Notice is hereby given that an Ordinary Meeting of Canterbury City Council will be held in The Council Chambers, 137 Beamish Street, Campsie on Thursday 25 September 2014, commencing at 7.30 P.M.

Disclosure of Interest: Section 451 of the Local Government Act 1993 requires a Councillor who has a pecuniary interest in any matter with which the Council is concerned and who is present at the meeting of the Council or Committee at which the matter is being considered must disclose the interest, and the nature of that interest, to the meeting as soon as practicable. The Councillor is required to leave the Chamber while the matter is being discussed and not return until it has been voted on.

Your attendance is requested.

Jim Montague PSM
GENERAL MANAGER
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This meeting will be recorded on audio tape for minute-taking purposes as authorised by the Local Government Act 1993.
REPORT SUMMARIES

MAYORAL MINUTES

ADOPTION OF TRAFFIC COMMITTEE REPORT

OFFICERS REPORTS

1 ELECTION OF DEPUTY MAYOR

This report sets out the procedure for the election of a Deputy Mayor, if one is to be elected.

2 REVIEW OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

We currently support and service ten Advisory Committees. As part of the mid-term review of the operation of the Committees it is proposed that a number of changes be made to the Committees including the frequency of meetings, title of the Committees and shared operations.

3 COUNCILLORS PAYMENT OF EXPENSES AND PROVISION OF FACILITIES POLICY

- Under section 252 of the Local Government Act 1993, we are required to review our policy on the Payment of Expenses and Provision of Facilities to Councillors within five months after the end of each financial year.
- Our policy has been reviewed and some amendments are recommended.
- It is recommended the amended policy be endorsed for public exhibition.

4 INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 26 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.

5 NSW PUBLIC LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION

The NSW Public Libraries Association was formed in July this year as the result of an amalgamation between the NSW Metropolitan Public Libraries Association and Public Libraries NSW to represent libraries across the state. Councils are asked to nominate an elected representative to the newly formed association.
6 STATE OF THE CHILDREN REPORT

- In 2009 we endorsed the implementation of the UNICEF Child Friendly Cities Initiative, based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which applies to anyone aged up to 18 years.
- A Child Friendly City working group was established to begin working through steps to ensure children’s rights are upheld in our City.
- In order to inform future meaningful policies and strategies for building a child friendly city we needed a sound and current knowledge base in regard to children and their rights in Canterbury.
- The State of the Children Report is based on 12 months of research, interviews, surveys and collation of all relevant information.
- The report recommends that Council support the introduction of a biennial Children’s Summit to meet the UNICEF requirements to engage children in discussions on ways to address their rights.

7 INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 AUGUST 2014

- This report includes a Performance Report on investments.
- Also contained in the report is a statutory report on investments submitted pursuant to the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005.
- It is recommended the report be noted.


- This report provides a progressive summary of the rates and charges that have been rebated to pensioners in the 2013/14 and 2014/15 years.
- For 2013/14 rates and charges, the report seeks Council’s authority to write-off $32,430.07 and recommends that 55% of this amount (ie. $17,836.54) be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act.
- For 2014/15 rates and charges, the report seeks Council’s authority to write-off $2,370,947.81 and recommends that 55% of this amount (ie. $1,304,021.29) be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act.

9 93-97 BONDS ROAD, RIVERWOOD: PLANNING PROPOSAL

- A planning proposal seeking the rezoning of the subject land from IN1 General Industrial to permit redevelopment for a combination of residential and retail/commercial activities has been received.
The planning proposal has been assessed by independent planning and economic development consultants.

Their report concludes that the land is a key industrial/employment site, is part of a much larger key industrial precinct and that the current zoning should be retained.

It is recommended that the planning proposal not proceed.

10 15-33 BRIGHTON AVENUE, CROYDON PARK: PLANNING PROPOSAL

- A planning proposal seeking the rezoning of the subject land from IN2 Light Industrial to permit a residential redevelopment of the site with some additional retail/commercial activities has been received.
- The planning proposal has been assessed by independent planning and economic development consultants.
- Their report concludes that the land is not part of a key industrial/employment area and a rezoning to permit residential redevelopment could be supported.
- Their report, however, also concludes that the level of redevelopment sought is excessive and that if Council supports the rezoning then building heights should be fixed at 11.5 metres (three storeys) and the floor space ratio fixed at a maximum of 0.9:1 in keeping with predominant surrounding land uses and scales of development.
- It is recommended that rezoning the land as R4 High Density Residential, subject to the maximum building height (11.5 metres) and floor space ratio (0.9:1) recommended in the independent consultants report be supported.

