The Project Control Group is the decision making group which gives direction to the Working Group and reference/external stakeholder groups. The PCG will meet monthly to oversee progress on the project. The internal Working Group will meet on an as-needs basis to discuss the project, share knowledge and provide advice and report back to the Project Control Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Complete detailed Project Plan for Stage 1 | • Identify data set to be collected  
• Identify data relationship to existing mapping tools  
• Collect data within agreed timeframes  
• Identify requirements of each project stakeholder |
| Establish external stakeholder/reference groups and meet (developers/landscapers/architects/state gov/ industry etc) | Held on an as-needs basis to establish:  
➢ known and perceived community sport and recreation issues  
➢ current gaps in knowledge |
| Complete literature review, facility inventory and demographic / sport and recreation data analysis components of Stage 1 | • Analyse data collected  
• Review demographics – establish links between projected demographics and sport and recreation facility needs  
• Complete demand analysis using available participation and trends data |
| Complete data entry into agreed electronic format | • Ensure data systems able to be shared and updated by all key stakeholders  
• Oversees data entry in standardised formats  
• Ensure data completeness and integrity |
<p>| Complete Stage 1 Draft Project Report | Complete Stage 1 draft report and review with Councils and key stakeholders |
| Finalise Stage 1 Report | Incorporate feedback into final report |
| Evaluate Stage 1 of Project | Undertake monitoring and review as per evaluation plan |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action / Activity – Stage 2 Future Planning</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalise analytics and output requirements for consultant brief, and engage suitable consultant</td>
<td>Employ consultant for duration of stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold inception meeting with lead Council and partners</td>
<td>Hold preliminary meeting with consultant, lead Council and partners to establish priorities and first steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Project Control Group and reference/external stakeholder groups (as required). (Note these may be ‘rolled over’ from Stage 1)</td>
<td>The Project Control Group is the decision making group which gives direction to the Working Group, consultant and reference/external stakeholder groups. The internal Working Group will meet on an as-needs basis to discuss the project, share knowledge and provide advice, liaison and oversight of the consultant and report back to the Project Control Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Complete detailed Project Plan for Stage 2 | • Identify information to be gathered – eg survey, interviews, focus groups, submissions, etc  
• Identify requirements of the consultant and each project stakeholder  
• Develop evaluation plan |
| Develop stakeholder management and communication plan | • Communications plan  
• Strategic stakeholder engagement plan |
| Establish reference groups (as required) and facilitate meetings / workshops | • Technical reference group  
• Policy reference group |
| Establish external stakeholder groups and meet (community organisations/sport and recreation associations/stategovt/ industry etc) | Held on an as-needs basis to establish:  
➢ known and perceived community sport and recreation issues  
➢ current gaps in knowledge |
| Draft report outlining current and future gaps for sport and recreation facilities and recommendations for future provision, | • Priority order of facilities  
• Indicative costs – capital and recurrent  
• Revenue  
• Funding opportunities  
• Partners |
| Draft policy options | Produce draft for this component |
| Draft governance framework | Produce draft for this component |
| Prepare draft Stage 2 Report | Use feedback from PCG and Working Group to finalise Stage 2 of the project. |
| Finalise Stage 2 Report | Incorporate feedback into final report |
| Evaluate project | Undertake monitoring and review as per evaluation plan |
## 2.4 Project milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone description</th>
<th>Performance measure</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.               | Confirm Project Plan & Brief and Funding for project | • Project Plan & Brief approved by IMAP Councils  
• Stage 1 Funding confirmed by IMAP  
• Stage 2 Funding confirmation contingent on SRV funding submission outcome | February 2016  
March 2016 |
| 2.               | Employ Project Staff | • Employment contracts signed and start date agreed for Project Staff (Stage 1) and Consultant (Stage 2) as required  
• Milestone report endorsed by Project Control Group and completed to the State Government’s satisfaction. | Feb 16 (Stage 1)  
TBD (Stage 2) |
| 3.               | Information Coordination and Analysis Stage of project. | • Draft report completed and endorsed by Project Control Group. Electronic database established which meets requirements for planning and updating purposes | June 2016 |
| 4.               | Future Planning Stage of Project | • Complete communications and engagement component of project.  
• Draft report delivered to PCG and key partners for feedback.  
• Draft report completed and endorsed by Project Control Group. | TBD |
| 5.               | Develop final project report  
• Compile financial report on entire project | • Final project report clearly articulates completed project activities, achievements, lessons learnt and evaluation | TBD |
3. **Proposed Funding Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Contribution</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015-16</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP contribution to staff costs</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne – salary top up as required</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne host council – office overheads</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPORT STAGE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Contribution</strong></td>
<td><strong>2016-17</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP – the cash contribution is generated from approved project funds from the five member councils, invoiced by the City of Stonnington for IMAP.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne – additional cash funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Phillip – additional cash funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yarra– additional cash funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stonnington – additional cash funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong City Council – additional cash funding</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Government Grant Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation Victoria Regional Planning Grant TBC</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In- Kind Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melbourne staff time- D Stewart</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Phillip staff time– A Traill</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yarra staff time – J Hanrahan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stonnington staff time – T Oulton</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong City Council staff time – A Jackson</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Authority staff time</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>58,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SUPPORT STAGE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>208,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Project management

4.1 Governance structure

This section of the Project Plan describes the roles and responsibilities of those involved with the project.

4.1.1 Senior Responsible Officer
The Senior Responsible Officer for the project is: Graham Porteous, Manager, Libraries and Recreation, City of Melbourne (CoM).

