

LODDON SHIRE COUNCIL

Notice of an Ordinary Meeting of the Loddon Shire Council to be held in the Council offices, Wedderburn on Tuesday 13 September 2016 at 3pm.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES	2
2. PREVIOUS MINUTES	2
2.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	2
2.2 REVIEW OF ACTION SHEET	2
3. COUNCILLORS' REPORTS	3
3.1 MAYORAL REPORT	3
3.2 COUNCILLORS' REPORT.....	3
4. DECISION REPORTS	4
4.1 REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS.....	4
4.2 REQUESTED UPGRADE OF PARK FURNITURE AROUND LITTLE LAKE BOORT	6
4.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFER PLACES (PLACES OF LAST RESORT)	9
4.4 VARIATION TO ELEMENTS OF THE ANNUAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS FOR 2015-16 AND 2016-17	12
4.5 BRIDGEWATER FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN	16
4.6 LAKE BOORT MANAGEMENT PLAN	21
5. INFORMATION REPORTS	24
5.1 INWARDS CORRESPONDENCE.....	24
5.2 2015/16 END OF FINANCIAL YEAR VARIATION ANALYSIS	25
6. COMPLIANCE REPORTS	32
7. GENERAL BUSINESS.....	33
8. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS	33

1. APOLOGIES

Nil

2. PREVIOUS MINUTES

2.1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

SUMMARY

Seeking approval of the unconfirmed minutes of the previous Council Forum and Meetings.

Author: Phil Pinyon, Chief Executive Officer

Council Plan ref: Core business 8: Compliance

File No: 02/01/001

Attachment: Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That Council confirm:

1. *the minutes of the Council Briefing of 23 August 2016*
2. *the minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of 23 August 2016*

2.2 REVIEW OF ACTION SHEET

SUMMARY

Notation of Action Sheet.

Author: Phil Pinyon, Chief Executive Officer

Council Plan ref: Core business 8: Compliance

File No: 02/01/001

Attachment: 2.2 Action Sheet

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive and note the Action Sheet.

3. COUNCILLORS' REPORTS

3.1 MAYORAL REPORT

SUMMARY

Approval of the Mayoral Report.

Author: Phil Pinyon, Chief Executive Officer

Council Plan ref: Core business 1: Leadership

File No: 02/01/001

Attachment: Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive and note the Mayoral Report.

3.2 COUNCILLORS' REPORT

SUMMARY

Approval of Councillors' Reports.

Author: Phil Pinyon, Chief Executive Officer

Council Plan ref: Core business 1: Leadership

File No: 02/01/001

Attachment: Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receive and note the Councillors' Report.

4. DECISION REPORTS

4.1 REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS

SUMMARY

Council approval is sought for a revised set of delegations following their review.

Author	Lynne Habner, A/Manager Executive and Commercial Services
Council Plan ref:	Core business 8: Compliance
File no:	18/01/003
Attachment:	S6 Instrument of delegation to members of Council staff

RECOMMENDATION

That Council, in the exercise of the powers conferred by section 98(1) of the Act and the other legislation referred to in the attached instrument of delegation, resolves that:

1. *There be delegated to the members of Council staff holding, acting in or performing the duties of the offices or positions referred to in the attached Instrument of Delegation to members of Council staff, the powers, duties and functions set out in that instrument, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in that Instrument.*
2. *The common seal of Council be affixed to the instrument, and the instrument comes into force immediately the common seal is affixed.*
3. *On the coming into force of the instrument all previous delegations to members of Council staff (other than the Chief Executive Officer) are revoked.*
4. *The duties and functions set out in the instrument must be performed, and the powers set out in the instrument must be executed, in accordance with any guidelines or policies of Council that it may from time to time adopt.*

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

In March 2016, Council reviewed delegations to members of Council staff.

BACKGROUND

In order for Council officers to effectively and efficiently discharge their duties, specific delegations, authorisations and appointments are required under a variety of Acts.

Council is required to review its delegations within 12 months after a general election in accordance with section 98 (6) of the Local Government Act.

In addition to this statutory requirement, presentation of new or revised delegations has become a more regular process for Council. Due to the ever changing nature of legislation, Council has

subscribed to a service by Maddocks legal firm that regularly reviews all applicable delegations, authorisations and appointments.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

The attached amended delegations have been updated as a result of the organisational restructure, to reflect the new position title of Project Management Coordinator.

COSTS/BENEFITS

Adoption of the recommendation will not have any financial impacts.

RISK ANALYSIS

Adoption of the recommendation will ensure that council staff are able to act on behalf of Council under the various pieces of legislation. If current delegations are not in place, actions of a council officer exercising those powers could be legally challenged.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Nil.

4.2 REQUESTED UPGRADE OF PARK FURNITURE AROUND LITTLE LAKE BOORT

SUMMARY

Presents Council with a report received from representatives of the Boort community seeking the renewal, upgrade or maintenance of park furniture surrounding Little Lake Boort, as well as a proposal to address this request via the existing mechanisms associated with development of the annual parks and gardens capital works program.

Author	Indivar Dhakal, Assets Engineer
Council Plan ref:	Core business 5: Providing quality infrastructure
File no:	15/02/012
Attachment:	Report on furniture in recreational parks surrounding Little Lake Boort

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. *Receive and note the report prepared by the Little Lake Boort Committee of Management regarding proposed park furniture upgrades surrounding Little Lake Boort.*
2. *Refer any outstanding park furniture upgrade projects identified within the report to the rolling parks and gardens program, thus facilitating potential inclusion within future annual capital works programs.*

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

The capital works program for parks and gardens 2016/17 was approved by Council during its ordinary meeting in July 2016. At this time Council also requested that Officers review the report received from the Little Lake Boort Committee of Management, proposing the renewal, upgrade or maintenance of various park furniture elements surrounding Little Lake Boort.

Officers were specifically requested to review the works proposed within the report and identify a potential funding strategy to deliver these works in a timely manner.

BACKGROUND

A variety of park furniture has been installed around Little Lake Boort or within adjacent public parks over an extended period of time. Much of this infrastructure is aging and requires consideration for replacement. There is also no consistency in either the style or standard of assets utilised throughout these public areas.

Council Officers attended a site meeting on 22 April 2016 with representatives of the Little Lake Boort Committee of Management and Boort Development Committee, to discuss the park furniture issues surrounding Little Lake Boort. The representatives of the aforementioned committees handed over a list of issues along with a proposed funding request to Officers during this meeting in the form of a report (see attached).

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

The report received by Officers was considered during the development of the capital expenditure program for parks and gardens 2016/17. However, the report was received in late April by which time the capital expenditure program was in the final stages of development.

The report, while identifying specific items to be replaced or upgraded, did not cost or fully scope the work required to achieve the specified outcomes. Preparation of detailed project scopes and associated costings are therefore still required before a full appreciation of likely cost can be determined or an associated funding strategy formulated.

Issues identified as a major safety concern in the park furniture surrounding Little Lake Boort were however included as part of the 2016/17 parks and gardens capital works program, with the intention of including further projects within the rolling program for consideration during development of subsequent annual capital works programs.

The report has also been forwarded to Council's Community Support Department to consider identified projects for delivery using alternate funding opportunities through various grants or community planning allocations.