11 280-284 BURWOOD ROAD, BELMORE: PLANNING PROPOSAL

- A planning proposal has been received in respect of land at 280-284 Burwood Road, Belmore.
- The planning proposal seeks to have the land rezoned from R4 High Density Residential to B2 Local Centre. A height increase from 14 to 18 metres and removal of floor space ratio controls is also sought.
- Requests to rezone this land have twice previously been considered by Council. On each occasion Council resolved not to support the rezoning of the land.
- There has been no additional compelling evidence or justification provided that would warrant Council altering its previously held position.
- It is recommended that the planning proposal not be supported.
12 PLANNING CONTROLS RELATING TO LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENT ALONG MAIN CORRIDORS

- The Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 (CLEP 2012) and Development Control Plan 2012 (CDCP 2012) came into effect in January 2013. In applying the controls contained in these planning instruments, it is clear that there has been significant local interest in the way that taller, more intense buildings transition to lower density residential areas, particularly along our significant corridors like Canterbury Road.
- This report explores the current controls that seek to provide a reasonable transition between larger scale buildings in Business zones and lower scale buildings in Residential zones and recommends that amendments be made to the DCP to improve these built form relationships that occur along our main corridors.
- It also explores the way in which Council resolution on 28 August 2014 (Minute No. 308) regarding rear lane access to these development sites, may be most appropriately implemented.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1 COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Community Safety Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 are presented for endorsement.

2 DISABILITY ACCESS COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Disability Access Committee meeting held on 20 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.

3 MULTICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Multicultural Advisory Committee meeting held on 3 September 2014 are presented for endorsement.

4 SENIOR CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee meeting held on 21 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.
MOTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

CLOSED COUNCIL
On Tuesday 16 September 2014, the General Manager and I met with representatives from the Campsie Local Area Command, at their specific request, to discuss critical issues regarding crime and policing in Lakemba Town Centre.

The Police representatives expressed strong concern to us that serious recent incidents of crime were not being reported to Police, and were instead being reported to local business groups and to Councillors. The Police expressed concern that when an incident is not reported directly to Police, others are put in the dangerous position of go-between. The ability of the Police to respond to violent crime appropriately and in a timely manner is lost. The community suffers, for without immediate reporting of crime, the Police are then unable to argue for any additional or specialist resources that may be needed to address crime in our local area.

In light of current worldwide events, and the focus on areas such as Lakemba, these actions are of even greater concern.

The Police representatives specifically sought our assistance to address this matter and to ensure that incidents of crime are reported to the Police without delay.

We have a strong history of liaison with our community, particularly in our town centres, through both our Town Centres/Economic Development program and through our Community Safety Program. Both of these programs are supported by Council staff and by local committees which includes local business and resident representatives. We are, appropriately, advocates for our community on the issues of crime prevention and community safety.

After discussions with the Police representatives, I have come to the conclusion that it would be in the best interests of our residents and local businesses for us to establish a Round-Table discussion with the Police, our staff, local business representatives and Councillors. The purpose of this Round Table would be to hear the concerns of the local business representatives and to work with the Police to develop strategies to reduce the occurrence of such incidents in the future.

I am aware that the Community Safety Committee is in a position to undertake further work in this area, such as safety audits, and even to seek further funds for specific preventative actions, however none of our remedial actions can replace the immediate actions of the NSW Police Force. They are the appropriate body to respond to the reporting of crime in Lakemba. I believe we should take very seriously their approach to us this past week, and ensure that we encourage all of our local residents and businesses to report any incident of crime to the Police, immediately.
In the meantime, work will be commenced to identify immediate measures that Council could implement to improve safety and security in Lakemba. These measures will include a survey of existing street lighting and selected safety audits within the Town Centre.

