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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>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 3 mins  **Introductions and Apologies**
Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra

3. 1 min  **Members Interest**
Disclosure by members of any conflict of interest in accordance with s.79 of the Act

### 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) – 30 November 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. 52 held on 30 November 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 – 19 December 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. 28 held on 19 December 2018 as an accurate record of the proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Business Arising (Attachment 3)</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence 8.10am</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to <strong>note</strong> 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 <strong>note</strong> the correspondence (Attachment 3a-e).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Correspondence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Inward</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3a - Email: J Dzomba, Principal Planner, DELWP – use of IMAP SDAPP Factsheet reference in LPPF policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3b – Email: A Suckling, Copyright Agency CEO - newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d – Letter: Cr S Stefanopoulos, Mayor CoS on behalf of ISMMF re lapsing of Better Indoor Stadiums Fund – encI letter to Minister Pukula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3e – Email: A Bradshaw (DEDJTR), Snr Advocacy Officer, Victorian Small Business Commission – enclosing Victorian Small Business Engagement Guidelines document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>Financial Report for the Six (6) Months ending 31 December 2018 (Attachment 4)</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence 8.20am</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to <strong>receive</strong> the IMAP Financial Report for the Six months ending 31 December 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. IMAP Communication and Governance (Attachment 5)
#### Recommendation
8.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves:
   a. To note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.
   b. To authorise legal advice be sought over the implications of the provisions of the Local Government Bill.

---

### 9. IMAP Operational Protocol (Attachment 6)
#### Recommendation
That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to approve the IMAP Operational Protocol as amended.

---

### 10. IMAP Progress Report (Attachment 7)
#### Recommendation
10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the IMAP Progress Report for February 2019.

---

### 11. G1.P1 Implementation of Census of Landuse and Employment
#### Recommendation
11.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to note progress on the Census for Landuse and Employment (CLUE) technology upgrade project.

---

#### Recommendation
12.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee supports the proposal to develop a bicycle network model that immediately benefits IMAP Councils, and which will also form a key part the broader Metropolitan Cycling Network.

---

### 13. IMAP Three year Implementation Program review (Attachment 10)
#### Recommendation
13.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:
   a. Note the proposed process for the IMAP Executive Forum and Committee review of the IMAP projects
   b. Approve a Special Meeting of the IMAP Implementation Committee to adopt the 2019-20 budget and project program (Date to be determined)
   c. Authorise a review of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 to determine any amendments needed to reflect current changes in the Local Government environment (Report to May meeting)

---

### 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
Item | Time Allot. | Agenda Topic | Responsibility
---|---|---|---
14. | 10 mins Commence 9.30am | G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets - Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism (Attachment 11) Recommendation | Gary Spivak, CoPP

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Item | Time Allot. | Agenda Topic | Responsibility
---|---|---|---
15. | 5 mins Commence 9.45am | Any other business | Chair

Close

Next Meeting:
Friday 24 May 2019 (8.00am)
City of Port Phillip – Council Chamber, St Kilda Town Hall, Carlisle Street, ST KILDA

**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. 52 held on 30 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td>Draft Minutes of the IMAP Executive Forum meeting No. 28 held on 19 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
<td>Business Arising Email: J Dzomba, Principal Planner, DELWP – use of IMAP SDAPP Factsheet reference in LPPF policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3b</td>
<td>Email: A Suckling, Copyright Agency CEO - newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3c</td>
<td>Letter: Hon Daniel Andrews, Premier – Letter of thanks re IMAP Annual Report Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3d</td>
<td>Letter: Cr S Stefanopoulos, Mayor CoS on behalf of ISMMF re lapsing of Better Indoor Stadiums Fund – encl letter to Minister Pukula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 3e</td>
<td>Email: A Bradshaw (DEDJTR), Snr Advocacy Officer, Victorian Small Business Commission – enclosing Victorian Small Business Engagement Guidelines document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Attachment 4</td>
<td>IMAP Finance report to 31 December 2018 IMAP Operating and Capital Works statement for the 6 Months ending 31 December 2018 IMAP Budget and Expenditure by Project to 31 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 4a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Attachment 5</td>
<td>IMAP Communications and Governance report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Attachment 6</td>
<td>IMAP Operational Protocol February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Attachment 7</td>
<td>IMAP Progress Report February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Attachment 8</td>
<td>CLUE Technology Upgrade – Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Attachment 9</td>
<td>Inner Melbourne Cycling Network – Briefing Paper Draft Project Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attachment 9a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Attachment 10</td>
<td>IMAP Three Year Implementation Program review – Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidential Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Attachment 11</td>
<td>Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism – Briefing Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda – Confidential Business
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CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time Alloc.</th>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

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

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).

Chair
ITEMS

14.  10 mins Commence 9.30am

G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets - Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism (Attachment 11)

Recommendation

Please refer to the report.

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

 ATTACHMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Attachment No</th>
<th>Attachment Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Attachment 11</td>
<td>G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls and Targets - Investigation of a Regional Affordable Housing Planning Mechanism - Progress report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT Minutes
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

Attendance:
Committee Members
Cr Steven Stefanopoulos, Mayor, City of Stonnington (Chair)
Cr Nicholas Reece, Chair Future Melbourne (Planning) Committee, City of Melbourne
Cr Danae Bosler, Mayor, City of Yarra
Cr Martin Zakharov, Mayor, Maribyrnong City Council
Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council
Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place, City of Melbourne

Associate Partner Representatives
Mr Adrian Salmon, Principal Planner, Planning Services, DELWP
Mr Rod Anderson, Strategy & Partnerships Regional Manager - Port Phillip, DELWP
Dr Evelyn Légaré, Director Integrated Place Transport Planning, TfV, DEDJTR
Mr Michael Anderson, Senior Project Officer, Place Strategy DEDJTR – for Cate Turner
Mr Peter Sagar, Director Inner Melbourne, Victorian Planning Authority

IMAP Guests
Mr Stuart Draffin, General Manager Planning & Amenity, City of Stonnington
Ms Gail Hall, Coordinator Green Infrastructure, City of Melbourne
Mr Martin Whittle, Wayfinding Signage Coordinator, City of Melbourne
Mr Gary Spivak, Housing Development Officer, City of Port Phillip
Mr Damon Rao, Senior Transport Planner, City of Melbourne
Mr Rufael Tsegay, Resilient Melbourne
Ms Maree Grenfell, Acting Chief Resilience Officer, Resilient Melbourne

IMAP Champions
Ms Kylie Bennett, Director CEOs Office, City of Port Phillip
Ms Tracey Limpens, Advocacy Performance & Improvement Manager, City of Stonnington

PRELIMINARIES

1. Appointment of Chair

1.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to appoint Cr Steven Stefanopoulos, Mayor, City of Stonnington as the Chair of the Meeting.

MOVED MR WALL / Cr Zakharov
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 Dick Gross, Mayor, City of Port Phillip

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments/Questions
Ms Vaidyanath noted approval subject to confirmation that the City of Yarra does not have any date clashes.
Cr Zakharov noted Lead West becoming more active; their council was supportive of them doing more.

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.

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

9. IMAP Progress Report

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to note the IMAP Progress Report for November 2018.

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

10. G1.P1 Implementation of Census of Land use and Employment
G1.P2 Smart City Solutions – CLUE Technology Upgrade– Project Update
Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, CoM spoke to the report. Key points included:
   • CoM setting up the cloud architecture currently which will enable CoM’s CLUE (Census for Land Use and Employment) to be accessed by other Councils
   • CoM staff are having discussions with each Council to see if they have an appetite to move into CLUE data collection

Comments/Questions
• Ms Vaidyanath noted progress, the escalated costs, and her concerns expressed at the Executive Forum. Inclined to wait to see how costs pan out across all the IMAP cities. Will consider part rather than all properties surveyed and awaits more details. Noted that the State Government should be in this space; and they initially supported this application.
• Mr Smith advised he supported involvement with CLUE. Sees that each individual council is likely to respond differently. Has used CLUE before; a very useful tool, sees its value with GIS. CoPP are likely to pursue involvement, but this will be dependent upon a consideration of final costs involved with participation.
  o Ms Ferres-Miles responded that there are opportunities provided to set up as it suits each Council. CoM will provide opportunities to be agile when budget available and once councils are interested in joining the CLUE system. CoM will work it out with each council and align where they can.
• Ms Ferres-Miles provided a brief summary of the CLUE data for the benefit of the new members of the Committee and noted:
  o The opportunity for the State Government to step in; sees significant value as a partnership project
  o The funding bid through the Inner Melbourne Metro Partnership for cost sharing
  o The importance of the data (commercial floor space detail/employment/sector changes etc.) for local and State Government planning and awareness during significant inner city change
  o Ability to show change over time across the city in commercial and residential spaces
  o Important source to help for private sector investment choices. Very positive feedback is received from the development industry
• Cr Stefanopoulos asked if IMAP should write to a government minister and Inner Melbourne Partnerships.
• Mr Sagar noted his interest in exploring further; especially with Cremorne’s enterprise development and conversations being had with the Metro partnerships
The Committee generally agreed the members should take the opportunity to speak with others – Mayors through Ministers and CEOs through Departments around SG partnering on this.

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to note progress on the Census for Land use and Employment (CLUE) technology upgrade project.
MOVED MR WALL / Ms Vaidyanath
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Action: Committee members to speak with State Government re CLUE – Mayors through Ministers and CEOs through departments around SG partnering on this

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

Mr Gary Spivak, Housing Development Officer, City of Port Phillip attended for this item and updated the IMAP Committee on the recent application proposal entitled: “PROPOSED IMAP PROJECT TO INVESTIGATE SCALEABILITY OF A PRIVATE MARKET AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY MODEL FOR NEGOTIATING DELIVERY OF AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING BY DEVELOPERS”

which was submitted to DELWP on 22 October seeking State Government funding (subject to approval of co-funding from the IMAP funds.)

Mr Spivak 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 for a total of $75K.

The proposal is to investigate private housing delivery models as a way to encourage the private sector’s take up of more affordable housing provision. Mr Spivak reviewed the key points of the application.

Comments/Questions

- Mr Roberts suggested a slight rewording of part b of the recommendation to:

  “Endorse a $25K co-contribution in support of our State Government application for $50K …”

- Cr Reece supported this amendment and noted:
  - this proposal supports an affordable housing model that is managed by the private sector instead of community housing
  - this would be more attractive to developers to retain control over rental, amenities etc. without a third party involved.
  - Aspects are challenging, but pragmatic; supportive of proposals that will bring affordable housing to market.

- There was discussion about providing further advocacy around Inclusionary Zoning - this application doesn’t preclude that but requires further time to get Councils aligned. A number of different approaches are emerging from progressive developers.

- Mr Smith noted significant advocacy through the Metro Advisory Panel and Metro Partnerships for affordable housing provision; and observed that affordable housing provisions need to work in high land value areas across Inner Melbourne – inner city provision is being diluted and provided in the outer suburbs.

- Additional advocacy/investigation was referred to the Executive Forum for further discussion.

- Cr Zakharov raised a query around a broader study of overseas examples.

  - Ms Ferres-Miles advised there was significant local research done on a range of models and Melbourne’s suppliers just needed to work together and try a few things out.
  - Mr Smith noted different tax regimes overseas lend themselves to different models.

- Ms Ferres-Miles noted:
  - There is likely to be a tool kit developed with a range of opportunities.
  - More mandatory type models are likely as the market has not provided affordable housing.
  - We need housing choices for the city; affordable housing is essential core infrastructure.
  - Need products provided across the spectrum of need.

- There was agreement that the Executive Forum consider advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms” in December/January and report back to the February meeting.

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 in support of our State Government 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.

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

*Actions: Executive Forum to consider advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms” in December/January and report back to the February 2019 IMAP meeting.*

12. **G1.P4 Wayfinding and Signage**
Mr Martin Whittle, Wayfinding Signage Coordinator, CoM attended for this item with a PowerPoint presentation of current progress. He noted:

- 3 councils adopted the 1st version of Way found as an operating manual. CoY determined the operational manual did not require Council approval for its use; CoMar will submit updated version 2 to Council.
- The current review of the manual indicated good support for the development of common standards
- New content to be included in version 2 includes detailed industrial design instructions for sign design, construction and installation
- User testing of CoM pilot signs installed at 2 locations is completed
- CoM has updated all signs to comply with new designs
- OVGA is interested in reviewing Way found and sign designs (refer scoping document circulated)
- Pete Stevens, TfV is working with the IMAP Councils on mapping
- A TfV/IMAP joint workshop has tested the merit of a joint approach to mapping. Collaboration with TfV over mapping was seen to have merit and the next steps for IMAP Councils will be brought back to Committee once we explore more about what that will entail. (The SGS report of the workshop was circulated for information).

Mr Whittle noted frustration with the large number of Government infrastructure projects happening across Melbourne/Victoria and the difficulty developing synergies over signage design despite CoM input on the need for consistency. Projects continue to develop their own systems. He noted the opportunity for IMAP Council members and Associates to help through consistent messaging and advocacy.

Mr Whittle advised the 2019-20 budget proposal covered the development of the design details for Way found 2.0 ($40K) and the Project Manager costs ($40K). Costs associated with mapping will be brought to the Committee for approval once known.

