MINUTES
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum
Meeting No. 27
10.00am – 11.00am Thursday 15 November 2018
Council Meeting Room, top floor, 311 Glenferrie Road, Malvern
City of Stonnington

Attendance:
IMAP Executive
Forum Members Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra (Chair)
Mr Stuart Draffin, Acting CEO, City of Stonnington
Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
Mr Nigel Higgins, Director Planning Services, Maribyrnong City Council - for Stephen Wall
Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place, City of Melbourne

IMAP Ms Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer

Guests Mr Gary Spivak, Housing Development Officer, City of Port Phillip
Ms Katrina Terjung, Manager City Strategy, City of Port Phillip
Mr Nick Casey, Senior Research Analyst, Smart City Office, City of Melbourne

1. Appointment of Chair
   1.1 Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, CEO CoY was appointed Chair of the meeting.

2. Apologies
   2.2 The following apologies were noted:
   - Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
   - Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
   - Mr Tim Booth, Economic Development Project Officer, City of Port Phillip (Team leader - IMAP Tourism Working Group)

ITEMS

3. Business Arising & Correspondence

The Executive Officer sought clarification on items in Matters Arising:

   a. Feb 2018 - CoM to follow up with Tony Nicholson to invite him to present at a future IMAP Implementation Committee
      Remove. TN stepped down as Exec Dir from Brotherhood of SL end of 2017 after presenting his advice to the Minister for Housing for a long-term strategy to reduce rough sleeping in Victoria. Unable to determine current position.

   b. Feb 2018 - Arrange a letter from the IMAP elected members to the Minister of Suburban Development (The Hon. Lily D’Ambrosio MP) seeking local government representation on the Metropolitan Development Advisory Panel
      Ms E Mottram (VPA) to follow up with Suburban Development executive about advancing greater local government representation
      Completed. Mr Smith advised this had been superseded by a letter written by the Inner Metro Partnership on this matter. Tony Keenan is now representing Local Government on MDAP.

   c. May 2018 - Peter Smith to provide an update on next steps after meeting with Ben Rimmer (Protecting People in Crowded Places)
      Mr Smith advised there were no matters to report on from this meeting with Ben Rimmer. Central City Collective had been contacted re joint procurement. A standardised process and Panel for risk assessment still required.
Agreed to request that Lucy Saaroni, CoY to continue to follow up on the recommendations with the project team

d. August 2018 – Various Items relating to Open Data, disruption, communication plans, Implementation plan:
IMAP Executive Officer has identified wider range of key personnel. Matters to be dealt with jointly – establish a single point of contact for disruption. Kate Raulings to lead discussion (confirmed by Mr Smith).

e. August 2018 – Item relating to Parking signage
Defer. Mr Smith advised CoPP undertaking current work on digital signage. CoPP will report back with a proposal at a later date.

f. August 2018 – CoY to ensure Urban Manufacturing reports are forwarded to University of Melbourne researchers working on associated projects
Ms Vaidyanath confirmed this action has been completed. Inner Melbourne Partnership is sourcing a combined study with UniMelb. Other councils could opt into these studies.
Ms Ferres-Miles noted Metro Partnership futures to be determined by election results. Government has recognised innovation clusters, and picked up Cremorne as an example. Mr Draffin noted this also affected the wider area into South Yarra.

The Executive Officer noted the updates for reporting to the next IMAP Implementation Committee.

4. G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets - Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism

Mr Gary Spivak and Ms Katrina Terjung, CoPP attended for this item. Mr Spivak reviewed a recent application proposal - “PROPOSED IMAP PROJECT TO INVESTIGATE SCALEABILITY OF A PRIVATE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY MODEL FOR NEGOTIATING DELIVERY OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING BY DEVELOPERS ” and how it varied from earlier discussions.

He noted $25K of the IMAP funds earmarked for affordable housing projects in 2018-19 could be applied to the application with the Committee’s agreement - as the application for $50K State Government funding requires a 50% contribution from the applicant (NOT $ for $), for a total of $75K.

