## Agenda

**Inner Melbourne Action Plan**

**Implementation Committee**

### Meeting No 52

**8.00 am – 10.00 am Friday 30 November 2018**

**City of Stonnington**

Council Chamber, Malvern Town Hall, Corner Glenferrie Road and High Street, MALVERN

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Cr Steven Stefanopoulos, Mayor, City of Stonnington (Chair)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Nicholas Reece, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Mayor, City of Port Phillip - TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Martin Zakharov, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy &amp; Place, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
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<tr>
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<th>Mr Adrian Salmon, Principal Planner, Planning Services, DELWP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Rod Anderson, Strategy &amp; Partnerships Regional Manager - Port Phillip, DELWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Evelyn Légaré, Director Integrated Place Transport Planning, TfV, DEDJTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Michael Anderson, Snr Project Officer Place Strategy, Econ Projects &amp; Precincts, DEDJTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Peter Sagar, Director Inner Melbourne, Victorian Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAP</th>
<th>Ms Elissa McElroy, IMAP Executive Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guests</th>
<th>Mr Stuart Draffin, General Manager Planning &amp; Amenity, City of Stonnington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr David Callow, Team Leader Urban Forest and Ecology, CoM - <em>for Matt Slavin, CoMar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Gail Hall, Coordinator Green Infrastructure, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Martin Whittle, Wayfinding Signage Coordinator, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Gary Spivak, Housing Development Officer, City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Katrina Terjung, Manager City Strategy City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Tim Booth, Economic Development Project Officer, City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Richard Smithers, Coordinator Transport Policy, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Damon Rao, Senior Transport Planner, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Rufael Tsegay, Resilient Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Maree Grenfell, Acting Chief Resilience Officer, Resilient Melbourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAP Champions</th>
<th>Mr Bruce Phillips, Director Planning &amp; Placemaking, City of Yarra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Kylie Bennetts, Director CEOs Office, City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Tracey Limpens, Advocacy Performance &amp; Improvement Manager, City of Stonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Katy McMahon, Manager City Business, Maribyrnong City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Jenny Bailey, Manager Engineering Services, City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRELIMINARIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Alloc.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2 mins</td>
<td>Appointment of Chair</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr Steven Stefanopoulos, Mayor, City of Stonnington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3 mins</td>
<td>Introductions and Apologies</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Members Interest</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Alloc.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2 mins</td>
<td>Confirmation of the Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee (Attachment 1) and the Minutes Confidential Business (Attachment 14) – 31 August 2018</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the draft Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 51 held on 31 August 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the draft Minutes Confidential Business of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 51 held on 31 August 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2 mins</td>
<td>Confirmation of the Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum meeting – 15 November 2018 (Attachment 2)</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the draft Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum No. 27 held on 15 November 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Business Arising (Attachment 3)</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the actions undertaken in response to Business Arising from the previous minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the correspondence (Attachment 3a-e) and confidential correspondence attached (Attachment 15a-b).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correspondence:**

**Outward**
- Att 3a – Letter to Premier re Homelessness policy
- Att 3b – Letter to Opposition Leader re Homelessness policy
- Att 3c – Email – Kangan Institute – Response to request to use ESD Factsheets

**Inward**
- Att 3d – Email from Cultural Tourism Victoria – Letter of thanks
- Att 3e – Letter from Cate Turner DEDJTR – advising change to IMAP rep
- Att 3f – DEDJTR newsletter
- Att 3g – Email from C Eyes, Recovered Energy Australia re Laverton North project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Scrutinizer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.  | 5 mins   | 8.10am | Financial Report for the Three Months ending 30 September 2018 (Attachment 4) | **Recommendation**  
7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **receive** the IMAP Financial Report for the Three months ending 30 September 2018. | IMAP Executive Officer |
| 8.  | 5 mins   | 8.20am | IMAP Communication and Governance (Attachment 5) | **Recommendation**  
8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:  
a. **note** the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.  
b. **approve** the amended IMAP Implementation Committee meeting dates for 2019. | IMAP Executive Officer |
| 9.  | 5 mins   | 8.25am | IMAP Progress Report (Attachment 6) | **Recommendation**  
9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the IMAP Progress Report for November 2018. | IMAP Executive Officer |
| 10. | 10 mins  | 8.30am | G1.P1 Implementation of Census of Landuse and Employment G1.P2 Smart City Solutions – CLUE Technology Upgrade – Project Update (Attachment 7 - Late item – Report to follow) | **Recommendation**  
10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to **note** progress on the Census for Landuse and Employment (CLUE) technology upgrade project. | Claire Ferres-Miles CoM |
| 11. | 10 mins  | 8.40am | G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets - Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism (Attachment 8) | **Recommendation**  
11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:  
a. Agree to a refocus of the IMAP work – to support investigation of a private market affordable housing delivery model, as outlined in Attachment A, 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.  
b. 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.  
c. Use these funds to engage a large accountancy firm (with property and taxation expertise) to undertake this investigation, following a competitive quotation process. | Gary Spivak, CoPP |
| 12. | 15 mins  | 8.50am | G1.P4 Wayfinding and Signage (Attachment 9) | **Recommendation**  
12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:  
a. support the approach outlined in this progress report; and  
b. approve the proposed 2019-20 budget | Martin Whittle, CoM |
### 13. 15 mins Commence 9.05am

**G4.P1 Urban Forest and Biodiversity Strategy and Approach (Attachment 10)**

**Recommendation**

13.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

a. Note the progress report on the IMAP Urban Forest Plan

b. Support a joint approach towards development of planning policies for the management of trees and greening on private land.

---

### 14. 10 mins Commence 9.20am

**G1.P5 IMAP Tourism (Attachment 11)**

**Recommendation**

14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve:

a. that the IMAP Tourism Working Group be wound up (Option 6.3); and

b. that ongoing cooperation/funding continues between the IMAP Councils to ensure updates of the Inner Melbourne map are undertaken.

---

### 15. 15 mins Commence 9.30am


**Recommendation**

15.1 To be advised. Refer to the report.

---

### 16. 10 mins Commence 9.45am

**IMAP Three year Implementation Program review (Attachment 13)**

**Recommendation**

16.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

a. **Note** this update on project progress on the Inner Melbourne Action Plan, and

b. **Approve** the request for each of the IMAP Partner Councils to make provision for funding in the 2019-20 budget as follows:

   - IMAP Annual Contribution: $40,000 per Council
   - IMAP Share of Operational Staff Costs: $45,000 per Council (Estimate – to be confirmed)

   (Total $85,000 per IMAP Council)

---

### 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Allot.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Confirmation of the Minutes Confidential Business of the IMAP Implementation Committee— 31 August 2018 (Attachment 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in Resolution under Item 4 above – for confirmation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Correspondence relating to contractual agreements (Attachment 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Included in Resolution under Item 6 above - for noting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correspondence: Outward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att 15a – Confidential - Letter to DM re Destination Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Plan
Att 15b – Confidential - Letter to DM re IMAP Visitor Map Printing & Distribution Agreement extension

OTHER BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Allot.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Any other business</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence 9.55am</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next Meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friday 22 February 2019 (8.00am)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maribyrnong City Council offices – Reception Room Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cnr Hyde &amp; Napier Streets, FOOTSCRAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 51 held on 30 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td>Draft Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum meeting No. 27 held on 15 Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
<td>Business Arising Outwards Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3a</td>
<td>Letter to Premier re Homelessness Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3b</td>
<td>Letter to Opposition Leader re Homelessness Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3c</td>
<td>Email to Kangan Institute - response to request to use ESD factsheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3d</td>
<td>Inwards Correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3e</td>
<td>Email from Cultural Tourism Victoria – Letter of thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3f</td>
<td>Letter from Cate Turner DEDJTR – advising change to IMAP rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3g</td>
<td>DEDJTR Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email from C Eyes, Recovered Energy Australia re Laverton North project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Attachment 4</td>
<td>IMAP Finance report to 30 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 4a</td>
<td>IMAP Operating and Capital Works statement for the 3 Months ending 30 Sept 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 4b</td>
<td>IMAP Budget and Expenditure by Project to 30 September 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Attachment 5</td>
<td>IMAP Communications and Governance report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 5a</td>
<td>Amended IMAP Meeting Dates 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Attachment 6</td>
<td>IMAP Progress Report November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Attachment 7</td>
<td>CLUE Technology Upgrade – Progress Report - Late item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Attachment 8</td>
<td>Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism – Briefing Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 8a</td>
<td>Proposed IMAP Project To Investigate Scaleability Of A Private Market Affordable Housing Delivery Model For Negotiating Delivery Of Affordable Rental Housing By Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Attachment 9</td>
<td>Wayfinding and Signage Project - Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 9a</td>
<td>OCGA Review - draft proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 11a</td>
<td>“Experience Culture 2018-19” guide – published Cultural Tourism Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 11b</td>
<td>Official Visitor Map – published Destination Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Attachment 12</td>
<td>Business case Inner Melbourne Cycling Network – Briefing Paper – Late item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 12a</td>
<td>Draft Project Brief - Late item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Attachment 13</td>
<td>IMAP Three Year Implementation Program review – Progress Report Funding model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 13a</td>
<td>IMAP Councils Staff engaged on IMAP Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Confidential Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>Attachment 14</th>
<th>Minutes Confidential Business of the IMAP Implementation Committee 31 August 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Attachment 15a</td>
<td>Confidential - Letter to DM re Destination Visitor Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 15b</td>
<td>Confidential - Letter to DM re IMAP Visitor Map – Printing and Distribution Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PRELIMINARIES**

1. **Appointment of Chair**
   1.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **appoint** Cr Nicholas Reece, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne as the Chair of the Meeting.

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

2. **Apologies and Introductions**
   The Chair welcomed all attending and acknowledged the elders of the land. Introductions were made.

   2.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the following apologies
   - Cr Cuc Lam, Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
   - Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place, City of Melbourne
   - Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
- Mr Chris Carroll, Acting Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
- Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
- Ms Cate Turner, Director Inner Melbourne, Metropolitan Econ Development, DEDJTR

**MOVED** MS VAIDYANATH / Cr Nguyen
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

### 3. Members Interest - Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act.
- None

---

### ITEMS

#### 4. Confirmation of the Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee – 25 May 2018

4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 50 held on 25 May 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.

**MOVED** CR VOSS / Cr Stefanopoulos
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

#### 5. Confirmation of the Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum meeting – 16 August 2018

The Committee noted a proposed amendment to the Minutes to change item 2 as follows:

2.1 (a) Review the open data standard currently used by the City of Melbourne to determine whether this could be applicable across all IMAP Councils
(b) no change

*Action: Executives to nominate representatives from each Council to review the open data standard currently used by the City of Melbourne to determine whether this could be applicable across all IMAP Councils*

2nd Action – no change

5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

- confirm the amendment to the resolution and action in item 2, and
- confirm the draft Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum No. 26 held on 16 August 2018 as amended as an accurate record of the proceedings.

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

#### 6. Business Arising

The IMAP Executive Officer:

- provided a brief update on the completed actions and
- noted an additional item of correspondence from the City of Melbourne calling for participants in Melbourne Knowledge Week 2019 (MKW), to be held 20-26 May 2019.

The Chair endorsed the value of involvement in MKW and encouraged the IMAP Councils to get involved.

6.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the actions undertaken in response to Business Arising from the previous minutes.

**MOVED** CR VOSS / Cr Nguyen
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

#### 7. Financial Report for the Financial Year ending 30 June 2018

The IMAP Executive Officer noted the key points for the year:

- Revenue was higher than expected due to
  - IMAP holding Council contributions for the Census for Landuse and Employment (CLUE) project, and
  - additional revenue received from the State Government and IMAP Councils for the StreetCount project.

- Expenditure exceeded annual income by $72K due to good progress on a number of projects:
  - Final payments and completion of the Urban Manufacturing project and the Information Requirements Investigation for the CLUE project
  - Payment of the IMAP contribution of $50K to CoM for the CLUE project – ahead of the additional Council contributions
- StreetCount coordination completed by Launch Housing within the financial year
- Recreation Project planning contract was let and funds for this were transferred to CoM
- Contributions towards 2 annual publications of the IMAP Official Visitor Map by Destination Melbourne fell within the financial year; plus final payments for the 2017-18 Cultural Guide

Comments/Questions
- Ms Vaidyanath noted the Urban Manufacturing expenditure led to a report that could tie into additional work being undertaken by the University of Melbourne representative through the Inner Melbourne Metro Partnership. Would assist us in how we look at urban manufacturing or development sites. Don’t want to duplicate this work in a new study. The Executive Officer offered to follow up with the CEO CoY regarding this matter.
- In response to a query, the Executive Officer clarified:
  - that the financial report covers the IMAP project expenditure only. Council contributions towards staff costs and overheads for the office of the IMAP Executive Officer are not included here.
  - The surplus carry forward is made up of (i) commitments for current projects (as set out in the report) and (ii) projects that have not yet started but which have been allocated funding in the IMAP Three Year Implementation Program.

7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to receive the IMAP Financial Report for the Year ending 30 June 2018.

MOVED CR NGUYEN/ Cr Voss
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED
Action: Executive Officer:
- to follow up with the CEO CoY to ensure Urban Manufacturing reports are forwarded to University of Melbourne researchers working on associated projects; and
- to forward the final reports to the Committee for information.

8. IMAP Annual Report 2017-18 and Summary
The IMAP Executive Officer noted that 13 projects are reported on in the Annual Report; four projects were completed during the year; and 7 Steering Group meetings were convened in addition to the usual Committee and Executive Forum meetings. She noted that transport and environment projects required greater priority this financial year. She thanked the Committee and the project teams for their assistance during the year.

8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to adopt the IMAP Annual Report 2017-18 and IMAP Annual Report Summary 2017-18

MOVED CR STEFANOPPOULOS/ Cr Voss
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

9. IMAP Communication and Governance
The IMAP Executive Officer noted the work undertaken during the 3 months particularly by the Wayfinding and Signage group and for the StreetCount. She noted a number of the IMAP Councils have now adopted the Wayfinding signage standards and a website was being designed to enable wider testing of the manual, while signage designs continue to be refined by CoM.

Comments/Questions
- Cr Reece requested an ‘executive summary’ of the style guide and asked about intersections between the style guide and other signing agencies such as the Royal Botanic Gardens. The Executive Officer advised that Parks Victoria were advised of the guide and discussions continue with Transport for Victoria and the Victorian Government Architects Office to ensure they (and the major projects) are aware of the signage guide development.
- Dr Légaré advised TfV knew about the project plan and noted the need for a wider group to get together. The Executive Officer noted that a workshop was being planned to assist with this.
- Cr Stefanopoulos praised the manual, and noted it was a fantastic project.

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
  a. note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper
  b. approve the 2018-19 meeting dates for the IMAP Implementation Committee meetings
MOVED MR WALL / Ms Vaidyanath
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED
Action: Executive Officer to source executive summary of the Wayfinding Signage guide for Cr Reece

10. Progress Report
Cr Voss asked about the draft report on the CLT project. The Executive Officer advised the first draft was circulated to the working group. The final version of the report was expected in late 2018. The project had been delayed due to availability of the project lead at University of Western Sydney.

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the IMAP Progress Report for August 2018.

MOVED CR NGUYEN / Cr Voss
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Leanne Mitchell, Acting Manager Social Investment, City of Melbourne attended for this item. Ms Mitchell showed the Committee the StreetCount video and the PowerPoint analysis of data for the City of Melbourne results. She noted:
- StreetCount required a lot of coordination, overall it was a good outcome.
- Stats indicate how homelessness changes. 8th count by CoM
- Staff from around 15 departments/areas in CoM council participated
- Good to have the State Government involved through their contribution – but changed some of the elements, especially media on the day
- Traditionally avoid media on the day of the count so as not to upset those sleeping rough. Required careful media management. Hiring a media consultant ensured a good outcome on the day

Cr Voss noted that it raised the bar around what the larger community think about homelessness. It was managed really well and we got out a good message i.e. that it can happen to anyone; it’s not a crime.
- Ended up with 2 bites at getting the message out. On count day the message was not overshadowed by the numbers. Showed collaboration between councils.
- Ability to count across 5 councils provided stronger, richer data.
- Media found opportunities to talk to particular people.
- Feedback from agencies and councils noted that people were not in their usual places. The night café’s numbers were really up.
- High level of private sector interest and engagement. An untapped resource. Very easy to get corporate support – lot of goodwill and people wanting to help.
- 70% of the work was managing the volunteers. Met our target with 400. 40 agencies brought people in. Considering other options – professional researchers?

Cr Reece noted the volunteers are living ambassadors for homelessness.
- Engaged people with ‘lived experience’ via Council for Homeless Persons to provide peer education as paid ambassadors for the project.
- 3 Infographics produced – data turned around in 10 days by research company. Some data anomalies. Continue to research electronic data gathering options wrt privacy issues.
- CoPP summer (91) and winter (65 %) counts indicate seasonality. Cold may have led more into the CoM. 27 at Salvos in 2016 and 80-100 this time.
- In Melbourne, numbers in the same area as 2016 have decreased while night café increased.
- Notable decline in 41-60 age group. (May have been housed through targeted action on those homeless for a long time (or left, sick or deceased.))
- Length of time moving around? >5 yrs -10yrs has shown the biggest decline. If this shows long term rough sleepers have been able to get into housing, this is a good outcome. We know they don’t always stay in the housing provided.
- Government now concentrating on where people want to live - near their communities. 40,000 on Victorian Housing Waiting List – can take 4 years. Have to attend 10 appointments, have documentation, lots of admin hoops. Significant numbers of homeless not on the list. Lot more Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders turning up.
- Great publicity went out. Recommendations cover further advocacy and propose further participation by the IMAP councils.

Comments/Questions
- Have we thanked the Minister for the funding? Executive Officer to follow up letter from the Mayors.
• Cr Nguyen noted still not clear about relevance of the numbers for any provider. Saw value around messaging and communication for advocacy purposes, and looking to community for volunteers – ambassadors who can help us. With 29 counted in CoY struggle with the ‘why’. Clearly for CoM it’s worthwhile as they have the numbers. Is it worth doing more thoroughly or differently?
  Leanne acknowledged these valid points. It’s not science or a statistically valid survey. The number allows us to advocate in ways we haven’t been able to in the past. Actions started once CoM had the numbers – SG funding/taskforce and greater CoM funds. All decisions cited the number.
  CoPP used a different method in February over a week; professional services workers did in-depth interviews and linked to housing outcomes. However Councils/agencies need to have a surplus housing stock supply before can take that housing link approach across an area with high homeless numbers.
• Cr Reece noted the number of disposable syringes found in CoM decreased by 25% since support service opened in Richmond. Issues are not confined to boundaries. Supportive of another joint undertaking.

11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
  a) note the outcomes of the IMAP 2018 StreetCount
  b) undertake further advocacy opportunities to discuss the StreetCount partnership and next steps through:
     i) meetings with the Victorian Minister for Housing and Department of Health and Human Services officers on service coordination and funding support program delivery across a broader area of Inner Melbourne
     ii) meetings with DELWP staff on affordable housing provisions and structural system issues
     iii) joint IMAP correspondence with Federal Ministers and State Opposition leaders in the run up to elections advocating for broader delivery of Government funding to address affordable housing and homelessness support
  c) acknowledge that a joint StreetCount is of value to the IMAP Councils in building a holistic understanding of rough sleeping in inner city Melbourne and that consideration be given to undertaking another joint count in 2020.

MOVED CR STEFANOPOULOS / Cr Voss
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Actions:
• Prepare Mayor’s letter of thanks to Minister Foley for the funding (if not already sent).
• Prepare joint correspondence from the IMAP Councils on homelessness support in the run up to state and federal elections.
• Note 2020 Streetcount budget in next Three year Implementation Program review.

12. G1.P42 Smart City Solutions – CLUE Technology Upgrade– Project Update
Nick Casey, Senior Research Analyst, City of Melbourne attended for this item.
Mr Casey reviewed work already undertaken on the project during the last 6 months. He reviewed the process now being undertaken to contract a technology supplier and advised the Committee on the high level criteria for selection of a developer. Currently drafting the business requirements with the aim of finishing the procurement in September, and appointing a supplier in October as a delivery partner.