Officers responsible for the parks and garden capital works program have identified that potential savings may be returned during the course of delivering the scheduled works for 2016/17. Any savings identified throughout the year are expected to be either returned to Council's budget surplus or alternatively may be reallocated to the next highest priority project within the parks and gardens rolling program (subject to Council approval).

As such the scoping and inclusion of projects identified within the report provided to Council will enable these works to be considered for potential funding this financial year should savings be realised, subject to their relative priority against other outstanding works.

Council's Community Support Department has also indicated that there may be budget savings of approximately \$10,000 associated with the redevelopment of the playground facilities at Nolen's Park, Boort. Depending on subsequent negotiations with the Boort Development Committee and Council, these savings may also be available for redistribution to projects identified within the report submitted.

As part of the budgets set for the last two years, Council have allocated \$100,000 towards the renewal and upgrade of various parks and gardens facilities. The current Parks Asset Management Plan (PAMP) 2010 outlines the factors to be considered when including and prioritising any related projects within the rolling program, used to develop the annual capital works program.

It is proposed that the issues identified by the development and management committees be considered for delivery via Council's existing process of inclusion within the rolling program and subsequent prioritisation and competition for available capital funding.

An initial assessment of the works identified within the report has been undertaken through which the total cost of works requested have been estimated to be in the order of \$100,000. In consideration of this value, the typical parks and gardens annual budget available and the demand for investment in parks and gardens assets across other areas of the Shire, it is expected that delivery of these works will take a number of years, under the current funding regime, to complete.

It is understood that this may not fully satisfy the expectations or desires of the Boort community; however such an approach is considered to be consistent with Council's current asset management and investment policies/strategies. It is believed that the integrity of the rolling program and allocation of available funding on a competitive basis offers the most equitable mechanism for distributing Council's efforts in parks and gardens across the Shire.

Other than an additional allocation to the parks and gardens program for 2016/17 or referral to future capital works programs, project specific funding may be sought via either the existing community grant or community planning programs. Consideration under these programs will again however be subject to the availability of discretionary funding and community support for its allocation to the works identified in the report.

Alternatively Council may wish to consider the creation of a project specific budget outside of the existing capital works program process to facilitate the rapid delivery of identified works. Such funding is expected to require an allocation from Council's surplus.

COSTS/BENEFITS

As officers have proposed that identified works be considered through the existing rolling program mechanism, it is not envisaged that there will be any additional cost to Council for the delivery of the identified works other than that which is budgeted annually for the parks and gardens capital works program.

Alternatively, should delivery of the identified works be required this financial year, it is estimated that an additional budget allocation of approximately \$100,000 shall be required.

Establishment of a consistent theme and standard of park furniture around Little Lake Boort will significantly improve the appearance and functionality of this public and recreational space, whilst also addressing existing deficiencies or safety concerns associated with current infrastructure.

RISK ANALYSIS

A number of items listed within the report are associated with issues concerning safety of the general public. It is considered that immediate issues relating to public safety have been addressed through inclusion of some of the identified works within the 2016/17 capital works program or via routine maintenance carried out by Council's Townscape Services team.

Any deviation from the proposed funding mechanisms is not recommended as it will not be in accordance with the Council Plan 2013-2017, Long Term Financial Plan, Asset Management Strategy and PAMP 2010.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

This report has been prepared following consultation with Council's Community Support Department, the Little Lake Boort Committee of Management and Boort Development Committee.

4.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD SAFER PLACES (PLACES OF LAST RESORT)

SUMMARY

Provides Council with a recommendation to adopt the attached Loddon Shire Council Neighbourhood Safer Places Plan (NSP Plan) September 2016, which includes and confirms all designated Neighbourhood Safer Places (Places of Last Resort) (NSP's) within the municipality located in the townships of Boort, Bridgewater, Inglewood, Pyramid Hill, Serpentine and Wedderburn.

Author	Ian McLauchlan, Director Operations
Council Plan ref:	Core business 2: Provision of wellbeing services
File no:	11/01/009
Attachment:	Loddon Shire Council Neighbourhood Safer Places Plan September 2016

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopt the attached Loddon Shire Council Neighbourhood Safer Places Plan (NSP Plan) September 2016, which includes and confirms designated NSPs within the municipality in the townships of Boort, Bridgewater, Inglewood, Pyramid Hill, Serpentine and Wedderburn.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

At its ordinary meeting held on 23rd August 2010, Council adopted the initial NSP Plan which contains the Council NSP Assessment Criteria.

At its ordinary meeting on 11th September 2011, Council endorsed the NSP assessment process and resolved to continue identification and assessment of potential sites for NSP's and once identified report these back to Council for consideration.

At its ordinary meeting held on 27 August 2012 Council adopted the Loddon Shire Council Neighbourhood Safer Places Plan August 2012, which included designated NSP's at Boort, Bridgewater, Inglewood, Pyramid Hill, Serpentine and Wedderburn.

At its ordinary meeting held on 23 September 2013 Council adopted the Loddon Shire Council Neighbourhood Safer Places Plan September 2013, which includes and confirmed designated NSP's at Boort, Bridgewater, Inglewood, Pyramid Hill, Serpentine and Wedderburn.

In 2015, the Inglewood NSP was moved from the grounds around the town hall to the J. Sloan Reserve between the Swimming Pool and Tennis Courts.

BACKGROUND

NSPs and the NSP Plan are direct consequences of the Black Saturday fires and the interim recommendations from the Bushfires Royal Commission. NSPs are legislated under the Emergency Services Legislation Amendment Act 2009 (Vic) ('ESLA Act') which amends the Emergency Management Act 1986 (Vic) ('EM Act') and the Country Fire Authority Act 1958 (Vic) ('CFA Act').

Councils in Victoria, under the 'ESLA Act 2009' are required to identify, certify, designate, establish and maintain NSPs within their Municipal district. Section one of the NSP Plan, the flow chart, sets out the process to follow in establishing a NSP.

In short this process includes:

- identification of potential sites by Council
- assessment of sites by Council against set criteria
- assessment of sites by CFA against CFA criteria
- designation by Council of the approved sites
- establishment and signage of site by Council
- annual review of existing and potential new sites by Council and CFA.

Under Section 50J of the CFA Act 1958 Council must, by 31 August each year, conduct a review of each designated NSP in its municipal district to determine if it is still suitable to be designated as a NSP and ask the CFA to assess each NSP in its municipal district in accordance with the Country Fire Authority Assessment Guidelines.

Once the Council and CFA assessments have been completed and the established NSP's have been determined by each organisation as being compliant, the Municipal Fire Prevention Officer (MFPO) under section 50K of the CFA Act 1958 must provide to the Authority by 30 September in each year, an up to date list of all designated neighbourhood safer places and community fire refuges in the municipal district.

In compliance with Section 50J of the CFA Act 1958, in June 2016 Council staff requested that the CFA conduct the annual inspection of the current designated NSPs in Boort, Pyramid Hill, Bridgewater, Inglewood, Wedderburn and Serpentine. In August 2016 Council Staff (Emergency Management Co-ordinator) conducted the Council's re-assessment of these NSP's.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

Council staff have confirmed that the six current designated NSP sites were re-assessed under Section 50J of the CFA Act 1958 as compliant against Council Guidelines. Similarly, CFA assessment has also determined that the existing sites are considered suitable to remain designated as NSP's.