4.1.2 Project Control Group
The Project Control Group (PCG) will oversee the planning, funding and delivery of the study, and will monitor the study’s completion in accordance with an agreed methodology, outcomes, timeframes, budget and quality parameters.

The Project Control Group shall be comprised of:

- Director, Community Facilities, Melbourne City Council
- Manager, Libraries and Recreation, Melbourne City Council
- Director, Yarra City Council
- Director, Port Phillip City Council
- Director, Stonnington City Council
- Director, Maribyrnong City Council
- IMAP Project Working Group (PWG)
- Metropolitan Planning Authority representative
- VicHealth representative
- Group Manager, Community Facilities and Planning, Sport and Recreation Victoria

In addition:

- Elissa McElroy, Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) is invited as an observer to each meeting.

4.1.3 Project Manager
The Project Coordinator for the project is:

- Dale Stewart, Senior Recreation Planner, Libraries & Recreation, City of Melbourne.

4.1.4 Project Working Group
The role of the Project Working Group (PWG) will be to provide technical advice on the study, ensure all relevant technical issues are considered, guide the work of the consultant and review information provided by the consultant.

The membership of the PWG will include:

- Manager Libraries and Recreation, Melbourne City Council *(Senior Responsible Officer)*
- Manager Recreation & Open Space, Yarra City Council
• Manager Public Space, Port Phillip City Council
• Manager Community Facilities, Stonnington City Council
• Manager Leisure Services, Maribyrnong City Council
• IMAP Executive Officer
• Parks Victoria representative (in lieu of the importance of Albert Park and Yarra Bend Park as community sports precincts)
• Senior Recreation Planner Melbourne City Council (Project Coordinator)
• Project Officer (Meeting Secretary)
• Senior Parks Planner Melbourne City Council
• Manager Metropolitan Community Facilities, Sport and Recreation Victoria
• MPA representative

The project team will work closely with the IMAP Executive Officer, Elissa McElroy.

4.1.5 Consultants and contractors
Consultants will be engaged to undertake Stage 2 of the project and will not be engaged until later in the project. Their details will be listed once known.

4.1.6 Other project groups
Technical Reference Group, Policy Reference Group: The reference/external stakeholder groups will contribute to the technical specifications and help develop policy and planning options for the project.

Part B

4.2 Terms of reference for Project Control Group

The Project Control Group (PCG) will provide steering on project direction including strategic decision-making. The PCG will also provide guidance and a sounding board for the Project Coordinator and the Project Officer (part of the project team). Governance on planning, legal, corporate risk, and liability will be monitored by PCG members in consultation with their governance advisors and in consultation with representative organisations such as IMAP, Sport and Recreation Victoria and the Melbourne Planning Authority.

4.2.2 Function of the Project Control Group

The PCG includes representatives from the IMAP partner councils - City of Melbourne, City of Port Phillip, City of Yarra, City of Stonnington and City of Yarra, as well as IMAP, MPA, SRV and VicHealth. The PCG has been formed to oversee the project direction and delivery, achieving objectives of plan, timelines, budget and consultancy components of the project as well as strategic insight and management of messaging around planning. The PCG is the decision making body for the project. The PCG is also responsible for consideration of management of governance issues such as legal and corporate risk and liability as well as processes relating to peer review and finalisation of external stakeholder selection in consultation with reference/advisory groups. The functions of the PCG will facilitate project delivery and achievement of project objectives and aims.
4.2.3 Role of the Project Control Group

The PCG’s role is to make decisions to facilitate the project to meet its aims. The PCG also has a role in providing direction for the Project Coordinator and Project Officer. Members have a role in offering access to, and the requisite support of, their own organisations, networks and specialist expertise in the field, and providing review and comment on project stages and drafts of project outputs.

Members of the PCG are expected to provide their expertise and comment within a short turn around time, and respect timelines requested of them. Members are also required to communicate messages about the project in line with the communication and stakeholder engagement strategy (to be developed by the Project Officer).

4.2.5 Meeting procedures

- Initially, all members of the PCG will be responsible for convening meetings using a rotating chair system. (The responsibility for convening meetings will be reviewed by the PCG upon commencement of the Project Officer).
- PCG will conduct meetings initially at monthly intervals and then every two months. Special extra meetings can be arranged as needed.
- The Chair of the meeting is responsible for provision of information about the meeting (such as invitation, agenda, previous minutes, relevant papers).
- The Chair is responsible for providing a minute-taker for each meeting. The distribution of minutes is required within two weeks of the date of the last meeting. Endorsement of minutes will be moved by a PCG member and seconded by a PCG member at the beginning of the next meeting.
- The Project Officer plays a Secretariat role and is invited to each meeting in that capacity. The Project Officer is responsible for keeping a complete set of the meeting minutes and attachments.
- In the event the meeting requires refreshment the cost will be a component of the partner organisation’s in-kind support.
- Travel costs to attend PCG meetings will be met by the individual members.

4.2.6 Reporting

The PCG is responsible for reporting to IMAP on the progress of the project. Councils will then be kept up to date through IMAP Implementation Committee meetings. Councils will also be able to provide direction to the project, if major issues arise, via these IMAP meetings. This will be the primary method of communicating with councils about the project. However, individual PCG members may need to provide briefings to their own council on an as-needs basis. Written communications (or written summaries of verbal communications) to councils must be provided to the Project Officer for record keeping purposes.

Other stakeholders will be kept up to date by email, which the Project Officer will distribute as required.