I move that a Round-Table discussion be held at the earliest opportunity and that representatives of all of the appropriate local organisations be invited to have their voice heard at this meeting, along with the Police, Council staff and Councillors.

Further, I encourage all Councillors who have been contacted by local residents or business owners to encourage them to call the Police when they witness or become aware of any incident of crime in our area. It is irresponsible of us not to heed the warnings of our most senior local Police representatives and we should work closely with them to ensure that residents and business owners of Lakemba feel safe in their community.

I move accordingly.

Cr Brian Robson

MAYOR
ADOPTION OF TRAFFIC COMMITTEE REPORT

The minutes of the Traffic Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 are provided in the attachments. The reports submitted to the Traffic Committee have been forwarded to Councillors separately.

Council’s attention is drawn to the following proposed works to be completed and funds to be expended, as recommended by the Committee.

ITEM 5  PENSHURST ROAD AT SHORTER AVENUE, BEVERLY HILLS - SAFETY AT PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

THAT
1. A kerb side blister island be installed north and south side of the existing pedestrian crossing in Penshurst Road at the intersection of Shorter Avenue, Beverly Hills, as shown on the concept plan included in the report.
2. The existing median island in Penshurst Road located near the pedestrian crossing be extended as shown on the concept plan included in the report.
3. A speed cushion be installed on the eastern side of the pedestrian crossing (travelling south on Penshurst Road) as shown on the concept plan included in the report.
4. Warning signs be installed on southern side of Shorter Avenue and on the western side of Penshurst Road, approaching the roundabout, as shown on the concept plan included in the report.
5. The estimated cost of the work of $20,000 be voted from the Traffic Committee Allocation.
6. The Councillor and the resident be advised of the decision.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Traffic Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 and the recommendations contained therein, be adopted.
OFFICERS REPORTS

1 ELECTION OF DEPUTY MAYOR

FILE NO: M-14-2 PT3

REPORT BY: GENERAL MANAGER

Summary:
This report sets out the procedure for the election of a Deputy Mayor, if one is to be elected.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Effective Governance.

Report:
Section 231 of the Local Government Act 1993 provides as follows:

- The Councillors may elect a person from among their number to be the deputy mayor.
- The person may be elected for the mayoral term or a shorter term.
- The deputy mayor may exercise any function of the mayor at the request of the mayor or if the mayor is prevented by illness, absence or otherwise from exercising the function or if there is a casual vacancy in the office of mayor.
- The Councillors may elect a person from among their number to act as deputy mayor if the deputy mayor is prevented by illness, absence or otherwise from exercising a function under this section, or if no deputy mayor has been elected.

The Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 (Schedule 7) provides regulations for the election of deputy mayor.

The procedure for the election of a deputy mayor is as follows:

- Nominations for the office of deputy mayor may be made without notice and must be signed by two or more councillors, (one of whom may be the nominee).
- The nomination must have the consent of the nominee in writing.
- The nomination must be handed to the General Manager (Returning Officer).
- The General Manager will announce the names of the nominees at the Council meeting.
- If there is only one nomination received, or if all the nominations except one are withdrawn, or if all the Councillors nominated except one decline nomination, then that one shall be declared elected.
- If more than one Councillor is nominated, the Council is to resolve whether the election is to proceed by:
  - Ordinary ballot
  - Preferential ballot, or
  - Open voting.
- The election is to be held at the Council meeting at which the Council resolves the method of voting.
Council should resolve if a deputy mayor is to be elected, and if so, the term of office of the deputy mayor. In addition, should there be more than one nomination for the office of deputy mayor, Council should resolve the method of voting to be used.

Submitted for Council's consideration.
2 REVIEW OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

FILE NO: C-117-3
REPORT BY: GENERAL MANAGER

Summary:
We currently support and service ten Advisory Committees. As part of the mid-term review of the operation of the Committees it is proposed that a number of changes be made to the Committees including the frequency of meetings, title of the Committees and shared operations.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Engaged Community and Effective Governance.

Report:
Background
Council’s policy on Advisory Committees states that “Council will constitute advisory committees as required by legislation, or as considered necessary to improve community life through enhanced local governance, and to promote the efficient and effective delivery of Council’s services, policies and programs”.