No new or additional NSP sites have been nominated by Council staff, the local community or the Municipal Emergency Management Planning Committee.

Subject to Council endorsement of the attached NSP Plan, the Emergency Management Coordinator will provide to the Authority, by 30 September 2016 (as per Section 50J of the CFA Act 1958), an up to date list of all designated NSPs within Loddon Shire.

COSTS/BENEFITS

Administration of the NSP process requires the allocation of Council and CFA resources to undertake the necessary site assessment as well as preparation of the associated reports and supporting documentation.

Costs of maintaining those NSPs contained within the boundary of recreation reserves is borne by the associated committees of management for these facilities. The remainder of NSPs are located in areas which Council maintain as a matter of routine operations.

Provision and maintenance of designated NSPs within the municipality contributes to the overall safety and wellbeing of the local community in the event of a bushfire and forms part of the response provisions within the Municipal Fire Management Plan.

RISK ANALYSIS

Failure to adequately and regularly assess the designated NSP sites for compliance against specified criteria has the potential to place members of the community utilising these sites at risk should site conditions change over time.

Failure to meet the inspection and reporting timelines may result in Loddon Shire failing to meet its legislated obligations under the CFA Act 1958 and EM Act 1986.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Determination of the suitability to retain the designated NSP sites has been made in consultation with the CFA.

4.4 VARIATION TO ELEMENTS OF THE ANNUAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS FOR 2015-16 AND 2016-17

SUMMARY

Seeks Council approval for the variation in the reseal projects identified within the annual infrastructure program for 2016-17, as well as amendments to carryover or current local bridges and culverts projects identified in both the 2015-16 and 2016-2017 annual infrastructure programs.

Author	Indivar Dhakal, Assets Engineer
Council Plan ref:	Core business 5: Providing quality infrastructure
File no:	14/01/001
Attachment:	List of individual projects to be removed from bitumen seal program 2016-17 Updated list of individual projects for bitumen seal program 2016/17 Revised list of individual projects for local bridges and culverts 2016/17

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. *Approve the variation to the annual reseals projects identified within the annual infrastructure program 2016-17.*
2. *Approve the variation to the local bridges and culverts projects identified within the 2015-16 and 2016-17 annual infrastructure programs.*

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Council previously approved the annual resealing program for 2016/17 as part of the annual infrastructure program 2016-17 during its ordinary meeting in May 2016. The program was also discussed in the Council forum held during the same month.

Council previously approved a number of local bridge and culvert projects as part of the annual infrastructure program 2015-16 during the Council meeting on April 2015. Further bridge and culvert projects were approved as part of the 2016-17 annual infrastructure program as above.

BACKGROUND

Council previously considered and approved a list of proposed reseal projects as part of the annual infrastructure program 2016-17. Similarly a list of identified local bridges and culvert projects were identified as part of both the annual infrastructure program for 2015-16 and 2016-2017.

During the course of implementing the approved projects, Officers have identified a number of reseal sites which have already been treated during previous years. It is believed these projects remained within the list of candidate projects as the details regarding their completion had not been updated within the rolling program.

The list of individual projects within the 2016-17 reseal program which have been identified as already having been completed is attached (attachment 1).

The total available budget for reseals as part of the 2016-17 annual infrastructure program is \$1,468,341. The value of works identified as having been previously completed is \$707,000.

In consideration of those projects which have already been completed and the subsequent residual program budget created, high priority projects based on the current condition of the sealed road network have been identified. It is proposed that these high priority projects be brought forward into the 2016-17 financial year to offset savings identified through the removal of completed works.

A revised program for annual reseals is attached (attachment 2). The highlighted projects in the attachment indicate the new projects to be added in the program.

With respect to the local bridges and culverts program that formed part of annual infrastructure program for 2015-16, it has been identified that delivery of project number LBC0358 – Janevale Bridge has been delayed. This project has been carried over into the 2016-17 financial year. The aforementioned bridge is a heritage listed structure and as such there are a number of preliminary assessments and permit requirements which need to be carried out before actual works can be initiated.

Recently it was identified that a major culvert in Rudducks Rd has passed its intervention and requires immediate rehabilitation. The detail of the project is attached with this report in the updated local bridges and culvert program (attachment 3).

Further investigation and detailed assessment of works identified within the bridges and culverts component of the 2016-17 annual infrastructure program, has uncovered a potential funding shortfall for three of the listed projects. It is considered that additional funding is required to complete these three bridges/culvert projects. The details of the proposed changes are attached with this report (attachment 3). The projects highlighted in yellow indicate those projects expected to incur additional expenditure.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

Reseals

The new projects proposed within the annual reseal program 2016-17 have been identified based upon their existing condition. In nominating projects for inclusion, a comparison of total seal area has been calculated so as to match the previously approved budget allocation. The listed projects are either at or close to the intervention level as set in the Council's current Road Asset Management Plan (RAMP). (attachment 2)

Local Bridges and Culverts

Rudducks Road Bridge: It is proposed to include this new project in the annual infrastructure program 2016-17 under the local bridges and culverts category. An inspection by design staff has revealed that the 5 cell box culvert has deteriorated and may be subject to imminent failure. The estimated cost of this project is \$80,000.

Talgitcha Street, Hannahs Rd Floodway and Gower Fenton Creek Rd: The total estimated budget for these three structures was \$110,010. Recent detailed assessment and preliminary design has revealed that the combined estimated cost will be \$72,000 more than the initial estimate. Individual updated prices are attached with this report (attachment 3).

Janevale Bridge (carried over from 2015-16): This project concerns a nationally recognised heritage structure and as such further assessment is required and permits need to be acquired before works can commence. The approved budget for this project is \$198,000. It is proposed to

conduct the assessment and obtain permits for this bridge in 2016-17 with completion of actual work to be carried out in 2017-18.

It is proposed that the additional costs for Rudducks Bridge and the variation in the other three bridges be funded using savings obtained by the partial deferral of the Janevale Bridge project. The remainder of the Janevale bridge budget (\$46,000) will be used for preparation of detailed specifications, design works, permit fees and any related assessments.

A summary of projects added, revised and partially deferred are presented below.

Project No	Project Name	Revised Budget (2016/17)	Revised Budget (2017/18)	Original Budget	Remarks
LBCC0363	Rudducks Rd (SN 291)	\$ 80,000	\$ -	\$ -	
LBCC0353	Gowar - Fentons Creek Road	\$ 100,010	\$ -	\$ 76,010	
LBCC0338	Talgitcha St	\$ 36,000	\$ -	\$ 12,000	
LBCC0266	Hannahs Rd	\$ 46,000	\$ -	\$ 22,000	
LBCC0358	Janevale Bridge (structure No 141) (Carry forward from 2015-16)	\$ 46,000	\$ -	\$ 198,000	Design and permit assessment
LBCC0358	Janevale Bridge (structure No 141) (Project Carry forward from 2015-16 - new funding required)	\$ -	\$ 152,000	\$ -	Construction
Total		\$ 308,010	\$ 152,000	\$ 308,010	

COSTS/BENEFITS

The proposed variation in the reseal program will not incur any additional cost. Inclusion of new projects will enable the ongoing response to the potential infrastructure renewal gap across the sealed network. It will also allow sealed roads which are at or near intervention level as per RAMP to be addressed.