Comments/Questions
• Some comments on the use of acronyms!
• Cr Voss clarified that all Councils will have access from mid next year. Mr Casey was asked to outline the benefits to Councils.
• How do Councils’ prepare for this? Mr Casey noted that CoM are working with key people in each organisation – GIS, Rates, Property, and technical staff - and are advising them what they need to do to prepare. Two people on each Council are championing the project. Also, having to prepare CoM property systems for the change over as CLUE has been closely worked with the property system.
• Open data source? Yes data is largely available except for some matters concerning privacy e.g. employment

12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to note the progress report on the CLUE
| 16. | There was no further business raised in the public meeting. |
|     | The meeting closed at 9.57am |

Next Meeting

**Friday 30 November 2018** (8.00am)
City of Stonnington
Council Chambers, Malvern Town Hall, Cnr Glenferrie Road and High Street, Malvern

IMAP Implementation Committee Meeting 31 August 2018– Endorsement of Minutes

Chairperson: Cr Nicholas Reece ___________________________ Date ______________________
RESOLUTIONS

1.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **appoint** Cr Nicholas Reece, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne as the Chair of the Meeting.

2.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the following apologies:
   - Cr Cuc Lam, Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
   - Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place, City of Melbourne
   - Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
   - Mr Chris Carroll, Acting Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
   - Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
   - Ms Cate Turner, Director Inner Melbourne, Metropolitan Econ Development, DEDJTR

4.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to confirm the Minutes of the IMAP Implementation Committee No. 50 held on 25 May 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.

5.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. confirm the amendment to the resolution and action in item 2, and
   b. confirm the draft Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum No. 26 held on 16 August 2018 as amended as an accurate record of the proceedings.

6.1 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 resolves to **receive** the IMAP Financial Report for the Year ending 30 June 2018.

8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **adopt the** IMAP Annual Report 2017-18 and IMAP Annual Report Summary 2017-18

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. **note** the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper
   b. approve the 2018-19 meeting dates for the IMAP Implementation Committee meetings

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the IMAP Progress Report for August 2018.

11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a) **note** the outcomes of the IMAP 2018 StreetCount
   b) undertake further advocacy opportunities to discuss the StreetCount partnership and next steps through:
      i. meetings with the Victorian Minister for Housing and Department of Health and Human Services officers on service coordination and funding support program delivery across a broader area of Inner Melbourne
      ii. meetings with DELWP staff on affordable housing provisions and structural system issues
      iii. joint IMAP correspondence with Federal Ministers and State Opposition leaders in the run up to elections advocating for broader delivery of Government funding to address affordable housing and homelessness support
   c) acknowledge that a joint StreetCount is of value to the IMAP Councils in building a holistic understanding of rough sleeping in inner city Melbourne and that consideration be given to undertaking another joint count in 2020.

12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to **note** the progress report on the CLUE technology upgrade project.

Procedural Motion:
That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to proceed into Confidential Business and the meeting be closed to the public as the matter to be considered falls within the ambit of:
• Section 89 (2) (d) (contractual matters), and
• Section 89 (2) (h) (any other matter which the Council or Special Committee considers would prejudice the Council or any person) of the Local Government Act 1989. (9.30am)

Procedural Motion:
That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves that the meeting be re-opened to the public. (9.55am)

ACTIONS PUBLIC RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Financial report</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>Executive Officer: to follow up with the CEO CoY to ensure Urban Manufacturing reports are forwarded to University of Melbourne researchers working on associated projects; and</td>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Comms &amp; Gov</td>
<td>CEO CoS</td>
<td>Executive Officer to source executive summary of the Wayfinding Signage guide for Cr Reece</td>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11. Street Count | IMAP Exec Officer | • Prepare Mayor’s letter of thanks to Minister Foley for the funding (if not already sent).  
• Prepare joint correspondence from the IMAP Councils on homelessness support in the run up to state and federal elections  
• Note 2020 Streetcount budget in next Three year Implementation Program review. | Oct 2018 |
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
Defers, 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.
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 ad 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, and
- 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 Borroodara 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

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

2.1 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)

4.1 That the Executive Forum endorse the report and the following recommendations for the IMAP Implementation Committee’s endorsement:
   - 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.
   - Endorse a $25,000 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.
   - Use these funds to engage a large accountancy firm (with property and taxation expertise) to undertake this investigation, following a competitive quotation process.

5.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum resolve to:
   - Endorse the following options for consideration by the IMAP Implementation Committee:
     o That the role and function of the IMAP Tourism Working Group remains unchanged
     o 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.
     o 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.
   - 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.

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:
   - 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.
   - 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.
   - CoM intends to report back to IMAP advising its position on collecting CLUE data on behalf of IMAP councils and potential collection options.
### IMAP Implementation Committee

#### Business Arising

#### 30 November 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>IMAP Executive Forum (9 February 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Homelessness</td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (23 February 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Update Metro Partnerships</td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>IMAP Executive Forum (17 May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Protecting people in Crowded Places</td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (25 May 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 Urban manufacturing | **Responsibility** | IMAP Exec Officer | **Action** | - Executive Officer refer Urban Manufacturing reports to IMAP CLUE project team to consider a new category to capture 'Makers' as part of future surveys and report back to IMAP as part of that project.  
- Project team leader arrange for an engagement session with Peak Group | **Due** | | **Progress** | EO raised definition at CLUE workshops |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>IMAP Executive Forum (16 August 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. IMAP Executive Officer

Establish a working group to develop an implementation plan including resourcing for a consistent standard on parking signage including improving clarity for community members

Nov 2018
CoPP undertaking current work on digital signage & will report back with a proposal at a later date

3. IMAP Executive Officer and City of Port Phillip

IMAP Executive Officer and City of Port Phillip to lead further investigation into options for a united ‘front door’ to triage and coordinate early detection and initial responses to disruption and innovation opportunities across IMAP Councils, State Government and other relevant parties.

Nov 2018
Key personnel identified.

3. IMAP Executives

Executives to nominate representatives from each Council to review existing Communication Plans and develop one Disruption Communication Plan for IMAP Councils for endorsement.

September 2018
Key personnel identified.

3. IMAP Executive Officer and City of Port Phillip

Establish a working group to develop an Implementation Plan (including resourcing) for the recommendations from the Think Tank report and provide this plan for endorsement by the IMAP Executive Forum.

Nov 2018
Key personnel identified.

F IMAP Implementation Committee (30 Aug 2018 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Financial report | IMAP Exec Officer | Executive Officer:  
- to follow up with the CEO CoY to ensure Urban Manufacturing reports are forwarded to University of Melbourne researchers working on associated projects;  
- to forward the final reports to the Committee for information. | Nov 2018 | Completed |
| 9. Comms & Gov | CEO CoS | Executive Officer to source executive summary of the Wayfinding Signage guide for Cr Reece | Nov 2018 | |
| 11. Street Count | IMAP Exec Officer | • Prepare Mayor’s letter of thanks to Minister Foley for the funding (if not already sent).  
- Prepare joint correspondence from the IMAP Councils on homelessness support in the run up to state and federal elections  

Correspondence

Outward
Att 3a – Letter to Premier re Homelessness policy  
Att 3b – Letter to Opposition Leader re Homelessness policy  
Att 3c – Email – Kangan Institute – Response to request to use ESD Factsheets

Inward
Att 3d – Email from Cultural Tourism Victoria – Letter of thanks  
Att 3e – Letter from Cate Turner DEDJTR – advising change to IMAP rep  
Att 3f – DEDJTR newsletter  
Att 3g – Email from C.Eyes, Recovered Energy Australia re Laverton North project
Recommendation:

a. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the actions undertaken in response to Business Arising from the previous minutes.

b. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the correspondence (Attachment 3a-e) and confidential correspondence attached (Attachment 15a-b).
25 October 2018

The Hon. Daniel Andrews MP
Premier
Office of the Premier
1 Treasury Place
MELBOURNE VIC 3002

Dear Premier

Request for further investment in specialist homelessness initiatives in Inner Melbourne

Thank you for your recent support and funding contribution towards Street Count, which took place on 19 June 2018. As you will be aware, this was an initiative of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) partner Councils, and was the first joint count across the five inner Melbourne municipalities of Melbourne, Maribyrnong, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra. The total count found 392 people sleeping rough on one of the coldest nights of the year. As a point in time count, it provides a baseline for addressing the complex issue of homelessness, and highlighted its continued prevalence across inner Melbourne.

We would like to collectively congratulate the Victorian Government on the recent commitment to fund new assertive outreach and supportive housing teams across Melbourne, along with the further investment in housing and the provision of subsidised travel for vulnerable Victorians. Importantly these investments will increase people’s access to specialist services in their local area, minimising the need for people to travel to inner Melbourne for assistance and support.

The five IMAP municipalities also welcome the Victorian Government’s recent investment initiatives to address the particular needs of the State’s transient rough sleeping population. However, we believe more needs to be done to address the service gaps and acute needs of rough sleepers in the inner city.

In particular we request your commitment to the following key priorities:

1. Funding for Street Count 2020. Allocate funds to ensure a further joint cross municipality street count of people sleeping rough is undertaken in 2020.

2. Resources and support to scale up the City of Melbourne Service Coordination Project (SCP) model across the IMAP councils. This model acknowledges the extent and complexity of challenges that must be overcome to give people sleeping rough a pathway out of homelessness.
3. Further investment in highly specialised outreach support services and practitioners to effectively engage with the inner cities most complex rough sleepers. Our research and practice experience shows the need for a different service model. This model needs to take account of the specialised skills, time and risk involved in engaging with acutely complex rough sleepers, who have compounded health, mental health, AOD and histories of institutionalisation, trauma and abuse.

4. A National Housing and Homelessness Plan. We call on the Victorian Government to advocate to the Federal Government for provision of a National Housing and Homelessness Plan. The only way to truly address homelessness is for all three levels of government to work together. Leadership from the Victorian Government is critical to make this happen.

   A national housing and homelessness plan, transformative service partnerships between State and Local Governments, as well as a coordinated service delivery model underpinned by multi-disciplinary homelessness, health and housing services, can effectively reduce the numbers of people sleeping rough.

We are committed to ensuring our most vulnerable and marginalised citizens are supported to find pathways out of homelessness and we request your leadership on addressing this National crisis.

Yours sincerely

Cr Bernadene Voss
Mayor, City of Port Phillip

Cr Cuc Lam
Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council

Cr Nicholas Reece,
Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee,
City of Melbourne (Chair)

Cr Steve Stefanopoulos,
Mayor, City of Stonnington

Cr Daniel Nguyen,
Mayor, City of Yarra

Cc Ms Sherri Bruinhout, Asst Director Homelessness & Accommodation, Dept of Health & Human Services.
25 October 2018

The Hon. Matthew Guy MP
Leader of the Opposition
Shop 30D, Bulleen Plaza Shopping Centre
101 Manningham Road
BULLEEN VIC 3002

Dear Mr Guy

Request for expanded and continued support for specialist homelessness initiatives in Inner Melbourne

On 19 June 2018 the five inner Melbourne municipalities of Melbourne, Maribyrnong, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra undertook a street count of people sleeping rough. This was an initiative of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) partner Councils, and was the first joint count across the five inner Melbourne municipalities. The total count found 392 people sleeping rough on one of the coldest nights of the year. As a point in time count, it provides a baseline for addressing the complex issue of homelessness, and highlighted its continued prevalence across inner Melbourne.

The five IMAP municipalities welcome the bipartisan support and investment initiatives to address the particular needs of the State’s transient rough sleeping population. However, we believe more needs to be done to address the service gaps and acute needs of rough sleepers in the inner city.

In particular we request your commitment to the following key priorities:

1. Funding for Street Count 2020. Allocate funds to ensure a further joint cross municipality street count of people sleeping rough is undertaken in 2020.

2. Resources and support to scale up the City of Melbourne Service Coordination Project (SCP) model across the IMAP Councils. This model acknowledges the extent and complexity of challenges that must be overcome to give people sleeping rough a pathway out of homelessness.

3. Further investment in highly specialised outreach support services and practitioners to effectively engage with the inner cities most complex rough sleepers. Our research and practice experience shows the need for a different service model. This model needs to take account of the specialised skills, time and risk involved in engaging with acutely complex rough sleepers, who have compounded health, mental health, AOD and histories of institutionalisation, trauma and abuse.
4. A National Housing and Homelessness Plan. We call on the Victorian Government to advocate to the Federal Government for provision of a National Housing and Homelessness Plan. The only way to truly address homelessness is for all three levels of government to work together. Leadership from the Victorian Government is critical to make this happen.

A national housing and homelessness plan, transformative service partnerships between State and Local Governments, as well as a coordinated service delivery model underpinned by multi-disciplinary homelessness, health and housing services, can effectively reduce the numbers of people sleeping rough.

We are committed to ensuring our most vulnerable and marginalised citizens are supported to find pathways out of homelessness and we request your leadership on addressing this National crisis.

Yours sincerely

Cr Bernadene Voss
Mayor, City of Port Phillip

Cr Cuc Lam
Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council

Cr Nicholas Reece,
Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee,
City of Melbourne (Chair)

Cr Steve Stefanopoulos,
Mayor, City of Stonnington

Cr Daniel Nguyen,
Mayor, City of Yarra
Elissa McElroy

From: Tesha Piccinin <teshapiccinin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 7 November 2018 10:47 AM
To: Elissa McElroy
Subject: RE: Copyright request on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute

Thanks so much Elissa. This has come along just in time. Thank you for your advice regarding the use of the fact sheets. Regards, Tesha

Tesha Piccinin
Development Team Lead
eWorks CoE Development Project
Mobile: 0408 996 545

From: Elissa McElroy [mailto:emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, November 7, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Tesha Piccinin
Subject: Re: Copyright request on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute


Hello Tesha
I write to confirm your use of the IMAP ESD fact sheets as part of your course material.

Above is the link to the IMAP website which lists all the fact sheets series - these versions contain the IMAP logo at the top which clarifies any copyright issues. These are the parent fact sheets that various councils then individualise with their own logos through our licensing provisions. I would recommend that you use the IMAP version as these are public documents and no license would be required for use of this set.

Around 20 council’s around Melbourne and Victoria now reference these guidelines and we are happy that the Kangan Institute has also found them of value.

Please contact me should you have any further questions.

Kind regards
Elissa

On 7 Nov 2018, at 9:21 am, Tesha Piccinin <teshapiccinin@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Elissa,
Following up on my earlier request are you able to confirm whether we have permission to use the IMAP fact sheet (referred to below) as a handout in our materials for the Bendigo Kangan Institute, Certificate III in Landscape Construction? We have a deadline for development and it would be really helpful to get an early response. Thanks so much, Regards, Tesha Piccinin

Tesha Piccinin
Development Team Lead
eWorks CoE Development Project
Mobile: 0408 996 545

From: Tesha Piccinin [mailto:teshapiccinin@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 3:51 PM
To: emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au
Subject: FW: Copyright request on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute
Hello Elissa,
I have been directed to you by James Depasquale in relation to my seeking permission on behalf of Bendigo Kangan to use an IMAP fact sheet as a handout in course materials for Certificate III in Landscape Construction.

The particular document we are seeking permission for is located at: https://www.whittlesea.vic.gov.au/media/1803/sdapp-construction-and-building-management-accessible-pdf.pdf

James has suggested that we should perhaps consider looking at all the Fact sheets available so if it was acceptable perhaps we could seek ‘blanket’ permission to use these. However we would be pleased if we could at least have permission to use the Fact Sheet for Construction and Building Management Building design for a sustainable future – we would be very grateful. We would of course provide appropriate attribution.

Thanks you so much for your help with this. We have a very tight development timeline so an early response would be very helpful.

Regards,
(on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute

Tesha Piccinin
Development Team Lead
eWorks CoE Development Project
Mobile: 0408 996 545

---

From: James Depasquale [mailto:James.Depasquale@whittlesea.vic.gov.au]
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 3:36 PM
To: teshapiccinin@gmail.com
Cc: Janine Morgan
Subject: RE: Copyright request on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute

Hi Tesha

Thanks for your inquiry. The fact sheet that you have requested to use is part of a larger set of fact sheets used by a number of Council’s across Victoria.

The fact sheets are actually owned by the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP). I just spoke to Elissa, the IMAP Executive Officer and I am sure they would be happy for you to use them. Her contact details are below:

Elissa McElroy
03 8290 1110
emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au

Also, it might be worth looking at the full suite of fact sheets, as they cover a range of topics related to sustainable development from stormwater to materials selection. The ten Whittlesea currently use can be found here, but Elissa will have access to additional ones that have been developed more recently.

Let me know if you require anything else.

Kind regards
James Depasquale | Sustainability Planning and Strategy Officer
City of Whittlesea
T 03 9217 2001 | TTY 133 677 (ask for 9217 2001)
Thanks James

From: Tesha Piccinin [mailto:teshapiccinin@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, 2 November 2018 10:27 AM
To: Janine Morgan <Janine.Morgan@whittlesea.vic.gov.au>
Subject: Copyright request on behalf of Bendigo Kangan Institute

Hello Janine,
Thank you for your assistance with this. As discussed we are seeking permission to use the document (accessed through the link below) provided by your council for educational purposes as a handout in class for students for students participating in a Certificate III in Landscape Construction with Bendigo Kangan Institute of TAFE Victoria.

The document is a Fact Sheet for Construction and Building Management
Building design for a sustainable future

We would like to make print copies of this document and provide to the students in class as part of their learning.
We would of course properly attribute the source and owners of the document. Thank you for your help with this.

Kind regards

Tesha Piccinin
Development Team Lead
eWorks CoE Development Project
Mobile: 0408 996 545

Any personal or sensitive information contained in this e-mail and attachments must be handled in accordance with the Privacy and Data Protection Act 2014 (Victoria), the Health Records Act 2001 or the Privacy Act 1988 (Commonwealth), as applicable.

This e-mail, including all attachments, is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not disclose, distribute, copy or use the information contained in this e-mail or attachments.

Any confidentiality or privilege is not waived or lost because this e-mail has been sent to you in error. If you have received it in error, please let us know by reply e-mail, delete it from your system and destroy any copies.
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Disclaimer: This message along with attachments is intended for the exclusive and confidential use of the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this email you must not use, distribute, copy or rely on any information contained in this email. If you have received this transmission in error, please delete it immediately from your system and inform the sender.
Hi Simon, Kim, Lisa and Elissa,

On behalf of the CTV Board, we would like to thank you for your generous hospitality in hosting us for the launch of the Experience Culture Victoria Guide. The venue was stunning and a fitting showcase of the wonderful cultural experiences on offer in the City of Yarra and Inner Melbourne.

The food was divine!

We look forward to sharing with you the digital platform in the coming weeks which will add a whole new dimension to the way visitors can connect with the state’s incredible cultural offerings. It has been a long and at times challenging journey but we are on our way. We value deeply the partnership with IMAP and thank you for your ongoing support and belief in the work of Cultural Tourism Victoria.

Enjoy the weekend ahead.

Kindest regards,
Carrie

Carrie Donaldson
Executive Officer
Cultural Tourism Victoria
M: 0415 581135
E: info@culturaltourismvictoria.com.au
W: www.culturaltourismvictoria.com.au
Follow us on Facebook
Hi Elissa

I hope you’re well. I have some news – I am saying farewell to DEDJTR and heading to Sustainability Victoria to lead their recycling industry support effort from 12 November. A challenging but exciting role.

I’ll miss working with you, and hope to stay in touch with you and the iMAP representatives. You do such an excellent job as Executive Officer of the group. Perhaps our paths will even cross in my new role at SV!

In the meantime, Michael Anderson will be DEDJTR Metro Economic Development’s representative on iMAP (now called Economic Projects and Precincts). He is the new Manager of the Inner Metro and Inner South East EPWGs, and his background in the City of Melbourne leading economic development initiatives makes him well equipped to take up the mantle. I’ll leave it to you to make contact with Michael when it works for you.

Take care and keep in touch!

My very best regards.

Cate
Welcome to the second Economy and Planning Working Group Update (EPWG).

As you will see in this update, EPWG’s are working ever closer to the Metropolitan Partnerships, and with many of major priority and regionally significant precincts.

As an example, is the announcement of the new Footscray Hospital at Victoria University’s Footscray Rd. campus. This $1.5 billion 500 bed commitment was worked on and supported by the Western EPWG, the Western Partnership as well as by Victoria University, Western Health, DHHS, DELWP, VPA, DEDJTR and Maribyrnong Council. It was an example of joined up government across departments, across Government sectors and in place.

Well done to all involved!