Key messaging and procedures for liaison with the media on the project will be outlined in the communication plan (under development) and this will be in line with IMAP communications protocols. PCG members will need to act within the bounds of the communication plan. Endorsement is not required before speaking to stakeholders about the development of this project. The Project Officer should be advised of all communications for record keeping purposes and ensuring the engagement plan can be kept up to date and relevant.
5. Work plan

The table below describes in detail the proposed steps of the project proposed to help achieve the planned outcomes. This list is not exclusive and will change throughout the project as the thinking around the project develops with data collection and analysis, stakeholder and reference group input. This is an initial work plan only. The most up to date work plan will be shared with stakeholders as adjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Scheduled start</th>
<th>Scheduled finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft Project Plan and Brief circulated for review comment</td>
<td>Project Manager / Council Reps</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>31 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete project plan and project brief</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>1 February 2016</td>
<td>29 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employ Project Officer to undertake Stage 1 of project</td>
<td>Project Manager / Council Reps</td>
<td>1 February 2016</td>
<td>29 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establish Project Control and Working Groups</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>1 February 2016</td>
<td>29 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop detailed stakeholder engagement and communications plans for Stage 2</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop monitoring and evaluation framework for Stage 2</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
<td>30 March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stage 1 work phase</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>1 February 2016</td>
<td>30 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Draft Stage 1 Report to Project PCG for review, feedback and finalisation</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>1 June 2016</td>
<td>30 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Engage Consultant for Stage 2 of Project</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
<td>30 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Review Project Plan and Project brief for Stage 2</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV</td>
<td>1 June 2016</td>
<td>30 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stage 2 work phase</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV / Consultant</td>
<td>1 July 2016</td>
<td>31 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Draft Stage 2 Report to Project PCG for review, feedback</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV / Consultant</td>
<td>1 October 2016</td>
<td>15 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Release for consultation with identified stakeholders</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV / Consultant</td>
<td>15 October 2016</td>
<td>31 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Draft Stage 2 Report to Project PCG for review, feedback and finalisation</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV / Consultant</td>
<td>1 November</td>
<td>30 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Present final report and evaluation to IMAP and identified key stakeholders</td>
<td>Project Officer / Council Reps / SRV / Consultant</td>
<td>1 December</td>
<td>31 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Stakeholder management and communication

6.1 Strategic stakeholder engagement plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of stakeholder engagement</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this type of engagement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide stakeholders with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the issues, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this type of engagement:</strong></td>
<td>To obtain stakeholder feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this type of engagement:</strong></td>
<td>To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this type of engagement:</strong></td>
<td>To partner with stakeholders in each aspect of decision making, including the development of alternatives and the identification of preferred solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of this type of engagement:</strong></td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Undertaking to stakeholders: | Promise: We will keep stakeholders informed. | Promise: We will listen to and acknowledge concerns, and provide feedback on how stakeholder input informed decision making. | Promise: We will work with stakeholders to ensure that concerns and issues are directly reflected in alternatives developed and provide feedback on how stakeholder input informed decision making. | Promise: We will look to stakeholders for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate stakeholder advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible. | Promise: We will implement what stakeholders decide. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant stakeholders</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevant staff in:</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>Project Control Group and Working group members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Port Phillip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Stonnington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Yarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Maribyrnong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tools of engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBC – eg Websites Media releases</td>
<td>TBC – eg Meetings Websites</td>
<td>TBC – eg Meetings Websites External stakeholder groups</td>
<td>TBC – eg Workshops Meetings</td>
<td>Project Control Group and Working Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stakeholder engagement outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased understanding, awareness and engagement about the project.</td>
<td>Increased awareness of current and future issues and opportunities Project team has the opportunity to hear from industry about their ideas on the project</td>
<td>Increased awareness about the current and future issues and opportunities Stakeholders providing input that shapes draft and final products Relationships with key stakeholders of mutual benefit</td>
<td>Commitment to the project outputs because of sense of shared ownership Increased awareness about the benefits and feasibility for sport and recreation facilities Stakeholders providing input that shapes draft and final products</td>
<td>Empowerment of individuals on reference group – they have increased knowledge of issues facing community sport and recreation now and in the future; they advocate for the project; and they directly shape the final outputs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stakeholder engagement evaluation tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Empower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBC -</td>
<td>TBC -</td>
<td>TBC – eg Interviews with project team to determine range of industries contributing the draft documents and number of people involved in external stakeholder groups</td>
<td>TBC – eg Survey of key staff involved in the project</td>
<td>TBC – eg Survey of people involved in the reference groups. Details of no. of meetings and no. of people involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic engagement plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement level</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
<th>Tools/activities</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Who’s responsible</th>
<th>Start and finish dates</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate</td>
<td>Relevant staff in:</td>
<td>Relevant staff in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
<td>City of Port Phillip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Stonnington</td>
<td>City of Yarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Yarra</td>
<td>City of Maribymong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower</td>
<td>Project Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2  **Communications plan**

6.2.1  Objective/s

- To connect with identified key stakeholders interested in the areas of community sport and recreation.
- To build networks among local and state government agencies to advocate for action that supports community sport and recreation.

6.2.2  Target audience

- Local and state government policy and planning professionals (encourage them to build partnerships to advocate for change)

6.2.3  Key messages

TBC

6.2.4  Implementation and tools

Tools to communicate key messages will include:

- Reference and stakeholder groups
- Council websites
- IMAP implementation meetings
- Media

6.2.5  Communicating project outcomes

When the project is complete, the outcomes will be communicated through wide distribution of project reports to all key stakeholders. Promotion opportunities may include IMAP council websites, press releases, seminars and development of articles for industry publications.

Other work conducted in this project, such as the opportunities and assessment and policy options paper, will be promoted at relevant conferences and other events, especially those which target other local councils and the building industry.