*Comments/Questions*

- Ms Vaidyanath asked that Recommendation b include the budget amount of $80K for clarity.
- Mr Smith commended the work to date and asked if digital signage was being considered.
  - Mr Whittle advised the SGS workshop focussed on mapping including the digital component. There is an opportunity to create a basemap for Victoria wide. The map design project is proving as extensive as the signage infrastructure design aspects.
  - Up till now the project team has been developing the modular physical signs that can be easily updated, maintained. Costs of $6K-$7K per plinth and $200/blade sign are likely. Digital signs costing $20K - $30K can be out of date as soon as installed. The project scope is more aligned to installing signs where we need them, and looking at how physical signs interact with phone links to digital maps etc.

- Mr Roberts asked the Mover to accept an amendment to the motion to write to authorities and Ministers.
- Ms Ferres-Miles noted this project was a flagship achievement of IMAP and the 5 councils have invested in it to achieve consistent outcomes. The letter to Government should strongly advise that communities want one system that is simple, legible, tested and reviewed. Need to be insistent about the consistent use of the toolkit being developed.
  - Mr Whittle noted until Way found 2.0 is completed, we have the technical and design elements in the document to promote. The project is at a cross roads, as we have the standards, but not the second section completed yet. He met with West Gate tunnel project contractors on our approach but we are still failing to get the message across.
• Ms Vaidyanath noted the need to target Government CEOs. Also asked if the shared base map is incumbent on working with TfV and others
  o Mr Whittle noted this is part of the current mapping review and will be brought back to Committee when fully scoped. Currently looking at the hierarchy of information that should be put on a map. He noted that Google maps promote Google priorities and are not so good at picking out visitor experiences, using consistent language and naming conventions etc. Wayfinding maps are a balance between cartography and design. Once they are digital, we can more easily change the language as required when place names change.
• There was support for carrying on with scoping an integrated basemap with TfV.
• Mr Wall noted Maribyrnong’s daily dialogue regarding the tunnel. Advocacy needs to be aimed at the Distributor Authority. It was noted the head of Office of the Coordinator General is acting head of the new Transport department.
• Mr Stefanopoulos summed up the need for CEO advocacy through Government agencies, and Councillor’s discussion with Ministers over signage consistency, that extends across municipal boundaries. IMAP needs to be vocal on these advantages as we are doing the hard work on this for everyone else’s benefit.

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 of $80,000.

MOVED MS VAIDYANATH / MR Roberts
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

12.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to write to relevant Ministers, TfV and agencies as an opportunity will be lost if we don’t reference and build upon the Way finding and Signage project while Government projects and signage is being rolled out.

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

Action: CEO advocacy to be targeted through Government agencies, and Councillor’s discussion with Ministers to include way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects.

The IMAP Executive Officer advised that Matt Slavin, Project Team Leader had recently left Maribyrnong City Council. She reviewed current progress on the project:
• Approval of the draft project brief by the Committee in May 2018
• Workshop to finalise the project brief in September 2018
• Establishment of the working group across strategic planning and urban forest teams
• Key areas for the project directed at
  o education,
  o analysis of baseline data to track changes over time, and
  o planning policy mechanisms to address tree loss on private properties.
The synergies with Melbourne City Council over planning policy controls became evident through discussions. To avoid duplication of effort, the project team recommends the IMAP project team collaborate with the CoM policy work on planning amendment options.
She introduced Gail Hall, Coordinator Green Infrastructure, CoM to advise the Committee on this work and to seek support for this collaboration.

Ms Hall noted the CoM project is to improve greening on walls, roofs and facades. Their 4 targets aim to double the green area in the city. Pursuing changes through the Planning Scheme will help achieve this. Key points she noted:
• aim to draw together all sustainability policies
• looking at how to develop an evidence base for policy change.
• All elements of water policy are being considered to see if they can be fitted into one policy.
• Consultants have been engaged in the first year to
  o review Energy, WSUD, and Stormwater policies,
  o to look for gaps, compare with CoM’s broader strategies, review mandatory targets and standards, look at economic impacts on developers and positive impacts on the municipality
o propose policy options for consideration.
• Will look to translate findings into policies and targets that affect the private realm, to reduce impacts on the environment.
• External reference groups will be established to discuss targets (Feb 2019). This can include Government agencies, IMAP, development community etc. – to discuss impacts more broadly. There will be the opportunity to discuss broadening out CoM’s approach to other Councils, state level etc.
• CoM will then develop the evidence base once have a clearer direction, then do the economic assessment.
• Plan to have a draft completed by the end of the 2018-19 financial year.

Ms Hall noted, regarding vegetation, CoM are looking at the potential to regulate good vegetation on private land i.e. a system to value the mature healthy tree in the ground more highly than the green roof or new vegetation. The Seattle points-based system is being considered as a model.

Comments/Questions
• Mr Smith noted interest in the data assessment associated with the Urban Forest Strategy and referred to the mapping work being undertaken by Resilient Melbourne. Understood that it excludes green infrastructure on buildings. Believed the Committee should check on the scope of this project in February after consideration by the Executive Forum.
• Ms Vaidyanath noted Urban Forest work being undertaken by Resilient Melbourne, IMAP and individual councils’ through their own Urban Forest Strategies.
  o The Executive Officer advised that the IMAP project team has taken into account the Resilient Melbourne project being undertaken by The Nature Conservancy, and the State Government’s mapping project with RMIT using LIDAR data, in setting IMAP’s project scope. The IMAP project wants to use the mapping information from these projects to identify standard base measurements for the IMAP Councils against which measurable improvements/losses of vegetation can be identified over time. She noted that many of the Urban Forest Strategies adopted by Councils will have difficulty meeting their vegetation targets based on public land planting alone.
  o Ms Hall noted the Green Infrastructure meeting with DELWP in September set outputs that were very relevant to CoM’s project.

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.

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

14 G1.P5 IMAP Tourism
Mr Roberts requested that this matter be deferred and referred back to the IMAP Executive Forum. He felt the IMAP Tourism Working Group had done good work promoting the IMAP region and wanted to revisit the decision as the Executive Forum had made a different recommendation to what was being suggested by group members. He believed strong work can still be delivered through this group.

Comments/Questions
• Cr Zakharov noted in reference to LeadWest, many were not aware of the growth in the tourism industry and its importance to local economies. International visitors are astounded with what they find in Melbourne and our attractions need a further push.
• The IMAP Executive Officer noted the Tourism Working Group were proposing a more strategic focus.
• Cr Reece felt the Cultural Guide could be significantly improved.

14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to defer item 14 on the future of the IMAP Tourism Working Group and refer it back to the IMAP Executive Forum for further discussion.

MOVED MR ROBERTS / Mr Wall
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

Damon Rao, CoM and Maree Grenfell and Rufael Tsegay, Resilient Melbourne (RM) attended for this item.

- Ms Grenfell thanked Councils with ongoing commitments to RM. RM were interested in scaling up IMAP’s efforts as part of their flagship project for RM.
- Rufael Tsegay, RM reviewed the rationale for RM’s interest in the metro cycling network –
  - Helps the community transition to more sustainable transport
  - Provides alternative transport during an emergency transport event
  - Recognises that the IMAP Councils’ issue with the bike network exists across metro Melbourne and there is the potential to address this collectively.
- Mr Damon Rao, CoM noted City of Melbourne were the lead Council on this project and described the model/tool that this project aims to develop. The original intention for IMAP was to come up with a business case – and to do things for the cycling mode that are already used for other modes of transport.
  - CoM have looked at where everyone is cycling – the overland network. Saw gaps over 2 census years and modelled the changes in behaviour when cycling network routes were improved. The model illuminates the cyclist behaviour changes as a result of building bike infrastructure.
  - Inner City residents were also surveyed. Many cycle but are not confident on all parts of the network. Looked at the added value of improvements to assess priority works.
  - Believe this whole approach can be extended across the IMAP area (as per the project brief.)

#### Comments/Questions

- Mr Wall said Maribyrnong sees the benefit of charting dedicated routes and supports the move to get more people onto bikes.
- Mr Smith noted Council contributions to Resilient Melbourne as well as being involved in the Inner South Metro Mayors Forum (ISMMF), and Metro Partnerships. He suggested the report be referred to the IMAP Executive Forum and queried:
  - the budget figures in the brief
  - what work RM has done in terms of the broader funding model (noted this was not a priority for the Inner Melbourne Metro Partnership)
  - if it duplicates what others are funding
  - if ‘infrastructure’ included ‘end of trip’ facilities or just bike lane gaps.
- Mr Smith noted benefit in starting with IMAP, but the full benefit is really metro-wide: he worried about IMAP funding this without a broader State Government and Others funding strategy.
  - Mr Rao clarified that this project primarily maps out the gaps and identifies the priority routes based on user data. The next step is to then determine what to build and what facilities are required.
- Cr Bosler noted Yarra is focussed on safety especially speed. Cyclists are entitled to use roads and are not restricted to trails/lanes.
- Ms Vaidyanath supported referring the report to the IMAP Executive Forum
- Cr Zakharov noted cycling is part of our cultural development, with long term health effects and growth in numbers, including female participation.
- Mr Wall noted further advocacy requirements for cycling, citing a lack of bike storage proposed at new stations for future users.
- Mr Smith suggested a scan of all options and clarification on who is working on what would be helpful. Understood that the Inner South Metro Partnership, Metro Transport Forum and others are working in this space. Find the best path forward to discuss this quickly and progress.
- Ms Grenfell noted undertaking the gap analysis and the links is one piece of the puzzle and important for making a business case. The audit will be useful and RM look to IMAP leadership to prioritise the approach that the rest of the metro area can follow.
- Cr Reece supported deferral to the Executive Forum and to bring this back to the Committee. Noted the beauty of local government is ‘think local and get things done’.
- The Chairman summarised that the matter go to the Executive Forum to clarify the budget. IMAP is focussed on the IMAP region and work that concentrates in inner city Melbourne. Need to seek funding from other external agencies for other outer parts of the metro region, end of trip facilities etc.

#### 15.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:

a. Defer item 15 on the Inner Melbourne Cycling Network project and refer it to the IMAP Executive Forum for further discussion.
b. Bring this project back to the February IMAP Implementation Committee.

**MOVED MR SMITH / Ms Vaidyanath**

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>IMAP Three year Implementation Program review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The IMAP Executive Officer tabled an update to Attachment 13b (project teams). Ms McElroy explained the requirements under s 86 delegations for the IMAP Implementation Committee to review a rolling Three year Implementation Program annually to implement the Inner Melbourne Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She noted the IMAP project shortlist was established 2 years ago following adoption of the new plan and indicative project funding allocated. The IMAP account is able to hold the funds from one year to the next while the projects are undertaken, and these often compete for staff time to get them completed. Ms McElroy reviewed the funding model circulated for consideration and indicated the changes that were proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comments/Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mr Smith noted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 8-9 projects are identified each year and IMAP runs a surplus of $600K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o CoPP wants to ensure tangible value from its membership in IMAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o While ensuring Stonnington as host Council are adequately reimbursed for administration costs, the projects need further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Requested the matter be deferred and referred to the IMAP Executive Forum for further discussion. Eg IMAP could aim to do a smaller number of projects more thoroughly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mr Roberts noted the potential impact of delaying certainty for each Council’s budget - a December EF review could generally be accommodated in the budget timetable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms Vaidyanath noted IMAP is a creature of statute. It has to have this Committee approve the budget. Project costs need clarification beyond those routine costs and to understand where the project costs lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ms Ferres-Miles thought IMAP partners needed to reflect around current regional collaborations and partnerships as it is really busy. Need to be clear what the value add is; be purposeful and fill gaps other partnerships are not doing. The Metro Partnerships will continue and be supported by the Government. Need to keep a watching brief on what other forums are doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mr Roberts noted the environment is more complex now than when IMAP was established. A number of other groups are overlaying our projects. May need to revise the deliverables in the plan. Identify points of difference between groups imposed on local government. Partnerships are doing different things; but as a s86 committee IMAP is a different set up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cr Stefanopoulos said it was important to note Councils are getting busier doing their own work. IMAP could use more externals to deliver more, faster, and we may need to feed more into it to do this. This group of IMAP Councils is a leader; other regions are looking at us and many asking why we can do this so well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mr Wall noted the volume of collaborations is doubling up. The difference between IMAP and the others is our control. Don’t have confidence in the Metro Partnership outcomes, but IMAP can drive the outcomes here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to defer item 16 on the IMAP Three year Implementation Program review and refer it to the IMAP Executive Forum for finalising the budget.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOVED MR SMITH / Mr Roberts**

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

| 17 | There was no further business. |
|    | The meeting closed at 10.02am |

**Next Meeting**

Friday 22 February 2019 (8.00am)

Maribyrnong City Council offices – Reception Room Level 1

Cnr Hyde & Napier Streets, FOOTSCRAY
### RESOLUTIONS

1.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **appoint** Cr Steven Stefanopoulos, Mayor, City of Stonnington as the Chair of the Meeting.

2.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the following apologies:
   - Cr Dick Gross, Mayor, City of Port Phillip

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.

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.

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.

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

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

7.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **receive** the IMAP Financial Report for the Three months ending 30 September 2018.

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.

9.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to **note** the IMAP Progress Report for November 2018.