The variation in the local bridges and culvert program will also not incur any additional cost. It is however recognised that additional funding shall be required to facilitate delivery of works on Janevale Bridge once all permits have been obtained. Consideration of refunding this work will occur during presentation of the 2017-18 annual infrastructure program.

Increases to available budgets for the three nominated structures will address the safety issues identified during the level 2 inspection conducted in 2014 and reduce the future possibility of liability issues that Council may face due to potential failure of bridges and major culvert structures.

RISK ANALYSIS

Reduction in the degree of expenditure across the sealed road network may contribute to the potential risk of an increased renewal gap. It is proposed that investment effort be maintained by reallocation of returned funding to address a considerable area of sealed surface which will reach or cross intervention level in near future.

Adoption of the proposed variation in the local bridges and culvert program will address the immediate risk associated with the failure of the Rudducks Road structure. If the proposed rehabilitation works on Rudducks Bridge project is not carried out, there is a significant risk of the structure failing and thus imposing a liability issue on Council. The probability of the failure of the structure is very likely with a severe potential consequence which elevates the risk level to very high if not addressed.

Similarly, if the variation in Talgitcha Street, Hannah Rd Floodway and Gower Fenton Creek Rd culvert structures is not adopted, there is a very high risk that the problems identified during the level 2 bridge inspections will not be addressed effectively. Also, if proper assessment is not carried out and permits are not obtained for Janevale bridge as proposed, there is a major risk of this project not being completed in the targeted year. For that reason, it is proposed to carry out design, specification and permit application processes in 2016/17 and the rehabilitation works in 2017/18.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Consultation with the Officers within the Technical Services department of the Council has been carried out regarding the variations proposed in this report.

4.5 BRIDGEWATER FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN

SUMMARY

Seeks Council endorsement of the Bridgewater Flood Management Plan and the associated actions arising from finalisation of the Plan. The Bridgewater Flood Management Plan has been developed by the North Central Catchment Management Authority in partnership with the Loddon Shire Council, a community based stakeholder committee and the local Bridgewater community.

Author	Ian McLauchlan, Director Operations
Council Plan ref:	Core business 5: Providing quality infrastructure
File no:	11/01/009
Attachment:	Bridgewater Flood Management Plan (Final Document) Bridgewater Flood Management Plan Community Brochure

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1. *Endorse the final Bridgewater Flood Management Plan.*
2. *Implement the identified actions within the Bridgewater Flood Management Plan in consultation with the Municipal Emergency Management Committee and relevant state government agencies.*
3. *Issue a public notice, or individual letter where appropriate, thanking members of the project steering committee, technical working group and general Bridgewater Community for their contributions and efforts in finalising the Plan.*

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

During its ordinary meeting held in August 2014 Council resolved to nominate two councillors to sit as members of a steering committee being established to guide the development of the Bridgewater Flood Management Plan (the FMP).

BACKGROUND

Following the flood events which impacted the Loddon Shire between September 2010 and January 2011, subsequent post event analysis and debriefs identified a community desire for various township flood studies to be undertaken. The primary aim of these studies was to evaluate the viability and configuration of potential flood mitigation infrastructure options as well as potential improvements to flood warning, monitoring and response protocols.

Specifically, it was identified that flood protection investigations were required for the townships of Boort, Pyramid Hill, Serpentine and Bridgewater. Funding for the completion of these flood studies or protection designs was sourced via grants under the Federal Government's Natural Disaster Resilience Program.

In applying for these grants, Loddon Shire Council worked in partnership with the North Central Catchment Management Authority (NCCMA) to identify the proposed project scopes, as well as identification of which agency was best placed to take the primary lead, for each individual project.

Accordingly, Loddon Shire has taken the lead with investigations into either the enhancement of existing flood mitigation infrastructure or construction of new levy systems for Boort, Pyramid Hill and Serpentine. This work was primarily focused on the development of construction or management plans for township flood protection levees.

With respect to Bridgewater, due to the complexity of flood behaviour associated with the Loddon River, the NCCMA nominated to take responsibility for being the lead agency in the development of a FMP for the Township. Development of this plan still involved an ongoing partnership between the NCCMA, Loddon Shire Council and a community based steering group.

The Bridgewater FMP has now been finalised and is being presented to Council for endorsement. Details regarding the process employed in developing the FMP, ultimate actions identified for implementation and extent of community consultation and input is provided below.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

Water Technology was commissioned by the North Central CMA to undertake development of the Bridgewater Flood Management Plan which included the preparation of detailed hydrological and hydraulic modelling of the Loddon River and Bullabul Creek, flood mapping of the study area, investigations into potential flood mitigation works, and recommendations regarding improving the total flood warning system and planning scheme.

To facilitate development of the FMP a community based stakeholder group was established. This group worked closely with the technical working group and project steering committee made up of representatives from various state government agencies and the Loddon Shire.

A number of local community members participated in the community stakeholder group and provided valuable input and local knowledge regarding observed flood behaviour, environmental and topographic conditions, priority assets within the Township and local flood event experiences. Representatives on this group also acted as a communication and feedback conduit between the steering committee and the local Bridgewater Community.

The flood mapping area for the FMP focused upon the Loddon River and Bullabul Creek floodplains from upstream of the Loddon River breakout to the Bullabul (approximately 7 km upstream of Bridgewater), to downstream of the Bullabul Creek confluence with the Loddon River (approximately 4 km north of Bridgewater).

Development of the FMP involved extensive data capture and flood behaviour modelling to inform the development and exploration of subsequent mitigation or flood response options. Details regarding the outputs from this modelling may be found within the attached FMP document. The data was supplemented by a significant amount of anecdotal evidence provided by the technical working group, steering committee and community members.

In addition to information pertaining to the extent of flooding, the steering committee was originally presented with eight potential mitigation options for discussion local community representatives. Ultimately, based upon further analysis and feedback, only three of these options were considered feasible for further investigation and consideration within the draft FMP document. These options included:

- diversion of waters from Loddon River to Bullabul Creek
- improved conveyance across the Calder Highway and railway
- a levee around the Caravan Park and along Peppercorn Lane.

Subsequent detailed hydraulic modelling was then undertaken for these three broad options, with slight variations also applied, to identify a solution that might best mitigate flooding for the Bridgewater Township.

Diverting water to Bullabul Creek was found not to be effective as it only shifted the problem elsewhere. Similarly, any additional capacity under the Calder Highway and Railway Bridge was not sufficient to reduce flood levels and extents within the Township.

The levees were found to be the most effective option for mitigation, and a number of refinements were made to the size, location and alignment of levees.

The final preferred mitigation package proposed involved construction of approximately 1,350 m of levee along the eastern side of the Loddon River, upstream of the pub (noting that some sections of this levee were to be temporary) as well as around 150 m of levee from the Calder Highway to the railway embankment across Eldon Street. Supporting these levees, 640 m of raised walkway along the western bank of the Loddon River was also to be constructed.

In November 2015 the draft FMP was released for public comment. This draft document outlined the findings from hydraulic modelling for various rainfall events and the associated areas of the Township which were predicted to be susceptible to flooding. Largely feedback received from the community verified that the modelling prepared by Water Technology was representative of observed conditions in 2010 and 2011.