6.2.6  Timing

Key dates are included in project plan and communications elements of these will be developed by Project Officer and other project staff as identified.

6.2.7  Evaluation methods

TBC

6.2.8  Issues and/or risk management

There are potential issues in conflicting views of what information should be included in the project plan and brief. This will be resolved through the governance structure of the project, which allows for input from several key stakeholder groups. The issue will be further reduced by releasing a draft for comment, which will allow a period of review and collation of feedback before finalising the project reports.

There are political risks associated with the project due to the requirement to identify and address community sport and recreation facility issues and the enthusiasm and the ability of key stakeholders to then implement change. The purpose of the project is to provide a platform to engage with these issues, and consider potential opportunities for change, growth and development of facilities and opportunities.
The committee comprises representatives of each of the Inner Melbourne councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria (PTV), VicRoads and Tourism Victoria.

Report prepared by: Helen Hardwick, Project team leader CoM
8.1 Intercept surveys, stakeholder interviews and accompanied journeys will be conducted prior to installation: to establish a baseline against which post-installation results can be compared.
8.2 Amendments will be made to the design and other elements based on user testing results.

9. **Evaluation framework**: Indicators that enable CoM to measure and monitor the costs, environmental performance and users' responses to the new signage 'family' and maps will be set at the commencement of the pilot.
9.1 Decisions relating to wider deployment of the new signs (or not) will be made in light of the results achieved.

10. Wyndham City will be developing a Strategic Location Scheme i.e. determining sign locations for Werribee City Centre. A business case has been submitted to develop, document, and install signs in the city centre commencing 2016-17. The agreed signage ‘family’ would be applied and user testing conducted.

11. **Wayfinding signage basemap**: Investigation of anticipated benefits, costs, operational, governance and IP requirements of creating a Melbourne basemap is also proposed during 2016.
11.1 A preliminary discussion has been held with VicMaps staff regarding a possible collaboration.
11.2 The signage project team leader, Helen Hardwick, has done some investigation of how *Legible London*’s mapping system is managed.

12. IMAP councils might choose to defer decisions relating to implementing the new signs – whether incrementally or as a system in priority areas – pending the results of CoM’s pilot.

**REPORTING**

13. The Project Team Leader updated the IMAP Executive Forum at their meeting on 28 January 2016 to gain clarification on the strategic direction of the project.

The IMAP Executive Forum resolved to:

13.1 **note** progress on finalising the Melbourne Visitor Signage Master Style Guide;
13.2 **support** work on piloting the new wayfinding sign designs within the City of Melbourne, and testing/validating the signs within other IMAP Councils;
13.3 **support** the broader application of standardised wayfinding signage infrastructure installation across metro Melbourne by:

(i) supporting preparation of a report identifying the implications and costs of establishing and maintaining a wayfinding map base in collaboration with VicMaps. (Timing of investigation and report tbc); and

(ii) investigating State Government support to roll out or advocate for standardised wayfinding signage across the metro area (bearing in mind the Destination Management Plan being undertaken through Destination Melbourne Ltd. will identify key visitor attractions requiring improved promotion to achieve best economic value).

13.4 **thank** the Steering Committee for their work to date.

**RECOMMENDATION**

14. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to note the current work being undertaken on the wayfinding signage project and the Draft Melbourne Visitor Master Style Guide.
### Wayfinding Visitor Signs Project

#### Wayfinding Visitor Signs Project (as at 21 January 2016)

#### INCOME

**Stage 1 - review current policies/identify attractions/decluttering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Councils (4) budget approved Aug 2012</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribyrnong Council contribution approved Aug 2012</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2 - develop Master Style Guide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Council budget approved Dec 2012</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham City contribution (2014-15)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 140,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURE

**2012-13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Visitor Signs Project - sign review - Traffinity</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 10,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2013-14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Visitor Signs Project - sign review - Traffinity final</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Signs - Master Style Guide consultant - 1st payment</td>
<td>9,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Signs - Master Style Guide edit - 2nd payment</td>
<td>9,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 28,560.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2014-15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Visitor signs project - Traffinity #1 of 2</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Visitor signs project - Traffinity #2 of 2</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP/Wyndham contribution to TfL visit</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Visitor signs project - Traffinity #1 of 2</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 36,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2 Wayfinding - Traffinity #2 of 2</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2 Wayfinding - Prototype testing</td>
<td>23,026.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 31,026.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 105,586.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance at 31 Dec 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 34,413.73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purchase Orders awaiting invoicing:**

- Real Business - Editing: $2,800
- Traffinity - Final sections: $6,000
IMAP Implementation Committee

Briefing Paper

Action 7.2 Supporting Creative Businesses - Urban Manufacturing research

BACKGROUND

1. At the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting of 27 November 2015 Dr Jennifer Day, Senior Lecturer University of Melbourne and Austin Ley, Practice Leader Research, City of Melbourne presented the draft Phase 1 Urban Manufacturing project report. Key points included:

   1.1. The findings indicated there is value in the project and the approach taken;

   1.1.1. it is a first approach to aid the makers

   1.1.2. it provides a better understanding of the information Councils have and the gaps that exist in the data to deliver policy results

   1.1.3. this is a key sector for growth of our economy – both jobs and innovation

   1.1.4. the makers.melbourne web platform engages the maker community and their support in collection of survey data for the project

   1.2. Commitment by the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA) and Moreland Council as a supporting partnership with a contribution of $10,000 per organisation

   1.3. As a result of a review of Carlton Connect funding availability, an application for Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage grant funding was lodged in November 2015

2. The IMAP Implementation Committee resolved in an Out of Committee decision to:

   2.1. Approve the agreement between the IMAP Councils and University of Melbourne; and

   2.2. Authorise the CEOs to sign on behalf of the IMAP Committee

   2.3. Accept the draft Phase 1 report and agree to a revised integration of Phase 2 and 3

   2.4. Endorse the continuation of the Urban Manufacturing Project and instructs the Steering Committee to apply for ARC Linkage grant funding in September 2015 in line with the original IMAP resolution of matched funding

   2.5. Accept the Steering Committees recommendation to request Moreland Council as a partner in the project, subject to a MoU being signed between IMAP and the City of Moreland.