10.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to **note** progress on the Census for Land use and Employment (CLUE) technology upgrade project.

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 in support of our State Government 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.

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 of $80,000.

12.2 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to write to relevant Ministers, TfV and agencies as an opportunity will be lost if we don’t reference and build upon the Way finding and Signage project while Government projects and signage is being rolled out.

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.

14.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to defer item 14 on the future of the IMAP Tourism Working Group and refer it back to the IMAP Executive Forum for further discussion.
15.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:
   a.  Defer item 15 on the Inner Melbourne Cycling Network project and refer it to the IMAP Executive Forum for further discussion.
   b.  Bring this project back to the February IMAP Implementation Committee.

16.1 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to defer item 16 on the IMAP Three year Implementation Program review and refer it to the IMAP Executive Forum for finalising the budget.

**ACTIONS PUBLIC RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. CLUE</td>
<td>All Committee members</td>
<td>Committee members to speak with State Government re CLUE – Mayors through Ministers and CEOs through departments around SG partnering on this.</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affordable housing</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Forum</td>
<td>Executive Forum to consider advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms” in December/January and report back to the February 2019 IMAP meeting.</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wayfinding signs</td>
<td>All Committee members</td>
<td>CEO advocacy to be targeted through Government agencies, and Councillor’s discussion with Ministers to include way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT MINUTES
Inner Melbourne Action Plan
Executive Forum
Meeting No. 28
3.00pm – 4.30pm Wednesday 19 December 2018
Meeting Room 1, top floor, Richmond Town Hall, Bridge Road, RICHMOND
City of Yarra

Attendance:
IMAP Executive Forum Members
Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council (Chair)
Mr Warren Roberts, Chief Executive Officer, City of Stonnington
Mr Eamonn Fennessey, Acting Director City Strategy & Place, City of Melbourne
Mr Bruce Phillips, Director Planning and Placemaking, City of Yarra – for Vijaya Vaidyanath
Ms Kylie Bennett, Director CEOs Office, City of Port Phillip (by telephone link) - for Peter Smith

IMAP
Ms Elissa McElroy – IMAP Executive Officer

Guests
Mr Stuart Draffin, General Manager Planning & Amenity, City of Stonnington
Mr Gary Spivak, Housing Development Officer, City of Port Phillip
Mr Damon Rao, Senior Transport Planner, City of Melbourne

1. Appointment of Chair

1.1 Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council was appointed Chair of the meeting.

MOVED: MR ROBERTS/ Mr Fennessey
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

2. Apologies

2.2 The following apologies were noted:
- Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
- Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
- Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place/ Interim Chief Executive Officer, City of Melbourne

ITEMS

3. IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan Review
Mr Wall directed the Executive Forum to the 3 budget items that needed to be reviewed before the Review report/budget could be considered, and invited Gary Spivak to present on the Housing paper.

Clarification on IMAP Project expenditure items:

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

Gary Spivak, CoPP was in attendance and reviewed the key points of his paper; in particular;
- Funding application for this investigation was not approved by DELWP as the assessment panel considered the application to be more about developing a business model for operating affordable housing, rather than supporting negotiation for a specific affordable housing agreement or developing policy infrastructure.
- Investigation on the reasons suggested that the panel may not have appreciated the importance of developing a new delivery model in order to then increase the private sector take-up of the voluntary planning mechanism.
- Sought IMAP’s authority to seek alternative funding sources
• Considering option of an application to the Lord Mayors Charitable Fund which has a homelessness category and seed grants to $50K. Application timing needs to be determined.
• That private development sector sources had been considered – clarification was needed on the potential for perception of specific vested interests, balanced with advantage of current preliminary interest in the model from a number of private sector bodies / companies.

Questions/Comments

CoS:
• Happy to source backfill funding. To avoid any possible perception of private sector vested interest and to maintain control over the project, suggest redefine project scope to clarify “Funding does not mean the funder can influence the outcome”. Acknowledged private sector concern about current affordable housing models. Sector have a vested interest in getting certainty - can be included as long as no strings attached.
• Suggested recommendation:
  o reflect funding from private, public and charitable sources
  o reflect how scalable the investigation is if get less funding than expected.

CoMar:
• $25K earmarked through IMAP. Nothing happens until get more funding. Budget not influenced further by this proposal.

CoY:
• Good proposal. Lendlease (Channel 9 site) and Amcor site developers involved in AH provisions. Yarra could help get a process underway to discuss proposal funding with companies.

CoM:
• Supported approaching philanthropic bodies.
• Queried DELWPs misreading of application.
• Noted IM Metro Partnership looking at AH mechanisms

3.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:
• Note the outcome of the DELWP grant application and the intent to seek alternative funding sources from private, public or charitable sources for up to $50,000 to undertake the project.
• Seek a report back to the IMAP Executive Forum in February 2019 on progress in pursuing alternative funding sources.
• Recommends looking at how the project could be scaled to accommodate whatever funding level that is able to be achieved.

MOVED: MR ROBERTS/ Mr Fennessey
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED


Damon Rao, CoM attended for this item and provided a handout of slides. He provided background and context to the proposal, and summarised the proposal - noting:
• There have been many bike network proposals/developments over time. Delivery has never been satisfactory and never delivered in a cohesive way.
• Started to scope this project 2 years ago to build a Business Case for the bicycle network completion. Reviewed how this was done in Sydney at significant cost ($300K) where a lot of component parts were brought together. Identified a 2 step process required.

1st step: Bike Network Model – looks at how people are moving through the network.
  o There is no centralised cycling infrastructure database in Melbourne. Need to bring this together.
  o Proposal is to develop an IMAP cycling model by joining up the parts, showing the links.
  o It can expand out to all of IMAP from the CoM Bike Plan
  o We have counters at network points but don’t know the journeys – CoM used GPS data to construct trips, and the model then scales up results using census data

2nd step: Bicycle User Survey – CoM have surveyed residents of Moreland and Melbourne to identify comfort with lanes vs separated lanes. Ascertained level of comfort with different types and found a larger % cycle for activity than ride around for transport. Suppressed demand for recreation cycling exists. Results can be applied across larger area.
  o Current commuters were excluded from the survey as we know they are happy to ride on most routes.
Questions/Comments

CoMar:
- CoMar seeking connectivity to schools and Universities. These are key features to build a network around.
  - Damon noted the surveys look at current lanes and movement, and confidence in moving around the network. The accessibility analysis of land use types considers how well the bike network serves different land uses.
  - This is the way that we plan for trains and roads etc. Missed doing this for bike lanes in the past. CoM’s Model allows future numbers to be assessed. Addresses gap in way projects are funded.
    - CoM originally focussed on trips to CoM.
    - Proposal will get all bike lanes in GIS and gather information on how people move around.
    - See gaps that will inform the Bike Plans.
    - Data on comfort levels is due to be overlaid across the other information.
    - By adding in the other IMAP councils – greater distances will give journey information.

CoPP:
- Queried the budget and how this project could overlap with other funding in this area. Was cautious at the IMAP Implementation Committee of the use of IMAP funding and work for the promotion of Resilient Melbourne. How does this funding commitment overlap with RM and the work of the Metro Partnerships?
  - Damon had noted these concerns and felt we had tried to do 2 steps at once in the earlier proposal. Now they are separated out. RM are across different Council groups that are not as co-ordinated as IMAP, data mapped etc. What RM bring to this falls after this IMAP phase and would ultimately add value to this for IMAP. RM would connect up the other Councils – same format and in our established format. We would ensure they follow us.

CoY:
- How close are Government to proposing something here? What is happening in Active Transport? Quote seems expensive.
  - Damon noted
    - The price was quite competitive. Spent this for CBD alone modelling for the Walking Plan.
    - Undertaking a full Business Plan may require $300-400K but that is not proposed here.
    - Should the SG be doing this? Yes - but they're not. Travel Smart and now Active Transport is under resourced; work is piecemeal. Political will is not there as, outside Inner Melbourne, cycling rates are lower.
    - This piece of work is the first step in providing further advocacy for the wider business case.
  - Mr Roberts noted
    - He shared Peter Smith’s concerns at the last meeting. Proposal was complicated by RM.
    - This proposal gives a different context. Lots of people seem to be doing bike stuff but not all to our benefit. Can see value in this proposal from an IMAP perspective.
    - Concerned that broader projects get diluted and suffer inertia with a lot of Councils involved. We see this with other groups where the focus becomes too broad, making it hard to put a value on the deliverables.
    - This is useful work, we control the output. It links to our own vision and objectives for Inner Melbourne – with actions that are deliverable and scalable and not overshadowed by RM.
    - The cost of $2K per day for consultant work is reasonable.
    - The information will help inform our own Councils and provide information to support the business case.
    - Proposal needs a Timeline and Deliverables noted when the project plan is next reported to Committee in February.
  - Mr Walls noted:
    - With most commuter bike traffic coming into the IMAP area, it is an obvious start point for the wider strategy. Maribyrnong Council supports cycling initiatives and will subscribe to this.
    - He confirmed the $100K was in the budget as a current year priority project.
    - The relationship with RM is complementary but separately funded.
CoPP:
- CoPP noted support of connected cycling networks and in 2018 Council adopted its Integrated Transport Strategy. Ms Bennetts noted CoPP’s review of Council memberships in achieving value.
- The CoPP continued to express concern about progressing this project prior to holding a prioritisation exercise of all of the IMAP projects in this and future years, their concerns around the role of the State Government and Resilient Melbourne (RM), and that some Councils are also financial members of RM as well as IMAP.
  - Mr Wall acknowledged the viewpoint but felt this project was committed to already by IMAP through the funding timeline and plan for the current financial year.
  - Mr Roberts agreed this is a valid project that is already funded, briefed and meets requirements for approval now. It is the projects going forward that are under further consideration.

3.2 That the Executive Forum supports the proposal to develop a bicycle network model that immediately benefits IMAP councils, and which will also form a key part of the broader Metropolitan Cycling Network.

**MOVED MR ROBERTS / Mr Fennessey**
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

- **G1.P5 IMAP Tourism – Future of TWG**

Mr Roberts had requested further discussion on the future of the Tourism Working Group (TWG) due to the importance tourism plays in the economy of our municipalities and City. The IMAP Executive Officer circulated the Strategy and Action Plan discussed by the Committee in August, which had been expanded with the assistance of officers, to better describe the proposed activities.

Mr Robert’s noted:
- deliverables in the Tourism and Economic Development Working Group areas are valuable and applicable to all, and lessons can be learned/shared across the Councils through this Working Group network.
- a proposal that IMAP retain $20K budget per annum to continue this work but that delivery and future budgets are reviewed regularly.

**Questions/Comments**

The Chair clarified the recommendation under consideration.

**CoY:**
- Following liaison with staff, continuing with the TWG would be supported. A different focus is supported; more social media aspects are required to get our message out.
- MP Richard Wynne has expressed interest in solutions to empty retail areas in his Yarra electorate.
- Support economic stimulation work, sharing information and investigation into what are the issues creating vacancy rates. Agreed it is useful for IMAP to stay in this

**CoPP:**
- While, the CoPP recognised the value of the TWG to other member Councils, the CoPP was not supportive of continuing the TWG.
- The CoPP did not support the proposal to work together on high street vacancies, and was of the view that each place is different and requires a unique solution or strategy to resolve the level of vacancies in a particular area. In addition, the respective high streets are often competing against each other for businesses and customers, so collaboration did not seem possible from the CoPP perspective.
- Notwithstanding the above comment, there may be some opportunities to collectively lobby for legislative or regulatory change, where these are identified as specific barriers to filling a commercial vacancy; however, a TWG would not be required to support this work.
- Tourism is an important priority for the CoPP which it progresses through its business as usual activities. The CoPP indicated that, from its perspective, tourism as a priority for the IMAP was less important than other priorities such as CLUE and affordable housing.

**CoM:**
- Noted the rent costs along strips like Chapel Street. Vacancies are due to heightened rental expectations and land taxes across the inner city.
- Supported a shift to an economic development and economic resilience focus; look at how to keep strong retail strips that complement each other.
CoS
- Local trader groups concerned with the impact of Chadstone. However a different demographic visit the high street and retailers need to generate a point of difference, not homogenise efforts.
- Propose the TWG redefine this project in their Action Plan to better reflect what the proposal is going forward - to demonstrate for the CoPP and Committee members that project deliverables reflect back to the 5 municipalities.
- Propose changing the Group to reflect Tourism and Economic Development. Have cut back on work with Destination Melbourne and can instead concentrate on our economic vitality and how the Working Group can support this.
- Propose the working group carries on but with greater clarity.

CoMar:
- Economic development is important for Maribyrnong. Identity of different strips in relation to Highpoint is important and the Council works closely with trader associations to assist.
- Support proposal to use existing funds to refocus energy on matters topical to the IMAP Councils.

3.3 That the Executive Forum supports

- Applying the $60K accumulated tourism funds across the next 3 years towards projects (i.e. no new funding), to a tourism and economic development working group strategy.
- Providing $5Kpa for map updates.
- Reframing a new Strategic Plan: review the project offering around economic vitality and resilience, and shopping strips research.
- Reviewing the Working Group and its delivery in 12 months time.

MOVED MR ROBERTS / Mr Fennessey
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED.