The stated functions of Advisory Committees, as outlined in Council’s policy, are to:
- facilitate new ideas and approaches;
- share information amongst stakeholders;
- provide a means of representation and advocacy on behalf of the community to Council by key stakeholders;
- provide an opportunity for participation; and
- provide a means of contributing to Council’s capacity by evaluating the effective delivery of services, policies and programs in relation to the matters defined by the terms of reference of the committee.

The current range and roles of committees was established soon after the 2012 local government election. As this is mid-term, we have conducted a review of the committees and propose changes to streamline their operations and support the delivery of their programs.

Current Situation
The City of Canterbury currently engages and provides support to ten Advisory Committees (in addition to a range of other reference groups).

Broad details of these Advisory Committees are detailed in Table 1.
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Meetings per year</th>
<th>Supported by</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Disability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Capacity Development</td>
<td>People with a disability and staff from disability focused organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Senior Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Capacity Development</td>
<td>People over the age of 55 and staff from aged services organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Multicultural Advisory Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Capacity Development</td>
<td>People from organisations which work with people from CALD backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Youth Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Capacity Development</td>
<td>Young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Community Safety Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community Capacity Development</td>
<td>Police and representatives of the Canterbury DV Committee and the Community Drug Action Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aquatics Advisory Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recreation Services</td>
<td>Users of aquatics centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sports Fields Advisory Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Representatives of sports clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Economic Development Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corporate and Economic Development</td>
<td>Representatives of Chambers of Commerce and local business groups, employment and economic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2 to 3</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>Artists and people representing the arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Environment and Sustainability Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Land Use and Environmental Planning</td>
<td>People from a range of organisations which focus on the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each Advisory Committee is supported by at least two staff members; one who supports the Committee including preparation of papers for discussion and consideration at the meeting, and another who takes minutes.

### Proposed Changes and Rationale

This report proposes changes to a number of the above Advisory Committees. Changes are being proposed in order to:

- streamline Council’s approach to Advisory Committees,
- ensure Committees meet Council’s and the community’s needs,
- ensure that the other work of Council can be managed by rationalising the administrative load associated with supporting the Committees,
- ensure that each Committee performs functions that take into account any new strategic directions of Council,
- establish a common frequency of meetings across Committees,
- align the name of the Committee to contemporary policy language for the issue or target group.
Table 2 details key issues, proposed changes and the rationale for individual committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability Access Committee</td>
<td>The National Disability Insurance Scheme and the 2014 Disability Inclusion Act establish a new and broader paradigm which this Advisory Committee needs to engage with.</td>
<td>i. Rename to Disability Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>i. With the reforms to the disability sector and the wider role that this Committee has been playing for the last couple of years it is appropriate to change its name to reflect its broader role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Reduce frequency of meetings to four per year.</td>
<td>ii. The reduction in meetings aligns it with the Older People Advisory Committee. (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Council on the Ageing, the peak body for all matters relating to older people, the Commonwealth and the NSW Department of FACS all use the term ‘older people or persons’. People who are 55 years and older do not identify with the term ‘senior citizen’.</td>
<td>Rename to Older People Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>The term ‘senior citizen’ was used originally to replace ‘old age pensioner’. It is no longer used widely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed change of name to the Committee will align with the contemporary description of the target group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Advisory Committee</td>
<td>This Committee has five meetings per annum. Staff also support the Inter-faith Religious Leaders Forum which meets four times per annum. The workload in supporting both the Committee and the Forum is significant.</td>
<td>Reduce frequency of meetings to four per year.</td>
<td>The reduction in meetings aligns it with the Older People Advisory Committee and reduces the burden of staff attending from other organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Council</td>
<td>It is often difficult to get a quorum of young people to attend five meetings per annum and most consultation with young people takes place at Belmore Youth Centre or Lakemba during drop-in.</td>
<td>Reduce frequency of meeting to four per year.</td>
<td>The reduction in meetings aligns it with the Older People Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A quorum will be easier to achieve with only four meetings per annum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Committee</td>
<td>This Committee currently meets on 10 occasions per annum. In order to generate papers in time for this frequency of meetings, staff are required to commence preparation of papers the week after a meeting.</td>
<td>Reduce the frequency of meeting to 8 per year.</td>
<td>A reduction of meetings by two per year would better enable staff to have a full agenda for each meeting and to complete the required work between meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics Advisory Committee and Sports Fields Advisory Committee</td>
<td>There are two Advisory Committees which cover two separate and very specific components of recreation – sports fields and aquatic centres. Two major pieces of work in relation to recreation – the Review of the Recreation Strategy and the Playground Study have been completed in 2014. Both of these pieces of work would benefit from an Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>i. Combine the Aquatics and Sports Fields Advisory Committees, invite broader representation, rename it to the Recreation Advisory Committee, and broaden the terms of reference.</td>
<td>i. The recently completed review of the Recreation Strategy and the Playground Study require that a consultation mechanism be established with the community to support work in relation to recreation and playgrounds. Each of the Aquatics and Sports Fields Committees are both recreation related but very narrow in focus. Establishing a reformed Committee as a Recreation Advisory Committee would broaden and provide a more balanced perspective across a range of recreational activities. ii. The Committee would need to meet quarterly to cover the workload. This also aligns the frequency to that of other Advisory Committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Advisory Committee</td>
<td>The Arts Committee meets infrequently and has limited representation from artists. There are limited initiatives across the City of Canterbury in relation to arts.</td>
<td>Combine the Arts Committee with the Library Community Language Reference Group and refocus the matters which relate to both the library and the arts. Maintain the new group as Arts and Libraries Reference Group only. This group currently meets four times per year.</td>
<td>Agenda items and content for the Arts Advisory Committee has been difficult to identify. Attendance at meetings has also been variable. By combining library issues and arts, there will be a larger group of people and greater opportunity for content that focusses on the wider range of Cultural programs supported by Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Sustainability Advisory Committee</td>
<td>The committee meets five times per year.</td>
<td>Reduce the frequency to four times per year.</td>
<td>The reduction in meetings aligns it with the proposal for other advisory committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Economic Development Committee operates effectively and no changes are proposed.