3. Letters were received in support of the ARC Linkage grant funding from the MPA, Moreland Council, City of Melbourne and City of Port Phillip as the lead Council for IMAP for the Urban Manufacturing Project.

PHASE 1 FINAL REPORT

4. The core purpose of the Phase 1 report ‘The Dilemma or Urban Employment Land – An inquiry into the viability of small urban manufacturing in inner Melbourne’ is to demonstrate the importance of the project and relay the findings to date and demonstrate that the objectives of Phase 1 were met. The following objectives were agreed on by the IMAP Implementation Committee in February 2015;

   4.1. Objective 1: To clearly define the urban manufacturing sector, to enable analysis of existing industry and employment data-sets;

   4.2. Objective 2: Identify the location and quantum of urban manufacturing firms in the IMAP region, using the agreed definition and available data-sets;

   4.3. Objective 3: To assess the significance of urban manufacturing to the economic geography of the IMAP region, including through stakeholder consultation;
4.4. Objective 4: To deepen IMAPs understanding of the scope, limitations and quality of current data regarding urban manufacturing firms, including gaps in currently-available data and required research;

4.5. Objective 5: To enable data sharing and joint analysis between departments and units within state and local government in Victoria; and

4.6. Objective 6: To use the findings of Phase 1 to articulate the need for further work and public policy rationale for further investment in the Urban Manufacturing Project in 2016/17

5. A snapshot summary of the Phase 1 report has been prepared (see attachment 10a) to outline the key findings of the report and demonstrate how the project objectives are being met. The following key points were determined from the study;

5.1. Definition maker = urban manufacturer = small urban maker (SUM)
   5.1.1. A SUM is defined in this study as a company or entity that makes or designs a physical or digital product; employs fewer than 20 people; & is located on highly-accessible urban lands in metropolitan Melbourne

5.2. More than 30% of firms identify under the generic Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) ‘Other’ category. Firms don’t see themselves as fitting into traditional ANZSIC manufacturing categories and so the nature of their small urban manufacturing (making) activity has remained limited

5.3. An extensive review of all existing datasets in Australia took place and found that the information required to measure the contribution SUMs make to the Melbourne economy, doesn’t exist

5.4. The survey aligned to the makers.melbourne website is helping to bridge the knowledge gap by collecting information on; employment and job creation; firm location choice and location requirements; support service requirements and location; space requirements; how well firms are networking together; relocation plans; markets and sales and threats and outputs

5.5. The study, together with Phase 2 research will identify how one centralised dataset and source might be enhanced – potentially through a refinement of one of the two datasets which showed the most potential (Census and Land Use Data (CLUE) or Australian Business Register (ABR))

5.6. Collaboration and data sharing across the IMAP Councils, the State Government and The University of Melbourne has underscored the findings and outcomes of the research to date and enriched by the interest shown by makers

6. Next steps pending the outcome of the ARC Linkage grant funding are;

6.1. Commence Phase 2 work consisting Streams 1 and 2 and build on this knowledge to produce policy guidance for state and local government partners
   6.1.2. Stream 2: Composition of and Influences on the Making Sectors (Land and Sector perspectives)

ISSUES

- Notification of the ARC Linkage grant funding will not be known until June 2016
- Carlton Connect Initiative Fund (CCIF) has provided a further ‘top up’ $20,000 to bridge the gap in progressing the project while awaiting an outcome of the ARC Linkage grant funding
- Subject to ARC Linkage grant funding success, the IMAP Implementation Committee has allocated $90,000 to the Urban Manufacturing Project subject to matched funding. Irrespective of the ARC outcomes the following budget is explained;
  a. $70,000 remains budgeted to the project by IMAP
  b. $10,000 committed by MPA
  c. $10,000 committed by Moreland Council
  d. $20,000 provided by CCIF (not yet matched by IMAP)
PROJECT OUTCOMES

7. A comprehensive final Phase 1 report (refer http://imap.vic.gov.au/index.php?page=urban-manufacturing) ‘The Dilemma of Urban Employment Land – An Inquiry into the viability of small urban manufacturing in Inner Melbourne’ has been submitted outlining findings from the analysis of existing data, inception workshop, and framing of the qualitative and quantitative studies that comprise the research.

The report summarises the original project proposal and several strategic decisions modifying the scope and path of the research.

RECOMMENDATION

8. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to;
   8.1. Accept the final Phase 1 report
   8.2. To be advised [Note the Project Steering Committee’s advice, to be tabled at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting, will advise on how best to continue the project, given that the outcome of the ARC linkage grant application will not be known until June 2016]
The Significance of Small Urban Makers (SUMs) to Inner Melbourne’s Urban Employment Land

A pilot research project focused on small urban makers has been undertaken by The University of Melbourne in partnership with the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) councils. The study aims to help local council and government make informed decisions about industrial and commercial land use versus residential land use. This is a summary of the key findings.
The term ‘small urban maker’ or SUM is adopted for this study (in place of ‘urban manufacturer’). This is in step with dialogue in the SUM sector.