Review Report: IMAP Three year Implementation Program

The IMAP Executive Officer reviewed:
- the key points of the report, noting the role and function of other regional groups operating across the IMAP region.
- noted the Funding model changes to clarify commenced and not commenced projects.
- noted the obligations under the s86 delegations and Terms of Reference to implement the IMAP through a 3 year list of Actions and annual reviews; and
- proposed a formal review of the list of ‘not commenced’ projects that could be reported back to the Committee.

Questions/Comments

CoS:
- Noted the groups illustrated in the diagram were demanding resources which diminishes Councils’ capacity to commit to the IMAP plan.
- Can review projects but also recognised that Council resources are leaking to other groups.
- Agreed we need to redefine core projects but also redefine how we resource them. May cost us more, but would ensure we apply efforts to signature projects.
- Increasingly need to cajole reps onto working groups; if we improve project planning we are also accountable for the delivery.

CoMar:
- Good to review projects for any duplication of effort; agree to focus on less and do it well.
- Acknowledge CoPP want IMAP to be clear on focus areas for IMAP. The Executive Forum may need to workshop these and each CEO determine what are the priority tasks for IMAP from each Council’s perspective.
- CoMar see a lot of value in IMAP; understand that some Councils are more passionate about some projects than others - but still subscribe as part of the team. Noted there is value in IMAP for developing Maribyrnong’s relationships. IMAP project budgets spread costs over 5 councils.
- Understand the CoPP challenge to keep on top of value for money.
- Need a broader conversation about what trying to achieve, cost implications and resourcing implications.
- Agreed to a review of not commenced projects and report the general priorities back to the Committee.
CoS:
- Suggested the IMAP Executive Forum agree to the following process:
  - 2019/20 budget - maintain the Council ask at current budget level for budgeting.
  - Undertake an Environmental Scan and review of projects that have not yet been commenced on the program.
  - Hold a EF workshop to review Environmental Scan and assess impacts of the changed environment.
  - Executive Forum report back on priorities and recommend a new 3 year Implementation Plan to the Committee.

CoPP:
- IMAP AR went to Council and there was discussion around a larger piece of work reviewing strategic memberships. Having a good look at staying or reducing memberships. Determining what is good for partnerships and what value we get from certain things. Looking to understand what we get in return for our annual IMAP contribution.

CoM:
- Inner Melbourne Metro partnership provides a look into State Government that you don’t get through IMAP.
- IMAP really demonstrates the value proposition of what’s unique about a group of councils working together.

CoY:
- IMAP has always been about Actions. Tries not to get involved in other things.
- When don’t have capacity, can’t get momentum going: projects are not competed.
- noted it was hard to get staff onto projects - a better approach may be to appoint project officers to help move projects along.

There was discussion about timing of the project review and finalisation of the budget. It was noted current funding levels could continue for budgeting purposes, but that it only becomes an expense once it’s invoiced (usually in the 2nd quarter) so we have until then to finalise the actual cost.

3.4 That the Executive Forum:

- Noted receipt of a report that highlighted IMAP’s position within the regional groups;
- Agreed to refocus the Three year Implementation Program - aiming to be as agile and resilient as some of these other groups; and
- Would report back the following agreed process to the Committee in February 2019:

  That the IMAP Executive Forum:
  - Have commenced the review of projects that have not yet been commenced on the program
  - Will undertake a workshop before 22 March to review the plan as a result of the findings of that review
  - Will report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee in May 2019 with a refreshed, amended implementation program reflective of the changes in the current environment.

MOVED MR ROBERTS / Mr Fennessey
A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

CoPP: Noted that CoPP will be reviewing memberships in February and information on IMAP projects will start to become clearer around March which would suit that timetable.

The Chair summarised that:
- We would review the action plan before May, and have a plan of action for the next 3 years that demonstrates commitments and value to members.
- That the EF will need time to work this through individual councils and will require a separate workshop and facilitation to assess the new plan.

The Executive Officer noted that she was available to assist with discussions on priorities at individual Councils to help with this work.
4. **Business Arising**

**Advocacy Matters - determine next steps:**

**A. Affordable Housing:**

Executive Forum to consider advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms” in December/January and report back to the February 2019 IMAP meeting.

Action: AGREED that the IMAP Executive Officer would prepare a letter that advises the Minister of the resolution of the Committee relating to advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms”.

**B. CLUE:**

Committee members to speak with State Government re CLUE – Mayors through Ministers and CEOs through departments around SG partnering on this

Action: AGREED that Claire Ferres Miles will liaise with the IMAP Executive Officer and take the lead on this (SG partnering on CLUE) to ensure it is done in a coordinated way

**C. Way finding and Signage**

- CEO advocacy to be targeted through Government agencies, and Councillor’s discussion with Ministers to include way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects.

- That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to write to relevant Ministers, TfV and agencies as an opportunity will be lost if we don’t reference and build upon the Way finding and Signage project while Government projects and signage is being rolled out.

Action: AGREED that the IMAP Executive Officer would draft a letter that addresses including way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects and advises Ministers and senior department executives of this issue

5. **Update of the IMAP Operational Protocol (Attachment 6)**

5.1 That the changes proposed in the amended IMAP Operational Protocol be approved.

MOVED MR WALL / Mr Roberts

A vote was taken and the MOTION was CARRIED

6. **Other Business:**

The Executive Officer advised that she had met with Lucy Saaroni, CoY regarded the recommendations of the Crowded Places Working Group and would be sending the CEOs an email of the information required from each Council on events management for their follow up.

The meeting closed at 4.40pm

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

1.2 Mr Stephen Wall, Chief Executive Officer, Maribyrnong City Council was appointed Chair of the meeting.

2.1 The following apologies were noted:
   o Mr Peter Smith, Chief Executive Officer, City of Port Phillip
   o Ms Vijaya Vaidyanath, Chief Executive Officer, City of Yarra
   o Ms Claire Ferres-Miles, Director City Strategy & Place/ Interim Chief Executive Officer, City of Melbourne

3.1 That the IMAP Executive Forum:
   a) Note the outcome of the DELWP grant application and the intent to seek alternative funding sources from private, public or charitable sources for up to $50,000 to undertake the project.
   b) Seek a report back to the IMAP Executive Forum in February 2019 on progress in pursuing alternative funding sources.
   c) Recommends looking at how the project could be scaled to accommodate whatever funding level that is able to be achieved.

3.2 That the Executive Forum supports the proposal to develop a bicycle network model that immediately benefits IMAP councils, and which will also form a key part of the broader Metropolitan Cycling Network.

3.3 That the Executive Forum supports
   o Applying the $60K accumulated tourism funds across the next 3 years towards projects (i.e. no new funding), to a tourism and economic development working group strategy
   o Providing $5Kpa for map updates
   o Reframing a new Strategic Plan: review the project offering around economic vitality and resilience, and shopping strips research
   o Reviewing the Working Group and its delivery in 12 months time.

3.4 That the Executive Forum:
   o Noted receipt of a report that highlighted IMAP’s position within the regional groups; and
   o Agreed to refocus the Three year Implementation Program - aiming to be as agile and resilient as some of these other groups: and
   o Would report back the following agreed process to the Committee in February 2019:
     - Have commenced the review of projects that have not yet been commenced on the program
     - Will undertake a workshop before 22 March to review the plan as a result of the findings of that review
     - Will report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee in May 2019 with a refreshed, amended implementation program reflective of the changes in the current environment.

5.1 That the changes proposed in the amended IMAP Operational Protocol be approved.

ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Bus Arising</td>
<td>IMAP Executive officer</td>
<td>That the IMAP Executive Officer would prepare a letter that advises the Minister of the resolution of the Committee relating to advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms”.</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Ferres-Miles, CoM</td>
<td>That Claire Ferres Miles will liaise with the IMAP Executive Officer and take the lead on this (SG partnering on CLUE) to ensure it is done in a coordinated way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That the IMAP Executive Officer would draft a letter that addresses including way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects and advises Ministers and senior department executives of this issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMAP Implementation Committee

### Business Arising

#### 22 February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>IMAP Executive Forum (16 August 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IMAP Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer and City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IMAP Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Officer and City of Port Phillip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (31 August 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Comm &amp; Gov</td>
<td>CEO CoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Street Count</td>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>IMAP Implementation Committee (30 November 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CLUE</td>
<td>All Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Affordable housing</td>
<td>IMAP Executive Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wayfinding signs</td>
<td>All Committee members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Report prepared by Elissa McElroy IMAP Executive Officer
D IMAP Executive Forum (19 December 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Bus Arising</td>
<td>That the IMAP Executive Officer would prepare a letter that advises the Minister of the resolution of the Committee relating to advocacy options around “affordable housing planning mechanisms”.</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer/ C Ferres-Miles CoM</td>
<td>That Claire Ferres Miles will liaise with the IMAP Executive Officer and take the lead on this (SG partnering on CLUE) to ensure it is done in a coordinated way</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>Ongoing – in progress. Refer item 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP Exec Officer</td>
<td>That the IMAP Executive Officer would draft a letter that addresses including way finding signage consistency across all State Government projects and advises Ministers and senior department executives of this issue</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>Ongoing – As above - Discussed approach/timing with DoT staff and joint committee. Exec Officer to provide verbal update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondence

Inward

3a - Email: J Dzomba, Principal Planner, DELWP – use of IMAP SDAPP Factsheet reference in LPPF policy
3b – Email: A Suckling, Copyright Agency CEO - newsletter
3d – Letter: Cr S Stefanopoulos, Mayor CoS on behalf of ISMMF re lapsing of Better Indoor Stadiums Fund – encl letter to Minister Pukula
3e – Email: A Bradshaw (DEDJTR), Snr Advocacy Officer, Victorian Small Business Commission – enclosing Victorian Small Business Engagement Guidelines document

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).
Hi Jenny,

Further to our discussion, the IMAP ESD factsheets page has now been updated on the website and is available at: http://imap.vic.gov.au/index.php?page=sustainable-design-esd-factsheets

I can confirm that the IMAP Councils would welcome DELWP’s use of this material as reference documents.

I also attach a list of the Councils that already utilise the IMAP Sustainable Design Factsheets series on their websites as information documents for their communities – for your information.

Kind regards,

Elissa

Elissa McElroy

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

Officer Location: CITY OF STONNINGTON
PO Box 58 Malvern, Victoria 3144
www.imap.vic.gov.au

Please consider the environment before printing this email

Hi Elissa,

I write in regard to the ESD policy rolled out by CASBE councils. (See Yarra Clause 22.17 for example). These policies will be translated into the new PPF with each of the relevant planning scheme’s LPPF translation project. In reviewing the existing LPPF policy, I believe the policy would benefit from a direct reference to the Sustainable Design Assessment in the Planning Process (IMAP, 2015) document; as it provides a clearer explanation of best practice, SDA’s and SMP’s than the policy does at present. I am proposing to include the reference in the list of ‘policy guidelines’ to the PPF policy and would like to include the reference in both IMAP and non-IMAP councils. I would like to understand your group’s view on this proposal.

I have already directed the above proposal to CASBE and Yarra City Council.

I look forward to hearing from you on the matter.
Regards,

Jenny Dzomba | Principal Planner | Smart Planning
Planning | Department of Environment, Land, Water & Planning
Level 8, 8 Nicholson Street, East Melbourne, Victoria 3002
PO Box 500, Melbourne, Victoria 3002 | DX210098
T: 03 8392 5400 | E: jenny.dzomba@delwp.vic.gov.au
Hello,

Welcome to our third edition of Licence Plus, produced quarterly for the Copyright Agency’s valued customers. You’re receiving this newsletter because your business has purchased a copyright licence from us.

In this issue, we discuss the role of creativity in the digital age. You’ll learn how copyright is like real estate; how Koda Capital is a leader in the finance industry for compliance, and some quick tips from IP lawyers. We’re also inviting you to fill in a short customer survey to help us improve our data, thereby enhancing the payment of licence fees to our members.

Enjoy the issue.

Adam Suckling
Copyright Agency CEO
VIDEO

How is copyright like real estate?
Watch and find out!

COPYRIGHT GOVERNANCE

Key takeaways from our recent Copyright tutorial with Holman Webb Lawyers

CASE STUDY

Koda Capital on taking the lead in compliance in the finance industry

AWARD

Got a terrific Annual Report? Make sure you enter it in the annual ARA awards

DOWNLOAD YOUR FREE COPYRIGHT GOVERNANCE GUIDE

SHOWCASE YOUR GOOD COPYRIGHT GOVERNANCE

MAKE THE MOST OF YOUR LICENCE WITH TRAINING

Official supporter of Australian creators
30 October 2018

Ms Elissa McElroy
IMAP Executive Officer
Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)
PO Box 21
Prahran VIC 3181

Dear Ms McElroy


I appreciate your organisation taking the time to keep me informed of its activities, and I look forward to hearing from you again in the future.

Thank you again for writing.

Yours sincerely

The Hon Daniel Andrews MP
Premier
Inner South Metropolitan Mayors Forum

18 December, 2018

Ms Elissa McElroy  
Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP)  
311 Glenferrie Road, Malvern  
PO Box 58, Malvern VIC 3144

Via email: emcelroy@stonnington.vic.gov.au

Dear Ms McElroy,

Re: The Better Indoor Stadiums Fund (BISF)

The Inner South Metropolitan Mayors Forum (ISMMF) would like to draw to your attention the lapsing of the Better Indoor Stadiums Fund (BISF).

