Minutes
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum

Meeting No 19
9.00am – 10.00pm Thursday 19 May 2016
Meeting Room 2.1, Level 2, 311 Glenferrie Road
City of Stonnington

Attendance: Mr Warren Roberts – Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington (Chair)
Mr Stephen Wall – Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
Mr Geoff Lawler – Director City Operations, City of Melbourne
Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath – Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
Ms Carol Jeffs, General Manager Community Development, CoPP – for Tracey Slatter
Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer
Ms Laura Cavello, CEO, Destination Melbourne Ltd
Ms Virginia Miller, City Business Officer – Industry, Investment & Research, CoPP
Mr Austin Ley, Practice Lead - Research, City of Melbourne
Ms Francesca Valmorbida, Manager Economic & Cultural Development, City of Stonnington

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 appointed Mr Warren Roberts 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</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 the item on Urban Manufacturing due to his advisory roles with the University of Melbourne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms Vaidyanath declared a conflict of interest in relation to the item on Destination Melbourne Ltd due to her Board role with DML.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Destination Melbourne Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Cavello, CEO for Destination Melbourne attended for this item. Ms Cavello provided an update on funding for the Destination Management Plan project and noted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 24 councils now secured – generally accept that all regions in Victoria have a DMP, and that there is a need for one in the metro region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Vaidyanath arrived at 9.07am. She declared an interest in this item and left the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some assistance from the IMAP CEOs to encourage two or three of the outstanding inner councils would be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some metro councils to the east align themselves with the Peninsula councils rather than the metro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
area which was understandable

- PTV and Visitor Victoria are included. PTV has recently completed a visitor project and will make these findings available to the project.
- A meeting is planned next week with Hugh Moore, Executive Director of Investment for DEDJTR.
- Parks Victoria also being approached.
- Overall, councils are confirmed in the west, north and 75% of the SE area of the city.
- The Steering group will be established at the end of June to develop an EOI for the consultants.
- EOI expected to require overview of key research, stats and qualitative research and engagement with industry.
- Expected to take 6-12 months to complete

Questions/Comments

- **Budget?** Ms Cavello advised $230K of a budgeted $260K has been secured.
- **What’s included in the DMP?** It is a 10 year plan. It provides an overall plan and subregional plans with a range of actions. Ms Cavello has received advice from a contact who has worked on other DMPs to guide the approach.
- **Representatives?** Ms Jeffs offered to provide a representative from CoPP for the Steering Group.
- **Time commitment:** Monthly meetings to bi-monthly meetings as the project progresses
- **Gaps?** Mr Roberts and Mr Wall offered to assist with those councils who have not committed to the project should Ms Cavello continue to have a problem getting a response. They recommended Ms Cavello approach the CEOs of these Councils to secure the project funding as in a couple of cases they are new CEOs.
- Ms Cavello noted that having IMAP’s commitment has added value to the project.

The Chair thanked Ms Cavello for updating the IMAP Executive Forum.

Ms Vaidyanath returned to the meeting at 9.20am.

### 5 Action 7.2 Urban Manufacturing

Mr Lawler left the meeting at 9.20am.

Mr Ley and Ms Miller attended for this item. Mr Ley noted:

- The Committee adopted the Phase 1 report at the last meeting and requested clarification on funding.
- Phase 1 received $40K from Carlton Connect in 2 payments and $20K from IMAP. Dr Day has advised further staff costs have used up the remaining balance and these funds have now been expended.
- The Project team have been advised the ARC Linkage Grant application for Phase 2 was unsuccessful.
- $90K remains to undertake Phase 2 and the project team believe they can complete the original project proposal for this amount. Other possible funding sources could be explored, but the project team believe the next phase should now proceed on current funding.

Ms Miller advised the ARC Linkage grant application gave the project a national context – without the grant, the project can revert back to the original scale – the Victorian context.

Questions/Comments

Mr Roberts noted the report would need to be amended to reflect this for the Committee with some discussion added around this to explain what that means.

Ms Vaidyanath requested the second recommendation be amended to clarify additional funding from non-IMAP sources could be sought.

5.1 The Executive Forum approved the amended recommendation on the Urban Manufacturing report:

> That the IMAP Implementation Committee agree;

- To endorse the commencement of Phase 2 with existing allocated funds
- That the Urban Manufacturing Project Management Team continue to seek additional non-IMAP funding to match the shortfall of $21,000
- To include in-kind contributions from the University of Melbourne as counting toward project contributions

and requested that the report be referred to the Committee to update them on the project.