Ms Terjung clarified that the application is to investigate administrative arrangements to incentivise the private sector to provide key worker housing - without any public benefit trade-off or loss of amenity.

4.1 That the Executive Forum endorse the report and the following recommendations for the IMAP Implementation Committee’s endorsement:

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:

1. Agree to a refocus of the IMAP work – to support investigation of a private market affordable housing delivery model, as outlined in Attachment 1, as a new approach to negotiating long-term private affordable rental housing under voluntary affordable housing agreements with developers; and investigation of incentives required to scale-up a broad use of the model.

2. Endorse a $25,000 co-contribution to the application for $50,000 made to the Voluntary Affordable Housing Agreements Grants Program of DELWP, to undertake this investigation project, to be funded from the $30,000 allocated in 2018/19 to the Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism project.

3. Use these funds to engage a large accountancy firm (with property and taxation expertise) to undertake this investigation, following a competitive quotation process.

5. G1.P5 IMAP Tourism

The Executive Forum considered a report prepared by Tim Booth, CoPP. The IMAP Executive Officer provided some background to the report and requested that a preferred option from the Executive Forum be noted in a recommendation to the IMAP Implementation Committee.
Comments/Questions
The Executive Forum members noted:
- economic functions are best worked on individually by councils
- there was little benefit to be gained from working jointly on issues around empty retail premises as the pressures on activity centres varied across the IMAP councils.

The Executive Forum favoured winding up the Tourism Working Group but also ensuring ongoing cooperation over updates of the inner Melbourne map continued.

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolve to:

1. Endorse the following options for consideration by the IMAP Implementation Committee:
   a. That the role and function of the IMAP Tourism Working Group remains unchanged.
   b. That IMAP ask the Tourism Working Group (TWG) to develop a proposal involving repurposing the TWG to focus on tourism and economic strategies to activate main streets and reduce commercial vacancies across all five Councils. The TWG to report to the next IMAP meeting on 22 February 2019.
   c. That the TWG be wound up, save for the work on the IMAP Map for the next two years or so until Wayfound mapping component is in place ($5,000 per annum) and all other allocated IMAP funding be reallocated to other IMAP projects.

2. Recommend to the IMAP Implementation Committee that the IMAP Tourism Working Group be wound up (Option 1c above) but that ongoing cooperation/funding continues between the IMAP Councils to ensure updates of the Inner Melbourne map are undertaken.

   G1.P2 Smart City Solutions (CLUE)
   Ms Claire Ferres-Miles spoke to her memorandum. It addressed the request by the Executive Forum for a response from the CoM to the last modelling report by Austin Ley. CoM have concerns regarding:
   (1) the cost structure,
   (2) excluded overheads, and
   (3) an assumption regarding annual surveys in the modelling.
   Actual cost estimates could be as much as 40% more.

   While the Commonwealth grant covered the architecture for the CLUE system, CoM are now seeking advice from the IMAP Councils regarding their interest in data collection and preferences around who would do that. Ms Ferres-Miles noted efficiencies of scale could reduce costs should CoM do the data collection on behalf of the IMAP councils.

   CoM have done work around IMAP Council costs for own collection compared with CoM collection on their behalf and noted significant savings in the latter approach with a cross-subsidy model.

   CoM are meeting with staff in each Council to provide high level indicative costs if Councils were to set up their own collection model based on the CoM model and also high level indicative costs if CoM were to do collection on behalf of IMAP Councils to form a view and early indications around whether they have an appetite for inclusion in the CLUE survey. This process will provide greater feedback and understanding.