The Andrews Government in its first term of office demonstrated a commitment to encouraging grassroots sports participation by working with local communities and clubs, sporting associations and local government to deliver modern facilities to help meet rapidly growing demand. One way in which this was demonstrated was through the Better Indoor Stadiums Fund (BISF).

The BISF is designed to develop new and upgrade existing stadiums to increase participation and community well-being. Under the program, local governments could apply for up to $3 million in funding for the development of indoor sports courts.

The ISMMF is seeking a continuation of this unique and much needed program and we are therefore calling on the Victorian Government to commit to the Better Indoor Stadiums Fund for the next four years.

We would expect that the program is of similar interest to Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP).

Your active support in joining with the ISMMF to advocate for a continuation of this program by writing to the Minister for Sport and your local MPs will be greatly welcomed and contribute to an increased chance of a successful outcome. (A copy of our letter to the Minister is attached for your information).

If you require any further information, or would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Mick Cummins, CEO at Bayside City Council on behalf of the ISMMF on (03) 9599 4378.

Yours sincerely,

Cr Steve Stefanopoulos  
Mayor City of Stonnington

On behalf of the members of the Inner South Metropolitan Mayors Forum (ISMMF)
19 December, 2018

The Hon Martin Pakula MP
Minister for Racing
Minister for Jobs, Innovation and Trade
Minister for Tourism, Sport and Major Events
Level 16, 121 Exhibition Street
Melbourne Victoria 3000

Via email: martin.pakula@parliament.vic.gov.au

Dear Minister Pakula,

Re: The Better Indoor Stadiums Fund (BISF)

Congratulations on your appointment as Minister for Tourism, Sport and Major Events, and on the return of the Andrews Government.

The Andrews Government in its first term of office demonstrated an admirable commitment to funding and encouraging grassroots sports participation throughout the state, working with local communities and clubs, sporting associations and local government to deliver modern facilities to help meet rapidly growing demand.

As part of its suite of tailored responses, a key Victorian Government program is the Better Indoor Stadiums Fund (BISF).

The BISF is designed to develop new and upgrade existing stadiums to increase participation and community well-being. Under the program, local governments could apply for up to $3 million in funding for the development of indoor sports courts.

Prior to the introduction of this program, local governments could only access Community Sports Infrastructure Fund Major Grants of up to $650,000.

As a demonstration of the need for the BISF, Wyndham City Council’s $47 million Werribee Indoor Sports Stadium only received state assistance of $650,000 (the maximum available prior to the BISF) – equal to a paltry 1.4 per cent of the total project cost.

The cost to deliver significant capital projects has increased at a rapid rate over the last 5 years – with escalations of 20-30 per cent over the last 18 months.

As an example, the contract to construct Glen Eira Sports and Aquatic Centre (GESAC) was awarded in late 2009 for a construction cost of $41 million. The equivalent construction cost for GESAC at today’s rates would be in excess of $60 million.
Within inner Melbourne the development of new stadiums often requires a number of other complimentary facilities to make them viable and financially sustainable — such as aquatics, community facilities or Council services. This increases the cost of these buildings significantly.

Many of these facilities have a regional catchment; and while it would be unreasonable to expect a neighbouring council contribution, the Government contribution for these regional facilities needs to be higher to reflect this. There is a noted shortfall of indoor basketball / netball / futsal and rectangular pitches for soccer/hockey across the region.

Against this background, the introduction of the BISF has proved invaluable in making possible the development of a range of much needed indoor stadiums right across the state.

The 2018-19 BISF grants round has now closed.

As members of the Inner South Metropolitan Mayors Forum (ISMMF), our Councils are seeking a continuation of this unique and much needed program. Without it, the maximum available funding for projects of this type and scale is only up to $800,000 through the Community Sports Infrastructure Fund.

Several Councils from our region alone have planned projects that are contingent on funding support.

Stonnington Council has identified a need for eight additional indoor courts. There are no basketball association competitions played in Stonnington and the local netball association has access to only two indoor courts at a single facility. There is a desperate need for indoor courts in the inner city that can cater for high levels of use. Existing open space of which there is very little on a per capita basis cannot continue to accommodate the bulk of organised sport within the municipality further highlighting the need for alternative sport and recreation facilities.

To partially address this court shortage, Stonnington is developing a masterplan for a new multipurpose sport and recreation facility that will include four indoor courts. These courts will be used primarily for basketball and netball.

The estimated cost for the development of this facility at the time was $37 million. The opportunity to apply for a $3 million contribution from the State Government’s Better Indoor Stadiums Funding Program was identified at the time. Any increase in the contribution required of Council to offset a reduction in funding from the State Government puts at risk the delivery of this facility.

Bayside City Council is planning a $10 million four indoor court basketball stadium. Should the anticipated State Government funding be reduced from $2.5 million to $800,000 by discontinuance of the BISF, a $1.7 million funding gap will be created for the Bayside community, in turn jeopardising the project.

In summary, the ISMMF calls on the Victorian Government to continue the Better Indoor Stadiums Fund, at least in its current form and quantum of funding, for the next three financial years. Through our discussions with sporting bodies and other Councils across Melbourne, we know that this is a shared and urgent priority for all involved.
If you require any further information, or would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Mick Cummins, CEO, Bayside City Council on behalf of the ISMMF on (03) 9599 4378.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Cr Steve Stefanopolous
Mayor City of Stonnington

On behalf of the members of the Inner South Metropolitan Mayors Forum (ISMMF)

CC:
Premier Daniel Andrews
Minister for Local Government, The Hon Adem Somyurek MP
Hi Elissa

I was given your contact details by Simon Osborne at City of Yarra.

I work at the Victorian Small Business Commission and we are currently monitoring the impact of disruptive infrastructure projects in Victoria.

As part of this process, we have created Engagement Guidelines that summarise best practice behaviours for project managers undertaking infrastructure works.

You can find out more about these here:


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...

It would be great if we could meet with you in the new to discuss the Guidelines and to find out whether IMAP would be interested in developing their own processes for project managers.

I understand it's a busy time of year so happy to touch base after Christmas to share some ideas moving forward.

Kind regards

Alice Bradshaw
Visit our website or follow us on LinkedIn.

Please note - I am not in the office on Thursdays.
Background

1. The IMAP financial position was last noted at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting held on 30 November 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 (comprising $582,470 IMAP funds and $50,000 held funds (CoY and CoMar CLUE contributions)). All IMAP Council contributions for 2018-19 were invoiced in the 2nd quarter.

4. **Total Income** for the 6 month period to 31 December 2018:

   **2810 Contract income:**
   - IMAP Councils (5) - Project contributions ($55K each): $275,000

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

   **TOTAL OPERATING INCOME**: $932,470

Expenditure

5. **Total Expenditure for** the 6 month period to 31 December 2018:

   **4040 Contract Staff**
   - Wayfinding Contractor – Project Management: $20,680
   - Recreation Contractor – Update maps and attributes: $9,900 $30,580

   **4104 Postage and Courier**
   - IMAP Couriers (Aug): $246
   - Couriers (Nov): $570 $816

   **4106 Software Support and Maintenance**
   - IMAP Basecamp monthly fee - File sharing service July-Aug: $150
   - Basecamp Sept: $78
   - Basecamp Oct: $79
   - Basecamp Nov: $77
   - Domain renewal (dotMelb1): $120
   - CLUE CLUE contributions (Held funds): CoS, CoY, CoMar: $75,000 $75,504

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

   **4131 Promotional Publications**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description and Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>CTV Cultural Guide 2018-19 – instalment 1</td>
<td>$ 7,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTV Cultural Guide - instalment 2</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4150 Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td>$ 14,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Update Visitor Cruise Guide (Visual Voice)</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Licence fee for CBD map (Visual Voice)</td>
<td>$ 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update digital maps (Visual Voice)</td>
<td>$ 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StreetCount</td>
<td>Launch Housing coordination - variation</td>
<td>$ 11,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media consultant</td>
<td>$ 19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional media costs</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Way found Website development (Printcess)</td>
<td>$ 11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management fees (Contractor – code error)</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design/deliver base map workshop (SGS)</td>
<td>$ 5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop report - Additional content/edits (SGS)</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>Annual Report 2017/18 design/print</td>
<td>$ 3,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Report Summary design/print</td>
<td>$ 2,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4211 Staff Catering</strong></td>
<td>$ 70,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td>IMAP staff meetings (various June-Sept)</td>
<td>$ 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catering IMAP Nov meeting</td>
<td>$ 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>$ 192,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operating Profit / (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$ 740,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NET SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>$ 740,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 6 months ending 31 December 2018.
# IMAP Operating Report

**Operating & Capital Works Statement for period ended December 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR TO DATE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actuals</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Actuals</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User fees</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>657,470</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>932,470</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Normal Salary expenses</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Annual Leave</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Long Service Leave</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net ADO</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workcover</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Professional Development</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraordinary Staff Payments</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4040 - Contract Staff</strong></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,980)</td>
<td>30,580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Employee Expenses</strong></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,980)</td>
<td>30,580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Benefits</strong></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,980)</td>
<td>30,580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4104 - Postage &amp; Couriers</strong></td>
<td>569</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(569)</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4106 - Software Support and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(197)</td>
<td>75,504</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4108 - Stationery - General</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4131 - Promotional Publications</strong></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>14,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4150 - Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>70,237</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials and Services</strong></td>
<td>8,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8,766)</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bad and doubtful debts.</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Grants</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance costs</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4211 - Staff Catering</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other expenses</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>14,875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14,875)</td>
<td>192,336</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/ (Deficit) for the year</strong></td>
<td>(14,875)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14,875)</td>
<td>740,134</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other comprehensive income / expenditure.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depreciation and amortisation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Capital Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Surplus / (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(14,875)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(14,875)</td>
<td>740,134</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMAP Budget 2018-19 - Expenditure by Project as at 31 December 2018

#### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2018/19</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 3rd qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 4th qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forecast total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,400</td>
<td>-420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROJECT ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>BUDGET 2018/19</th>
<th>Carry forwards</th>
<th>ACTUALS 1st qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 2nd qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 3rd qtr</th>
<th>ACTUALS 4th qtr</th>
<th>Total YTD</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forecast total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

- Bold: Identified as priority projects in the new plan
- #: Identified as priority projects in the new plan

Please note that the funding calculation does not include Operational Costs of $40,000 per council in 2018/19.
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. The IMAP Executive Forum meeting #28 was held on 19 December to consider the Three year Implementation Program and items referred by the Committee – refer to the Draft Minutes Item 5 Attachment 2.

Prior to the meeting, the Executive Officer met with the CEO’s of Maribyrnong (11 December), Stonnington (12 December), and Yarra (17 December) to discuss IMAP priorities. A brief meeting was held with C Ferres-Miles (while Interim CEO, CoM) and representatives of the CEOs office at Port Philip (18 December).

3. The IMAP Operational Protocol has been updated and is attached for Committee approval – refer Item 6 Attachment 6

4. The Local Government Bill is due to be reintroduced into the Victorian Parliament. There is a new section proposed relating to Special Committees – now called Delegated Committees under this Bill. This may effect the IMAP Special Committee structure and delegations, as follows.

   a. The current provisions of the Local Government Act 1989 in relation to Special Committees include the following excerpt:

   **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1989**

   86 Special committees of the Council

   (1) In addition to any advisory committees that a Council may establish, a Council may establish one or more special committees of the following—

   (a) Councillors;
   (b) Council staff;
   (c) other persons;
   (d) any combination of persons referred to in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).

   (2) A Council may appoint members to a special committee and may at any time remove a member from a special committee.

   (3) Except as provided in subsection (4), a Council may by instrument of delegation delegate any of its functions, duties or powers under this or any other Act to a special committee

   **87 Special committee meetings**

   (2) The Council may appoint a Chairperson for a special committee.

   (3) If the Council has not appointed a Chairperson under subsection (2), the members of a special committee must appoint a Chairperson.

   (4) If the Chairperson is not present at a meeting of a special committee the members must appoint a Chairperson for that meeting.

   b. The proposed Local Government Bill includes the following new provisions:

   **LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL 2018**

   60 Joint meetings of Councils
(1) Two or more Councils may determine to hold a joint meeting.
(2) A joint meeting is a meeting of each Council for the purposes of this Act.
(3) A joint meeting is to be constituted by the Councillors and the number of Councillors determined by the Councils holding the joint meeting.
(4) Subject to subsection (5), section 59 applies to a joint meeting as if it were a Council meeting but the Chairperson of the meeting does not have a second vote.
(5) A joint meeting must comply with any requirements prescribed by the regulations.

61 Delegated committees

(1) A Council may make a delegation under section 10 to the members of a delegated committee.
(2) A delegated committee—
   (a) must include at least 2 Councillors; and
   (b) must be chaired by a Councillor appointed by the Council or the Mayor; and
   (c) may include any other persons appointed to the delegated committee by the Council who are entitled to vote.
(3) Subject to any express variations specified in the Council’s Governance Rules, section 59 (other than subsection (1)) applies to a meeting of a delegated committee as if—
   (a) the Chairperson was the Mayor; and
   (b) the members were Councillors.