EPWG’s offer a place for councils and government to discuss planning and economic and transparent issues in place, in a way that all can learn and understand another position. And like Footscray hospital over a 12 month process gain an understanding and agreement about how major developments can drive jobs and investment for a whole region.

Steve Booth | Director
Economic Projects and Precincts, Melbourne RDA
Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources

The six Economy and Planning Working Groups (EPWGs) across Melbourne join up economic development, transport, infrastructure and planning across local and State Government. The six EPWGs (North, South, East, West, Inner Metro and Inner SE) are partnerships between Directors of all Councils and a Council CEO as Chair - with DEDJTR Economic Development and Transport, Victorian Health and Human Services Building Authority, DELWP Planning, the Office for Suburban Development and the VPA.

Northern EPWG
- Working with RMIT and Moreland City Council to develop the Brunswick Design District which will support creative sector businesses
- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan, in collaboration with council officers in the North.
- Significant consultation has been occurring with all councils and other EPWG members to understand their needs in relation to work of the EPWGs.

Inner South East EPWG
- Identifying ways to create more opportunities to work locally and maintain the vibrancy of the regional strip malls and the local economy.
- Exploring options to better connect transport routes within the region.
- Identifying collaborative investment opportunities in precinct development, economic development, and transport.
- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan. A second draft due to be produced in December.
Western EPWG

- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan has been occurring, in collaboration with council officers in the West.
- Working on development of a precinct in Sunshine leveraging off the airport rail link.
- Significant consultation has been occurring with all councils and other EPWG members to understand their needs in relation to work of the EPWGs.
- Discussions about industrial and commercial land planning.
- We are working internally within DEDJTR on the Jobs and Skills Plan for the West. EPWG members are being consulted on this Plan.

Eastern EPWG

- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan, in collaboration with council officers in the East.
- Significant consultation has been occurring with all councils and other EPWG members to understand their needs in relation to work of the EPWGs.
- Discussions have commenced on the Box Hill precinct.

Inner Metro EPWG

- New Chair from City of Melbourne (Claire Ferres Miles) to better link with the Metro Partnership.
- Significant activity on the Cremorne Enterprise Precinct, in conjunction with VPA and CoY.
- Focus on new work plan, including clear narrative for the Inner Metro region.
- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan has been occurring, in
Southern EPWG

- Drafting of the Land Use Framework Plan, in collaboration with council officers in the East. A draft will be considered in October.
- Significant consultation has been occurring with all councils and other EPWG members to understand their needs in relation to work of the EPWGs.

Recent Announcements

The Victorian Government launched its new planning zone and policy to support enterprise Precincts

Creative and technology clusters in Victoria will be strengthened by a new planning zone and policy to support Enterprise Precincts. On 12 September, the Minister for Planning Richard Wynne and Minister for Innovation and Digital Economy Philip Dalidakis launched the Victorian Government’s new policy ‘Unlocking Enterprise in a Changing Economy’. To support this policy a new zoning tool – the Commercial 3 Zone – has been developed to help planners implement Enterprise Precincts across Victoria.

Read the policy on the Planning Victoria website.

What’s On

RESOLVE THE TENSION BETWEEN TECH+HUMANITY

Tickets for Pivot Summit 2019 are now on sale!

Supported by LaunchVic, Pivot Summit is held annually in Geelong. The summit opens up a range of local, national and global opportunity for the region, and will this year bring together Australian and international thought leaders to share insights on the future of digital and its impact on how we work, live and think.

Resources
Laneways is curated to bring you the best advice for founders and investors in the Victorian startup ecosystem. If you want to learn about running or investing in startups Laneways will send tricks and tips straight to your email inbox!

**SUBSCRIBE with Laneways**

**Season 2 Out Now!**

Scale Up is our podcast about startups in Melbourne scaling to global success. What can founders, teams, investors and fellow Melbourne entrepreneurs learn from their success and failures?

**LISTEN to Scale Up via iTunes**

**MyVictoria**

MyVictoria gathers and combines data to help you draw meaningful insights. Converting data into visual formats like maps, graphs and charts tells a story that:

- creates clear understanding
- brings important context
- conveys related information
- informs research and planning

**Investment Strategy**

DEDJTR’s strategy for supporting investment in Victoria’s economy. The Investment Strategy is available online at the Invest Victoria website.

**Victorian Small Business Engagement Guidelines**

The Victorian Small Business Engagement Guidelines were created by the Victorian Small Business Commission to provide a tool for constructive engagement between small businesses and organisations undertaking disruptive infrastructure projects. The Guidelines were developed in consultation with organisations who undertake disruptive infrastructure projects and traders who have directly been impacted by recent projects. These conversations allowed us to create processes within the Guidelines that we believe are both practical and achievable for the involved parties. These processes guide organisations to consider:

You can have a closer look at the Victorian Small Business Engagement website. If you would like hard copies please contact the Victorian Small Business Commissioner’s office on 13 VSBC (13 87 22).

**Innovations Vs Enterprise Precincts**

**Unlocking Enterprise in a Changing Economy**

Learn how Enterprise Precincts are being promoted through new policy and reforms to the planning system to respond to changes in the economy and evolving ways of working.
Melbourne Data Viewer

The Melbourne Data Viewer is an interactive map providing demographic, housing and employment information for Melbourne. Click on the link above and select a region, map selection, topic and subtopic to explore.

Funding

**Expert-in-Residences (EIRs) for Co-working Spaces**

**OPEN ROUND**

Launch Vic’s latest funding aims to encourage co-working spaces to appoint high-calibre, experienced startup professionals to support their residents.

Through its 'Expert-In-Residence' (EIR) program LaunchVic will invest up to $25,000 per successful application to support growth and learning opportunities for resident startups by attracting EIRs that will provide business guidance, mentorship and support for startups to improve their business capabilities.

Applications for the EIR program are now open for established co-working spaces. The funding round will remain open until the total funding pool is allocated.

**Round 9 of LaunchVic**
Round 9 of LaunchVic funding will provide Victoria’s startup sector with a $500,000 boost for the state’s co-working spaces. Open since the 3 August, it will close when funding is allocated.

We’re giving this another plug, because if you haven’t seen it - you should! We gathered some of our amazing founders together to create this video that we think really captures the amazing momentum around startups in Victoria right now.

Watch it on Youtube.

LaunchVic

The Melbourne Start-up Scene

The Wade Institute’s VC Catalyst program is now open for expressions of interest. Funded by LaunchVic, the program is one of Australia’s first university-affiliated startup investor courses. VC Catalyst looks to unlock the full potential of venture capital investing by mobilising smart capital by keen investors who want to drive and support founders and their burgeoning companies.

Find Out More

Caulfield Innovation Precinct

The Inner South East EPWG Metropolitan Partnership highlighted Caulfield as a potential innovation and education precinct (see image below). In collaboration with the City of Stonnington and Monash University, the Economic Projects and Precincts team is drafting a report that will detail stakeholder plans and provide an analysis of Caulfield based on enterprise precinct criteria. A draft report will soon be provided to key stakeholders involved.

Council welcomes the state government’s acknowledgement of the important and special role that Cremorne plays in Yarra and Melbourne.

For many years, we have seen the value of protecting and retaining key employment precincts in Yarra, such as Cremorne and the Gipps Precinct. Cremorne has developed over many decades and is maturing into a significant economic precinct based around the creative and high-tech businesses that have been attracted to precinct.

Cremorne will continue to grow and evolve. The announcement of a Cremorne Place Implementation Plan will enable us, in partnership with the Victorian Planning Authority, to work with the local resident and business community to plan for the future of the precinct and address issues already raised by the community including transport, car parking, open space and public realm improvements.

At this time, we are working with the VPA are working together to further define the scope of work. Further information will be provided on the VPA website.
“Australia is the 13th largest economy in the world and Victoria is the engine room of Australia’s economy, responsible for nearly a quarter of national economic activity. We offer investors a stable and competitive business environment with longstanding ties to Asia, a skilled multicultural workforce, world-class institutions and infrastructure and unbeatable lifestyle. These attributes generate exciting, diverse and unique opportunities for investors.”
Elissa McElroy

From: Craig Eyes <craigeyes@recoveredenergy.com.au>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 October 2018 4:35 PM
To: Elissa McElroy
Subject: Laverton North MSW Waste Gasification to Energy Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Elissa

Recovered Energy Australia is developing a MSW Waste Gasification to Energy project at Laverton North to process 150,000 tonnes per annum of household residual waste that would otherwise go to landfill.

In August we lodged our planning permit with Wyndham Council and have submitted our EPA Works Approval application and working through that process with them now. We plan to construct the project next June for operation by 2021.

This is proven technology operating worldwide and it will be competitive with current landfill rates and enable Councils to significantly reduce their greenhouse footprint.


We had a display booth at last weeks Waste Expo and the positive response was overwhelming to our exhibit and presentation from many local government visitors.

It would be great to let your members know of this development and we welcome the opportunity to provide further details for you.

Regards
Craig Eyes
Recovered Energy Australia
13/150 Chestnut St
Cremorne, VIC 3121
https://youtu.be/iAsqGz8lt3w
Energy Recovery Facility will generate enough electricity for 16,000 homes.

Recovered Energy Australia Pty Ltd proposes to construct a world leading high tech process to convert up to 200,000 tonnes per annum of general household domestic waste into baseload renewable energy.

The location identified by Recovered Energy Australia Pty Ltd (REA) as the preferred area for its first waste gasification to energy plant is on the appropriately zoned industrial land at Laverton North. It has been selected for its extensive buffer zone and position within an area identified by the State Government as an existing Resource and Recovery Hub of State Importance\(^1\). It also has access to high energy consuming industries that could utilise the renewable power generated.

The proven technology used by REA is called waste gasification to energy and is currently in use throughout Asia and the Middle East. It meets the Victorian operational and environmental standards and is an economically viable alternative for municipal waste disposal.

The process, a controlled air gasification system is one of the most scalable and environmentally responsible thermal technologies for converting solid municipal waste to electricity. It also recovers valuable metals and glass and produces bottom ash or slag that can also be utilised for road base.

Waste to Energy (WTE) technology is a proven waste management solution that is extensively used worldwide. There are hundreds of facilities around the world safely converting millions of tonnes of waste into electricity. Waste buried at landfill decomposes and releases methane, a very potent greenhouse gas that is over 25 times more destructive to the atmosphere than CO2.

\(^1\) Statewide Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan 2015-2044, Table 2.2, Existing Hubs of State Importance, p35
Waste Gasification to Energy – How it Works

Most homes have three waste bins to separate their waste streams:

- **Green waste** like lawn clippings.
- **Recyclables** like plastics and paper.
- **Residual waste**. It is this residual bin that Councils will send to the WTE facility for recovery of energy, metals and glass.

During the waste gasification process there is a thermochemical transformation of the rubbish into a synthetic gas (syngas) that is used to heat water in the boiler and this drives a turbine to produce electricity. The energy is fed into the grid to power local industry and homes.

There is an extensive operation inside the WTE plant to clean up the gases to meet the strict air emissions and environmental conditions required under the EPA approvals process.

The WTE plant will operate on 24/7 basis generating over 10 MW of electricity that will be exported into the grid which is enough to power 16,000 homes. It will also employ 15~25 people.

For Further Information or to Contact us, visit www.recoveredenergy.com.au
Planning Application submitted for Energy Recovery Facility.

Recovered Energy Australia submitted a planning application to the City of Wyndham to construct a world leading high tech plant to convert 200,000 tonnes per annum of residual Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) gasification to energy (WTE).

The location selected by Recovered Energy Australia Pty Ltd (REA) as the site for its first residual waste gasification to energy plant is located on industrial zoned (IN2Z) land at 28 Alex Fraser Drive, Laverton North. It is a fully enclosed building with high speed roller doors and operates under negative air pressure. This ensures no odour from waste or noise is emitted from the plant.

The next step in the licencing & approval process is to submit an Environment Protection Victoria (EPA) Works Approval application to show that it meets the Victorian operational and environmental standards.

This Australian first gasification technology will divert more than 97% or 194,000 tonnes of waste that was destined to go to landfill and at the same time recover the energy from the waste. There will be 11-14% of the waste that is non-organic creating 30,000 tonnes per annum of slag which can be used for clean fill, road base, bricks or tiles.

Where is the Location of the Residual Waste Gasification to Energy Project?

Location of the Residual MSW Waste Gasification to Energy Plant.
What is the Waste Gasification to Energy Technology?

Gasification is a thermo-chemical process producing a syngas for generation of electricity. Proven gasification technology has been selected for its superior environmental performance, its scalability and its ability to be commercially competitive with other waste disposal options. The controlled air and high temperature of the gasifier also creates a process that is unsuited to the production or reformation of unwanted emissions. The syngas is used to raise the process temperature to >1,100 degrees Celsius and this drives a steam turbine to generate electricity which is supplied to the local grid.

Emission levels are strictly adhered to through a constant and sophisticated online monitoring process to achieve very low levels of acid gases (SO2, HCL, NOx), particulates CO, volatile metals, dioxins and furans. The controlled air and high temperatures of the gasification process ensures emissions remain at the lower end of limits set by the EPA.

What will be the cost to process Councils residual Waste?

REA’s residual MSW waste gasification to energy process is a local solution to a local problem. REA will only be able to service the residual MSW waste volumes from 3 or 4 Councils. This can be achieved at a cost competitive rate compared to the alternative waste disposal methods used by Councils.

For Further Information or to Contact us, visit www.recoveredenergy.com.au
IMAP Implementation Committee

Financial Report for the Three Months ending 30 September 2018

1 July 2018 – 30 September 2018

Background

1. The IMAP financial position was last noted at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting held on 31 August 2018.
2. Retained Earnings carried forward from the 2017-18 financial year totalled $632,470 (excluding GST).

Income

3. Income indicates the Carry Forward of $632,470 during the first quarter.
   All IMAP Council contributions for 2018-19 have been invoiced during November (second quarter).
4. Total Income for the 3 month period to 30 September 2018:

   **2800 Sundry Income:**
   - Retained Earnings carried forward from 2017-18 $ 632,470
   - CLUE technology project contributions to CoM (held funds):
     - City of Stonnington $ 25,000 $657,470

   TOTAL OPERATING INCOME $ 657,470

Expenditure

5. Total Expenditure for the 3 month period to 30 September 2018:

   **4040 Contract Staff**
   - Wayfinding Contractor – Project Management: Aug – mid Sept $ 9,100

   **4104 Postage and Courier**
   - IMAP Couriers (Aug) $ 246

   **4106 Software Support and Maintenance**
   - IMAP Basecamp monthly fee (File sharing service - July) $ 150

   **4108 Stationery**
   - IMAP Stationery IMAP - Aug $ 80

   **4131 Promotional Publications**
   - Tourism CTV Cultural Guide 2018-19 – instalment 1 $ 7,750

   **4150 Consulting Fees**
   - Tourism Update Visitor Cruise Guide – Visual Voice (August) $ 250
   - StreetCount Launch Housing coordination - variation $ 11,655
   - Media consultant $ 19,500
   - Additional media costs $ 9,000 $40,405

   **4211 Staff Catering**
   - IMAP IMAP staff meetings (various June-Sept) $ 241
6. Refer to Attachment 4b to see total expenditure against project budgets to date.

Recommendation

7. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to receive the IMAP Financial Report for the 3 months ending 30 September 2018.
## IMAP Operating Report

### Operating & Capital Works Statement for period ended September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>Year To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actuals</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800 - Sundry Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Normal Salary expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Long Service Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net ADO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workcover</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Professional Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary Staff Payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040 - Contract Staff</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>(9,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employee Expenses</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>(9,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>(9,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4104 - Postage &amp; Couriers</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4106 - Software Support and Maintenance</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4108 - Stationery - General</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4131 - Promotional Publications</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>(7,750)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4150 - Consulting Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>8,152</td>
<td>(8,152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad and doubtful debts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4211 - Staff Catering</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>(240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>17,492</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/ (Deficit) for the year</td>
<td>(17,492)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comprehensive income / expenditure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortisation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>(17,492)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 13</th>
<th>Year 14</th>
<th>Carry forwards</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st QTR</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd QTR</th>
<th>ACTUALS 3rd QTR</th>
<th>ACTUALS 4th QTR</th>
<th>ACTUALS CY</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart City Solutions - CLUE Technology Project</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities Project (ex SRV grant)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Controls &amp; targets</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Approach in the Response to Homelessness</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole of Water Cycle Planning</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainable Design Facilitators Project</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>493,052</td>
<td>390,940</td>
<td>883,992</td>
<td>57,972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,972</td>
<td>-826,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Surplus (Deficit)**
- $883,592

**Opening Balance of IMAP Account**
- $12,476

**Closing Balance of IMAP Account**
- $48,679

---

Please note that the funding calculation does not include Operational Costs of $40,000 per council in 2018/19. Bold: Identified as priority projects in the new plan.
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 Steering group meetings:
   - 1 November – IMAP Neighbourhood and Places Steering Group meeting #5 – Enterprise zones (Bryn Davies from DELWP) and Affordable Housing

3. The IMAP Executive Forum meeting #27 was held on 15 November – refer to the Draft Minutes Attachment 2.

4. The IMAP Implementation Committee meeting dates for 2018 are attached – these were approved at the last meeting but an amendment to the May date is requested as the Executive Officer will be on leave – refer Attachment 5a.

5. The Annual Report and Annual Report Summary were printed and distributed early October to all IMAP Councillors, CEOs and Mayors of Victorian Councils, State and Federal Government contacts and elected representatives, and all project teams.

6. In October the Executive Officer had discussions with Chris Eddy, Acting CEO Lead West about IMAP governance arrangements. It is of interest to note that in recent months:
   - 1. Lead West
   - 2. Melbourne’s Northern Councils (Banyule, Darebin, Hume, Mitchell Shire, Moreland, Nillumbik and Whittlesea); and
   - 3. Eastern Region Group of Councils (Knox, Maroondah, Monash, Whitehorse, Yarra Ranges)

   These alliances have established different groups than those covered by the Metro Partnerships..

Communications

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

   - Wayfinding and Signage - Master Style Guide
     - August to September – development the Wayfound website to assist with consultation on contents
     - 11 Sept - met with development team at PTV
     - 12 Sept – technical operation meeting at PTV
     - The Project Manager met with the 7 identified agencies/Councils to receive feedback on Wayfound Version 1.0

   - 12 September/8 &15 October – Working group update meetings
   - 15 October – IMAP Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee meeting
   - 29 October - TfV and IMAP Mapping Workshop held – SGS facilitator
   - November – Project team leader met with the Office of the Victorian Government Architect to review signage infrastructure designs. Preparing a short report on the key issues for the OVGA.
   - 12 November – Working group meeting - reviewed the forward project budget
Active Sport and Recreation Facility Planning Study
- September to October – additional work undertaken by original contractor to update the 5 Council’s 2018 data and reconfigure it to assist SGS’s requirements

IMAP Tourism
- 18 September – IMAP Tourism Working Group meeting on Tourism Strategy going forward
- September – Letters to Destination Melbourne prepared regarding decisions on the Destination Management Plan and Agreement for the Printing and Distribution of the Melbourne Visitors Map
- 31 October – Launch of the Experience Culture Victoria Guide 2018-19 at Abbotsford Convent
- 15 November – IMAP Executive Forum considered report proposals on future directions

Smart City Solutions – CLUE Technology upgrade
- 15 November – IMAP Executive Forum considered proposal on next steps with the project
- November – CoM staff holding meetings with each of the IMAP Councils to discuss budget requirements
- 29 November – CoM meeting planned for IMAP Councils to meet vendor appointed for the CLUE technology upgade

Consistent Approach in the Response to Homelessness
- 12 October – met with CoM re preparation of letters to the State Government and opposition on future policies
- 22 October – letters sent sent out following approvals received from IMAP’s elected representatives.
- Key points in the correspondence were advised in the CoS Councillor Bulletin

Inner Melbourne Cycling Network
- 11 September - Attended the Metro Cycling Network - Senior Reference Group convened by Resilient Melbourne.
- 12 November – Meeting at CoM re IMAP Inner Melbourne Cycling network project brief development in conjunction with Resilient Melbourne.
- 14 November – IMAP Transport Managers meeting – presentations on the Cycling project proposals and Wayfinding Projects mapping work; as well as reviewing all transport project proposals.
- November – preparation of the project brief for IMAP Implementation Committee approval.