A small urban maker (SUM) is defined in this study as:
- a company or entity that makes or designs a physical or digital product
- employs fewer than 20 people
- and is located in a highly urbanised area

**Extinction or prosperity**

Against a backdrop of rising house prices particularly in Melbourne and Sydney, councils are under pressure to make decisions about land reallocation from urban employment land uses (industrial and commercial) to residential. Threat of displacement and survival is an omnipresent concern for small urban makers.

Once land has been allocated for housing, there is no turning back. Jobs, skills loss, history, innovation, agglomeration economies, community, diversity, vibrancy, culture and liveability – are just a few of the things impacted.

This thought leadership research on small urban makers (SUMs), a sector not yet well understood in Australia, is therefore of critical importance.

**Manufacturing state of play**

Despite the overall decline in the manufacturing industry generally throughout much of the developed world, there is evidence that some small and specialised manufacturing sectors in the USA are growing. This might be echoed in Melbourne, however more data is needed to make this call. Manufacturing still exists in Melbourne, however larger noisier manufacturing is being replaced by smaller scale manufacturing in a different environment.

This pilot study established that:

While many of the sub-sectors within the manufacturing industry in inner Melbourne (ANZSIC 3 digit) decreased employment (2006-2011), a number of sub-sectors actually increased, the largest being pharmaceutical and medicinal products followed by professional and scientific equipment.

The IMAP study area showed increases in manufacturing employment in:
- Glass and Glass Product Manufacturing
- Fruit and Vegetable Processing
- Professional and Scientific
- Equipment Manufacturing, Other Food Product Manufacturing
- Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Product Manufacturing
- Beverage and Bakery Product Manufacturing

Declines in manufacturing employment in the IMAP study area included:
- Textile Product Manufacturing
- Other Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing
- Sugar and Confectionery Manufacturing
- Motor Vehicle and Motor Vehicle Part Manufacturing
- Manufacturing
- Printing and Printing Support Services
- Clothing and Footwear Manufacturing

A movement towards specialisation in a number of industries was also reported, suggesting these firms may be attracted to a local economy. Collingwood for example, appears to have a high concentration of furniture, clothing and fabric manufacturers.
Manufacturing Employment Change by Sector, Melbourne Metro and IMAP Area, 2006-2011

About ANZSIC codes

ANZSIC is the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification system determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) which organises information into categories suitable for economic analysis. Periodic reviews of major classifications such as the ANZSIC ensure they remain current and relevant and reflect new and emerging industries, and the new business methods and technologies applied in the production of goods and services.

Source: www.abs.gov.au

Melbourne’s emerging SUM sector

Findings from this pilot study strongly suggest “a new, servicised (an added service component to the product), high value-added, knowledge-intensive production sector is emerging in Melbourne – the small urban maker (SUM).”

Small urban makers were found to be a vibrant and distinct sector with unique features. Rather than being a relic of the city’s industrial period there has been a reversal of the historic relationship between manufacturing and services.

The quantity and economic contribution of SUMs has largely remained incognito, due to a lack of datasets capturing this information. Contributing to the low profile of SUMs is the current Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) codes, which appears to be housing many SUMs in the generic ‘other’ manufacturing category for want of options that fit what they do.

A subsequent Phase 2 study is set to generate the evidence needed to assist local and state governments to plan for and support the growth and prosperity of SUMs. The findings will have national application for urban SUMs (small urban makers) and regional SMs (small makers).

Decisions surrounding core industrial sites should therefore be preserved for now.

Understanding SUMs better will ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assist local &amp; state governments to</th>
<th>Assist makers to</th>
<th>Enhance and ensure city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitalise on the window of opportunity.</td>
<td>Develop economically sustainable businesses.</td>
<td>Liveability, experience, character and vibrancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster the potential of SUMs to improve economic and material sustainability in Australian cities.</td>
<td>Have their value celebrated.</td>
<td>Cultural, creative and arts fabric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill knowledge gaps to make informed and strategic decisions about urban employment land allocation versus residential land and get the balance right.</td>
<td>Be seen, heard and understood.</td>
<td>Activation by community orientated makers and their customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrupt displacement pressure faced by SUMs and fool the potential ripple effect of their loss.</td>
<td>Access support and services needed to prosper.</td>
<td>Economic sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish what SUMs need and implement support services to help them thrive.</td>
<td>Share knowledge and pass on skills to help sustain their craft.</td>
<td>Distinctive identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reap value from the innovative culture of SUMs.</td>
<td>Create community.</td>
<td>Sense of place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the history of craft and making.</td>
<td>Strengthen Melbourne’s arts and cultural fabric.</td>
<td>Reputation for innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Anybody who is making or doing creative things adds value to the city. If all the creative people move out – the city will lose its charm - it will become a very boring city if creative people can’t afford to stay”

(Source: A small urban maker 2015)
Research ambitions

Six research objectives were set in February 2015. All have been met.

1. To clearly define the urban manufacturing sector, to enable analysis of existing industry and employment data-sets;
2. To identify the location and quantum of urban manufacturing firms in the IMAP region, using the agreed definition and available data-sets;
3. To assess the significance of urban manufacturing to the economic geography of the IMAP region, including through stakeholder consultation;
4. To deepen IMAP’s understanding of the scope, limitations and quality of current data regarding urban manufacturing firms, including gaps in currently-available data and required research;
5. To enable data sharing and joint analysis between departments and units within state and local government in Victoria; and
6. To use the findings of Phase 1 to articulate the need for further work and public policy rationale for further investment in the Urban Manufacturing Project in 2016/17.