With regard to the proposed mitigation options, strong opposition for any levee system was received from the community, with over 70% of respondents indicating that they did not support any of the three levee configurations presented. Residents who didn't support the levee were concerned about the divisive aspect of (marginally) increasing flood risk to some properties (west of the Loddon river) in order to protect others. Other concerns included insurance costs, property values, compensation for diminished property value, impacts on business, alignment/height of the proposed levees, levy maintenance, and access/parking for adjacent properties.

The opposition was not limited to those who were adversely impacted by the levee, but resonated throughout the whole community. It was generally felt that while the levee provided protection to the majority, some would be adversely impacted and that this was not an equitable solution.

There was however strong community support for developing an improved flood warning system for the township of Bridgewater focusing on the message dissemination. Much of the criticism received in relation to the handling of the recent flood events was centred on the lack of advanced warning for local residents or a point of reference to obtain meaningful interpretation of flood level advice.

Based upon feedback received through the community consultation period the Bridgewater FMP document was amended and the final version subsequently endorsed by both the steering group (including technical and community working groups) and the NCCMA board. It is considered that the plan now represents the majority view of the Bridgewater community with respect to future flood management demands for the Township.

Following significant consultation with the community, the Bridgewater FMP steering committee has recommended the following actions:

- amendment of the planning scheme for Bridgewater to reflect the flood risk identified by this project (i.e. planning scheme amendments to adjust flood overlay)
- adopt the design flood levels for existing conditions for use in future planning related decisions (e.g. specified minimum floor levels for new development)
- integration of findings into the Municipal Flood Emergency Plan to improve emergency response
- conduct regular education/information sessions regarding the management of reservoirs to address community concerns regarding reservoir management
- improve availability of education/information material or engagement sessions regarding flood risk, starting with the production of a VICSES FloodSafe Guide
- provide flood related information to the community through the NCCMA website (i.e. individual property reports with flood information)

- investigate the suitability and effectiveness of the total flood warning system, with particular emphasis on the dissemination of information
- develop a network of community flood observers to provide local information to emergency services during a flood event.
- ensure that all people requiring assistance are registered in the Loddon Shire Vulnerable Persons Register.

The refined mitigation option outlined in this report (levee protection system) is not a recommended outcome of the FMP, given the lack of community support. Details of this mitigation option can be reviewed at a later date should the level of interest change.

It is being recommended that Council endorse the content and findings of the Bridgewater FMP. Council Officers in collaboration with relevant state government or emergency management agencies may then continue to pursue implementation or further investigation of the actions identified by the FMP steering committee.

COSTS/BENEFITS

Implementation of the actions identified within the Bridgewater FMP will require the utilisation of various Council resources or existing emergency management arrangements (e.g. Municipal Emergency Planning Committee) to undertake or co-ordinate the associated investigations or preparation of supporting documentation. It is not believed that additional resources shall be required to achieve the majority of the actions listed.

It is not envisaged that there will be any significant direct financial impact upon Council. The most likely financial cost could be associated with any expansion of the total flood warning system if additional stream monitoring gauges are ultimately decided upon. This is in light of the state government's recent adoption of the Floodplain Management Strategy and the expectation that Council will co-fund such installations.

Actions identified within the FMP are expected to yield benefits for the local Bridgewater community through improved awareness and knowledge of flood behaviour, control over potential future developments to minimise risk and potentially improved information dissemination and relevance of local flood warnings.

RISK ANALYSIS

The final Bridgewater FMP represents the views conveyed to authorities, that the local community is prepared to accept the potential risk of flooding within the Township so as to avoid any potential negative impacts on individual landowners (e.g. associated with the construction of the proposed levee). It was also conveyed that the required height of the levee would detract from the local amenity of the Township.

The major risk associated with the FMP is in relation to the demand for improved flood warning systems and information dissemination. A reputational risk exists for both Council and relevant emergency management agencies should improvements not be made to address the local communities concerns.

No potential financial or legal liability is considered to exist with respect to either the decision to abandon any proposal for construction of the flood levee, or future modification of local planning overlays or minimum structure floor heights.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Throughout the study, a range of community consultation activities were undertaken, including several community information mailouts and drop-in sessions, media releases and questionnaires to ensure that community issues were heard and the ideas of the community were considered in the development of potential flood mitigation options. The community participation was very helpful, with flood observations, local information and feedback greatly improving the outcomes for the study.

A community-led steering committee was formed by the NCCMA to guide the development of the FMP. Council also maintained representation on the project steering committee with two nominated Councillors in attendance. A Council Officer also sat on the technical working group. State government agencies and water authorities were also well represented on both the steering committee and technical working group. Agencies represented included the NCCMA, Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, VicRoads, SES, Goulburn Murray Water and VicTrack.

4.6 LAKE BOORT MANAGEMENT PLAN

SUMMARY

Seeks Council endorsement of a proposed submission in response to the recently released Draft Lake Boort Management Plan

Author	Ian McLauchlan, Director Operations
Council Plan ref:	Core business 10: Advocacy and partnerships
File no:	17/01/001
Attachment:	Draft Lake Boort Management Plan Council submission in response to Draft Plan

RECOMMENDATION

That Council endorse the proposed submission (attached) in response to the Draft Lake Boort Management Plan.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person's conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

During its Ordinary meeting on 26 July 2016, Council requested that Officers undertake a review of the Draft Lake Boort Management Plan (the Plan) and prepare a submission in response to the call for public comment. Specific concerns flagged by Council at the time related to the potential impact upon the operation and management of the fill/flush channel interfacing with Little Lake Boort.

BACKGROUND

The proposed management plan for Lake Boort (the Lake) provides the basis for the future management of this crown reserve. This Plan extensively references and recognises the cultural and environmental significance of the area within or around the Lake and seeks to put in place various control or mechanisms to protect or enhance related assets.

The Plan also explicitly recognises the enduring connections of the Dja Dja Wurrung people to this place. Once finalised and approved, the Plan will represent one important outcome of the Dja Dja Wurrung Recognition and Settlement Agreement (2013).

The Plan (see attached) is currently being exhibited for public comment. Parks Victoria has indicated that information and comments received will be carefully considered in developing the final plan which will be submitted to the Minister for approval.

As stated within the Plan, key elements include:

- protecting and interpreting the cultural landscape and cultural sites of the Lake
- revitalising the Lake as a productive wetland, able to support an enriched biodiversity through environment watering, natural regeneration and revegetation and habitat protection
- increasing community and visitor awareness and appreciation of the reserve's values and
- encouraging environmentally responsible practices and behaviours
- facilitating opportunities for nature-based and cultural tourism, especially through interactive guided tours that may be offered by Dja Dja Wurrung businesses
- enhancing recreation opportunities by exploring the options for new walking and shared tracks, designating a camping area to manage impacts, and providing new visitor information
- rationalising access tracks to minimise the risk of damage to natural and cultural values
- building and strengthening partnerships with the Boort community, Dja Dja Wurrung Aboriginal Corporation (DDWAC), Loddon Shire, North Central Catchment Authority and other key organisations, and promoting opportunities to work together to achieve shared goals for the reserve.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

The development of the Lake Boort Management Plan is strongly supported as the document will provide clarity around operational and management responsibilities for this reserve. The Plan identifies clearly what activities are permitted within the reserve and seeks to put in place a management regime which will ultimately protect and enhance the important cultural and environmental aspects of the Lake.