IMAP Urban Forest Plan
- 11 September – attended CoM Green our City Strategic Action Plan launch
- 30 October – EO and Project Team Leader met with Gail Hall, CoM re alignment opportunities between the projects
- The Project Team Leader (Matt Slavin) is leaving Maribyrnong City Council this month, which will likely affect progress on this project.

Other
- Researching open data policies, identified reps from the 5 councils, CEOs signed off on policy sharing.
- Attended Deakin University’s Urban Logistics Laboratory meeting (20 Sept) and Scenario Planning Melbourne Workshop (Oct) on the National Logistics Plan
- 17 October - Met with Dr Sebastian Fastenrath on the review of Resilient Melbourne
23 October – Attended ‘Unlocking Enterprise in a Changing Economy – realising enterprise precincts’ seminar held by DELWP (Bryn Davies)

**Recommendation**

8 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves:
   a. **To note** the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.
   b. **To approve** the amended IMAP Implementation Committee meeting dates for 2019.

**Attachments:**

*Att 5a IMAP Meeting Schedule 2019 updated*
# IMAP - Meeting Schedule 2018-2019

**IMAP Implementation Committee Meetings (Quarterly)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 52</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday 30th November 2018 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>City of Stonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cnr High St &amp; Glenferrie Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 53</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday 22nd February 2019 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>Maribyrnong City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reception Room, Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maribyrnong Council offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cnr Hyde &amp; Napier Streets, Footscray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday 24th 31st May 2019 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Kilda Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 55</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday 30th August 2019 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>City of Yarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Room 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 56</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday 29th November 2019 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>City of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Chair Future Melbourne [Planning] Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Meeting Room, Level 2, Town Hall Admin Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swanston Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting 57</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date / Time</td>
<td>Friday February 2020 (8.00am)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>City of Stonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cnr High St &amp; Glenferrie Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) 2016-2026 identifies 27 strategies across 5 Goals to help build the inner Melbourne region’s creativity, liveability, prosperity and sustainability across a range of diverse neighbourhoods experiencing rapid growth.

Some of the following projects were commenced under the provisions of the former Inner Melbourne Action Plan; and continued in the new plan.

Completed Projects:
- G1.P1 Information Requirements investigation (Part of the CLUE project)
- G4.P1 Urban Manufacturing Project - The Dilemma of Urban Employment Land
- G5.P5 Green Roofs Research Project - Australian Research Council Linkage Grant

PROGRESS ON CURRENT PROJECTS

GOAL 1 ECONOMY

Strategies 1.1 and 1.2
IMAP CLUE (Census for Land Use and Employment)

G1.P2 Smart Cities and Suburbs application – “Taking CLUE to the Cloud for Councils, Communities and Commerce”

BACKGROUND
- On 30 June 2017, the IMAP Councils submitted an application for Smart Cities and Suburbs funding to update the CLUE technology to cloud computing, to enable access to CLUE by the IMAP Councils.
- In November 2017 the Council were advised their application was successful. It was agreed that the IMAP Economy Steering Group would help oversee progress on the project.

CURRENT PROGRESS
- By July, CoM completed the first round of Human Centred Design (HCD) workshops with IMAP Council’s and the project plan was socialised among IMAP Council’s. This included purpose, governance, roles and responsibilities, milestones, budget, resource plan/people plan, and project method.
The IMAP council CEO’s signed an MOU with the City of Melbourne which documents the approach that will be taken by to meet the requirements of the Smart Cities and Suburbs funding agreement for the project.

An initial (draft) solution architecture was developed.

A standardised data model, called the CLUE MVP model, was developed.

A market scan considered private sector partners that could potentially provide components of the future CLUE system. This was the first step of the procurement process.

A vendor was approved in July

On 15 November, the IMAP Executive Forum considered the proposed next steps with the project. CoM staff holding meetings with each of the IMAP Councils to discuss budget requirements

On 29 November – CoM are holding a meeting for IMAP Councils to meet the vendor appointed for the CLUE technology upgrade

NEXT STEPS

Key milestones for the remainder of the project include:

2018

- November - Appointment of a delivery partner

2019

- April - Solution trial
- May - Implementation and project close

Strategy 1.3

G1.P5 IMAP Tourism

BACKGROUND

The IMAP Regional Tourism Working Group (TWG) has progressed its work through a number of three year strategic plans since 2006. The aim of the group is to promote the Inner Melbourne region to tourists and visitors.

In recent years the group has undertaken a range of approaches, having successfully:

- developed visitor itineraries,
- promoted ‘Famils’ to information centre volunteers from Ballarat and Geelong,
- undertaken inner Melbourne promotion on the Skybus,
- completed joint opinion research with Destination Melbourne, and
- provided a consistent promotional effort to delegates at major events such as the AIDS conference.

The most successful collateral developed by the group is the IMAP regional tourism map – now the Official Visitors Map which is promoted in conjunction with Destination Melbourne for wide distribution. The group also investigated development of a tourist bus route around inner Melbourne.

Work in 2017- 18 included:

- Participation in Destination Melbourne's development of a Destination Management Plan for metro Melbourne,
- Updating the visitor map to include an accurate GIS map base, and
- With Cultural Tourism Victoria, Tourism staff participated in promoting local cultural features in the “Experience Culture Victoria 2016-17” guide and the following 2017-18 edition launched on 25 August 2017.
- Met with Destination Melbourne on the Board’s Three Year Strategy and
- Met with Visit Victoria on their new interstate promotion campaign for inner Melbourne.

CURRENT PROGRESS

- The Tourism Working Group presented their next three year Strategy and 2018-19 Action Plan in August 2018 to the IMAP Implementation Committee.
Subsequent deliberations led to a proposed change in direction and a number of options for future directions have been developed for consideration by the Committee in November, including winding up this working group.

On 31 October the IMAP Councils joined CTV to launch the 2018-19 culture guide.

**Strategy 1.4**

**G1.P3 Managing Conflict in Activity Centres**

**BACKGROUND**

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.

- At the August 2016 meeting, the committee requested this matter be followed up. The Executive Officer has been unable to progress this project due to other commitments. A lead council is sought to undertake this work.
- On 2 November the Executive Forum identified that City of Yarra and City of Stonnington staff would liaise to develop a project brief for the IMAP Committee setting out the proposed approach.
- An update report to the February 2018 Committee meeting recommended this matter be deferred pending the outcome of changes in both planning and liquor legislation.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Legislation is currently under review.

**Strategy 1.4 and Strategy 2.4 (Transport section)**

**G1.P4 Melbourne Visitor Wayfinding and Signage**

**BACKGROUND**

Initially completed in 2010, this project was reactivated in 2012, 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.
- Apply consistent shared symbols and terminology across these key signage systems; and
- Coordinate responses to signage requests by tourist attractions, precincts and major developments.

The Melbourne Visitor Signage coordinating committee comprises representatives of the five IMAP councils, City of Wyndham, Public Transport Victoria, VicRoads and Transport for Victoria. The aim was to build a Master Style Guide setting out agreed signing principles, guidelines and language (the ‘business rules’) to be adopted by collaborating authorities.

In April 2015 Paul Street, the Program Manager of Transport for London’s (TfL) *Legible London* wayfinding system visited for 12 days providing workshops on best practice, implementation 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 Wayfound guide is now completed and undergoing Council reporting and approval.
   - Signage Infrastructure Design is ongoing at CoM looking at functionality, legibility, accessibility and view from different distances. CoM has rolled out a pilot project at several sites to test the new sign design, content and placement with users.

2. **Strategic approach**
   - The project team are investigating:
the feasibility of building a single base map for metropolitan Melbourne
commissioning a business case on the benefits of improved wayfinding signage in Melbourne.

Progress has included:

- August 2016 - The visitor signage Master Style Guide (MSG) was endorsed by the IMAP Implementation Committee. The guide or ‘standards’ for signage has been designed by PTV for release as a reference document.
- May 2017 - The Project team met with Transport for Victoria to discuss the next steps for communicating the Guide and considering mapping options.
- May 2017 – the IMAP Implementation Committee adopted Wayfound as an operational manual by the Councils. It was referred to the Councils for adoption. The WayFound manual continues to be updated as user feedback on the trials is processed
- August 2017 - the Business case for the next stage of this Project was approved by the IMAP Committee meeting. Some amendments were incorporated.
- 2017 - A site visit at Southern Cross station was held with representatives of neighbouring councils to review the pilot signage project and seek pilot projects to test the WayFound manual.
- 2017- An MoU and licence was drafted to cover the relationships between the project partners and 3rd party users
- 2018 - Met with Transport for Victoria to discuss arrangements for greater liaison through their new approved Project Manager position.
- 2018 - Three IMAP Councils have now formally adopted or noted the operational manual

CURRENT PROGRESS:

- User testing of City of Melbourne’s pilot signs is now complete. The results were very favourable for the signs and maps.
- Two IMAP Councils – Yarra and Maribyrnong are yet to adopt the manual but will now await updates before proceeding
- August to September 2018 - The Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee established a website for Way Found to enable feedback on the document and provide version control.
- October to November 2018 - The Project Manager met with the 7 identified agencies/Councils to receive feedback on Way found Version 1.0
- 15 October – IMAP Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee meeting
- 29 October - TfV and IMAP Mapping Workshop held – SGS facilitator
- November 2018 - Liaison is now established with the Victorian Government Architects Office over sign infrastructure design. A short report on the key issues is being prepared for the OVGA.

NEXT STEPS

- The feedback will inform amendments to be incorporated in version 2 of Way found.
- Understanding the potential to integrate mapping across IMAP councils as well as the transport portfolio and infrastructure projects.
Goal 2 TRANSPORT

Strategy 2.3
G2.P1 Business Case – Inner Melbourne Cycling Network

BACKGROUND
The Inner Melbourne Action Plan shares this priority project with a number of other authorities and agencies who seek to support sustainable transport options and address the gaps in the metro cycling network. The IMAP project has been deferred awaiting clarity around the work of these other agencies. City of Melbourne have been appointed to lead this project for IMAP.

CURRENT PROGRESS:
- On 11 September 2018, the Metro Cycling Network Senior Reference Group, convened by Resilient Melbourne, discussed how the various agencies could collaborate to achieve a positive outcome in the further development of the cycle network.
- This was followed up by a further meeting on 12 November between CoM, Resilient Melbourne and IMAP staff to develop a project brief for consideration.
- On 14 November the IMAP Transport Managers heard presentations on the Cycling project proposals and Wayfinding Projects mapping work; as well as reviewing all transport project proposals. Support was given to proceed with the joint cycling infrastructure mapping proposal.
- November 2018 – the project brief is to be considered by the IMAP Implementation Committee.

NEXT STEPS
- Await Committee approval.

Refer to the following Transport project under the Economy section.

Strategy 2.4
G1.P4 Melbourne Visitor Wayfinding and Signage
Goal 3 COMMUNITIES

Strategy 3.1
G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls & Targets

BACKGROUND

➤ Completed

Stage 1: Planning mechanisms

Stage 2: Community Land Trust (CLT) Research Phase 1

➤ Research undertaken on Community Land Trust models and their application in Australia is published in *The Australian Community Land Trust 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.

➤ Current

Community Land Trust (CLT) Research 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.

➤ The Scope of Work for Phase 2 was reported to the IMAP Committee meeting in February 2014 and advice that fund raising had been successful

➤ June 2016: Project partners met by conference call to assess progress. A number of the case studies are still working through establishment issues and looking at design and build approaches which meet both sustainability and affordability aims. The discussion agreed a program of work planned for 2016-17.

➤ December 2016: The University of Western Sydney advised partners about delays in the project.

➤ November 2017: Draft report circulated for discussion at the next steering group

➤ Draft report considered at the CLT Steering Group meeting on 21 November 2017.

CURRENT PROGRESS:

➤ Second draft circulated during 2018.

NEXT STEPS

➤ Finalising the report by the end of 2018

Strategy 3.4
G3.P4 IMAP Regional Active Sport and Recreation Facilities Planning Study project.

BACKGROUND

Following work undertaken by the Victorian 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 project brief was considered at the August 2015 meeting and a further report on funding implications were discussed in November 2015 and February 2016.

➤ An SRV regional planning grant application was submitted for this project and has been successful.
A Project Officer to assist the project commenced employment at the City of Melbourne in May 2016 to undertake data gathering across the councils and state government agencies.

Phase 1 data gathering was completed in December 2016.

A Workshop was held on 20 January 2017 to determine data storage and maintenance and to review the analysis that had been undertaken.

The Consultant brief for phase 2 was considered by the Committee in May 2017. Requests for Quotes were called for in December/January.

SGS Economics and Planning were engaged on 2 March 2018 and an Inception Workshop held on 28 March 2018. All parties have provided a range of reference documents for the consultants to review as outlined in the project brief.

29 June 2018 – IMAP Demand Forecasting Workshop held with SGS Economics

CURRENT PROGRESS

September to November 2018 – additional work was undertaken by the original contractor to update the 5 Council’s 2018 data and reconfigure it to assist SGS’s requirements

NEXT STEPS

The proposed project completion date has been delayed until early 2019.

A draft Final Report will be presented to the February IMAP Implementation Committee meeting.
GOAL 4 NEIGHBOURHOODS AND PLACES

Strategy 5.4 (Also 1.1)
G4.P1 Urban Forest and Biodiversity Strategy and Approach

BACKGROUND
In May 2018 the IMAP Implementation Committee considered the Project Brief for the IMAP Urban Forest Plan.

Its purpose is to develop an urban forest plan aimed at protecting existing trees and increasing tree planting and green infrastructure on private land. The objective is to increase tree canopy and landscape cover to improve the environmental quality of the IMAP region, human health, amenity, liveability and appeal.

CURRENT PROGRESS
- Following IMAP Committee approval, a brief for services is being developed which requires a consultant team (led by a Planning consultancy) to detail the importance of Urban Landscapes (trees and green infrastructure).

- The project is being developed to provide a value add and uplift to the other Urban Forest initiatives such as Resilient Melbourne and Vision 202020. The Urban Forest Plan will focus on private land and the mechanisms to retain urban landscapes, particularly trees through guidelines and policies that may involve incentives or deterrents such as the use of tree bonds.

- Deliverables have been identified as:
  - Education
  - Baseline data and measuring is required to track progress in achieving the urban forest across the IMAP region.

- On 11 September 2018, the CoM launched their ‘Green our City’ Strategic Action Plan. On 30 October the Executive Officer and Project Team Leader met with Gail Hall, CoM to assess alignment opportunities between the two projects.

- Ms Hall will present details of the CoM project to the IMAP Implementation Committee in November.

- The Project Team Leader (Matt Slavin) is leaving Maribyrnong City Council this month, which will likely affect progress on this project.
GOAL 5 LEADERSHIP IN SUSTAINABILITY

Strategy 5.4
G5.P5 Sustainable Design Factsheets Project

BACKGROUND

- **Completed** - Stages 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.
  - 5 additional topics were completed in 2016.
    - 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
  - Approximately 20 Melbourne Councils now use the factsheets under an IMAP licence.
  - The project was presented at the 9th International Urban Design Conference held in Canberra in November 2016.
- 5 additional factsheets to further extend the series were approved at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting on 27 May 2016.
  - 1.1 Daylight
  - 1.2 Ventilation
  - 5.1 Windows and Glazing
  - 6.1 Car Share
  - 9.1 Innovation Strategies

CURRENT PROGRESS

- Review and development continuing. The Factsheets were licensed to CASBE and supplied to Kangan Institute as a student learning tool.

NEXT STEPS

- Completion of the Factsheet series this financial year.
- Staff changes are likely to affect delivery on this project.

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.
Late item - Item 7 (to follow)

G1.P2 Smart City Solutions – CLUE Technology Upgrade

UPDATE ON CLUE PROJECT - NOVEMBER 2018
Inner Melbourne Action Plan

Briefing Paper

Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Briefing Paper is to:

a) Advise of a recent funding opportunity from the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) under a new grant program, Voluntary Affordable Housing Agreements Grants Program. This program aims to support local government to successfully negotiate voluntary affordable housing agreements with the private sector. A funding application was made on 22 October, to investigate a private market affordable housing delivery model, subject to a co-contribution from IMAP.

b) Seek IMAP agreement on the scope for this project, which will investigate how a private market affordable housing delivery model can be scaled up through offering a range of potential incentives, for potential application by IMAP Councils under voluntary affordable housing agreements.

c) Recommend allocation of $25,000 to this project, as a required co-contribution to the application for a $50,000 grant, to be funded from the $30,000 currently allocated for the 2018/19 financial year to the Affordable Housing Planning Mechanisms project.

d) Note that this proposed project is a refocus of the project outline submitted to the IMAP Executive Forum in October 2018, which focused on investigating planning mechanisms that could increase the private sector take-up of voluntary affordable housing agreements, in particular ‘development yield’ incentives, such as ‘floor area uplift’.

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE IMAP AFFORDABLE HOUSING PLANNING MECHANISMS PROJECT

Background

In August a briefing paper was submitted to the IMAP Executive Forum outlining the continued broadening of the housing affordability problem, the introduction of the voluntary affordable housing planning mechanism, and increasing interest from the private sector in affordable housing products and planning mechanisms, in particular affordable housing products targeting moderate income households, such as key workers.

In this context, it was recommended to pursue an approach for investigating how to increase uptake of voluntary affordable housing agreements that would:

- Broadly align any investigation with State policy, current work on its implementation, and the changing context.
- Seek incremental change that that gradually builds on current mechanisms.
• Working in partnership with the State Government and the private sector in the investigation of a proposed mechanism.

At the time the focus of the project was envisaged to investigate the regional use of planning incentives, in particular ‘yield’ bonuses such as ‘floor area uplift’ incentives.

**Project re-focus**

Whilst planning leavers such as ‘floor area uplift’ incentives are still recognised as important, the application of these will generally require a lengthy revision of established planning controls. This is made more complex by the ‘regime’ of existing controls that are typically based on maximum building heights, rather than a combination of density and height controls applicable to FAU mechanisms. Negotiating ‘uplift’ from existing controls may be perceived as a trade-off between social and amenity outcomes, and requires application at a localised level.

An opportunity has arisen to investigate and further develop application of a private market affordable housing delivery model, such as the Permanent Rental Affordable Development Solutions model recently conceived by the private sector, or a variation of such a model. This model involves negotiating with private developers to deliver private affordable rental housing, (ie allocating a number / proportion of dwellings) that will:

- be sold to small investors on the basis that they are rented at a discounted market rent (eg. 30%, 50%) for the life of the building
- be managed by the private sector (not a community housing organisation)
- incorporate a range of safeguards to maintain the housing affordability (refer to Attachment A for a more detailed outline of the model).

The proposed IMAP project will investigate a range of incentives to facilitate greater private market take up of the voluntary planning mechanism, without being reliant on a direct development yield incentive. Note, this does not preclude the identified incentives being used in tandem with ‘development yield’ incentives, where and when available.

The model has a number of potential advantages, compared with seeking the gifting of dwellings for community housing purposes or the offer of discounted sale of dwellings to the community housing sector, and would lead to an increase in uptake of voluntary housing contributions and affordable housing units delivered. These advantages are:

- It can achieve a greater number of dwellings allocated to affordable housing, compared with the currently used approaches (outlined above).
- It can be negotiated faster, as it will be more acceptable to the private sector, in particular due to having private management of the affordable dwellings.
- It creates long-term affordable housing (for the life of buildings), similar to the perpetual nature of community housing.
- It will attract small (‘mum and dad’) investors to owning this affordable housing as a new asset class, who pay a price commensurate with the discounted rental income.
- It is likely to target moderate income households, including key workers, and address the bottlenecks in the housing system by helping create a continuum of affordable housing products.

**State grant opportunity**

On 2 October, the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) announced that a new grant program, Voluntary Affordable Housing Agreements Grants Program, would allocate

---

*Project Team:* Gary Spivak, CoPP (Project Lead) Katrina Terjung CoPP; Bridie Allanadale CoM; Malcolm McCall, CoY; Allison Blacket, CoS; Justin Burgess and Virginia Howe, CoMar; Stevie Meyer, CoPP.
$500,000 in total grants (with a maximum of $50,000 per successful application) to municipalities to assist in successfully reaching agreements for the delivery of affordable housing through the planning system (i.e. under voluntary planning agreements). This can include:

- developing a voluntary affordable housing agreement for a specific site or collection of sites; or
- developing policy infrastructure or other resources that will assist the successful negotiation of such agreements in the short to medium term.