PROGRESS SCORE: findings, issues and recommendations

OBJECTIVE 1. Defining a maker

‘A small urban maker (SUM) is defined in this study as
A company or entity that makes or designs a physical or digital product
Employs fewer than 20 people and
Is located in a highly urbanised area

This definition is deliberately an open-ended ‘working definition’ so that it can continue to be shaped by input from small urban makers on makers.melbourne during Phase 2 research.

Evidence to date, reveals that SUMs range from ‘makers’ who may not have traditionally been thought to be makers to more time-honoured maker crafts, with the addition of a high value-added service component. Having a ‘working’ definition is allowing a larger than anticipated variety of businesses to emerge and self-identify.

This working definition was derived from a review of scholarly and professional work on urban manufacturers, including the Trident Method for Determining Employment within the Urban Manufacturing Workforce (see table 4.1). It was validated during this study’s fieldwork interviewing firm owners in the IMAP area.

SUMs: a sector with vibrant character

- Makers are not focused on economies of scale or mass production - for this reason they prefer to be known as ‘makers’ not ‘manufacturers.’
- Craft skill and passing on those skills to new generations of artisans is important.
- Location in urban centres and inner suburbs is core to firm identity and linked to customer and supplier relationships.
- Some firm agglomeration economies and knowledge sharing is evident.
- Displacement pressures and future viability in inner Melbourne are major concerns. Some makers expressed firm closure as a preferred option to outward relocation.

Servicisation was one of the most common themes

Making was more than simply making things - it was linked to the maker’s creativity, customer relationship, thinking about a solution, design, delivery and sometimes installation and all the extra things that they have added to their product to respond to customer’s needs.

- Makers find difficulty identifying with a particular sector or ANZSIC code due to the variety of business tasks they do and their strong service component.
- Makers add value to made products through high levels of added service and educational programming

Examples of varying services in varying levels added by makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-manufacturing</th>
<th>Post-manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with customer</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing specific material</td>
<td>Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design solutions</td>
<td>Providing special custom made box for objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering solutions</td>
<td>Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making prototypes</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other characteristics evident but needing further exploration ...

- Strong face-to-face interactions between SUMs.
- Some SUMs may rely on an urban core, others may thrive outside the core.
OBJECTIVE 2. SUMs Location and Quantity

This study represents the early beginnings of capturing the location and quantity of small urban makers in the inner Melbourne IMAP region.

Examination of all available current data found the City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) survey 2012 (see Figure # 7.12), to be the most illuminating in terms of data depicting the location and numbers of SUMs in inner Melbourne. Of the Top 10 most prevalent urban manufacturing firm sectors in the City of Melbourne by size, the front-runner was very small firms in the ANZSIC manufacturing code ‘Other.’ Very small being 5 or fewer employees and small being 20 or fewer employees.

Table 7.7 & Table 7.8 show that 19.5 percent of firms (144 very small firms of 737 firms in total), identify under the generic ‘Other’ category. This means the firm doesn’t see themselves as fitting into traditional ANZSIC manufacturing categories and so the nature of their small urban manufacturing (making) activity is a mystery.

Table 7.8 indicates that small and very small manufacturers are strongly over-represented in some categories; notably, “other” manufacturing, clothing and footwear, baking, and furniture. The table also indicates that small makers are under-represented in some ANZSIC codes such as computers and electronics, and food production.

“We are trying to associate with inner city clients so being close to the city is very important.” A small urban maker 2015

The fact that most small making firms are classified as “other” highlights the current ANZSIC code classification problem, which prohibits understanding the new urban economic sector of making.

Notwithstanding an absence of current data on the number, concentration and activity of SUMs in the Melbourne IMAP region to inform policy, this City of Melbourne example together with the study’s working definition of a SUM (a firm that makes or designs product, employs under 20 staff and is located in a highly urbanised area) - indicates the types of inner urban making taking place.

The 2012 CLUE data reveals the existence of 737 SUMs in the City of Melbourne and in addition - qualitative data from this study confirms that SUMs do exist in other IMAP regions. Phase 2 research will produce the evidence needed to more accurately substantiate the number of SUMs and their economic contribution, however based on these findings to date it’s recommended that core industrial sites should be preserved for now.

The makers.melbourne website (which hosts a maker survey), includes a map view that will pinpoint clusters across Melbourne. Makers believe that location in the urban core is critical to their work with strong service components being part of their value chain.
Whether or not SUMs benefit from agglomeration economies - being in close proximity to each other as opposed to being far away - has been the subject of considerable study in the USA. Benefits of agglomeration for SUMs were found to include: innovation, jobs sharing, supplier proximity, collaboration and knowledge sharing.

An extensive review of all existing datasets in Australia found that the information required to measure the contribution SUMs make to the Melbourne economy, doesn't exist. Continuing discussions with the Australian Business Register, is therefore essential, to create the necessary proprietary datasets.

The makers.melbourne survey is helping to bridge the knowledge gap by collecting information on: employment and job creation; firm location choice and location requirements; support service requirements and location; space requirements; how well firms are networked together; relocation plans; markets and sales; threats and output.

Preliminary feedback from a small sample of makers does point to the potential for loss of skills and innovation in the economy from the closure or displacement of SUMs from the IMAP region.

OBJECTIVE 3. Economic significance

In order to inform policy that will enable urban employment land rezoning decisions to be made, one centralised dataset and source is recommended to:

- Provide a complete picture encompassing land, sector, and economic approaches and analysed for small manufacturing firms
- Enable analysis of makers’ location, contributions and productivity
- Allow number, firm size, concentration, economic output and activity of SUMs to be determined
- Provide information about why firms leave the IMAP region.

Of the plethora of datasets reviewed for this study - nationally, state-based and locally - some were found to be useful, but insufficient. None of the databases talk to each other, and while getting them to do so was considered, it was deemed impracticable.