Following preliminary discussions with City of Stonnington’s legal counsel, it is recommended that legal advice be sought to determine:

- Whether the five Inner Melbourne Action Plan Special Committees can continue to operate under the proposed new provisions; and
- If affected, what action is required to comply with the new provisions.

Communications

5 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 and Mapping**
  - 11 December – Way found Reviewers Feedback Meeting at Library at the Dock to reflect on the overall comments from the 7 independent reviewers
  - 17 December – Meeting with David Blain from VicMaps on mapping requirements
  - 18 December – Way found and Bike Path wayfinding - planning meeting with TfV to address this identified gap in the Manual
  - 18 January – meeting with TfV re wayfinding signage advocacy and mapping strategy across the Government projects
  - 17 and 24 January – Working group update meetings
  - 31 January – Cycling and Walking signage meeting with DoT – Adrian Webb and Pete Stevens
  - 4 February – IMAP Visitor Signage Coordinating Committee meeting
  - 7 February – planning meeting for a Round Table Forum on Bike and Shared Path Wayfinding – date of Round Table TBA

- **Active Sport and Recreation Facility Planning Study**
  - 14 December – SGS ran the Recreation Project Gap Analysis Workshop
  - December/January – final reviews of the data by council staff.

- **IMAP Urban Forest Plan**
  - Received the Draft “Living Melbourne’ strategy from Resilient Melbourne and The Nature Conservancy (Martin Hartigan). The Living Melbourne Strategy was reviewed at a
Workshop held on 13 February and has generally been well received. 36 organisations provided feedback and the amended version 2 is due to be circulated to Council CEOs and organisations on 22 February 2019. Resilient Melbourne is seeking endorsement of the Strategies Vision, Goals and actions prior to a launch on 5 June.

- 18 February – attending the External Advisory Workshop on CoM’s Green our City Strategy and Action plan looking at Planning Scheme amendment provisions
- Liaising with Maribyrnong Council to get the IMAP Project Leader replacement on board.

  o Safety in Crowded Places
    - 6 December – provided updates to Lucy Saaroni at City of Yarra
    - 19 December – met with Lucy Saaroni to determine next steps to implement the working groups recommendations
    - Met with Nicole Warren, Events Coordinator at CoS to inform Council data and contacts requests.
    - January - Received City of Brisbane enquiry on IMAP Council work in this area.
    - February - Advised Lucy Saaroni has now left CoY – commenced liaison with replacement Sophie Barison

  o ESD Factsheets Project
    - Enquiries from Whittlesea, Yarra Ranges, Greater Geelong and City of Wodonga for access to the IMAP ESD Factsheet series. The Executive Officer has been handling these enquiries since Euan Williamson left CoY.
    - DELWP advised request to use the SDAPP factsheet as a reference document as part of their framework plan review – refer correspondence item (see Business Arising and Attachment 3a)

  o Other
    - Undertaking the Environment scan for IMAP project review
    - Briefed CoS Economic Development Manager on IMAP
    - 21 January - Met with Evelyn Legare, DoT on evaluation

Recommendation

6 That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves:
   a. To note the Communications and Governance Briefing Paper.
   b. To authorise legal advice be sought over the implications of the provisions of the Local Government Bill.
IMAP Implementation Committee
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Update to the IMAP Operational Protocol

Purpose

1. To note the recent changes made to the IMAP Operational Protocol for approval by the IMAP Implementation Committee.

Background

2. The Operational Protocol was last considered by the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting on 24 November 2017 - primarily in response to queries from auditors which the changes sought to clarify. Following discussion, these amendments and others were referred to the IMAP Executive Forum to review and included:
   - Provide additional clause on support, feedback, development and recognition of the activity of the IMAP Executive Officer
   - Add to Section 6.2 a. Role references to include coordination of responses to avoid duplication through Resilient Melbourne, Metro partnerships and other forums; e.g.
     - Have a coordination and advisory function across all different forum.

3. The Executive Forum considered the amendments to the documents at their meeting on 9 February 2018. The Executive Forum requested further changes:
   - The IMAP Executive Forum resolves that:
     a. sections 7.4 and 7.5 of the IMAP Operational Protocol be merged and reworded (both relate to the EO role); and
     b. the Operational Protocol be amended to reflect the Executive Officer’s annual engagement directly with the CEO’s through the Executive Forum, so that the CEO’s can provide feedback and assistance to the role in a more dynamic way.

4. In November 2018, the IMAP Executive Officer’s contract was renewed and the Position Description and Contract updated to reflect the Operational Protocol for consistency. Of necessity, the changes were made to the Operational Protocol at that time in line with the above recommendation, so they could be incorporated into those contract documents. These amendments were subsequently approved by the IMAP Executive Forum on 19 November 2018.

   The attached copy provided for Committee approval indicates the updates made. The changes are highlighted in red.

Recommendation

5. That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to approve the IMAP Operational Protocol as amended.
Operational Protocol

of the

Inner Melbourne Action Plan

Implementation Committee
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1. **Background / Context**

1.1 Generally, the purpose of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan Implementation Committee (‘Committee’) will be to oversee the implementation of regionally based actions identified in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan (IMAP) 2016-2026, as adopted by member Councils in December 2005.

1.2 The Cities of Melbourne, Port Phillip, Stonnington and Yarra, in association with VicUrban, developed the first action plan in 2006 to strengthen the liveability, attraction and prosperity of inner Melbourne.

1.3 The Maribyrnong City Council became a member of the Committee from 1 July 2013. The Inner Melbourne Action Plan was reviewed in response to the State Government’s Metropolitan Planning Strategy and to change the IMAP boundary to include the 5 Councils.

1.4 The IMAP project scope is to provide for the development of regional actions to deliver agreed regional outcomes. The broad outcome is to ensure the liveability of the inner region and the sustainable development of Melbourne into the future.

1.5 Implementing IMAP will involve ongoing regional collaboration, commitment through capital works and infrastructure programs, changes to municipal planning scheme policies and controls and partnerships with State Government, agencies and others.

1.6 This protocol has been adopted by the Committee to provide the basis for the working relationships between the member Councils in respect to matters within the Committee’s Terms of Reference and for the resolution of any issues that arise between member Councils in respect to IMAP.

2. **Scope of protocols**

2.1 The scope of the Operational Protocols is as follows:

a. Meeting Procedures – general

b. Committee member behaviour

c. Conflict of interest procedures

d. Definition of the role, relationships and operational processes of the Leadership Forums

e. Definition of the role, relationships and operational processes associated with the IMAP Executive Officer

f. Definition of the role, relationships and operational processes associated with the Technical Working Group (the project teams).

G. Processes for co-opting associate partners to the Committee.

h. Definition of the role and relationships of associate partner representatives

i. Voting arrangements

j. Procedures for conflict resolution (conflict in views)

k. Joint statements.
I. Processes for review of Governance arrangements

m. Effective date of the Operational Protocol

3. Meeting Procedures – general

3.1 Public Notice

a. Times and places of meetings are to be determined by the Committee

b. Meetings must be open to the public except for confidential matters.

c. The Committee must give reasonable notice to the public of its meetings including dates, starting times and places of the meeting, and order of business on the agenda.

3.2 Order of Business

a. An ‘Order of business’ will be provided on a formal agenda to be provided prior to each meeting.

3.3 Notice of Agenda Papers

a. Reasonable notice of Agenda papers shall be given and distributed to the Committee members and Associate Committee Members (generally three working days).

b. Agenda papers shall not, in the first instance, be provided in electronic format, with the exception of late agenda items that may be provided electronically. (Full Agenda papers can be provided electronically by request.)

3.4 ‘Out of Committee’ decision making

a. Agenda items may be electronically distributed and responses received between Committee meetings.

b. Where consensus is not reached regarding an item distributed electronically, the agenda item will be formally listed for discussion and the issue addressed at the next meeting.

c. Any decision made on these agenda items must be ratified at the next meeting via the normal voting processes.

3.5 Recording of minutes and adoption of minutes of the last meeting

a. Minutes of decisions made at each meeting will be formally recorded in writing.

b. Minutes of the previous meeting must be confirmed as an accurate record at the subsequent meeting of the Committee.

c. The Minutes of the previous meeting are considered certified once they have been confirmed by the Committee.

d. The Minutes will be made available for public inspection at each IMAP Council. The draft Minutes and confirmed Minutes will also be available on the IMAP website.
3.6 Confidential matters

a. Meetings may be closed to discuss confidential matters.

b. A resolution to close & reopen a meeting and the reason must be taken and recorded in the minutes.

c. Members of Committee must not release confidential information to the public.

3.7 Declaration of interests

a. Members of the Committee are required to declare at a meeting any interests or conflict of interests.

b. Where Committee members have already completed a Register of Interest for their respective councils this is considered satisfactory unless new interests arise.

c. Each Council will exempt all non-Council members of their Special Committee from having to complete a Register of Interest as per the requirements of the Local Government Act.

3.8 Requesting and receiving information

a. Requests for information by the Committee shall be made through the IMAP Executive Officer unless otherwise agreed by the Committee.

b. Information to be received by the Committee shall be made through the IMAP Executive Officer unless otherwise agreed by the Committee.

c. Committee members may receive information via email and electronic transfer, except for agenda papers, which shall be provided in hard copy. (Refer section 3.3 b. above)

3.9 Presentations requested by the Committee

a. Presentations by guests may be made at the request of the Committee.

b. Requests for presentations shall be made through the IMAP Executive Officer unless otherwise agreed by the Committee.

3.10 Calling of special meetings

a. Special meetings may be called by any of the five IMAP Councils.

b. The elected representatives of a majority of three IMAP Councils must consent in writing for a special meeting to be called.

c. Reasonable public notice of any special meeting must be given of any special meeting called.
3.11 Committee Vacancy

a. The provisions of Section 69 of the Local Government Act 1989 are applicable.

4. Committee member behaviour

4.1 The Committee affirms the following principles of behaviour:

a. Each Committee member is aware of their responsibility to comply with the rules of conduct specified in Section 76B of the Local Government Act 1989 that require that Committee members must:
   - Act honestly;
   - Exercise reasonable care and diligence;
   - Not make improper use of their position to gain, or attempt to gain, directly or indirectly, an advantage for themselves or for any other person, or to cause, or attempt to cause, damage to the Committee;
   - Not make improper use of information acquired because of their position to gain, or attempt to gain, directly or indirectly, an advantage for themselves or for any other person, or to cause, or attempt to cause, damage to the Committee.

b. Committee members will treat all people with courtesy and respect, recognising that there will be robust debate and legitimate differences in opinions, race, culture, religion, language, gender and abilities. Robust political debate is part of the Committee environment and is encouraged.

c. Committee members will always act with integrity and honesty.

d. Committee members recognise that they hold a position of trust and will not misuse or derive undue benefit from their positions.

e. Committee members will exercise appropriate prudence in the use of public resources and information.

f. Committee members will treat with appropriate caution Committee information by recognising the requirements of the Information Privacy Act 2000 regarding the access, use and release of personal information.

5. Conflict of Interest Procedures

5.1 Committee members will comply with all the provisions of the Act in regard to Interests and Conflicts of Interest as per the provisions of the Local Government Act 1989.

6. Leadership Forums

The following Leadership Forums have been established:

6.1 Annual Forum (previously referred to as Elected Representatives Forum)

a. Role

The role of the Annual Forum is to:

   - Advise on annual priorities
b. Relationships

To undertake these roles, the forum will interact with the:

- Inner Councils
- The Minister for Planning and other Minister’s as required
- State Government and Agencies
- The Executive Forum
- The IMAP Implementation Committee
- The Technical Working Groups

c. Operational Process

- The Annual Forum will meet annually, or as necessary, and provide advice to the Committee.

- The Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson shall be appointed from the councillor representatives of the Forum on a rotational basis for each meeting.

6.2 Executive Forum (previously referred to as CEO/Senior Management Forum)

a. Role

The role of the Executive Forum is to:

- Determine the annual priorities program
- Drive regional priorities
- Provide opportunities for State Government liaison.
- Look for partnerships with regional stakeholders
- Identify synergies and opportunities arising from State Government and individual Council initiatives recognising that implementation will be opportunistic not sequential.
- Receive Annual Report and progress reports.

- Have a coordination and advisory function across all different forum e.g. Inner South Metro Mayors Forum, the Metro Partnerships and Resilient Melbourne. This could include:

  - ensure that the groups are not duplicating work
  - be aware of what other groups are doing, and that they don’t dilute the efforts of IMAP
  - undertake IMAP’s mandate to implement certain strategies i.e. be focussed on what we are doing and to influence others
b. Relationships

To undertake these roles, the Executive Forum will interact with:

- The IMAP Councils
- The Minister for Planning and other Ministers as required
- State Government and Agencies
- The Annual Forum
- The IMAP Implementation Committee
- The Technical Working Groups/Project teams
- Various Forums where groups of Councils are involved e.g. Metro Partnerships, Inner South Metropolitan Mayors group

c. Operational Process

- The Executive Forum will meet every six months, or as necessary.
- The Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson shall be appointed from the executive officer representatives of the Forum on a rotational basis for each meeting.
- The forum will report as necessary to the Committee.