An application for a $50,000 grant (as a policy infrastructure project) was submitted on 22 October for this refocussed project, with a proposed $25,000 co-contribution by IMAP in the 2018/19 year, subject to an IMAP decision on 30 November. DELWP has indicated that applicants will be notified by the end of October if they have been successful.

RECOMMENDATION

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:

a) Agree to a refocus of the IMAP work – to support investigation of a private market affordable housing delivery model, as outlined in Attachment A, 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.

b) 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.

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

PROPOSED IMAP PROJECT TO INVESTIGATE SCALEABILITY OF A PRIVATE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY MODEL FOR NEGOTIATING DELIVERY OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING BY DEVELOPERS

October 2018

THE MODEL

Summary

The model involves negotiation with developers to deliver a proportion of private dwellings in residential/mixed use developments, that are sold to investors and then rented at a discounted rent for the life of the building. The model would include several safeguards for ensuring ongoing affordability.

This model, if scaled up for delivery through voluntary planning agreements, has the potential to create a significant supply of long-term affordable private rental housing at a faster rate, compared with negotiating developer contributions for community housing, which require a greater ‘subsidy’ per unit. From a governance perspective, it will be based on a similar process that currently exists and is used with managing National Rental Affordability Scheme (NRAS) properties.

The model

This model is summarised as follows:

- **Affordable apartments** - a number of affordable housing apartments will be allocated in a development.

- **Affordable rent** - the affordable housing apartments are to be leased to households on low to moderate incomes at a proportion of market rents for the life of the building (eg. 50%), creating perpetually affordable private rental housing. This is purely a rental product, and takes a different approach providing greater certainty of income for investors, compared with social housing that is based on rent levels up to 30% of household income (which varies depending on tenant). Similar to student housing, these dwellings will not be available for owner occupation. They are purely a rental product.

- **Discounted rent** - a valuation will be undertaken by a not-for-profit housing provider to determine the market rent from which a discount of 50% is applied. This rental figure will be conveyed to the private sector property manager and will become the maximum rental which can be charged. The developer can sell the apartment to the market at a lower value reflecting the lifetime encumbrance. This aims to provide a more cost neutral approach for investors, where the discounted purchase price is balanced by lower rental returns.

- **Eligible households** - have to meet the income tests for very low, low and moderate incomes as defined under s 3AB of the P&E Act.

- **Management Framework / Process** - this will involve:
  - Property management - appointment of a Property Manager of the owner or developer’s choice. This does not need to be a community housing organisation. This will remove the market perception (rightly or wrongly) associated with the community housing management.
- **Affordable rent levels** - Property Manager requests from an agreed Housing Provider (a community housing organisation) the maximum rental to be charged for the designated apartments. This will be based on a sworn valuation of market rent which will then be reduced by 50% (in the above case) by the community housing organisation. A fee for service will be provided to the Community Housing Provider.

- **Tenant selection** - the Property Manager reviews tenancy applications based on NRAS income selection criteria and dwellings are then leased to tenants.

- **Verification** - the Property Manager submits required documentation (incomes and rents) to the Housing Provider to verify affordability compliance. Housing Provider checks documentation and submits it to the State Government (the relevant department is yet to be determined). It also does it annually for all tenancies.

- **Affordable housing register** - the State Government creates an affordable housing register to record all affordable housing units (subject to consideration by the State and identification of a department to manage the register).

- **Owners Corporation fees** - are not charged to the tenants or included in the rent, and are paid by the owner/investor.

- **Legal mechanism** - a section 173 Agreement is registered on title to lock in affordability:

  - **Defaults**: If the owner/ developer defaults on the affordability provisions in the section 173 Agreement, the following options are available / to be further investigated to enforce the provisions:

    - **Enforcement by VCAT orders** - to minimise risk of a successful challenge, the Agreement needs to have clear, comprehensive and water tight provisions that are difficult to successfully challenge at VCAT, to ensure compliance can be enforced.

    - **Financial penalty** - a penalty needs to be imposed of a sufficient size to act as a disincentive for dwelling owners to default on the affordability requirement. The legal mechanism for enforcing a penalty is to be investigated.

    - **Resale** - if an owner of an affordable housing dwelling wishes to sell, the affordability requirement is automatically transferred to the new owner via the section 173 Agreement, which is declared as an encumbrance on the title in the section 32 Statement.

**BENEFITS OF THIS MODEL**

In general, this model has the capacity to engage the private sector in the delivery of affordable housing, by attracting two players: developers in the delivery of affordable housing, and investors in the ownership of affordable housing.

There are five key benefits of the model:

1. **Housing supply** - it increases supply by creating greater certainty of negotiating an affordable housing outcome with a developer, through removing a number of perceived risks. It also significantly increases
supply, as a greater number of affordable discounted rental dwellings will become available, compared with the number of dwellings that can be generated through ‘gifting’ to a registered Housing Association or Housing Provider (e.g. while the level of discount will vary and could be up to, say 50%, by comparison the ‘cost’ of 1 gifted apartment is effectively the same as 5 apartments with a rent restriction of 80% of market).

2. **Housing system bottlenecks** - directly targets the source of the problem (the unaffordable private rental market created by the inability to afford home ownership), which provides an alternative to home ownership and reduces demand for social housing created by increased rental stress and homelessness.

3. **Speed** - has the capacity to establish an agreed, transparent model that can be negotiated faster than the alternative of gifting units or discounting sales to Housing Associations or Housing Providers; and can facilitate pre-sales to smaller ‘mum and dad’ investors to accelerate bank finance for developers. This may result in developers starting to drive affordable housing outcomes.

4. **Perpetual affordability** - it creates perpetually affordable housing, as there is a mechanism to maintain affordability for the life of the building. This avoids the shortcomings associated with other similar models which defer an affordability problem to the future, ie:

   - **NRAS**, that provided Commonwealth and State subsidies for private affordable rental housing at 20% below market rent for only 10 years, after which these units revert to market rents or can be sold.
   - **Regulatory agreements in the USA**, which are commonly negotiated between municipalities and developers under mandatory Inclusionary Zoning planning provisions. These require developers to maintain affordable rent to designated income cohorts for periods of between 15 and up to 50 years, after which they revert to market prices or can be sold.

5. **Market perception and management** - private management avoids use of community housing management, which can be a disincentive with developers, but involves a community Housing Provider in the verification and monitoring process. This also:

   - creates a commercial operating return for a private manager managing affordable dwellings for the investors on a commercial basis.
   - avoids the inclusion of Owners Corporation fees in discounted rents, which otherwise applies to gifted units for community housing and reduces community housing viability.

6. **Broader investor market** - it provides an investment opportunity that may be more attractive to small ‘mum and dad’ investors, due to the lower purchase price commensurate with the discounted rental returns. This seeks to create a new private sector source of investment in affordable housing, in contrast with the challenges of attracting institutional investment (e.g. superannuation industry), or social housing, which relies on government and/or philanthropic funding.

**PROPOSED PROJECT TO FURTHER INVESTIGATE THE MODEL**

The proposed project will investigate how the model could be scaled- to increase the supply of private affordable housing through negotiating discounted market rents for the life of new residential buildings. This would deliver private affordable housing at a faster rate, compared with current approaches to developer contributed community housing.
The project would investigate the capacity of the model (and variations of it) to increase private sector involvement in deliver of affordable rental housing, through identifying the incentives that would:

(a) Attract private developers to enter into voluntary planning agreements; and

(b) Create a market for developers offering discounted rental dwellings, through targeting small investors who pay a reduced purchase price, based on the discounted rent.

It is proposed that the project would be delivered by a suitable consultant (eg. large accountancy firm with property and taxation expertise). This consultant would identify the potential of the model by investigating the following aspects of (or variations to) this model:

1. Determining the housing need the model could address - whether the model’s intended focus on moderate income households is most suitable, in contrast with low to very low-income households that are assisted by social housing, as defined under section 3AB of the Planning and Environment Act 1987, as follows:

2. Identifying the affordable housing products most applicable to the model, eg. the capacity for the model to –

   - Attract / be used by developers providing Build to Rent developments; or
   - Enable volume leasing of some of the large numbers of private, vacant apartments that exist in particular locations of Melbourne, including the inner Melbourne areas of Docklands, South Bank, Abbotsford and South Melbourne.

3. Defining the minimum necessary development margin (relative to risk) to achieve development viability under hypothetical development scenarios - through variations in factors such as the proportions / numbers of dwellings with discounted market rents, and the level of discounted rent.

4. Identify incentives that may be sufficient to bridge the gap between the market rent and a discounted rent - in the current foreseeable future housing market. These rents are to be affordable to moderate income households, and potentially whether the model could be extended to lower income households. Incentives include the value benefit of:

   - A greater speed for negotiating conditions for development permit approval - in addition, assess the value benefit of a guaranteed fast-tracking of development approval (eg. within three months, subject to the provision by the applicant of all information reasonably required by Responsible Authorities for assessment of applications). His would apply to Council’s decisions, not any VCAT appeals, however, the benefit of seeking developments using this model (and social and affordable
housing generally) to become VCAT priority cases under the Major Projects List, should be investigated.

- **An enhanced ‘market’ perception of property management** - via a private (not community housing) property manager, and the potential for a future income stream from the property management of the affordable housing dwellings owned by investors. This may require identification of liability for property operating costs and their apportionment between the developer, the owner/investor, and the tenant. These costs include Owners Corporation fees (except in the case of Build to Rent developments), Council rates, land tax and utility costs, and cyclical maintenance and long-term upgrading.

- **A reduction or waiver of the requirement for car parking spaces** - allocated to the affordable housing.

- **Any financial arrangements** or ‘structures’ - that may provide investors and philanthropists with tax and other offsets to invest in the purchase of affordable private rental housing (and community housing) that is valued on the basis on a discounted market rent for the life of the building. Options include but are not limited to:
  - A unit property trust - a traditional property trust that will ensure that the accommodation units are retained within the (financial) Trust unless traded with the intent of replacing or increasing unit numbers.
  - Social impact bonds - also known as ‘Pay for Success Financing’, ‘Pay for Success Bond’, or a ‘Social Bond’ - a contract with the Government in which a commitment is made to pay for improved social outcomes that result in public sector savings. The Victorian government has a program for Social Impact Bonds with Anglicare Victoria, VincentCare and Sacred Heart Mission.
  - Long term lease - the model of discounted rent for the life of the building in lieu of a traditional long-term lease of property. The issue with such investments in private affordable rental housing or community housing is the gap between subsidised rent and the market rent expected by the investor. The attraction of the model (or a long-term lease) can offset the gap to some extent for an ethical investor.

- **Any associated, existing but underutilised tax arrangements** - that could attract investment by ‘mum and dad’ investors (or institutional investment) in the model of discounted rent for the life of the building, with or without any financial structure. Investigate implications for packaging the model and a structure with potentially relevant, existing tax concessions:
  - Private tax ruling 2016 - HomeGround Real Estate
    The ruling stated that for the management of private rental flats for investors (with social housing tenant), investors can claim difference between social housing rent and assessed market rent as a tax offset. Does the tax ruling have broader implications for similar other arrangements, or only if the assets are managed by HomeGround real estate or via organisations acting as a subsidiary to HomeGround Real Estate?
  - Federal change to rules for Managed Investment Trusts
Grounds for claiming tax concessions became limited only to affordable housing (and commercial property) from 1 June 2018. This may help support creation of a new investment asset class associated with affordable housing.

- Any Commonwealth and State policies and programs that could be used to bridge the gap between discounted rent and market rent sought by ethical investors.

- Any other incentives that may be needed to achieve a sufficient margin / viable development.

Note: The focus of this project is not on the use of development ‘yield’ incentives, such as the ‘floor area uplift’ controls now established in Fishermans Bend and the CBD. Whilst such planning leavers are recognised as potential incentives, the application of these will generally require a lengthy revision of established planning controls. This is made more complex by the ‘regime’ of existing controls that are typically based on maximum building heights, rather than a combination of density and height controls applicable to FAU mechanisms. There may be perceived conflict in negotiating additional development yield for affordable housing, against built-form environmental objectives / controls.

This project seeks to investigate a range of incentives without reliance on providing a floor area uplift / development yield incentive. However, this does not preclude a range of incentives being used in tandem with ‘yield’ incentives, such as ‘floor area uplift’.

5. Modelling how the model could be scaled up, without relying on the affordable housing offer being a rationale for development approval, when there are planning barriers associated with non-compliance of planning controls.

6. Recommending the governance process for establishing and maintaining safeguards to ensure that the affordable housing is maintained for the life of buildings.

PROJECT FUNDING

The project is proposed to be funded from the following sources:

$50,000 DELWP grant under the Voluntary Affordable Housing Agreements Grants Program commenced 2 October 2018. This is the maximum allowed per successful application, subject to the outcome of the application to be made on 22 October.

$25,000 Co-contribution from local government as a regional initiative via IMAP (excluding in-kind contributions).

As required by the DELWP grant, grant applicants need to make a 50% co-contribution (excluding in-kind staffing costs). It is proposed that this be funded from existing IMAP funding allocated to the Affordable Housing Planning Mechanisms project, based on a refocusing of that project from use of planning incentives to investigating the capacity of the PRADS model. The $25,000 could be contributed from the $30,000 allocated by IMAP in 2018/19 (part of the total of $110,000 allocated over the years 2018/19 - 2021/22).

$75,000 Interim total funds

This excludes any potential DHHS contribution that has been indicated in-principle could be provided.
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Progress Report
G1.P4 Wayfinding and Signage

PURPOSE
1. To update the IMAP Implementation Committee on the Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee (MVSC) projects.

BACKGROUND
2. Improving wayfinding signage is a focus of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026.

3. Opportunities identified as part of Goal 1 (which supports marketing tourism destinations and ensuring Melbourne’s entertainments precincts are safe and accessible) and Goal 2 – A connected transport network that provides real travel choices – include:
   - Implementing a regional wayfinding signage suite and style guide;
   - Collaborating with State Government to develop a single base-map for wayfinding signs.

PROJECT PROGRESS
4. Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee (MVSC) - member updates
   4.1 Helen Hardwick continues to be employed as the Analyst / Project Manager (IMAP contractor) for the committee. Helen’s work has meant that the project deliverables are being met and in many cases moving quicker than expected.
   4.2 Pete Stevens, Project Manager, Integrated Mapping and Journey Planning, Transport for Victoria (TfV), has joined the committee. Pete and TfV see value in the committee’s work to date, and Pete is keen to collaborate with IMAP on related mapping projects.
   4.3 Wyndham City has left the committee due to Council priorities. Wyndham City is currently rolling out wayfinding signs throughout Werribee Town Centre in the same style as City of Melbourne’s newly designed signage suite (developed by City of Melbourne in collaboration with MVSC members).
   4.4 Nick Vincett, Landscape Architect, has replaced Leigh Abernethy as City of Port Phillip’s representative on the committee. Nick recently coordinated the fabrication and installation on new wayfinding signs along the Port Phillip Bay foreshore. These new signs are consistent with City of Melbourne’s signage suite.
   4.5 Andrew Carcelli, Coordinator Economic Development, has replaced Christina Foscolos as City of Stonnington’s representative.
   4.6 Hayley McNichol, Senior Urban Designer, has replaced Richa Swarup as City of Yarra’s representative. Hayley and Martin Whittle (City of Melbourne, Wayfinding Signage Coordinator) have begun discussions around connecting signage from Richmond (CoY) to the Sports Precinct (CoM).
   4.7 Eng Lim, Transport Coordinator, has replaced Malcolm McDonald as City of Maribyrnong’s representative.
   4.8 Initial discussions have commenced regarding Parks Victoria and Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) joining the committee.

   5.1 City of Melbourne, City of Port Phillip, City of Stonnington have all submitted Way found as a council report. All 3 councils have adopted Way found as an operational manual. City of Yarra has advised the committee, that being an operational manual, it does not need to go to Council for approval.
of Yarra still supports and is engaged with Way found’s future developments. City of Maribyrnong will submit Way found to Council for adoption once final edits are made following the review (Way found 2.0).

5.2 The committee has now completed a review of version 1 of Way found. The review sought feedback on Way found’s contents, coverage, ease of use and perceived value, and on the operation of Way found’s test website. Representatives of seven organisations were involved in the review: four councils (one regional), two government agencies, and one private sector company.

5.3 Review participants supplied feedback via an online survey and through debriefing sessions. The review feedback is currently being collated and a report will be submitted to the MVSC in January 2019. The feedback will inform amendments needed for version 2 of Way found. Amongst other things, the review revealed strong support for common (state-wide) standards for wayfinding signage. The Way found initiative has been welcomed.

5.4 The second version of Way found (2.0) will contain four sections:

- Sections 1 and 2 (Principles, Standards and Guidelines). These sections have been completed and reviewed. The final version (Way found 2.0) will include the latest updates to these sections and is expected to be launched in the second half of 2019.
- Sections 3 and 4 (Signage Manual and System Application) will cover:
  - product details,
  - graphic standards,
  - technical details, and
  - information relating to the signage suite’s operation.

The design and technical details that will be outlined in these two sections have been in development for two years, and are expected to be ready for inclusion in Way found 2.0 by the second half of 2019.

Given the Office of the Victorian Government Architect (OVGA’s) involvement in the Major Transport Infrastructure Program and heavily involvement in the Metro way finding design, the OVGA is well placed to review Way found and the signage designs.

MVSC will be scoping what their review may entail (draft proposal attached – refer Attachment 9a). The completion of Way found 2.0 will assist all Councils in the rollout of a single unified wayfinding system (excluding mapping).

6 Exploring development of a shared basemap.

6.1 In early 2018, TfV established a two-year integrated mapping project. It is being managed by Pete Stevens, Project Manager, Integrated Mapping and Journey Planning. Amongst other things, TfV’s project is responsible for understanding ‘… the potential to integrate mapping across the transport portfolio, infrastructure projects and IMAP Councils.’

6.2 A workshop examining how the TfV-IMAP collaboration could work was held on 29 October. The workshop was facilitated by Dr Marcus Spiller from SGS Economics and Planning and its purpose was:

- To define the mapping problems and opportunities which are of mutual interest to IMAP and TfV
- To test the merits of a joint approach (between IMAP and TfV) to resolving these problems and unlocking the associated benefits, and
- Pending these outcomes, to outline how IMAP and TfV might collaborate in implementing a joint mapping strategy.

A report on the workshop’s outcomes and suggested next steps will soon be available. It will be circulated to MVSC members.

7 Project budgeting to complete these next stages:

7.1 Currently on-track to spend the 2018-19 budget.
7.2 **2019-20 Budget provision requirements:**

- Contingent provision for Analyst/Project Manager fees ($40,000).
- Provision for *Way found 2.0* development including product details, graphic standards, technical details and information relating to the signage suite’s operation ($40,000).

7.3 In light of the integrated mapping developments, there is potential for IMAP to contribute to collaborative work with TfV. IMAP funding might be needed for this exploration of a shared basemap in 2019-20 ($50,000 preliminary estimate).

Project scope, budgeting, deliverables and details are still to be developed, and further details will be submitted to the IMAP Implementation Committee once this scoping has been done.

**RECOMMENDATION**

8. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:

   a. Support the approach outlined in this progress report.
   b. Approve the proposed 2019-20 budget
Wayfinding Signage Project
Proposal for Office of the Victorian Government Architect (OVGA) to review pedestrian signage design

1. PROPOSAL

The Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee (MVSC)* is requesting the Office of the Government Architect (OVGA) to review the design of a pedestrian signage suite developed by City of Melbourne (CoM) in collaboration with MVSC, and to advise on improvements.

Amongst other things, MVSC is seeking OVGA’s advice on the suite’s compliance with accessibility requirements.

* IMAP Councils (Maribyrnong, Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra), Transport for Victoria, Public Transport Victoria and VicRoads.

2. WAYFINDING SIGNAGE PROJECT: THE AMBITION

MVSC’s ambition is to:

- *Make journeys easy:* by improving the consistency and integration of wayfinding signage systems users rely on to travel* through unfamiliar areas or along unfamiliar routes within Melbourne and Victoria.
- *Lower the costs of design, fabrication, installation and maintenance* of wayfinding signage: by pursuing opportunities for developing shared signage designs and technical details, and shared procurement.