A number of concerns have however been flagged with the draft Plan. These have been documented within a proposed submission (attached) and primarily relate to consequential impacts of proposed management protocols on third party assets located within the operational boundary of the Plan. Items of concerns identified within the attached submission include:

- accuracy of boundary mapping
- protection of operation access and management rights for water supply and drainage infrastructure
- implications for VicRoads & Council road assets
- relocation of Boort Clay Target Club
- restrictions on walking of dogs through the reserve
- restrictions on the use of power boats
- extent of area available for hunting and boating
- fire management responsibilities on Boort Pyramid Road
- consideration of proposed flood mitigation infrastructure and flood management planning.

Many of the suggested changes in the context of items above shall only require a minor amendment to the content of the plan. Adjustment of the boundaries to which the Plan shall apply or the creation of operational easements over existing infrastructure may prove more complicated to achieve.

It is recommended that Council endorse the attached submission and that it be provided to Parks Victoria for consideration during formulation of the final Plan document.

COSTS/BENEFITS

The focus of the plan is primarily on the establishment of management protocols which Parks Victoria (in partnership with the DDWAC) shall apply to this reserve. This provides benefit in the form of clear delineation of boundaries of responsibility as well as details regarding approved activities or exemptions relevant to the Recognition and Settlement Agreement.

Other benefits of the Plan will include the development of partnerships between the NCCMA, Parks Victoria, Loddon Shire and the DDWAC with respect to the long term management and planning for future development and use of this area.

Whilst the Plan does not explicitly identify or quantify any immediate cost to Council with respect to its implementation, a number of elements of the long term vision for the operation of the Lake, and the degree (i.e. geographic area) to which management protocols shall be applied, may result in Council incurring additional costs in the future. These elements include:

- assistance in the relocation of the Boort Clay Target Club
- cost of establishing and complying with Cultural Heritage Management Plans for the operation and maintenance of the fill/spill channel from Little Lake Boort
- possible licence costs for existing third party assets or land tenure.

The vast majority of works proposed around the Lake, including funding of these works, will be undertaken by Parks Victoria and the DDWAC.

RISK ANALYSIS

Management controls proposed within the Plan are aimed towards minimising potential risk of further deterioration or damage to important cultural or environmental assets.

It is considered that an appropriate balance must be struck between establishing appropriate management controls to protect such assets whilst maintaining recreational and community availability of this reserve.

Controls specified within the plan are also proposed to encompass a number of third party assets due to their geographic positioning within the proposed boundary of the Plan. Application of additional controls, restrictions or requirements over these assets has the potential of creating additional administrative or cost burdens with respect to the operation, management and renewal of these assets.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Parks Victoria has engaged with various stakeholders at relevant stages during development of the Plan. This includes direct consultation with relevant state government agencies, Council, water authorities and representative community groups. A number of public workshops have also been conducted.

The release of the draft document and call for public submissions is the latest iteration of consultation with respect to development of the Plan before it is finalised and presented to the Minister for approval.

5. INFORMATION REPORTS

5.1 INWARDS CORRESPONDENCE

SUMMARY

Relevant correspondence received by Council since previous meeting.

Author:	Phil Pinyon, Chief Executive Officer
Council Plan ref:	Strategic enabler: Transparent communication
File No:	various
Attachment:	Copies of inwards correspondence

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receives and notes the Inwards Correspondence.

Date	From	Subject
12/8/2016	Wedderburn Lions Club	Several letters regarding Aged Care Facility Land – adjacent to Wedderburn Community Centre
29/08/2016	Keren Chapman	Enclosing letter sent to Peter Walsh regarding Boort Primary School site.

5.2 2015/16 END OF FINANCIAL YEAR VARIATION ANALYSIS

SUMMARY

This report provides Council with an analysis of variances contained within the Finance Report for the year ended 30 June 2016 compared to the revised budget projection at the time of setting the 2016/17 Budget.

Author	Deanne Caserta, Manager Financial Services
Council Plan ref:	Strategic enabler: Sound financial management protocols
File no:	08/06/001
Attachment:	Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That Council receives and notes the “2015/16 End of Financial Year Variation Analysis” Report.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Are there any conflicts of interest for any council staff involved in writing this report, or involved in the subject matter of the report?

No

If yes, the following details identify the conflict of interest.

Officer name	Nature of interest	Reason for conflict
Click here to enter text.	Choose an item. If indirect, the type of indirect interest is: Choose an item.	[Explain the specific circumstances of this person’s conflict of interest.]

[Refer to the Staff and Contractors Code of Conduct for definitions of conflict of interest.]

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DISCUSSION

As part of the 2016/17 budget process, budget projections for the end of 2015/16 financial year were presented to Council in the form of a Revised Budget.

At the September Council Forum a brief snapshot at activity level of the major variations between the 2015/16 Revised Budget and the 2015/16 Actuals was presented. Explanations were given where variances existed outside Council’s threshold of 10% or \$10,000.

BACKGROUND

The annual budget process requires that budget projections of the current financial year be undertaken to calculate the potential carried forward surplus that will form part of the next year’s budget.

As this process is generally finalised in late March or early April, there are a further three months of activity to the end of June which may give rise to variations to the budget projections.

This report outlines the variations which have arisen between the budget projections made and the actual final results achieved at year end 30 June 2016.

ISSUES/DISCUSSION

The revised budget projections called for an end of financial year closing cash surplus position of \$939K. The actual cash surplus was \$1.18M, a positive variance of \$242K.

The monthly Finance Report tables are provided as Appendix 1 to this report, and include the budget, actuals, variance in dollars and percentage terms.

Whilst there are a number of variances, this report focuses on those which fall outside a 10% or \$10,000 threshold, whichever is the greater.

SUMMARISED FINANCIAL RESULT

The table below discloses the actual result for the year in comparison to the budget:

Report item	2015/16 Revised Budget \$	2015/16 Actual \$	Variance of Actual to Budget \$	Variance of Actual to Budget %
Revenue	(26,075,352)	(26,305,876)	230,525	101%
Expenses	28,224,335	26,634,671	1,589,664	94%
Net operating result	2,148,983	328,796	1,820,189	15%
Funding decisions	(6,307,123)	(1,712,164)	(4,594,957)	27%
Capital expenditure	12,954,009	9,845,442	3,108,567	76%
Non cash adjustments	(8,543,463)	(8,452,118)	(91,346)	99%
Accumulated deficit b/f	(1,191,863)	(1,191,863)	0	100%
Net cash surplus/(deficit)	(939,456)	(1,181,909)	242,453	126%

INCOME

Income for the year was \$26.31M representing a variance of 1% or \$231K higher than the budget of \$26.08M. Within the income items the following variances occurred:

Recurrent contributions

Recurrent contributions were below budget by \$59K or 46%.

Instances where Council received income that was less than the budget were:

- due to a delay in the commencement of the Serpentine Pavilion project, the \$100K contribution from the committee has not yet been raised.

Instances where Council received income that was greater than budget were:

- works were undertaken at the Boort Netball Courts where the expenditure was higher than expected and the committee was required to contribute the shortfall of \$21K back to Council.

Interest income

Interest income was higher than the budget by \$82K or 19%. This is due to the availability of extra cash for investments due to delays in some large capital works projects and up front funding.