MOVED/Seconded: MS VAIDYANATH / Mr Wall

Ms Vaidyanath returned the meeting at 9.30am.
**IMAP CLUE**

Mr Ley requested the Executive Forum consider an additional item in relation to the work being undertaken on the Urban Manufacturing study, and provide some guidance on scoping a business case for considering an IMAP CLUE (Census of Land Use and Employment).

The Executive Officer noted this item is on Business Arising matters for the Committee and was awaiting initial work on the Urban Manufacturing study to be completed to provide insights into current data availability.

Mr Ley noted:
- The Urban Manufacturing project identified information that exists - and the lack of it.
- We still need to investigate state government information
- His question is about how to approach an IMAP CLUE project – would the Committee like the project scope to explain how the IMAP CLUE would work? And cover:
  - What demand there is for information across the region generally
  - How information requirements are currently being met
  - Identify the numerous projects being undertaken at the IMAP Councils through incremental surveys (this was the reason why CoM established CLUE)
  - What costs are currently involved in data gathering by the councils
  - What mechanism we would use – he noted the State Government had established VIC CLUE (no longer funded) so there is a multi-council system that could be rolled out
  - What information the CLUE covers – IC, employment, capacity measures, gaming machine numbers etc
- CoM CLUE is regularly updated, consistently maintained in the same format, and collected in conjunction with the Property team within Council so property information is constantly updated. Better record keeping, accurate mail outs etc are one advantage.
- CoM has a strong core research group which could provide support
- The initial survey is expected to cost more than subsequent updates
- Mr Ley noted CLUE is the solution. Must first determine what is the demand and also any additional information that should be added.

**Questions/Comments**
- Ms Vaidyanath commented that some councils already have used CLUE. Yarra has gone a step further. Agrees CLUE is a useful adjunct to project work like the urban manufacturing project, to continue to monitor the sector
- Mr Roberts agreed the project scope needs to cover the points raised by Mr Ley before it can be considered.
- Ms Valmorbida advised that Stonnington’s Economic Development team and those in other councils were speaking about getting a business database together. There is value in knowing the broader details – carpark usage, people working from home etc. The proposal is to do this across the board. They have met with a company proposing to set up a framework for this at a reasonable maintenance cost from her initial review. She noted the ongoing issues of not having up to date contact details for our businesses.
- Mr Lawler asked if the data collection would need to be the same as Melbourne. Mr Ley noted the ABN register information is useful except councils cannot access the ATO information. AURIN is looking at this but future access cannot be relied on. The State Government have a GEMS database of businesses with more than 20 employees – but checks have indicated it is not as accurate as CLUE data – and it is proving hard to share.
- Ms Miller noted the Phase 1 report on Urban Manufacturing has identified the shortcomings of the various databases.
- The Chair noted that Mr Ley and Ms Valmorbida need to collaborate and bring the matter back. It is important to:
  - Identify costs that Councils are already incurring; and
  - Identify the work council property valuers are doing
  - Note the benefits of CLUE, and
  - Identify work undertaken outside CLUE
- Ms Miller noted the Phase 1 report on Urban Manufacturing has identified the shortcomings of the various databases.
- The Chair noted that Mr Ley and Ms Valmorbida need to collaborate and bring the matter back. It is important to:
  - Identify costs that Councils are already incurring; and
  - Identify the work council property valuers are doing
  - Note the benefits of CLUE, and
  - Identify work undertaken outside CLUE
- in a report back to the Executive Forum.
Mr Wall asked that the report be provided ahead of discussion so that it can be considered by each council – noting that each may come up with a different view on this.

*Action:* Austin Ley to prepare a report on an IMAP CLUE and refer it to the Executive Forum for comment.

### 7 Car Park Levy – consideration of joint advocacy

The Executive Officer noted this matter had come up in response to publicity on the draft Plan and her report brought together the CoM Agreement, a comprehensive CoPP report from 2014 and some background on the levy and its administration.

Mr Roberts noted that this is of concern to all councils who own off street car parks.

Ms Jeffs advised of her council’s frustration at a lack of response from the State Government on this issue and regional support on the issue would be helpful. She noted the discrepancies of large scale supermarket car parking being free and unlevied, whereas small local supermarkets and places like South Melbourne Market are levied for their long term spaces.

Ms Vaidyanath noted the State Government’s position that the agreement with CoM won’t be applied elsewhere and that all revenue will be held in the consolidated fund. Other councils bordering the IMAP councils also see it as a matter of ‘when’ it affects them as well. She noted some unintended consequences of the recent change such as the taxing of Abbotsford Convent parking, when zoos and churches are exempted, affecting their viability. Ms Vaidyanath noted actually losses have been computed by the councils. There have been discussions at MAV and concern at costs multiplying as land values increase.