*Travel = public transport, walking, cycling

To achieve this ambition, MVSC has been working to develop ... *(see details Attachment C)*

- common standards and guidelines for Victoria’s wayfinding signage systems: pedestrian, cycling and public transport. *(Way found: Wayfinding Signage Standards for Victoria)*
- a pedestrian wayfinding signage suite, design and technical information that could be adopted by local councils *(This proposal is a request for OVGA to review this work)*
- a data-driven base map for use by Victorian state and local authorities for wayfinding purposes. *(Transport for Victoria’s integrated mapping and journey planning project)*

3. MEASURES OF SUCCESS

If MVSC’s ambition were met:

- Confidence in Victoria’s wayfinding signage systems would be high: signage would be identifiable, carry consistent information, located where needed, and well maintained.
- Journeys between modes and across jurisdictions would be easy: the frequency and location of signs would support users’ journeys eg pedestrian signs would ‘flow’ across council boundaries and be integrated with Parks Victoria’s, VicRoads’s and Public Transport Victoria’s signage.
• Visitors’ experience of Melbourne and Victoria would be positive, and local communities and businesses would benefit from more people exploring Melbourne and Victoria.
• Melbourne’s and Victoria’s ‘brand’ as a welcoming destination would be strengthened.
• The costs of designing, fabricating, installing and maintaining wayfinding signs would be lowered.

4. WHAT NEEDS TO BE RESOLVED – SIGNAGE SYSTEM DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

MVSC's first step was to apply Way found’s standards and guidelines to the design of a pedestrian signage ‘suite’. CoM set up a program of user testing to support the design process (see Attachment D) and changes were made based on feedback.

The following issues still need to be resolved in terms of the design of signage systems:

• **Compliance** of the CoM-designed pedestrian signage suite with *principles of good design*, in particular, compliance with accessibility requirements.
  - CoM and MVSC are now requesting that OVGA review the design.
  - OVGA has a state-wide role and the expertise required to review a design that, it is hoped, will become a benchmark across Victoria.
• **Leadership and advocacy**: for statewide adoption of Way found’s signage standards and guidelines, and a common approach to wayfinding signage.
  - The work to develop a common approach is being done by a loose collaboration of the five Inner Melbourne (IMAP) councils and three State Government agencies.
  - This group has neither the mandate nor capacity to roll the work out across Victoria.
  - Leadership by a state agency would give impetus to the group’s work. The State Government has the remit necessary to lead and advocate for adoption of a common approach across Victoria.
• **Identifying the ‘lever’**: making the case for investment in integrated signage.
  - Integrated signage systems have been developed as a response to clear problems eg *Legible London* was designed to address overcrowding on the Underground; as a means of encouraging people to walk rather than take the ‘tube’ (modal shift).
  - Victoria doesn’t have the same ‘lever’ as London. Nevertheless, the large-scale development in Melbourne and regional Victoria, and the unprecedented investment in transport infrastructure, present a unique need and opportunity.
  - Evidence from other cities is that investment in integrated signage systems generates a positive Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) (*SGS report November 2015.*)
  - Preliminary work by the MVSC - following Treasury and Finance’s Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) framework - suggests that investment in an integrated wayfinding signage system for Melbourne and Victoria would generate a positive BCR.
  - A pilot project in key metropolitan and regional areas could test this hypothesis.
• **Funding**: authorities wishing to roll out the signage system may require funding support.
  - State and/or Federal Government funding will be required to roll-out integrated wayfinding signage across Victoria.
  - A range of funding models could be investigated: eg grants, matched funding (50:50), and/or purchasing the system under licence.
- The design would also be available also to private companies. Under licence? Built into the cost of developments??

- **Resourcing the next steps**
  - Regular updates of *Way found: Wayfinding Signage Standards for Victoria* will be required. This issue can be addressed in discussions about a state government lead.
  - The pedestrian signage suite is the first of a number of several: shared path and bike signage also be needed. *(City of Melbourne is working with other authorities to investigate coordinated approach to bike + shared path signage suites + tech details.)*

5. **CHALLENGES FOR THE WAYFINDING SIGNAGE PROJECT – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

- **Delivery of effective wayfinding signage is a city-wide / state-wide issue**
  - particularly at a time of unprecedented city and regional development, and of major transport infrastructure works.

- **Responsibility for Melbourne’s and Victoria’s wayfinding signage ‘system’ is dispersed**
  - no single authority is responsible for this area of public policy and service delivery.

- **Building wayfinding signage systems is currently an unco-ordinated process**
  - each local and state authority does their own thing.

- **MVSC doesn’t have the authority to design, create and fund an integrated system that would assist users**
  - The project is currently being led by City of Melbourne as a collaboration of the five Inner Melbourne (IMAP) Councils and three State Government agencies.
  - Involvement of the eight authorities in the collaborative project is ‘voluntary’; this work is not identified in individual business plans.

- **Our customers are adversely affected by poor (or non-existent) wayfinding signage**
  - International research shows the associated costs and lost opportunities.

- **Consistent, predictable and well-maintained signage is key**
  - international research shows these features are key to users’ confidence in a system, and therefore to exploring unfamiliar areas and travelling along unfamiliar routes.

- **Support for statewide standards**
  - The seven public and private sector organisations reviewing *Way found* all support MVSC’s aim of common standards and a shared, user-tested signage system.
  - Transport for Victoria has expressed interest in the results of the *Way found* review.

**COSTS AND EFFECTIVENESS**

- **Little local research has been done into what users want or value in wayfinding signage.**
  - Some authorities test their systems with users – most / many probably don’t.
  - PTV’s research into visitors’ experience of Victoria’s public transport system contains excellent insights into how people use signage.
  - However, little is known about why, when and how people use wayfinding signage in Melbourne and Victoria. This research is particularly important in the digital age.

- **The cost of each authority developing their own signage system (Business as Usual)**
- The time and money involved in designing, developing and maintaining many different signage systems is likely to be high eg each council has its own system.
- This cost is likely to be even higher if current systems don’t meet users’ needs e.g. costs related to slow journey times, failure to reach destinations, and lost business.

- **Funding for a Melbourne-wide/state-wide, integrated system is likely to be high**
  - some councils might be able to fund the roll-out a ‘shared’ system in their areas over time, but it is likely to be beyond the means of many (or most) councils.

- **A co-ordinated approach to funding wayfinding signage is needed**
  - an evidence-based argument that outlines the current problems and impacts, anticipated benefits, strategic responses, expected costs and benefits, is required.

**RESOURCING WORK ON INTEGRATED SIGNAGE**

- **This area of public interest is no single authority’s responsibility**
  - MVSC members have worked on the project in a semi-voluntary capacity.

- **CoM’s motivation for initiating the project was growing demand for wayfinding signage**
  - Particularly in developing areas like Docklands and areas of the central city disrupted by major transport infrastructure projects.
  - Pedestrian wayfinding signs weren’t all that was needed.

- **CoM resourcing**
  - CoM is better resourced than other councils eg it employs industrial designers.
  - CoM has resourced MVSC’s work (meetings, workshops, the signage design and user testing process). It is the project lead and MVSC Chair.
  - CoM makes every attempt to ensure the project is a true collaboration.
  - Nevertheless, the key role of CoM staff in resourcing the committee’s work means that the project’s work – most particularly the signage design – is perceived as City of Melbourne’s, rather than as a shared output.
  - This level of resourcing is not sustainable. Nor is the perception conducive to continuing collaboration.

- **Other resourcing**
  - IMAP Councils, Wyndham City and PTV funded the development and design of *Way found: Wayfinding Signage Standards for Victoria.*
  - Since February 2018, IMAP has been funding a part-time Analyst / Project Manager to manage the wayfinding signage project.

**ASSET MANAGEMENT**

- **A shared, regularly updated asset ownership and maintenance system is needed**
  - Don’t just add signs: remove too. Too many.
  - Maintenance / updating information.

6. **ATTACHMENTS**

A. Background: origins of the wayfinding signage project
B. Specialist inputs to the wayfinding signage project
C. The wayfinding signage project’s three elements: outputs to date
D. A shared pedestrian wayfinding signage design: the user testing program.
ATTACHMENT A

Background: origin of the wayfinding signage project

In 2010, the City of Melbourne (CoM) undertook wayfinding signage work in response to complaints from businesses in newly-developed areas (Docklands) and from operators of major new developments (the then-new Convention Centre).

As part of its work, in 2011 CoM commissioned Chorus Studio to ‘audit’ signage along 17 journeys typically taken by visitors within the Melbourne municipality. The audit revealed a paradox: too few wayfinding signs at certain points along these journeys, and too many at others.

Insights from the audit included:

- **Too few**: there were few orientation maps or wayfinding signs to aid visitors entering Melbourne through the city’s gateways eg arriving by SkyBus at Southern Cross Station’s coach terminal.
- **Too many**: at some points along the journeys, multiple wayfinding signs had been installed in the same location by separate authorities. The effect was a confusing ‘street clutter’.
- **No consistency of information or maps**: each authority had its own logic for selecting and naming destinations, its own mapping style, and and its own approach to graphic standards (colour palettes, symbols, arrows and maps). None of the systems ‘talked’ to the others.
- **No integration**: signage installation reflected authorities’ (providers’) jurisdictions rather than users’ journeys, eg pedestrian and public transport signs didn’t ‘join up’ along journeys, and pedestrian and bike signs (and networks) stopped at municipal boundaries.
- **Competing interests**: authorities’ branding and promotional interests seemed to be a more important consideration than users’ needs for consistent, integrated signs along journeys.

Users’ journeys can typically involve more than one mode of transport and travel through more than one municipality. CoM understood that improving pedestrian wayfinding signage within its municipality would only be part of the solution: that improving wayfinding signage for users would require collaboration by local councils and the state’s roads and public transport authorities.

In November 2012, CoM established the Melbourne Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee (MVSC). The committee currently comprises representatives of Transport for Victoria (TfV), Public Transport Victoria, VicRoads, the five IMAP Councils and Wyndham City.

(*As the committee’s work evolved it became apparent that the issue was broader than visitors – it was anyone travelling through an unfamiliar area or along an unfamiliar route; and that it was a state-wide issue, not just a Melbourne issue. The committee’s name is likely to be changed to reflect these broader constituencies.*)
ATTACHMENT B

Specialist inputs to the wayfinding signage project

The following specialist inputs have also contributed to the project:

Legible London: a user-focused, integrated wayfinding signage system

6. In April 2015, the five IMAP (Inner Melbourne) Councils and PTV funded a two-week workshop program run in Melbourne by Transport for London (TfL); the designer and operator of the internationally acclaimed Legible London wayfinding signage system.

7. The TfL representative outlined the design, testing and development process for Legible London. He also advised on TfL’s business case development, research and consultation programs.

8. In particular, TfL’s representative emphasised the strategic importance of a data-driven basemap to an integrated wayfinding signage system.

Defining the problem: the current state of wayfinding signage in Victoria

- June 2015: CoM contracted SGS Economics and Planning to run a workshop for the MVSC to define the current state of Melbourne’s wayfinding signage, its problems and impacts.
- Problems with Melbourne’s wayfinding signage were identified as ...
  o Lack of consistency between signs and maps across all areas and modes of travel in terms of design, style and content
  o Lack of regulation, maintenance and avoidance of proliferation of signage and maps across all areas and modes of travel
  o Lack of information and wayfinding context for travel between modes, and
  o Lack of continuous signage for wayfinding; incomplete or disjointed signage.
- Workshop participants also identified a range of potential benefits that might arise from improved wayfinding signage in Melbourne. These included:
  o Safety and health
  o Environment and liveability
  o Brand reputation and tourism
  o Other economic benefits and cost savings
  o Government relations

Quantifying the benefits of an integrated system: international experience

- November 2015: CoM commissioned SGS to review the Benefit Cost Ratios (BCRs) achieved by four international cities that had developed integrated wayfinding signage systems. The four cities achieved positive BCRs from their investments in the systems.
- The benefits of improved wayfinding fell into five broad categories: transport, social and community, economic, environmental and urban design.
- Administrative benefits in the form of efficiencies and cost savings for government (local and state) were also considered to be a likely outcome.
- SGS advised that it is reasonable to assume that a business case evaluation of a program of investment in wayfinding signage for Melbourne would also result in a favourable economic assessment.
ATTACHMENT C

The wayfinding signage project’s three elements: outputs to date

MVSC’s wayfinding signage project has three elements. Outputs to date are ...

i. Common standards and guidelines for wayfinding signage in Victoria

The MVSC’s first task was to draft ‘business rules’ governing the design of and information carried by wayfinding signs. Users would only need to learn one set of ‘rules’ if Victorian authorities applied agreed standards and guidelines to their wayfinding signage systems.

The MVSC worked with a consultant traffic engineer to develop Way found: Wayfinding Signage Standards for Victoria, a set of standards and guidelines to improve the consistency and reliability of information carried by wayfinding signage systems operating in Melbourne and across Victoria.

Way found, a web-based document, is intended as an operational manual to provide guidance for good signing practice for use by any council, agency, organisation or individual responsible for planning, designing or installing wayfinding signage.

Amongst other things, the document outlines eligibility and priorities for what is signed, a hierarchy of destinations, naming conventions, the visual ‘language’, graphic standards and signage placement criteria.

In August 2016, the first draft of Way found was endorsed by the IMAP Implementation Committee (the Mayors and CEOs of the five Inner Melbourne councils).

The first draft is currently being reviewed by seven metropolitan and regional, private and public sector organisations. The reviewers will provide feedback on the proposed standards and guidelines, and on the preliminary signage design concepts and technical details (see #2 below).

The MVSC will use the reviewers’ feedback to finalise Way found’s contents, written expression and layout, and its operation as a web-based document. The feedback will also assist the MVSC finalise Way found’s design and technical sections.

Way found: Wayfinding Signage Standards for Victoria will be launched publicly in 2019.

ii. A shared pedestrian wayfinding signage design

Between 2014 and 2017, CoM led a collaborative design process which applied Way found’s draft standards and guidelines to the design of a new pedestrian wayfinding signage system.

MVSC members and special interest groups worked with CoM’s industrial designers during the design process. The industrial designers produced the design concepts proposed by the MVSC, selected materials for the signage ‘family’, and developed technical drawings for fabrication and installation.

A user-testing program was conducted as part of prototyping and piloting the design concepts (see Attachment A).

In February 2016, the IMAP Implementation Committee resolved to support CoM piloting the pedestrian signage design, after which other IMAP councils would ‘test/validate’ the system.

Following feedback from the user testing, CoM has:

- made changes to the pilot signage system design and updated the technical drawings
- added other elements to the signage ‘family’; in particular, a narrower plinth sign suitable for smaller streets and laneways, and areas of heavy pedestrian traffic
- drafted a licence enabling other councils to adopt the signage designs and technical drawings for a fee of $1.00 (payment on request only).

Maribyrnong, Port Phillip, Yarra, Wyndham councils are reviewing CoM’s updated signage design. Maribyrnong and Wyndham are considering adopting elements of the pedestrian signage ‘family’.

Several other local councils (metropolitan and regional) have expressed interest in adopting the pedestrian signage design once the testing and review process has been completed.

As part of this review process, City of Port Phillip has sought the involvement of the Office of the Victorian Government Architect (OVGA). This approach is enthusiastically supported by the MVSC.

iii. A single basemap for Victoria

International experience (London, New York and Toronto) demonstrates that a single, shared basemap is the most important element in an integrated wayfinding signage system.

9. Legible London’s basemap is the key feature of London’s pedestrian, bicycle, bus, underground and overground wayfinding signage

10. Transport for London applies the basemap to all its wayfinding signage, as do the Greater London boroughs.

As part of its Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026, IMAP Councils have committed to work with the Victorian state government to build a regional basemap for Inner Melbourne.

In early 2018, Transport for Victoria (TfV) established a two-year Integrated Mapping and Journey Planning project. Amongst other things, the recently-appointed Project Manager is responsible for understanding ‘... the potential to integrate mapping across the transport portfolio, infrastructure projects and IMAP Councils.’

IMAP Councils and Public Transport Victoria are currently exploring their relationship with and input into TfV’s integrated mapping project.
ATTACHMENT D

A shared pedestrian wayfinding signage design: the user testing program.

Key steps in the testing process were:

Workshops
- MVSC members participated in workshops focussing on signage design and graphic standards.

Accessibility testing
- Design outputs from the workshops were tested with people with accessibility needs: dementia, vision, language and mobility. The designs were also tested with State and local government staff responsible for ensuring accessible customer information and wayfinding signage.
- Changes were made to the design outputs following this testing eg colour contrasts were strengthened, information was lowered and font sizes increased.

Prototyping
- CoM, City of Port Phillip and Wyndham City each tested a prototype of a plinth (sign) design with visitors and commuters (n=455) at Station Pier, Werribee Station and in the CBD. Over 80 per cent of respondents said they would use the signs if they were installed.
- Some further changes were made to the design based on feedback from this testing.

Pilot
- CoM piloted the proposed signage system (plinth signs, blade signs and wall maps) in two areas within Melbourne municipality: areas where journeys typically involve travel between public transport and pedestrian networks.
- User testing was conducted as part of the pilot ...
  o A random sample of people travelling through Southern Cross Station (n = 54) were asked to compare two signage designs and state which worked better for them in terms of visibility, legibility, and helping them find their way to a designated destination. Results: 75 per cent of respondents rated one of the designs as better on those dimensions.
  o Intercept surveys were conducted with a random sample of visitors in the two pilot areas (n=180). Results: compared with the pre-installation test, a significantly higher number of respondents reported being confident about finding their way to designated destinations.
  o Accompanied journeys were conducted in each of the two pilot areas with five people with accessibility requirements. Results: prior to installing the signs, one of the 10 people was able to find their way to a designated destination. After the signs had been installed, 10 out of the 10 successfully navigated their way to the designated destinations.
  o Prior to and after the installation of the pilot signs, interviews were conducted with business and community services stakeholders (n=8) from the two areas. Following installation of the signs, stakeholders in one area noted a decrease in requests for directions by visitors.
  o As part of the intercept surveys, people were asked their preferences for digital vs static wayfinding information. International and first-time visitors were more likely than local visitors to rely on both digital and static information. (See research by T-Kartor, an internationally renowned mapping company: https://citywayfinding.com/how-does-legible-london-hold-up-in-the-digital-future/)
- Per unit costings of each sign type (materials, fabrication and installation) were also undertaken by CoM. It is also intended that CO2 emissions will be measured.
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Progress Report

G4.P1 Urban Forest and Biodiversity Strategy & Approach:
Update on the IMAP Urban Forest Plan

BACKGROUND

1. At the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting of 25 May 2018, the Committee considered the Urban Forest Draft Project Brief and resolved to:
   a. support the scope of the Urban Forest Plan, and
   b. approve the development of a project brief and appointment of a suitable consultant team to deliver the project to the timelines and budget outlined in this submission.

2. Strategy 4.2 of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 notes the opportunity for the IMAP Councils to collaborate “to implement urban forest strategies to increase the shading by tree canopy cover and associated green infrastructure.”

3. As noted in the approved project brief, the deliverables of the project will focus on three main components –
   a. Education - directed at council planners, the development sector and the community
   b. Data assessment – baseline data and measuring to track progress achieving the urban forest
   c. Planning policy mechanisms – policies and incentives/deterrents addressing losses of trees on private property

The deliverables of the Urban Forest Plan would be tailored and presented so that each IMAP Council could act on the mechanisms that best suit their needs.

DISCUSSION

4. The Working Group membership has been finalised and a first meeting held on September 7 2018 to finalise the project brief.

5. It became apparent through discussions that there was a strong synergy between the ambitions of the planning policy mechanisms component of the IMAP project (protecting trees on private land) and current work being undertaken by the City of Melbourne looking at similar planning policy options. The Project Team Leader has since followed up with further discussions with staff at the City of Melbourne to ascertain the potential expansion of the Melbourne CC brief to include IMAP.

6. Planning staff at the five IMAP councils have been canvassed and are all supportive of participating in the potential expansion of the work being undertaken by City of Melbourne. This would address part of the IMAP Urban Forest brief and ensures the Councils do not duplicate effort in this area.

7. Gail Hall, Coordinator Green Infrastructure from the City of Melbourne will attend the IMAP Implementation Committee to brief the IMAP Councils on the City of Melbourne’s work in this area and seek the Committee’s support for exploring a joint approach around this policy development.

8. Other components of the IMAP Urban Forest Project would proceed as approved by the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

9. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:
   a. Note the progress report on the IMAP Urban Forest Plan
   b. Support a joint approach towards development of planning policies for the management of trees and greening on private land.