EXPENDITURE

Expenditure for the year was \$26.63M representing a variance of 6% or \$1.59M below budget. Within the line items the following variances occurred:

Materials and services

Materials and services were \$1.39M or 16% below budget; the main reasons are outlined below.

Items below budget include:

- lower than expected bookings for Loddon Discovery Tours during the financial year and as a result were \$68K underspent; this will be offset by a decrease in fees and charges income.
- outdoor staff superannuation of \$44K with vacancies throughout the year and as a result a lower amount of oncost expenditure.

Items below budget where transfers to reserve have resulted are:

- major projects of \$80K which has been transferred to the major projects reserve
- environmental strategy of \$76K, weed and pest program of \$159K, Serpentine Pavilion project of \$74K and canoe trail of \$54K which have been transferred to the unspent grants reserve
- various community planning projects of \$240K which have been transferred to the community planning reserve
- unspent allocations for home and community care projects of \$373K which have been transferred to the unspent grants reserve.

Items above budget:

- local road maintenance of \$59K with most of the savings in sealed and gravel road maintenance
- tips, earthworks and slots of \$100K with an increase to the maintenance works to ensure that the centres are operating within EPA guidelines
- dam safety works undertaken at the Wedderburn Caravan Park reservoir were \$33K higher than budget, with a change in the scope of works carried out due to the opportunity to clean it while it was empty.

Utilities

Utilities were \$148K or 41% higher than budget; the main reasons are outlined below.

Items above budget:

- caravan park water expenditure was higher by \$32K due to the dry summer and the additional watering required to keep the grass alive especially at the Bridgewater Caravan Park
- water for the standpipes and truck washes of \$12K with additional use of the facilities with many local farmers needing to cart water for stock with dams drying up over the summer
- townscape services water usage of \$52K due to low summer rainfall and the additional water required to keep the grass alive in the township parks and gardens.

Loss on sale of assets

There is no budget allocation for the loss or profit on the sale of assets due to its unpredictable nature. There was a \$103K loss for the 2015/16 financial year. This included a loss of \$126K for plant and equipment and a gain of \$24K from land and building sales. In 2014/15 this was a loss of \$17K.

Bad debts expense

There is no budget allocation for bad debts expenses due to its unpredictable nature. There was a \$22K cost to Council for the 2015/16 financial year. In 2014/15 this was a cost to Council of \$36K.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Capital expenditure was \$9.85M representing a variance of 24% or \$3.11M below the budget of \$12.95M.

Furniture and office equipment

Furniture and office equipment were 43% or \$44K below budget of \$103K.

The main variances below budget which are offset by reserve transfers were:

- asset edge devices of \$30K
- photocopier and scanners of \$15K.

Land and buildings

Land and buildings were 14% or \$392K below budget of \$2.86M.

The main variances below budget which are offset by reserve transfers were:

- building asset management plan allocation of \$199K
- operations centre expansion of \$109K
- livestock and domestic pound of \$65K
- Bridgewater Hall community planning allocations of \$58K.

These projects have all been carried forward into 2016/17 and are expected to be completed by 30 June 2017.

Plant and equipment

Plant and equipment was 15% or \$380K below budget of \$2.48M.

The main variance was the delay in delivery of new plant which had been ordered within 2015/16.

Roads infrastructure

Roadworks were 20% or \$895K below budget of \$4.46M.

The main variances below budget which are offset by reserve transfers were:

- \$50K of uncompleted local road safety program projects
- \$43K of uncompleted local road amenity program projects
- \$65K of uncompleted local road construction projects

Items below budget:

- reseal program of \$226K due to a competitive tendering process, all jobs were completed with savings
- local road gravel resheets of \$166K due to more efficient work practices and a cheaper supply of gravel.

Urban and road drainage

Urban and road drainage were 100% or \$427K below budget of \$427K.

This is due to \$427K of uncompleted works that have been carried forward into the 2016/17 financial year for completion.

Recreation, leisure and community facilities

Recreation, leisure and community facilities were 55% or \$534K below budget of \$976K.

The main variances below budget which are offset by reserve transfers were:

- \$398K for the Bridgewater foreshore project
- \$147K for the Bridgewater boat ramp project.

Items below budget:

- swimming pool strategy capital component of \$35K with higher expenditure in the operating component of the strategy allocations.

Parks, open space and streetscapes

Parks, open space and streetscapes were 8% or \$102K below budget of \$1.22M.

This represents a relatively small variation which falls outside the reporting threshold.

Footpaths

Footpaths were 78% or \$334K below budget of \$429K.

The main variances below budget which are offset by reserve transfers were:

- \$88K for the Railway Avenue project in Pyramid Hill
- \$214K for the Albert Street project also in Pyramid Hill.

FUNDING DECISIONS

Funding decisions were \$4.59M or 73% below budget.

Transfers to reserves

Transfers to reserves were \$3.92M above budget.

The main reasons were:

- Unspent Grants Reserve was \$2.5M above budget which represents funds received for a variety of projects that remained unspent at 30 June 2016
- Capital Expenditure Reserve was \$1.0M above budget which represents projects that will now be added to the 2016/17 program
- Community Planning Reserve was \$288K above budget which represents projects that are either incomplete or will not commence until 2016/17.

Transfers from reserves

Transfers from reserves were \$651K below budget.

The main reasons were:

- Plant Replacement Reserve was \$396K below budget due to the delay in plant replacement equipment delivery

- Economic Development Reserve was \$141K below budget with less expenditure for items where amounts were to be transferred from the reserve.

Proceeds from sale of assets

Proceeds from sale of assets was \$23K below budget, this falls within tolerance therefore is not reported.

SUMMARY

In summary, at the end of the financial year Council had a surplus of \$242K in excess of expectation.

There are many variances throughout the different elements of the financial statements, however, it can be reported that:

- Council used Capital Expenditure, Community Planning and Unspent Grants to capture any financial items that were not affected in 2015/16 and will be completed in 2016/17 or subsequent years
- Savings in many areas of the accounts were realised due to strong financial management by the officers responsible for delivering projects and programs.

COSTS/BENEFITS

The benefit of Council receiving a variation report of actual to projected budget is that it gives Council an understanding of the difference in the cash surplus position and keeps Council fully informed.

RISK ANALYSIS

The provision of a variance to budget report to Council minimises the risk of Council not understanding the financial position at year end, and provides reasons for carry over projects.

CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

There has been considerable consultation internally with respective managers in understanding their budget responsibilities and keeping within budgetary constraints.

External engagement with the community was undertaken during the submission period for the Budget, and regular reporting provides a mechanism for monitoring the financial outcomes of Council against the Budget.