Phase 1 together with Phase 2 research will edify how one centralised dataset and source might be enhanced – potentially through a refinement of one of the two datasets which showed the most potential: the CLUE data or ABR data. CLUE for example, might inform some of the things that need to be taken into consideration in ABR.

One output of the Phase 2 research will be a revised set of ANZSIC codes, particularly relevant to makers. Current findings suggest there is a strong over-representation of makers in the vague “other” classification, indicating these codes are in need of updating.

OBJECTIVE 4. SUM Datasets: findings and issues

The Urban Manufacturing Project is a partnership between the five inner Melbourne Councils (IMAP) of cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong in collaboration with the Metropolitan Planning Authority (MPA), Moreland Council, makers and other contributors.

Through the process of data sharing, all project partners recognize that there is a multitude of datasets with limitations and have indicated a desire to collaborate to achieve an inclusive dataset that will accommodate SUMs.

Collaboration and data sharing across the IMAP Councils, the State Government and The University of Melbourne has underscored the findings and outcomes of the research to date. The research has been enhanced by the interest shown by makers and through the adoption of their ideas. These include:

1. The makers.melbourne geospatial website which hosts a survey data collection tool, is a by-product of this study that was created and developed in response to maker feedback that an online data collection tool was preferred to a clipboard survey. The website would help to demonstrate commitment by the IMAP research partners as well as providing an incentive for maker input. For makers who register and complete the survey, makers.melbourne provides the opportunity for makers to promote their goods and services to the public while contributing to important research supporting makers in the future.
2. Moreland City Council accepted the invitation to become an IMAP study partner at the suggestion of makers.

OBJECTIVE 5. Data sharing & joint analysis

Datasets examined included:
- ANZSIC: Australia Bureau of Statistics Industry Classifications
- City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) survey
- Australian Business Register (ABR) data.

The place to find the Makers of Melbourne

Melbourne is dotted with cool makers intent on making Melbourne a unique experience and creative hub. makers.melbourne provides the opportunity for makers to promote their goods and services to the public, while contributing to important research supporting makers in the future.

Join the Maker community

Datasets examined included:
- ANZSIC: Australia Bureau of Statistics Industry Classifications
- City of Melbourne Census of Land Use and Employment (CLUE) survey
- Australian Business Register (ABR) data.
Where to next?

OBJECTIVE 6. Recommendations

This Phase 1 pilot research has produced strong and extensive new insights about SUMs. The recommendation is that Phase 2 work: research Streams 1 and 2, should proceed and build on this knowledge to produce policy guidance for state and local government partners.

STREAM 1: Impacts of Making Configuration on Economic Development (Land and Economic perspectives) – What are the broader benefits to the city of a successful urban manufacturing sector and what future commercial space is required for survival of these firms?

This project will measure: economic impacts on jobs innovation and displacement of firms out of Melbourne, Victoria, and Australia

STREAM 2: Composition of and Influences on the Making Sectors (Land and Sector perspectives) – what is currently happening in industrial/commercial-zoned land and what does the sector require to prosper? This research will examine:

- the links between the configuration of the work settings of makers, their productivity and the success of the sector
- what kinds of firms are classified as “other” in the ANZSIC codes and how they might be better incorporated into the industry classification system
- relationships between clustering, location, industry classification and making
- Whether makers benefit from location in clusters of like firms or a variety of firms and agglomeration economies

Phase 2 Funding

A resolution was made by IMAP in November 2015 to proceed with an application for an ARC Grant for funding towards this future work to assist in expanding the research scope nationally. Irrespective of that outcome, funds have been set aside within IMAP and from other support partners to allow Phase 2 to proceed.

Phase 1 Research Activities have included:

Three pilot research projects (two qualitative and one quantitative). A multi-faceted approach comprising land, sector and economic approaches was designed to investigate the urban employment land dilemma to extract the implications for policy, planning controls and design in inner city industrial zones. There are elements of all of these approaches in each research project undertaken in the Phase 1 pilot study.

- Analysis of all existing and available data that could inform knowledge of SUMs in the IMA area
- A workshop to bring together makers and policy makers and seek feedback on the approach
- Extensive literature review resulting in a working sector definition
- Case study on the presence of creative clusters in Yarra
- Case study on the importance of service in the sectors
- Makers.melbourne website and survey
- Preliminary spatial study of makers resulting from the makers.melbourne site

Glossary

Agglomeration economies: the productivity benefits that firms receive from being located in close proximity to concentrations of firms and people

IMAP councils IMAP region: City of Port Phillip, City of Melbourne, City of Yarra, City of Stonnington, Maribyrnong City Council plus Moreland City Council

IMAP area includes the Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong that have prepared the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)

IMAP Moreland project area includes five IMAP area councils plus the City of Moreland

IMR Inner Melbourne region (Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington, Yarra and Maribyrnong)

SUM Small urban makers or small urban manufacturers. A working definition created for this survey, of firms that: make or design a physical or digital product; employ fewer than 20 people; are located in metropolitan Melbourne

Urban employment land: land designated for industrial or commercial use

Urban manufacturing/manufacturers is interchanged with ‘makers’ in this research

Servicisation: the service composition of making firms

Further Information

http://makers.melbourne

Dr. Jennifer Day, Senior Lecturer in Urban Planning,
The University of Melbourne
Phone: 0451 054 878
Email: jday@unimelb.edu.au

Ms. Virginia Miller, Industry, Investment & Research – City of Port Phillip
Phone: 9209 6361 or 0478 319 836
Email: vmiller@portphillip.vic.gov.au
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