Project Team: Matt Slavin and Olivia Savona (CoMar) David Callow and Robyn Hellman (COM), Susan Price and Simon Holloway (CoS), Renae Walton and Stevie Meyer (CoPP), David Walmsley and Peter Mollison (CoY).

Report prepared by: Matt Slavin, Team Leader and IMAP Executive Officer
1. **REASON FOR REPORT**
   - This report considers the role of the IMAP Tourism Working Group (TWG).

2. **BACKGROUND**
   - The IMAP Implementation Committee meeting on 31 August considered the IMAP Tourism: Three-year Strategic Plan and 2018-19 Action Plan.
   - The Committee resolved to:
     - note the work of the IMAP Tourism Working Group
     - note the IMAP Tourism: Three-year Strategic Plan and 2018-19 Action Plan and refer to the Executive Forum to approve more detail on this Plan.
   - $119,000 has been allocated by IMAP to TWG initiatives in 2018-19 made up as follows:
     - provision for $50K pa for the IMAP map publication and distribution (in conjunction with Destination Melbourne – this has now been discontinued); and
     - provision of $20K pa for IMAP tourism projects
     - the 2018-19 budget also includes a carry forward of $49,431.
   - As at 12 November 2018, $1,037 has been spent on the inner Melbourne map updates (digital/cruise guide/licenses) and $15,125 on the Cultural Guide publication with Cultural Tourism Victoria, leaving a balance of $103,270.
   - Subsequently, Port Phillip coordinated a meeting of the TWG. The TWG noted that, since development of the Three-year Strategic Plan 2013 – 2016 each Council has developed their own tourism strategies and digital content and a joint 2018/19 Three Year Strategic Plan duplicating some of these activities was not necessary.

4. **DISCUSSION – ISSUES & OPTIONS**
   - On 18 September, the TWG:
     - Considered an initiative involving the sharing of digital content (particularly video content) but agreed that it would be of limited benefit because of cost and the diverse range of issues across the five Councils.
     - agreed there was value in continuing with the IMAP Map for the next two years or so until “Wayfound” mapping component is in place
     - recognised commercial vacancies in activity centres as a common issue across all five Councils, which significantly impacts on tourism and visitor perceptions. See table 1.
agreed that, one option, is to redirect IMAP TWG funding to work with business and other stakeholders to develop both tourism and economic strategies to address or minimise the impact of shop vacancies. Once completed, further ongoing projects of a similar nature could be considered by the Committee on their merits.

Table 1. Examples of selected current vacancy rates in key precincts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>Vacancy rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yarra</td>
<td>Bridge Rd</td>
<td>66 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonnington</td>
<td>Chapel St</td>
<td>81 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Phillip</td>
<td>Fitzroy St</td>
<td>22 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. ORGANISATIONAL IMPACT
- Impact on IMAP is subject to IMAP consideration of options listed below.

6. OPTIONS

6.1 That the role and function of the IMAP Tourism Working Group remains unchanged

6.2 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.

6.3 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.

7. RECOMMENDATION
That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve:

a. that the IMAP Tourism Working Group be wound up (Option 6.3 above); and

b. that ongoing cooperation/funding continues between the IMAP Councils to ensure updates of the Inner Melbourne map are undertaken
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Briefing Paper

G2.P1 Business Case: Inner Melbourne Cycling Network

Purpose

1. To propose that the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) Implementation Committee agrees to commission transport modelling work to support cycling in inner Melbourne, as an important step in the development of a wider Metropolitan Cycling Network.

Background

2. One priority in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 is the proposal for an Inner Melbourne Cycling Network, led by the City of Melbourne.
3. The City of Melbourne commissioned the development of a bicycle network modelling tool to analyse rider behaviour in the municipality and the impact of infrastructure on rider behaviours. This analysis identified and ranked priority links within the municipal network for both future investment and research (Appendix 3)
4. Resilient Melbourne has committed to developing a metropolitan wide cycling network. To deliver on this Resilient Melbourne, with representatives from 28 of the 32 metropolitan councils (including all IMAP councils) and Jacobs (a 100 Resilient Cities Platform Partner), developed an Action Plan for the implementation of the Metropolitan Cycling Network.
5. A key action from this was the creation of a network map that unites existing cycling routes from the metropolitan region. These include the Strategic Cycling Corridors, the Principal Bicycle Network, as well as routes and trails developed and maintained by local government.

Discussion

6. It was agreed with the IMAP Transport Managers Forum that IMAP should, in their own councils’ interests, support this broader work with Resilient Melbourne and that this proposal should come to Committee for agreement.
7. The proposal is that existing City of Melbourne modelling work be scaled up to the inner Melbourne region. Having a clear guidance for the placement of recommended network links and upgrades will provide a strong evidence case to advance collective active transport and cycling efforts. It was agreed that this approach provides a greater opportunity and is the logical next step to advance support for cycling in Inner Melbourne than a business case, as previously suggested.
8. Alignment to IMAP 2016-2026 is provided in Appendix 1, along with an indicative project staging process in Appendix 2.
9. This project could be applied at individual council levels, as well as for the inner Melbourne region.

Benefit to IMAP Councils

10. The IMAP councils would see a number of benefits individual and collectively, including:
   a. An accessibility analysis report of the proposed routes with relation to education, jobs and entertainment within the IMAP region.
   b. Identification of forecast ridership increase based on initial market survey and correlation between social accessibility indicators and the proposed network links.
11. The above will be completed for the IMAP councils. It will provide an important platform that will support Resilient Melbourne in attracting funding to complete additional mapping for the wider metropolitan network map, which will in turn have further benefits for IMAP councils.

RECOMMENDATION

12. That the Implementation Committee supports the proposal to develop a bicycle network map that immediately benefits IMAP councils, as well as having broader application beyond the inner Melbourne region that will in turn support the creation of a Metropolitan Cycling Network.
### Name and purpose of the project/action

**Name:** Inner Melbourne Cycling Network  
**Purpose:** Build and provide a metropolitan wide cycling model to map existing infrastructure, analyse gaps and prioritise future network planning:
- Collect existing cycling infrastructure (bike lanes, protected bike lanes and off road) and GIS data from across the 32 metropolitan councils, commencing with the Inner Melbourne Councils.  
- Include State Government priorities including the Strategic Cycling Corridors, Metropolitan Trails Network, Principal Bicycle Network.  
- Source and map the detailed user modelling (as per City of Melbourne work) across inner Melbourne.  
- Identify and rank key gaps in the network according to current bicycle usage.  
- Identify and evaluate the value uplift of key gaps in the IMAP area including the potential increase in bicycle use and their correlated benefits to key social and economic indicators.

### Alignment with IMAP Goals and Strategies;

This was listed as an action with the goal of making Inner Melbourne an “internationally renowned cycling and walking region that is well connected by a network of convenient, comfortable, safe and direct walking and bike riding routes” within 10 years.

The specific goals and strategies that this action meets are:
- **Goal 2:** A connected transport network that provides real travel choices.
- **Strategy 2.3:** We will make Inner Melbourne a ‘cycling friendly’ region by creating a continuous network of on and off road cycling routes. Opportunities include:
  - Developing evidence based guidance for the design and implementation of the complete central sub-region cycling network;
  - Improving connectivity and quality of cycling and walking networks in the inner west, inner south and inner southeast.

### IMAP Three Year Implementation Program:

The current Program lists the following priority project commencing 2017-18 with a budget of $100,000:

**G2.P1 – Business Case: Inner Melbourne Cycling Network**
- Prepare a network map for an integrated IMAP connected cycling network, highlighting existing routes, modelled rider flow and prioritised missing links.
- Prepare evidence based guidance for IMAP councils to advocate for improved cycling infrastructure both municipally and regionally.
- Overlay the prioritised routes with existing and forecasted improvements in social and economic indicators for the inner Melbourne region.

**Investment logic analysis (e.g. what are the problems, benefits, potential strategic responses and solutions)**

- This provides the first single resource for the inner Melbourne Councils which encompasses existing routes within individual councils and the wider region.
- To build on the City of Melbourne’s work it is regionally and economically more viable that this be completed as part of Resilient Melbourne’s metropolitan cycling network.
- This will provide a per council more resource effective tool to recognise and prioritise future transport both for IMAP councils, the inner Melbourne region and across metropolitan Melbourne.
- Additionally, this will provide the IMAP councils a more solid baseline to seek State Government funding as it relates to active transport infrastructure both within inner Melbourne and within the metropolitan region.

**Project scope and timeframe:**

- Initial inquiries indicate that this project would be completed within 3-6 months.

**Project cost and funding sources:**

Total Metro-wide Project Cost Estimate range: $200,000 - $450,000

The intention of a metropolitan wide initiative is that individual investments are collaborated and congregated with those additional and related investments across the region.

Resilient Melbourne has been working across the metropolitan region to review and propose funding sources for this network map, these include:

**Indicative potential funding sources:**

- Metro Partnerships (6) - $50K State Government funding each (Total $300,000) – Positive response from Office for Suburban Development received. Distribution of funds cannot be made until next round of partnerships in 2019.
- IMAP Councils - $100,000 IMAP project funds (already allocated for a Bicycle Network project)
- State Government partners – Funding TBA
- Regional transport collectives (i.e. Eastern Transport Coalition)

As this is a project budget which exceeds the lead council’s procurement threshold, the contract will go to tender.

**Lead Council and project team**

City Of Melbourne, Resilient Melbourne.

- Toby Kent, Resilient Melbourne
### Assessment against IMAP project criteria:

#### Alignment with the IMAP vision -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Will the project/action demonstrably enhance the liveability of Inner Melbourne by delivering defined outcomes which contribute to achievement of the goal and aims of the plan? | This builds on existing work from the City of Melbourne, to create a cycling network and meets Goal 2 of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 by:  
- Improving connectivity and quality of cycling and walking networks by identifying priority routes for Inner Melbourne residents.  
- The modelled routes would provide guidance to highlight local social and economic benefits for increased cycling infrastructure in the Inner Melbourne region.  
- Additional to the goal, this will directly relate IMAP’s connectivity to the metropolitan region as a whole, granting it further importance to relevant state government actors. |
| Does the project/action align with potential programs and/or funding opportunities within the state or federal government, or elsewhere? | As well as the Metropolitan Cycling Network, this action aligns with a number of external strategies with potential funding, including:  
- **Infrastructure Victoria 30 year Strategy**  
  - Action 4.1 Increase walking and cycling for transport  
- **Plan Melbourne**  
  - Action 42: Strategic Cycling Corridors  
  - Action 44: Local networks of cycling routes  
- **Victorian Cycling Strategy 2018-28**  
  - Goal 1: Invest in a safer, lower-stress, better connected network. |

### Regional benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Benefits for IMAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Will the project/action’s benefits accrue to a broader region (i.e. more than just one local authority)? | Critical collateral to support making the case for cycling infrastructure within Inner Melbourne.  
Has the benefit of providing immediate solutions beyond a relatively simplistic lobbying position that a cost benefit study might be used for.  
It could nonetheless be used to support a more comprehensive business case for the development of cycling infrastructure within the region, in line with state government objectives and the wider metropolitan region. |

As described in appendix 2 stages 2, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 are undertaken exclusively for those IMAP councils. These are:  
- IMAP will be the first to benefit from the implementation of the Metropolitan Cycling Network.  
- An accessibility analysis of proposed routes with relation to education, jobs and entertainment within the IMAP region.  
- Identification of potential increase of ridership based on initial market survey and correlation between social accessibility indicators and the proposed network.
- Is there sufficient agreement amongst the IMAP members to undertake the project/action?

- It has been agreed by both the lead council and the IMAP Transport Managers Forum that proceeding as outlined will deliver significant benefits to IMAP councils.

**Shared resources**

- Are there opportunities for resource sharing and/or economies of scale?

Apart from IMAP, the following organisations share the objective of developing cycling infrastructure and present an opportunity of shared resources and scaling, these include:

  - Metropolitan Partnerships – Transport connectivity, active transport and open space were recognised as priorities across all partnerships.
  - Transport for Victoria – Which prioritises both *Putting people first* and *supporting one system* through the Movement and Place Framework.
  - VicRoads – Cycling identified as critical to the six transport objectives identified in the *Transport Integration Act 2010*.

**Focus on results**

- Does the project/action present opportunities to find new or better ways to address issues/challenges facing Inner Melbourne?

- An Inner Melbourne Cycling Network map will:
  - Allow IMAP councils to determine how and where to invest to achieve their cycling and active transport priorities and increase ridership across the region.
  - As well as the above, this will better equip IMAP councils to invest on priorities which expand into the metropolitan region.
  - More broadly linking this to a Metropolitan Cycling Network will best mitigate the challenges of population growth and traffic congestion.
  - When implemented there is the potential to address other issues such as rates of chronic illness through increased physical activity through transport.
  - This provides a more robust advocacy platform, based on the broader economic viability of the region as it relates and can be improved by active transport infrastructure.

- Can the expected results of the project/action be clearly defined?

- As a similar method has been completed by the city of Melbourne, there is an existing concept to review and expand on.
  - Appendix 2 gives an indicative stage by stage process for this project.
  - Appendix 3 of this document provides a summary of the proposed work to be scaled for the inner Melbourne and metropolitan region.

**Timeliness**

- Can the desired result be achieved within a 5-10-year period?

- The creation of the IMAP and metropolitan wide network map is estimated to take between 3-6 months.
  - Moreover, the prioritised links will best position the IMAP councils to deliver on their priorities in optimal timeframes both as individual councils and regionally.

**Effectiveness**
- Do the expected outcomes warrant the expected investment of time and resources?
- As described in “Regional Benefit”, the existing funding will meet as well as provide additional benefits to the inner Melbourne councils, their ability to advocate for increased active transport infrastructure and ultimately the benefits to their communities.

**Value add**

- Does the project/action overlap, duplicate or enhance other strategies being undertaken elsewhere?
  - This builds on existing work from the City of Melbourne as well as overarching State Government strategic objectives to deliver additional benefits to the inner Melbourne region, these include:
    - City of Melbourne work
    - The Metropolitan Cycling Network
    - Victorian Cycling Strategy

**Sponsor organisations and potential partners;**

- It has been agreed that this work be led by the City of Melbourne and Resilient Melbourne with input from relevant parties as necessary, including:
  - Melbourne Water
  - Parks Victoria
  - Public Transport Victoria
  - Transport Accident Commission
  - Transport for Victoria

**Recommendation.**

- That the IMAP Implementation Committee supports the prescribed approach for the Inner Melbourne Cycling Network.
### Appendix 2 – Indicative staging of a metropolitan wide network map ("Stages exclusive to IMAP councils")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Kick off meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Inception meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Identification of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Method workshop/presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Network Preparation IMAP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Collection of data existing and proposed Network IMAP Councils*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Collection Open street map*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Existing Network preparation (paint/protected/off road)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Proposed Network Preparation (paint/protected/off road)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Network Preparation Non IMAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Collection of data existing and proposed Network Non IMAP 27 Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Collection Open street map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Existing Network preparation (paint/protected/off road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Proposed Network Preparation (paint/protected/off road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>OD Matrix ABS 2016 (assignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Routes analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Identification of Gaps (current gaps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Accessibility analysis, Education, Jobs, entertainment (SGS small area model zones) 2018 &amp; 2028 (bicycle and PT)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Correlation accessibility analysis (JTW/access to Job)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Identification of potential increase in ridership based on market survey and/or correlation (whichever works better)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 5</th>
<th>Accessibility report (for IMAP municipalities)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Results workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>IMAP Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Individual Municipalities infographic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – Summary of City of Melbourne Bicycle Network Modelling

City of Melbourne commissioned SGS to analyse commuter rider behaviour in inner Melbourne and the impact that improved infrastructure has had on rider flows. SGS completed detailed spatial analysis to compare actual rider routes (record on the Bicycle Victoria’s Rider Log app) with the shortest route possible using network analysis. From this SGS developed a Switch Route Model (SRM) that emulated rider’s behaviour and estimated commuter flows across the network. The model incorporates actual rider preferences and hence highlights the impact of improved infrastructure/links.

A number of key findings can be drawn from the study:

- **Cyclists do take longer routes to access improved infrastructure.** In fact, 65 per cent of riders choose a route 15 per cent longer than the shortest route possible to access improved bicycle infrastructure.

- **Recent bicycle infrastructure has significantly changed rider patterns.** Analysis of actual Rider Log data has shown that riders quickly shift their routes to leverage improved infrastructure. This can often impact route choice well before the actual piece of infrastructure and effectively create preferred rider corridors, similar to how major arterial roads and freeways focus traffic.

- **Data can be used to model commuter rider behaviour and inform investment decisions.** ABS Census Journey to Work data can be combined with rider behaviours to model commuter rider flows. This can be used to provide and evidence base to prioritisation of network gaps. It can also be used to model the impact of improvements (or removal) on key links in the network.

The study identified and ranked 14 priority gaps in the network based on the analysis (see below). These should be the focus of future research and potential investment.

The cutting edge study represents the first time rider behaviour has been modelled to this level of detail in the Melbourne context. It provides a platform to prioritise future investments and to model the impact of them. It could also model the impact of competing infrastructure conflicts such as; distribution on Swanston Street during the development of the Melbourne Metro.
1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide the annual update to IMAP’s rolling Three Year Implementation Program. The Implementation Program sets out how the Committee will achieve the Goals and Strategies in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 through undertaking a range of cross-Council projects/actions.

The Implementation Program identifies the timing for spending on the Projects, and the proposed funding contributions sought from the partner Councils in 2019 – 20 for approval.

The detailed financial modelling is attached- refer Attachment 13a. It sets out current and proposed projects, and indicative funding over the next 3 years for the 25 projects short listed in November 2016.

This funding model is based on a reduced funding level compared to the current year, as a result of proposed project changes and timing.

IMAP funds are held in a trust fund by the City of Stonnington and are not lost at the end of each financial year. As a result, when projects are not completed within the year the funding is modelled/allocated, it is carried forward and accumulates, tagged to that project, until completion. This can result in a significant carry forward across multiple projects.

The projects are managed/undertaken by cross-Council project teams and compete for staff time to get resolution. The actual staff resourcing for many projects is generally minimal and can cause an additional load for staff already fully engaged with their own Council tasks. The IMAP Executive Officer helps manage this balance to get projects resourced and completed.

2. BACKGROUND

The Goals and Strategies in the new Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 identify regional priorities as follows:

Goal 1 - A globally significant, strong and diverse economy;
Goal 2 - A connected transport network that provides real travel choices;
Goal 3 - Diverse, vibrant, healthy and inclusive communities;
Goal 4 - Distinctive, high quality neighbourhoods and places;
Goal 5 - Leadership in achieving environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation.

The current program of work and funding focuses on projects across these 5 priority areas. Funding provision is also made for IMAP administration costs and staff costs.

The IMAP Executive Officer is the only IMAP full time employee. The staff costs and overheads are reported separately through the City of Stonnington accounts and are not included in IMAP’s project modelling and reporting.

This report updates the Committee on the status of the current IMAP projects and the overall funding position. It also identifies IMAP Councils’ in-kind staff resourcing involved on the IMAP projects - refer Attachment 13b.

There are a number of new and ongoing projects in various stages of development. The Committee has reviewed Briefs for some projects while others are still under discussion. Some assumptions have been made in the attached modelling regarding those Briefs still under discussion.
The following chart summarises the current status of the 25 projects two years into the 4 year planning period originally approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Not started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Economy</td>
<td>G1P1 CLUE – Information requirements review</td>
<td>G1P1 CLUE technology upgrade</td>
<td>G1P3 Managing Licensed Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G1P5 IMAP Tourism (refer November report)</td>
<td>G1P2 Smart City Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>G1P4 Wayfinding and Signage (Also listed under Economy)</td>
<td>G2P1 Business Case Cycling network (refer November report for Brief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P2 Planning for Future vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P3 Travel Mode research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P4 Public Transport Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P5 Promote Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P6 Infrastructure Victoria priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G2P7 IMAP and PTV partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Communities</td>
<td>G3P4 Consistent Approach in Response to Homelessness – StreetCount 2018</td>
<td>G3P1 Recreation Planning Project</td>
<td>G3P2 Affordable Housing Controls (see November report for proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G3P2 Affordable Housing Controls – CLT project ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G4P3 IMAP 3D Modelling Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sustainable Environment</td>
<td>G5P5 Implement ESD and Green Demo Projects – ESD Factsheets</td>
<td></td>
<td>G5P1 Waste Cycle Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5P2 Water Cycle Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5P3 IMAP Water Use targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G5P4 IMAP Greenhouse Gas Emissions Targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

The Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-26, approved in June 2016, contains 5 Goals and 27 Strategies and identifies a number of opportunities for IMAP to explore. Unlike the previous plan, the new plan does not specify Actions, thus allowing projects to be determined over time which are relevant to current issues.