   Comments/Questions
   - Mr Smith expressed concern over cost increases but acknowledged the value of CLUE based on his Adelaide experience. Councils would need to do their own cost benefit analysis then come back with a view about joining. Individual arrangements with each council could be canvassed.
   - Mr Draffin advised Stonnington would be concerned about increased costs.
   - The Executive Officer noted that no costs had been finalised at any stage, as Austin Ley’s modelling had been reported to the Executive Forum in the knowledge that CoM were yet to respond, and had been referred to CoM for comment.
   - Ms Vaidyanath noted costs remain a concern even if specifications limit CLUE to employment precincts only. She noted the timing of the 3 proposed actions fits the budget timeline well for 2019-20 budget consideration.
   - Ms Terjung noted interest in having the time series data from CLUE; which Mr Smith supported.
   - Mr Casey advised the Forum on the dates of the CoM meetings with councils’ staff.
   - Mr Higgins asked about State Government support/interest and contributions to costs. Ms Ferres-Miles advised the Inner Melbourne Metro Partnership had submitted a funding request for CLUE data.
6.1 That the Executive Forum agree that the next steps for the CLUE Project include the three proposed actions as set out in the Memorandum:

a. In the first instance, CoM can provide to each IMAP Council a draft cost estimate if CoM was to be the central CLUE data collection agency. This cost estimate could then be considered as part of each Council’s forthcoming Annual Plan and Budget process for the 2019-20 Budget.

b. In parallel, each IMAP Council could commission further work to explore models and costs with Option 2 (Individual Approach) and Option 4 (Commercial Organisation) to provide a cost comparison with the draft CoM cost estimate.

c. CoM intends to report back to IMAP advising its position on collecting CLUE data on behalf of IMAP councils and potential collection options.

Ms Ferres-Miles noted CoM can provide to each IMAP Council a draft cost estimate if they were to set up their own collection capability based on the CoM model and if CoM was to be the central CLUE data collection agency, and will report back to the IMAP Councils on progress early in the New Year.

7. IMAP Three year Implementation Plan review

The IMAP Executive Officer noted that the Three Year rolling Implementation Program of approved IMAP projects would be reviewed at the November Committee meeting. For information she had circulated:

- the current Three year program,
- the current year’s budget, which indicated a small $48K surplus if all project teams across the IMAP Councils actually prioritised and completed the programmed work to be undertaken within the approved timeframes.

The IMAP Executive Officer also provided:

- A chart of the project priorities of the 3 Metro partnerships for State Government projects and their alignment with the IMAP Council projects; and
- A map of the newly formed Eastern Region Group of Councils, based around Maroondah; Melbourne Northern Councils group, based around Whittlesea; and LeadWest all of whom have recently made approaches to investigate IMAP’s governance structure. Only Boroondara and Manningham are left out of these groupings. The groups do not follow Metro Partnership lines.

Mr Smith noted that the IMAP Annual Report went to their last Council meeting. One councillor had questioned the cost of IMAP activities and the value for money for their community. Mr Smith advised they were looking for any opportunity to reduce contributions to IMAP and reviewing all strategic partnership involvements.

It was noted that further discussion by the Executive was required.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. Other Business:

1. Correspondence - Car2Go request

The Executive Officer requested assistance on the response to this request. She provided an update on comments from the IMAP Transport Manager’s meeting where this was discussed.

Comments:

- Many dockless car share cars are parking legally in our streets now. If they want exemptions to parking fees, that becomes a different issue.
- Need further discussion across the member Councils and State Government leadership on this.
- It is a difficult time to respond with an election imminent. Once we know who is in Government we will be able to respond.

2. Cladding Rectification Agreements

Mr Smith raised this as an additional item and advised what is proposed as Councils’ role in providing credit, pursuing payment through the rates system and taking the risk for these projects. CoPP believe Government should take the risk and Councils should not be guaranteeing these loans.
CoY and CoS noted no support for these Agreements, although it was acknowledged Councils will be pressured into this.

The meeting closed at 11.00am

Next Meeting – Schedule of proposed meeting dates for 2019 will be circulated at a later date.

RESOLUTIONS
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