7. IMAP Executive Officer

7.1 Role

The role of the IMAP Executive Officer is to:

a. Provide executive advice and support to the IMAP Implementation Committee and the IMAP Leadership Forums. The Executive Officer has a high level of autonomy within agreed parameters and guidance of the CEO/General Manager of the IMAP Executive Officer’s host Council.

b. Work across the five IMAP Implementation Committee Councils effectively to achieve the actions outlined in the approved IMAP Implementation Plan.

c. Coordinate and promote the implementation of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan.

d. Where practicable, strive to minimise the administrative burden on this position by utilizing the administrative resources of the Committee member Councils.

e. Manage the policy review and update the strategies and actions contained in the Inner Melbourne Action Plan as required
f. Act as the Executive Officer servicing the IMAP Implementation Committee and facilitate implementation of IMAP Implementation Committee decisions.

g. Provide leadership to multi-disciplinary Project Working Groups to achieve timely and effective project outcomes.

7.2 Accountability

The IMAP Executive Officer is accountable for:

a. Reporting to the IMAP Implementation Committee and Senior Executives where the need arises in an accurate, professional and timely manner.

b. The coordination of the delivery of the actions outlined in the approved Inner Melbourne Action Plan.

c. The co-ordination of papers and actions arising from the IMAP Implementation Committee (as directed by the Chair) including the preparation and co-ordination of papers for consideration and approval.

d. Co-ordination and facilitation of major projects under the IMAP banner.

e. Effective leadership of project teams and meeting of deadlines.

f. Professional advice provided and anticipation and forecasting of actions required to advance the achievement of project objectives.

g. Preparation and presentation of briefings, progress reports and other items at the IMAP Implementation Committee.

h. Delivering agreed work plans on time.

i. Providing clear, professional and timely advice.

j. Accuracy, professionalism and analysis in officer reports.

k. Co-ordination of and assistance in the delivery of items at the meetings of the IMAP Implementation Committee (as required).

l. Reporting on project milestones.

m. Management of IMAP finances and administration of IMAP’s Procurement Policy for Goods and Services

7.3 Authority

The IMAP Executive Officer has the authority to:

a. Work across the five Committee Councils, State Government, agencies and other partner organisations to achieve the actions in the approved IMAP Implementation Program; and taking into account the work of other regional forums, where known, to avoid duplication of effort.

b. Liaise with government authorities to progress the planning objectives of the Committee and IMAP outcomes.

c. Prepare correspondence for the Chair of the IMAP Implementation Committee.
d. Sign letters, act on behalf of, and represent the Committee where directed by the Committee.

e. Prepare agendas and minutes, write reports, provide status updates, and provide recommendations to the Committee and IMAP Councils.

f. Act as the key nominated person on major projects as specified.

g. Represent the Committee with stakeholders, community, the media and interested parties to advance IMAP objectives and outcomes.

h. Act as a co-ordinating point and report to the Committee on other projects under the IMAP banner.

i. Instruct and supervise consultants undertaking work on the IMAP projects.

j. Coordinate the level of work required to achieve outcomes.

k. Instruct and supervise consultants to achieve agreed planning outcomes.

l. Prepare budget reports for consideration by the Committee on a quarterly and annual basis.

m. Engage consultants up to a value of $25,000 and arrange authorisation for larger contracts.

n. Where an expenditure item exceeds $25,000, the Executive Officer’s host Council executive will authorise expenditure.

7.4 Review

a. The host Council will undertake the annual performance review of the Executive Officer’s activities and use the opportunity to provide feedback and recognition as well as respond to any requests for additional support.

b. The IMAP Executive Forum will annually schedule an agenda item to discuss the EO role, provide feedback and any assistance to the IMAP Executive Officer.

c. The CEO of the host Council will confer with colleagues of the partner Councils at the time of the contract review to canvass feedback on performance and to confirm any contract and remuneration changes and decisions.

d. Should Committee members wish to point out any matters regarding the IMAP Executive Officer, contact shall be made through the relevant Committee CEO/executive officer from the Executive Officer’s host Council.

e. Should a Committee member consider that the IMAP Executive Officer has acted inappropriately or unprofessionally the matter will be addressed in the first instance to the relevant Committee CEO/General Manager from the IMAP Executive Officer’s host Council.

7A. Host Council

7A.1 Appointment
Every three years, the IMAP member Councils will appoint one of its members to be the Host Council.

The current Host Council is the City of Stonnington.

7A.2 Functions of Host Council

The Host Council will perform the following functions on behalf of all member Councils and such other functions as may be approved by the IMAP Implementation Committee from time to time:

- Provision of an office, administrative services and ancillary support for the IMAP Executive Officer;
- Access, technical support and use of the Host Council’s financial systems to record all financial income and expenditure of IMAP projects and staff operational costs in a form approved by the Committee; which assists the IMAP Executive Officer in the
  - Management and reporting of income and expenditure across the IMAP projects
  - Preparation of quarterly financial statements in a form approved by the Committee for distribution to the member Councils;
  - Preparation and delivery to member Councils of an annual report by 30 September each year;
- Invoicing and collection on behalf of IMAP of funds contributed from time to time by member Councils and others; and
- Retention of funds on behalf of member Councils pending their approved expenditure.

7A.3 Costs of Host Council’s Functions

The cost of the Executive Officer’s salary package and support functions performed and provided by the Host Council to the Committee will be agreed by the member Councils annually in November and provided for in IMAP’s annual review of the Three year Implementation Plan. These costs will be shared equally by the member Councils.

The Host Council’s annual staff operational costs and projects funding will be invoiced to the partner Councils annually or as otherwise may be agreed by the Committee from time to time.

8. IMAP Coordinator (or “Champion”)

8.1 The IMAP Coordinator, appointed by individual IMAP councils shall provide support to the IMAP Executive Officer by undertaking the following actions:

a. Acting as the initial contact to their respective Councils and providing information about and introduction to relevant officers within their respective Councils.

b. Attending IMAP Implementation Committee meetings as necessary, but particularly those where the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting is being hosted at their Council offices.

c. Acting as project managers or working group members for IMAP action projects where their respective skills and work program would make this appropriate.
d. Providing feedback to the IMAP Executive Officer regarding IMAP action implementation reports as appropriate e.g. six monthly progress report and annual report.

9. Associate Partners to the Committee

9.1 In the first instance, representatives from each of the following associate partners will be invited to attend the meetings of the Committee:

a. Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (DELWP) (2 representatives)
b. Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR) (2 representatives)
c. VicRoads (1 representative)
d. Metropolitan Planning Authority (1 representative)

9.2 Where other associate partners are essential to a nominated IMAP project, an invitation shall be provided to the appropriate associate partner executive inviting a nominee to attend the Committee.

9.3 Partner organisations have been determined in consultation with each nominated partner organisation as part of the implementation of each action and may include:

- participation through Officer involvement and information
- project specific funding (where appropriate)
- engagement on priorities for future expenditures (where appropriate).

9.4 Associate partner representatives will not be members of the Committee or entitled to vote, but can participate in any discussion.

9.5 Associate partners may change from time to time.

10. Committee Structure

10.1 The representatives for each Council are:

a. The Mayor or other elected representatives of the Cities of Stonnington, Yarra, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council, and Chair of the Melbourne City Council’s Planning Committee or nominated representative acting as Chair of the Melbourne’s City Council’s Planning Committee.

b. The CEO, or other approved representative acting as CEO, of the Cities of Stonnington, Yarra, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council, and the Director City Strategy and Place of the Melbourne City Council or nominated representative, acting as the Director City Strategy and Place of the Melbourne City Council.

11. Voting arrangements

11.1 The voting arrangements as specified in the five Terms of Reference shall apply for determining resolutions of the IMAP Implementation Committee, being:
• two (2) votes for the Cities of Stonnington, Melbourne, Yarra, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council.

This includes the following voting protocol:

a. Total unanimous vote will be eight (8) Committee members, with all 5 councils represented. The Annual approval of the rolling Three year Implementation Program must be carried unanimously.

b. The majority vote will be six (6) Committee members from four (4) Councils, of which the support of three (3) must be elected representatives, is required to pass a motion.

c. A quorum will consist of six (6) members, three (3) of which must be elected representatives.

11.2 ‘Moving’ or ‘seconding’ a motion may be undertaken by the Mayor, or an elected representative acting in the position as Mayor, of the Cities of Stonnington, Yarra, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council, or the Chair of the Melbourne City Council’s Planning Committee or nominated representative acting as Chair of the Melbourne City Council’s Planning Committee, or the CEO, or an approved representative acting in the position of CEO, of the Cities of Stonnington, Yarra, Port Phillip and the Maribyrnong City Council, or the Director City Strategy and Place of the Melbourne City Council or an approved representative acting in the position of Director City Strategy and Place.

11.3 Any member Council of the IMAP Implementation Committee may amend its voting representation in a motion placed before the IMAP Implementation Committee.

11.4 That any other non-approved representative can attend as an observer, on behalf of a Committee Member, but will not be granted voting rights.

12. Procedures for conflict resolution (conflict in views)

12.1 The guiding principle of this dispute resolution protocol is that every Committee member has the right to be heard.

12.2 Any grievance that cannot be resolved by the parties is to be brought before the Committee.

12.3 If the grievance cannot be resolved, and on agreement of the Committee, the Committee will engage an independent mediator.

13. Joint Statements

13.1 To enable a collaborative approach to new initiatives that may be rolled-out by the State Government or other organisations from time-to-time, the IMAP Member Councils may from time-to-time release ‘Joint Statements’ to media or via other public releases.

13.2 Any such ‘Joint Statements’ shall be co-ordinated through the IMAP Executive Officer and be agreed by the appropriate media officers of each IMAP Council.
13.3 Individual IMAP member Councils shall be able to add distinct content to an agreed ‘Joint Statement’, where an action has particular local relevance, provided the distinct content does not contradict the intent of the agreed ‘Joint Statement’.

14. **Process for review of Governance arrangements**

14.1 The Committee will consider a review of the Operational Protocol arrangements on an annual basis, or as determined necessary by the Committee.

15. **Effective Date / Administration**

15.1 These Amended Operational Protocols shall become effective as of 22 February 2019
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 (from 2016):

- 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

G1.P1 IMAP CLUE (Cens 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 2018, 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 2018

On 15 November, the IMAP Executive Forum considered the proposed next steps with the project.

CoM staff held meetings with each of the IMAP Councils to discuss budget requirements.

On 29 November 2018 IMAP Councils were invited to meet the vendor appointed for the CLUE technology upgrade

At their meeting on 30 November 2018 the IMAP Implementation Committee discussed the need for advocacy to encourage a State Government partnership in funding an IMAP CLUE for Inner Melbourne.

NEXT STEPS

Key milestones for the remainder of the project include:

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 2 editions launched on 25 August 2017 and 31 October 2018.
- 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 were developed for consideration by the Committee in November, including winding up this working group.
- This matter was referred to the IMAP Executive Forum on 19 December for further consideration. The Minutes of that meeting will be considered by the Committee on 22 February 2019 including the
recommendation to continue the work of this group, but with a wider Economic Development /Tourism brief.

NEXT STEPS
- It is proposed the Tourism and Economic Development Working Group report back on progress with their revised strategy in 12 months (Subject to Committee approval of the EF recommendations)

Strategy 1.4
G1.P3 Managing Entertainment Precincts

1. 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.

2. Protecting People in Crowded Places

BACKGROUND
In August 2017 officers from the IMAP Councils met to review the Federal Government’s recently released document “Australia’s Strategy for Protecting Crowded Places for Terrorism”, share insights and identify opportunities for collaboration. The Strategy has local government implications, particularly in the areas of event management, emergency management and urban planning.

The working group agreed that the Strategy’s templates and checklists for site security are a useful tool and identified:

- the need for a consistent, robust risk management assessment framework for the planning and conduct of public events.
- opportunities to share resources, expertise and specialists in risk management
- value in creating a comprehensive, standardised risk evaluation tool that can be provided to community members wishing to apply for an event permit.
- joint education, projects or programs that consolidate community connectivity and pride.
- protection of critical infrastructure and safety considerations embedded systemically into urban design
- reviews of site and procedural security

The Working Group reported on their recommendations to the Committee in February 2018. These are now being followed up on a joint basis and in conjunction with the State Government.
3. Disruption – new technologies, communication plans; IMAP Open Data policy

BACKGROUND

In February 2018 the IMAP Executive Forum agreed to convene a Think Tank to scan Councils’ current and future environment to identify/assess the main disruption technologies and threats facing Councils and communities in Inner Melbourne.

The Think Tank was formed in April and reviewed approaches to disruption and innovation as well as identifying challenges, trends and technologies which may cause disruption. Usually these disruptions have been enabled through digital or related technologies. Assessment of likely impact and proposed responses to these have not yet been considered.

Several trends have been identified which will impact Councils and our communities, and emerging technologies identified which can be leveraged to foster disruption.

- In-depth analysis and assessment of the trends and technologies identified above has commenced.
- This work will be finalised during early 2019.

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:
2016
➢ August - 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.