IMAP is a unique partnership between the inner city Councils, with five Section 86 Special Committees meeting as one, bound by identical Council Delegations and Terms of Reference; and with formal MoUs in place for Procurement protocols and joint Intellectual Property matters. Its primary function is to oversee the implementation of the Plan by undertaking Actions through cross council teams and associated partners.

The IMAP area represents the high growth, high density areas of the city and includes the greatest concentration of commercial buildings in the metropolitan area. The Committee included the City of Maribyrnong as a full Member in July 2013 due to its potential for development, increased growth and high density on the western boundary of the IMAP area.

IMAP’s Terms of Reference requires the preparation of a rolling Three Year Implementation Program, which is the basis for the annual budget. The attached draft Implementation Program builds on last year’s model - with some further refinement around timing and funding of projects based on work achieved by project teams during the year. Some of the proposed projects have indicative budgets which, once approved in principle, will be further refined.
The five Councils contribute the same amounts annually to the IMAP project budget. The funds are able to be held in the account until the projects draw down the expenditure. There is generally a lag before expenditure is incurred, hence inevitably there are carry forwards. The financial accounting arrangements enable all unexpended funds to be carried forward until the project commences.

5. THREE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Draft Three Year Implementation Program for the period 2019-20 through until 2021-22 has been prepared on the basis that:

**Projects**
- Revenue: Current project funding levels are reduced in 2019-20 and subsequent years as a result of (proposed) changes to IMAP’s tourism activity (Reduced from $55k pa per Council to $40k pa per Council)
- Current approved projects will continue to proceed through to completion
- Any new funding requirements can be absorbed into the current funding envelope through adjustment in timing of other projects.

**Operational costs**
- Some increase in operational costs is required to cover City of Stonnington on-costs and overheads and ensure equal contributions towards the cost of the Executive Officer’s position.

The status of the current 2018-19 and new 2019-20 IMAP projects are summarised below. Where it is proposed that expenditure and timing varies from that put forward in the model last year, these changes are highlighted in orange to assist the Committee.

Revenue:
Total project revenue proposed to reduce from $275k to $200k

Expenditure:

**IMAP ADMINISTRATION**
- General administration $35,000 in 2018-19. Reducing to $25,000 from 2019-20. This includes:
  - $11,000 pa General expenses
  - $4,000 pa IMAP website support (imap.vic.gov.au)
  - $4,000 pa Other websites, domains, licences (GrowingGreenGuide.org; 2x dot Melbourne domains, Basecamp license fees; Way found website)
  - $10,000 provision for administrative support (2018-19 only)
  - $6,000 pa Annual Report (2 versions & printing costs of both)
- Upgrade IMAP website $45,000 (2018-19 only)
- IMAP plan printing and design $4,500 (2018-19 only)
- Total operational expenditure (staff costs) proposed to increase to cover overheads.

**ECONOMY GOAL**

G1.P1 Implementation of Census of Land use and Employment (CLUE)
Upgrade CLUE technology to the Cloud

| Lead Council | IMAP Project Budget | City of Melbourne | Nil. IMAP and Council contributions were paid during 2017-18 and 2018-19. |

G1.P2 Smart City Solutions
Project still to be determined. Inner Melbourne Action Plan identified the need to adopt new technologies across the 5 councils and to draw on CoM knowledge where possible. Current investigations on safety in crowded places, open data, disruption communications etc. may have need of these funds this financial year. This will be advised later this year once these groups have met.

**IMAP Project Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project to be determined - subject to future Committee approval.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Crowded Places Strategy Working Group**

**Lead Council**

City of Yarra

**IMAP Project Budget**

$ Nil – staff time currently. Some funding maybe required to address recommendations (from funding identified above).

**Status**

Established in response to the PMs Strategy paper. Reported to IMAP in February 2018. Following staff changes, the November Executive Forum supported the working group reconvening to address recommendations – funding requirements subject to future Committee approval.

**G1.P3 Managing Licensed Premises and Entertainment Precincts**

**Lead Council**

TBA

**IMAP Project Budget**

Current - $ Nil

**Status**

Provision is made for biennial joint forums (liquor licensing) in 2019-20 and 2021-22.

**G1.P4 Wayfinding and Signage – Master Style Guide and mapping**

**Lead Council**

City of Melbourne

**IMAP Project Budget**

Current balance of $123,400 in 2018-19 (Phase 2) for:

- Communications/Production/Design Wayfound
- Gap Analysis Submission preparation
- Basemap Workshop/Analyst

2019-20 budget request of $80,000 to continue this work

- Project Manager - $40,000 (1.5d - 2d per week) to complete Way found 2.0; manage map development with State Government and/or effect development of standardised map guidelines for the IMAP councils
- Development of detailed sign design specifications estimated at $40,000
- Mapping work – funding TBA - subject to future Committee approval.

**Status**

Way found 1.0 signage standards parts 1 and 2 completed, website established, testing undertaken, sections of Way found to be updated as a result. Infrastructure design work advanced, user testing completed, design details to be compiled and included in parts 3 and 4 of Way found. Map discussions with TfV commenced, workshop completed. Map specifications to be prepared. Refer to November report.

**G1.P5 IMAP Tourism**

**Inner Melbourne map and regional tourism programme**

**Lead Council**

City of Port Phillip (Rotates)

**IMAP Project Budget**

$70,000 per year plus any Carry Forward funds (includes $50,000 for the map production and $20,000 for projects) Propose to reduce this to $5,000 pa for map updates only.

**Status:**

Map Printing and Distribution agreement wound up by Committee at August meeting. Funding no longer required except for map maintenance. Project funding not required current and future years. Refer to November report and recommendation that Project team be wound up. Reduces funding requirements.
TRANSPORT GOAL

G2.P1 Business Case: Inner Melbourne Cycling Network
Lead Council: City of Melbourne
IMAP Project Budget: $100,000 accumulated in 2018-19
Status: Refer to November report and proposed Project Brief to commence project - to establish infrastructure map base and cycling priority routes in conjunction with Resilient Melbourne

G2.P2 Planning for Future Vehicles
Status: No Action required. $30,000 provision over 2 years commencing in 2019-20

G2.P3 Travel Mode research
Status: No Action required. $30,000 provision over 2 years commencing in 2020-21

G2.P4 Public Transport Standards
Status: No Action required. $20,000 provision in 2020-21

G2.P5 Promote Walking
Lead Council: City of Yarra (Provisionally)
IMAP Project Budget: $45,000 over 2 years commencing 2019-20 (Brought forward)
Status: IMAP Transport Managers meeting in November recommended a greater priority be given to this project. Promotion supports healthy communities, reduction of short vehicle trips and support for local activity centres - "visit your local store". Brief to be developed for consideration by the Committee.

G2.P6 Infrastructure Victoria Priorities
Lead Council: None
IMAP Project Budget: $20,000 over 2 years from 2018-19
Status: Not started. For consideration after State Government election.

COMMUNITIES GOAL

G3.P1 IMAP Regional Active Sport & Recreation Facilities Planning Study
Lead Council: City of Melbourne
IMAP Project Budget:
1. Planning Study: Balance of $22,000 after consultant costs transferred to CoM in 2017-18. (A further $10,000 has been used to update data)
2. Implementation Study: Funding of $50,000 provided to implement consultant report once available.
Status: SGS appointed as consultants to provide future planning requirements. Required some data updates and reconfiguration for analysis which was completed in November. Draft final report due February 2019. The new plan makes provision for the next phase of this work, following completion of this project.

G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets
Part 2 of the Community Land Trust project
Lead Council: City of Port Phillip
IMAP Project Budget: Nil – contributions have been paid
Status: Stage 2 is investigating the development of financial packages to support CLTs. Project commenced November 2014. Final report due December 2018.

Affordable Housing Controls and Targets
Lead Council: City of Port Phillip
IMAP Project Budget: $110,000 provided over 4 years commencing 2018-19
**Report Prepared By: IMAP Executive Officer**

**Status**

The new plan makes provision for the continuation of advocacy work in the area of affordable housing.

Refer November report requesting approval for 2018-19 funding ($25k) to co-fund State Government funding application entitled “Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism”

G3.P3 IMAP Communities Infrastructure Plan 2026

Status

No Action required. $55,000 provision over 3 years commencing in 2019-20. To be referred to the next Communities Steering Group for consideration – funding requirements subject to future Committee approval.

G3.P4 Consistent Approach in the Response to Homelessness

Lead Council: City of Melbourne

IMAP Project Budget: $50,000 in 2019-20 and 2021-22

Status: Committee recommended biennial street count funding provision at the August 2019 meeting.

Provision made on same basis as 2017-18.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD AND PLACES GOAL**

G4.P1 Urban Forest and Biodiversity Strategy & Approach

Lead Council: Maribyrnong City Council

IMAP Project Budget: $110,000 over 4 years commencing 2018-19.

Status: Project Brief approved by Committee in February 2018. Refer further project update in November report to coordinate project planning policy development with City of Melbourne.

G4.P2 Green Street Best Practice Guide

Lead Council: TBA

IMAP Project Budget: $40,000 provision over 4 years commencing in 2018-19

Status: Requires further consideration by the IMAP Neighbourhoods and Places Steering Group

G4.P3 IMAP 3D Modelling project

Lead Council: TBA

IMAP Project Budget: $40,000 provision over 2 years commencing in 2019-20

Status: Preliminary consideration by the IMAP Neighbourhoods and Places Steering Group in November. Initial research into council systems undertaken

G4.P4 Increasing Employment Opportunities

IMAP Project Budget: $50,000 over 4 years commencing 2018-19

Status: Urban Manufacturing project completed.

IMAP Councils Strategic Planning Managers briefed on Commercial 3 zone on 1 November.

Inner Melbourne Metro Partnership exploring additional research with University of Melbourne.

Ongoing funding provisions not likely to be utilised – $50,000 removed from funding program.

**SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT GOAL**

G5.P1 Whole of Waste Cycle Planning

Lead Council: None

IMAP Project Budget: $50,000 commencing in 2018-19

Status: Considered by Steering Group. Await review by IMAP Environmental managers. Not started due to significant recent changes in this area.

G5.P2 Whole of Water Cycle Planning
5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Approval of these projects annually as part of a rolling 3 Year Implementation Plan is delegated to the Inner Melbourne Action Plan Implementation Committee by the IMAP partner Councils. The Terms of Reference requirement for the IMAP Implementation Committee is to:

- “Make recommendations to the member Councils of budget allocations required to effect the implementation of specific IMAP actions, to enable consideration in each Council’s annual budgeting process.
- Each member Council’s budget is expected to reflect necessary resources to deliver on commitments agreed in the Plan.
- The budget of each member Council would be specific to meeting the IMAP actions relevant to that respective municipality.
- The recommended budget allocation is to be based on the perceived benefits and/or capacity of each member Council.”

6. FINANCIAL AND RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

The IMAP Implementation Committee is to assess funding requests for all existing and new projects for the next 3 years.

The project funding for the implementation program of identified IMAP projects is derived from:

- Accumulated funds in the IMAP account
- The annual IMAP project contribution from the partner councils – currently $55,000 per council project funding based on the current project load and timing (and $40,000 per Council operational funding for staff costs in 2018-19).
- Additional funding on a per project basis as required - sourced from Council funds
- Government grants (where successful) or external partners.

To meet the costs of the implementation program, the IMAP Councils’ individual contributions for 2019 - 20 are proposed as follows:

**IMAP Annual Project Contribution** $40,000 - per Council
- this is $15K less than in previous years. It recognises the decrease in tourism funding and the need to reduce/defer the number of new projects until more are completed.

**IMAP Share of Operational Costs** $45,000 - per Council (Estimate, to be confirmed).
- this is $5K more than in previous years to ensure all Councils share the cost of the IMAP office/officer.

**Total $85,000 per IMAP Council**
The proposed projects are in line with the Goals and Strategies contained in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan. Further consultation on the proposed projects will continue to further define the resource requirements and detailed project briefs.

8. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to:

a. **Note** this update on project progress on the Inner Melbourne Action Plan, and

b. **Approve** the request for each of the IMAP Partner Councils to make provision for funding in the 2019-20 budget as follows:
   - IMAP Annual Contribution: $40,000 per Council
   - IMAP Share of Operational Staff Costs: $45,000 per Council (Estimate – to be confirmed)
   (Total $85,000 per IMAP Council)
### IMAP Three Year Implementation Program (Nov 2018) of Projects for the Three years commencing 2019-20

Implementation program for the 25 shortlisted projects approved by the IMAP Implementation Committee in December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Year 2 Current</th>
<th>Year 2 Forecast Revenue</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Contributions</td>
<td>$ 275,000</td>
<td>$ 275,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$55,000 per Council in 2018-19. Propose reduce to $40,000 per Council in following years (Reflects $65K reduction in Tourism spend - see November report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project allocations</td>
<td>$ 582,470</td>
<td>$ 582,470</td>
<td>$ 173,070</td>
<td>$ 33,070</td>
<td>$ 33,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CoS/Cat/Ct CLUE contributions (Held funds)</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CoS CLUE Contribution (Held funds)</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visitor map licence fees</td>
<td>$ 400</td>
<td>$ 400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Total</td>
<td>$ 932,870</td>
<td>$ 932,870</td>
<td>$ 373,070</td>
<td>$ 233,070</td>
<td>$ 233,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>Year 2 Forecast</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Administration costs</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>$ 27,400</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>Current project - Ongoing provision for map updates - see November report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website project</td>
<td>$ 41,600</td>
<td>$ 41,600</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP - print and design</td>
<td>$ 4,239</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism map distribution/updates</td>
<td>$ 10,548</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current years contribution to map distribution</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.P1: IMPLEMENTATION OF CENSUS OF LAND USE AND EMPLOYMENT - CLUE (Cat)</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>Current project - Ongoing provision for Biennial joint forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.P2: SMART CITY SOLUTIONS - NEW - Available for CLUE or non-CLUE projects</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.P3: MANAGING LICENSED PREMISES AND ENTERTAINMENT PRECINCTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.P4: WAYFINDING AND SIGNAGE</td>
<td>$ 123,450</td>
<td>$ 123,500</td>
<td>$ 80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1.P5: IMAP TOURISM - Committed: Culture Guide</td>
<td>$ 17,000</td>
<td>$ 17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.P1: BUSINESS CASE: INNER MELBOURNE CYCLING NETWORK</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.P3: PLANNING FOR FUTURE VEHICLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>Delivered from 2019-20 on recommendation of Transport Managers Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.P4: PUBLIC TRANSPORT STANDARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.P5: INFRASTRUCTURE VICTORIA PRIORITIES - NEW</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2.P7: IMAP AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT VICTORIA (PTV) PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.P1: SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITY PLANNING</td>
<td>$ 22,727</td>
<td>$ 22,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.P2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTROLS AND TARGETS</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.P3: IMAP COMMUNITIES INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN 2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3.P4: CONSISTENT APPROACH IN THE RESPONSE TO HOMELESSNESS</td>
<td>$ 48,595</td>
<td>$ 48,600</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4.P1: URBAN FOREST AND BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY AND APPROACH</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4.P2: GREEN STREET BEST PRACTICE GUIDE - NEW</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4.P3: IMAP 3D MODELING PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4.P4: INCREASING EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES - NEW</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.P1: WHOLE OF WASTE CYCLE PLANNING</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.P2: WHOLE OF WATER CYCLE PLANNING</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.P3: IMAP WATER USE TARGETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.P4: IMAP GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION TARGETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5.P5: IMPLEMENT ESG AND GREEN DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS</td>
<td>$ 18,950</td>
<td>$ 19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>$ 883,992</td>
<td>$ 759,800</td>
<td>$ 340,000</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ 215,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoy Balance</td>
<td>$ 48,878</td>
<td>$ 373,070</td>
<td>$ 33,070</td>
<td>$ 33,070</td>
<td>$ 18,070</td>
<td>Propose to increase this contribution to $45K each as CoS carrying more overheads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that this model does not include the $40K per Council contribution to salary and overheads for the Executive officer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>IMAP Membership</th>
<th>External Partners/Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart City Solutions</td>
<td>Application for Smart Cities and Suburbs Funding</td>
<td>Michele Fitzgerald (TL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Licensed Premises and Entertainment Precincts</td>
<td>Liquor Licensing and Planning Scheme Definitions</td>
<td>Christine Drummond, Michelle Bliston</td>
<td>James Lenihan, Adele Denison, Dana Pritchard, Lukas Nott, Craig McLean</td>
<td>Target: Kenann, David Taylor, Noel Kieman, Lisa Stafford, Simon McKenzie-McHaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td>Crowded Places Strategy Working Group</td>
<td>Leigh Abernethy</td>
<td>Christina Foscolos, Tom Haysom</td>
<td>Eng Lim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding and Signage</td>
<td>Stage 2: Promote &amp; test Wayfound; Gap analysis, Base map</td>
<td>Helen Hardwick (TL), Richard Greig, Martin Wittle, David Hassett</td>
<td>Leigh Abernethy</td>
<td>Christina Foscolos, Tom Haysom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Tourism</td>
<td>Stage: Ongoing</td>
<td>Stephanie Hamilton, David Power (Acting TL)</td>
<td>Lisa Stafford</td>
<td>Susan Wickes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT</td>
<td>Business Case: Inner Melbourne Cycling Network</td>
<td>Preparing brief</td>
<td>Damon Rao (TL)</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Recreation Facility Planning</td>
<td>Stage: Completing Part 2 of 2: Contracting Planning Consultant</td>
<td>Dale Stewart (TL); Graham Porteous</td>
<td>Anthony Trail</td>
<td>Tony Oulton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Controls and Targets</td>
<td>Stage: Phase 2 - Community Land Trust Project</td>
<td>Gary Spivak &amp; Elisa McElroy</td>
<td>Kate Incerti, Vanessa Schernickau, Gary Spivak, Pam Newton</td>
<td>Lisa Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Approach in the Response to Homelessness</td>
<td>Initial stages of development</td>
<td>Leanne Mitchell, Sean Mulgrew, Dean Craig</td>
<td>Kate Incerti, Vanessa Schernickau, Gary Spivak, Pam Newton</td>
<td>Lisa Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest and Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td>Initial stages of development</td>
<td>David Callow</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Increasing Employment Opportunities (aka Urban Manufacturing)</td>
<td>Stage: Phase 2 Urban Manufacturing Project; Team-Policy Reference Group; Steering Group</td>
<td>Yury Onyshchuk + Emma Appleton</td>
<td>Ray Tiernan (TL), Leonie Kirkwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement ESD and Green Demonstration Projects</td>
<td>Stage: Phase 3 Environmental Sustainability factsheets project</td>
<td>(Lapsed - Michelle Leembruggen)</td>
<td>Steven McKellar (TL)</td>
<td>Shannon Best / Nadia Ford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMAP Executive Forum**
- Kate Vinot
- Peter Smith
- Warren Roberts
- Stephen Wall
- Vijaya Vadayanath

**IMAP Implementation Committee**
- Crt Reece + Kate Vinot
- Crt Voss + Peter Smith
- Crt Klasaris + Warren Roberts
- Crt Carter + Stephen Wall
- Crt Stone + Vijaya Vadayanath

**IMAP Economy Steering Group**
- Katrina McKenzie
- Karen Watson
- Nigel Higgins
- Jane Waldoke/Bruce Phillips/David Walsmsley

**IMAP Communities Steering Group**
- Linda Weatherston
- Carla Jeffs/Vanessa Foscolos
- Karen Watson
- Clem Gilings
- Lucas Gossling

**IMAP Neighbourhoods and Places Steering Group**
- Kate Vinot
- Claire Ferres-Miels
- Stuart Drathil
- Nigel Higgins
- Bruce Phillips/David Walsmsley

**IMAP Transport & Environment Steering Group**
- Kate Vinot
- Claire Ferres-Miels
- Simon Thomas
- Suni Bhalla
- Jane Waldoke