APPENDIX 1: FINANCE REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2016

	2015/16 Original Budget	2015/16 Revised Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	Variance of YTD Actual & YTD Budget	% YTD Actual to YTD Budget	% YTD Actual to Budget
REVENUE FROM ORDINARY ACTIVITIES							
Rates	\$9,701,598	\$9,751,869	\$9,751,869	\$9,742,761	(\$9,108)	100%	100%
Revenue grants	\$9,241,910	\$5,687,111	\$5,687,111	\$6,050,957	\$363,846	106%	106%
Capital grants	\$4,086,181	\$6,958,299	\$6,958,299	\$6,964,375	\$6,076	100%	100%
Vic Roads	\$758,232	\$598,511	\$598,511	\$629,581	\$31,070	105%	105%
User fees	\$2,155,825	\$2,231,925	\$2,231,925	\$2,030,303	(\$201,622)	91%	91%
Capital contributions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
Recurrent contributions	\$0	\$129,114	\$129,114	\$69,869	(\$59,245)	54%	54%
Interest income	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$507,306	\$82,306	119%	119%
* Reversal of impairment losses	\$0	\$570	\$570	\$570	(\$0)	100%	100%
* Library equity	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,145	\$8,145	0%	0%
Reimbursements	\$267,953	\$292,953	\$292,953	\$302,009	\$9,057	103%	103%
Total revenue	\$26,636,699	\$26,075,352	\$26,075,352	\$26,305,876	\$230,524	101%	101%
EXPENDITURE FROM ORDINARY ACTIVITIES							
Labour	\$8,837,550	\$8,950,804	\$8,950,804	\$8,774,807	\$175,997	98%	98%
Materials & services	\$7,678,350	\$8,582,820	\$8,582,820	\$7,195,125	\$1,387,695	84%	84%
Depreciation	\$8,544,033	\$8,544,033	\$8,544,033	\$8,335,880	\$208,153	98%	98%
Utilities	\$456,320	\$366,931	\$366,931	\$515,679	(\$148,748)	141%	141%
Contract payments	\$1,425,037	\$1,486,204	\$1,486,204	\$1,399,824	\$86,380	94%	94%
Loan interest	\$7,259	\$7,259	\$7,259	\$4,271	\$2,988	59%	59%
Auditor costs	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$65,120	\$9,880	87%	87%
Councillor costs	\$211,284	\$211,284	\$211,284	\$219,013	(\$7,729)	104%	104%
Loss on sale of assets	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,681	(\$102,681)	0%	0%
* Impairment losses	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166	(\$166)	0%	0%
Bad debts expense	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,107	(\$22,107)	0%	0%
Total expenditure	\$27,234,833	\$28,224,335	\$28,224,335	\$26,634,671	\$1,589,664	94%	94%
NET RESULT FOR THE PERIOD	(\$598,134)	(\$2,148,983)	(\$2,148,983)	(\$328,795)	(\$1,820,188)	15%	15%
The operating expenditure shown above is represented in Council's key direction areas as follows:							
	2015/16 Original Budget	2015/16 Revised Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	Variance of YTD Actual & YTD Revised Budget	% YTD Actual to YTD Budget	% YTD Actual to Revised Budget
EXPENSES FROM ORDINARY ACTIVITIES							
Economic development & tourism	\$1,440,199	\$1,660,162	\$1,660,162	\$1,496,984	\$163,178	90%	90%
Leadership	\$824,805	\$859,107	\$859,107	\$823,959	\$35,148	96%	96%
Works & infrastructure	\$11,638,831	\$11,306,298	\$11,306,298	\$11,212,804	\$93,494	99%	99%
Good management	\$4,857,785	\$4,839,748	\$4,839,748	\$4,828,687	\$11,062	100%	100%
Environment	\$1,827,009	\$2,228,325	\$2,228,325	\$1,994,448	\$233,877	90%	90%
Community services & recreation	\$6,646,204	\$7,330,695	\$7,330,695	\$6,175,110	\$1,155,586	84%	84%
Loss on sale of assets	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,681	(\$102,681)	0%	0%
Total operating expenditure	\$27,234,833	\$28,224,335	\$28,224,335	\$26,634,671	\$1,589,664	94%	94%
NET RESULT FOR THE PERIOD	(\$598,134)	(\$2,148,983)	(\$2,148,983)	(\$328,795)	(\$1,820,188)	15%	15%

APPENDIX 1: FINANCE REPORT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 2016

	2015/16 Original Budget	2015/16 Revised Budget	YTD Budget	YTD Actual	Variance of YTD Actual & YTD Budget	% YTD Actual to YTD Budget	% YTD Actual to Budget
FUNDING DECISIONS							
Add loan interest accrued	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%	0%
Less loan repayments	(\$131,145)	(\$131,145)	(\$131,145)	(\$131,125)	(\$20)	100%	100%
Add transfer from reserves	\$2,625,540	\$13,599,885	\$13,599,885	\$12,949,286	\$650,599	95%	95%
Less transfer to reserves	(\$2,620,256)	(\$7,516,394)	(\$7,516,394)	(\$11,437,487)	\$3,921,093	152%	152%
Add proceeds from sale of assets	\$372,128	\$354,777	\$354,777	\$331,490	\$23,287	93%	93%
TOTAL FUNDING DECISIONS	\$246,267	\$6,307,123	\$6,307,123	\$1,712,164	\$4,594,959	27%	27%
NET FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CAPITAL	(\$351,867)	\$4,158,140	\$4,158,140	\$1,383,369	\$2,774,771	33%	33%
CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BY ASSET TYPE							
Furniture and office equipment	\$572,500	\$102,500	\$102,500	\$58,427	\$44,073	57%	57%
Land and buildings	\$1,811,200	\$2,860,098	\$2,860,098	\$2,467,958	\$392,141	86%	86%
Plant and equipment	\$1,057,394	\$2,476,886	\$2,476,886	\$2,097,008	\$379,878	85%	85%
Roadworks	\$3,868,173	\$4,462,776	\$4,462,776	\$3,567,369	\$895,407	80%	80%
Urban and road drainage	\$427,900	\$427,900	\$427,900	\$939	\$426,961	0%	0%
Recreation, leisure and community facilities	\$266,650	\$975,854	\$975,854	\$442,293	\$533,561	45%	45%
Parks, open space and streetscapes	\$186,912	\$1,218,786	\$1,218,786	\$1,116,490	\$102,296	92%	92%
Footpaths	\$319,022	\$429,209	\$429,209	\$94,959	\$334,250	22%	22%
TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PAYMENTS	\$8,509,751	\$12,954,009	\$12,954,009	\$9,845,442	\$3,108,567	76%	76%
NON CASH ADJUSTMENTS							
Less depreciation	\$8,544,033	\$8,544,033	\$8,544,033	\$8,335,880	\$208,153	98%	98%
Add reversal of impairment losses	\$0	(\$570)	(\$570)	(\$570)	(\$0)	100%	100%
Add library equity	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$8,145)	\$8,145	0%	0%
Less loss on sale of assets	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,681	(\$102,681)	0%	0%
Less impairment losses	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$166	(\$166)	0%	0%
Less bad debts expense	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,107	(\$22,107)	0%	0%
TOTAL NON CASH ADJUSTMENTS	\$8,544,033	\$8,543,463	\$8,543,463	\$8,452,118	\$91,345	99%	99%
Accumulated surplus brought forward	(\$334,043)	(\$1,191,863)	(\$1,191,863)	(\$1,191,863)	\$0	100%	100%
NET CASH (SURPLUS)/DEFICIT	(\$16,458)	(\$939,456)	(\$939,456)	(\$1,181,908)	\$242,453	126%	126%

6. COMPLIANCE REPORTS

Nil

7. GENERAL BUSINESS

8. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Closing of Meeting to the Public

RECOMMENDATION

That the meeting be closed to the public.

NEXT MEETING

The next Ordinary Meeting of Council will be held on 11 October at Wedderburn commencing at 3pm.