Mr Walls noted it is another property tax in a rate capping environment, affecting councils as well as others who own parking areas. He noted it was in the interest of Stonnington and Maribyrnong to consider this as it would have a huge impact if their areas were covered.

Mr Lawler noted the policy purpose of the levy to discourage commuter parking. Parking was discouraged for 20 years prior to the imposing of the levy through the planning scheme requiring off-street parking. However the state government has spent significantly on improving the PT services in this time. The number of commuters driving to the city has reduced from 60-70% to below 40% while growth has been occurring. The levy came at the same time as CoM developed its policy, which aligned with the levy’s objectives. Hence the Government could see that CoM was contributing to the policy outcome. The contribution to CoM comes in the form of a grant for capital works. London introduces a similar thing through a cordon. This would not work for Melbourne as not all residents have equal access to PT.

Mr Roberts noted the levy is recovered through increased parking changes. It doesn’t stop people driving to the city – it becomes the cost of doing business.

Ms Jeffs asked if there were any IMAP provisions that the councils could tag some advocacy to?

General discussion determined it was better to have an actual regional project that IMAP could put to the State Government to support rather than tying it to the levy per se. One example was expanding the tram network. The Executive Officer noted the draft Plan proposes development of a business plan to complete the bicycle network in the inner city. This would be a joint project completing the gaps in the network, shared by state and local government, which would create an asset the State Government could promote. It was noted that this was also one of the big projects tagged from the resilience work.

The Chair suggested this would be a very good project to put to the Committee in response to discussion on the parking levy.

#### 7.1 The IMAP Executive Forum resolved:

a. to note the information provided by the City of Melbourne on allocation of the revenue from the car park levy; and

b. to consider developing an IMAP regional project plan and outcomes to complete the Inner City cycling network so as to provide a catalyst for seeking funds from the State Government.

**MOVED/Seconded: MR WALL / Ms Vaidyanath**

*Action:* Refer the suggested development of a regional project plan and outcomes to complete the Inner City cycling network to the Cycling Network project team to report back.

### 8 IMAP Review

The Executive Officer noted the draft Plan has been adopted by 2 councils. She noted a couple of
submissions for consideration that requested additional discussion with the IMAP councils and sought some discussion on the development of the working groups.

Ms Vaidyanath left the meeting.

Questions/Comments

It was noted that the councils have MoUs with universities in their municipalities. The Executive Forum welcomed the submission from the University of Melbourne and noted they would be happy for any indications of areas in the plan that the University wanted to contribute towards.

The Executive Officer noted that an invitation could be extended to the DHHS for a representative to attend the IMAP Implementation Committee for the next discussion on affordable housing.

There was some discussion on working groups. Ms Jeffs noted the value in the Community Services directors meeting regularly and saw that this group could assist with overseeing the Communities section of the Draft plan.

The working groups would take on the role of a Steering group under the draft Plan, taking a wider, objective “portfolio view” rather than a project view. The IMAP executive officer was asked to sketch out how this could work; outlining the purpose of the steering group compared to the project team roles.

Action: IMAP Executive Officer to prepare an overview of the working groups roles and purpose under the new plan for further discussion by the Executive Forum.

The meeting closed at 10.20am

RESOLUTIONS

5.1 The Executive Forum approved the amended recommendation on the Urban Manufacturing report:

That the IMAP Implementation Committee agree:
- To endorse the commencement of Phase 2 with existing allocated funds
- That the Urban Manufacturing Project Management Team continue to seek additional non-IMAP funding to match the shortfall of $21,000
- To include in-kind contributions from the University of Melbourne as counting toward project contributions and requested that the report be referred to the Committee to update them on the project.

7.1 The IMAP Executive Forum resolved:

a. to note the information provided by the City of Melbourne on allocation of the revenue from the car park levy; and
b. to develop an IMAP regional project plan and outcomes to complete the Inner City cycling network so as to provide a catalyst for seeking funds from the State Government.

ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>A Ley CoM V Miller CoPP</td>
<td>The Urban Manufacturing report to be amended and reported to the Committee to update them</td>
<td>27 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6IMAP CLUE</td>
<td>Austin Ley CoM</td>
<td>Austin Ley to prepare a report on an IMAP CLUE and refer it to the Executive Forum for comment.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Parking Levies Cycling Network project team</td>
<td>Refer the suggested development of a regional project plan and outcomes to complete the Inner City cycling network to the Cycling Network project team to report back.</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8IMAP review</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer to prepare an overview of the working groups roles and purpose under the new plan for further discussion by the Executive Forum.</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>