2017
➢ May - The Project team met with Transport for Victoria to discuss the next steps for communicating the Guide and considering mapping options.
➢ May – the IMAP Implementation Committee adopted Wayfound as an operational manual by the Councillors. It was referred to the Councillors for adoption. The WayFound manual continues to be updated as user feedback on the trials is processed.
➢ August - the Business case for the next stage of this Project was approved by the IMAP Committee meeting. Some amendments were incorporated.
➢ August - the Business case for the next stage of this Project was approved by the IMAP Committee meeting. Some amendments were incorporated.
➢ 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.
➢ Met with Parks Victoria who expressed interest in reviewing the Manual.
➢ An draft MoU and licence was prepared 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.
➢ Three IMAP Councils formally adopted or noted the operational manual – Way found1.0. Two IMAP Councils – Yarra and Maribyrnong are yet to adopt the manual but will now await updates before proceeding.
➢ User testing of City of Melbourne’s pilot signs in North Melbourne and Southern Cross is complete. The results were very favourable for the signs and maps.
➢ August to September - The Melbourne Visitor Signage Committee established a website for Way Found to enable feedback on the document and provide version control.
➢ October to November - The Project Manager met with the 7 identified agencies/Councils to receive feedback on Way found Version 1.0. The feedback will inform amendments to be incorporated in Way found 2.0.
➢ 29 October - TfV and IMAP Mapping Workshop held – SGS facilitator.
➢ November - Liaison is now established with the Victorian Government Architects Office over sign infrastructure design. A short report on the key issues was prepared for the OVGA.

CURRENT PROGRESS
➢ 11 December – Way found Reviewers Feedback Meeting at Library at the Dock to reflect on the overall comments from the 7 independent reviewers.
➢ 17 December – Meeting with David Blain from VicMaps on mapping requirements.
➢ 18 December – Way found and Bike Path wayfinding - planning meeting with TfV to address this identified gap in the Manual.

2019
➢ 18 January – meeting with TfV re wayfinding signage advocacy and mapping strategy across the Government projects.
➢ 31 January – Cycling and Walking signage meeting with key DoT staff.
➢ 7 February – planning meeting held to develop a Round Table Forum on Bike and Shared Path Wayfinding to coordinate efforts across councils and authorities – date TBA.

NEXT STEPS
➢ 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 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 which included 2 aspects:
  - build and provide a cycling model to map existing cycling infrastructure across Inner Melbourne,
  - analyse gaps and prioritise future network planning through mapping the detailed user modelling (as per City of Melbourne work) across Inner Melbourne.
- November 2018 – the project brief was considered by the IMAP Implementation Committee and referred to the IMAP Executive Forum meeting on 19 December for further clarification.
- Comments on the revised brief have been sought from IMAP Council’s transport planning staff and the IMAP Transport and Environment Steering Group.
- The Committee will consider the updated report and brief at their meeting on 22 February 2019.

NEXT STEPS
- Await Committee approval.

Strategy 2.4
G1.P4 Melbourne Visitor Wayfinding and Signage

Refer to this project under the Economy section.
Goal 3 COMMUNITIES

Strategy 3.1
G3.P2 Affordable Housing Controls & Targets

BACKGROUND

- Completed
  - Stage 1: Planning mechanisms
    - 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 in 2019.

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 December 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

January 2019 – Final checks being made to the data to ensure no facilities were omitted.

The next workshop to finalise results of the data analysis is planned for 8 March 2019

NEXT STEPS

The proposed project completion date has been delayed until 2019.

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 presented details of the CoM project to the IMAP Implementation Committee in November 2018. The Committee agreed to coordinate those aspects of the IMAP project focussed on policies for trees on private property with the CoM’s work in this area.
- The Project Team Leader (Matt Slavin) left Maribyrnong City Council in November which has affected 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. Other enquiries are continuing as more councils adopt ESD policies and local planning amendments.

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.
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CLUE update report to follow
IMAP Implementation Committee

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.

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 a bicycle network modelling tool in 2015 to analyse existing rider behaviour and the impact of new infrastructure on rider’s route choice. This identified priority links within the City of Melbourne for future investment and research (Appendix 1). Based on CoM’s success, if expanded across IMAP - in conjunction with mapping existing cycling infrastructure in Inner Melbourne - this approach would provide a useful working model and dataset of cycling commuter journeys to work, identify bicycle routes and network gaps and assist in identifying key improvement areas. This expanded project would also add a future projection capability to the model to assess the benefit of an upgraded bicycle network on increased appeal to the Inner Melbourne population.

4. City of Melbourne is currently in the process of refreshing its Transport Strategy, the City of Port Phillip has recently endorsed its Integrated Transport Strategy 2018-28 and other Councils are considering renewing strategies to address the challenge of growth.

5. This project scope and modelling proposal was initially discussed with the IMAP Transport and Environment Steering Group on 19 May 2017. Following their general support for the project, the approach has also been canvassed with the Metropolitan Cycling Network Senior Reference Group on 11 September 2018.

6. The IMAP Transport Managers were briefed on the proposed project at their recent forum held on 14 November 2018 to assess future IMAP projects. The Draft Brief was then considered by the IMAP Implementation Committee on 30 November and by the IMAP Executive Forum on 19 December 2018. Latest revisions have been circulated to IMAP Council’s transport staff for their comments.

7. Following that consultation, the revised Project Brief reflects this input and is the subject of this report.

Discussion

8. The proposal is that existing City of Melbourne mapping and modelling work be scaled up to the Inner Melbourne region. Having 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.

9. 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.

10. Indicative project staging for the IMAP region is noted in Appendix 2 and alignment to IMAP 2016-2026 is provided in Appendix 3.
Costing

11. Initial inquiries suggest that for the IMAP region, fees for mapping existing infrastructure and modelling an Inner Melbourne Cycling Network would range from $90,000 - $95,000.

Benefit to IMAP Councils

12. The IMAP Councils would see a number of benefits individually and collectively, including:
   a. An accessibility analysis report of the proposed routes with relation to education, jobs and entertainment destinations within the IMAP region.
   b. Identification of the forecast ridership increase based on initial market survey and correlation between social accessibility indicators and the proposed network links.
   c. A range of ridership increases on identified bike routes based on different levels of separation – protected bike lanes; buffered bike lanes versus conventional painted bike lanes.
   d. Support the delivery of Council’s respective bike networks by quantifying key benefits.

Timeline and deliverables

13. Following Committee approval, formal quotes would be requested for suppliers to undertake the modelling, for approval by the Project Team. GIS cycling infrastructure data would be requested from the Councils for modelling. If this data is supplied in a timely manner, it is expected that the Supplier would have completed the project within 3 - 6 months. All project expenditure is expected to occur this financial year.

RECOMMENDATION

14. That the IMAP Implementation Committee supports the proposal to develop a bicycle network model that immediately benefits IMAP Councils, and which will also form a key part the broader Metropolitan Cycling Network.
Appendix 1 – Summary of City of Melbourne Bicycle Network Modelling

City of Melbourne commissioned SGS in 2015 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 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.
## Appendix 2 – Indicative staging and associated costs for IMAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>INDICATIVE COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process kick-off</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Inception meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Approx. $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Identification of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Method workshop / presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network preparation IMAP</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Approx. $23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Collection of data existing and proposed network for IMAP councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Collection open street map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Existing network preparation (paint / protected / off road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Proposed network preparation (paint / protected / off road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Approx. $37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Accessibility analysis: Education, Jobs, Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Correlation accessibility analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Identification of potential increase in ridership based on market survey and / or correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility report for IMAP</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Approx. $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Results workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. IMAP Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Individual Municipalities infographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – Inner Melbourne Cycling Network alignments and project rationale

IMAP Projects - Business case template
Inner Melbourne Cycling Network Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and purpose of the project/action</th>
<th>Name: Inner Melbourne Cycling Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose: Build and provide a cycling model to map existing infrastructure, analyse gaps and prioritise future network planning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Collect existing cycling infrastructure (bike lanes, protected bike lanes and off road) and GIS data from the Inner Melbourne Councils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Include State Government priorities including the Strategic Cycling Corridors, Metropolitan Trails Network, Principal Bicycle Network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Source and map the detailed user modelling (as per City of Melbourne work) across Inner Melbourne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Identify and rank key gaps in the network according to current bicycle usage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Enable the model so that it is accessible, and can be built on and replicated, across the 32 metropolitan councils.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with IMAP Goals and Strategies;</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The specific goals and strategies that this action meets are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Goal 2</strong>: A connected transport network that provides real travel choices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Strategy 2.3</strong>: We will make Inner Melbourne a ‘cycling friendly’ region by creating a continuous network of on and off road cycling routes. Opportunities include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Developing evidence based guidance for the design and implementation of the complete central sub-region cycling network;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Improving connectivity and quality of cycling and walking networks in the inner west, inner south and inner southeast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMAP Three Year Implementation Program:**

The current Program lists the following priority project across 2 years 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.
- This will provide, per Council, a more resource effective tool to recognise and prioritise future transport projects 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;
- Cost estimates for the IMAP region range from $90,000-$95,000. Appendix 2 provides an indicative stage by stage cost breakdown.

#### Lead Council and project team
- City of Melbourne – Lead council
  - Damon Rao, City of Melbourne
  - Representatives of the cities of Yarra, Maribyrnong, Port Phillip and Stonnington.
  - Rufael Tsegay, Resilient Melbourne

#### Assessment against IMAP project criteria:

**Alignment with the IMAP vision -**

- **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**
  - As well as the Metropolitan Cycling Network, this action aligns with a number of external strategies with potential funding, including:
| Programs and/or funding opportunities within the state or federal government, or elsewhere? | **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

- **Will the project/action’s benefits accrue to a broader region (i.e. more than just one local authority)?**
  - Benefits for IMAP  
    - 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 advocate for, and 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.

#### The benefits of this work for the IMAP Councils includes:

- 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.  
- A range of ridership increases on identified bike routes based on different levels of separation – protected bike lanes; buffered bike lanes versus conventional painted bike lanes.  
- Support the delivery of Council’s respective bike networks by quantifying key benefits.

- **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/Dept of Transport** – 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 model 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.
    - Allow IMAP Councils to determine what the key benefits are from their investments in better protected bike corridors.
    - 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 physical inactivity and obesity through improved active transport options. 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 1 of this document provides a summary of the proposed work to be scaled for the Inner Melbourne and metropolitan region.
    - Appendix 2 gives an indicative stage by stage process for this project for the IMAP 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
    - City of Port Phillip – Implementation of transport strategy
    - The Metropolitan Cycling Network
    - Victorian Cycling Strategy
| Sponsor organisations and potential partners; | This work be led by the City of Melbourne with input from relevant parties as necessary, including:  
- IMAP Councils  
- VicRoads  
- Active Transport Victoria  
- Bicycle Network  
- Transport for Victoria/ Department of Transport |
| Recommendation. | That the IMAP Implementation Committee supports the prescribed approach for the Inner Melbourne Cycling Network. |
1. **PURPOSE**

The Purpose of this report is to:

- Provide the Committee with an overview of those issues being considered by the Executive Forum as part of their IMAP Project review
- Propose a process for the IMAP projects review
- Agree the timeline for this review
- Seek a Committee meeting date for approval of:
  - the 2019-20 IMAP budget
  - the IMAP Three year Implementation Program
  - any Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 update that may be required as a result of the review

The IMAP Executive Officer will provide a presentation at the IMAP Implementation Committee meeting to give further detail on these aspects of the IMAP Review.

2. **BACKGROUND**

On 30 November 2018 the IMAP Implementation Committee considered a report for the annual review of the IMAP rolling Three year Implementation Program.

The main purpose of the annual review is to identify the priority projects on the Program and determine the budget and IMAP Council contributions required for the following financial year.

The Committee noted the surplus funding being carried forward is partly allocated to (1) commenced projects and (2) to projects which have not yet been scoped; and reflected that:

- current/new regional collaborations and partnerships now position IMAP in a more complex and changed environment
- the demands of other partnerships on staff time have effected resourcing the IMAP projects
- the IMAP Councils need to look at less projects and different delivery methodology to complete the Actions in a more timely manner.

The Committee resolved as follows:

16.1 **That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolves to defer item 16 on the IMAP Three year Implementation Program review and refer it to the IMAP Executive Forum for finalising the budget.**
3. DISCUSSION

The IMAP Executive Forum met on 19 December 2018 to consider the issues around the IMAP Three Year Implementation Plan Review. (Refer Minutes – Item 5, Attachment 2)

They considered:

- the role and function of other groups working across the IMAP region
- the obligation of the Committee under s86 delegations to implement the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026
- those projects which are ‘approved and ongoing’ as opposed to those which still await scoping and project briefs
- the limitation on Councils to resource the IMAP projects in line with the current timelines
- the need to
  1. reassess the projects themselves; (e.g. others working in this space, value for the councils etc); and
  2. consider other ways to resource the projects to ensure timely completion.

The IMAP Executive Forum advise that they:

- Have commenced the review of those projects that have not yet been scoped and commenced on the program
- Will undertake a workshop before 22 March to review the plan as a result of the findings of that review
- Will report back to the IMAP Implementation Committee in May 2019 with a refreshed, amended implementation program reflective of the changes in the current environment.

4. RECOMMENDATION

That the IMAP Implementation Committee resolve to:

a. Note the proposed process for the IMAP Executive Forum and Committee review of the IMAP projects

b. Approve a Special Meeting of the IMAP Implementation Committee to adopt the 2019-20 budget and project program (Date to be determined)

c. Authorise a review of the Inner Melbourne Action Plan 2016-2026 to determine any amendments needed to reflect current changes in the Local Government environment (Report to May meeting)