**Conclusion**
We have conducted a mid-term review of the operation of our Advisory Committees. Changes relating to the names of committees, frequency of meetings and shared operations are proposed in order to streamline operations and support the delivery of programs.
RECOMMENDATION:
THAT
1. Changes proposed to the operation of the Advisory Committees as outlined in the report be endorsed.
2. The changes come into effect from 1 January 2015.
3. The Advisory Committees Policy and amended Charters be the subject of a further report to Council.
SUMMARY:

- Under section 252 of the Local Government Act 1993, we are required to review our policy on the Payment of Expenses and Provision of Facilities to Councillors within five months after the end of each financial year.
- Our policy has been reviewed and some amendments are recommended.
- It is recommended the amended policy be endorsed for public exhibition.

COUNCIL DELIVERY PROGRAM AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

 Provision has been made in the budget for the payment of Councillor expenses and the costs for provision of facilities. A review and amendment of the policy supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Effective Governance.

REPORT:

BACKGROUND

Section 252 of the Local Government Act 1993 requires us to review within five months after the end of each financial year and amend, if required, our policy for the Payment of Expenses and the Provision of Facilities for Councillors. It also requires that the policy comply with the Act, the Local Government (General) Regulation and the Guidelines for the Payment of Expenses and the Provision of Facilities. Our policy meets these requirements.

POLICY REVIEW

Our current policy was last reviewed and amendments adopted by Council on 22 May 2014. Our latest annual review of the policy has now been completed and minor changes are proposed to the existing policy.

- Part 3 Establishment of Monetary Limits
  3.1.3 iPad Data Limit
  The most recent amendment to the policy included setting data limits and maximum costs for smart phones and landline telephone provision and use. Additionally a maximum data limit was set for iPads, however, a cost limit was not set.

  It is proposed that a cost limit be set by rewording the clause as follows:

  3.1.3 iPads
  Council will meet the cost of providing for the maintenance, monthly service and access fees and download charges for iPads, incurred during the conduct of civic duties only, up to a maximum of $300.00 per month for the Mayor and $250.00 per month for other Councillors, which includes up to a maximum of 2 gigabytes data limit per month within Australia for all Councillors.
Councillors are reminded of the need to ‘turn off’ international roaming when taking mobile phones or iPads overseas as this can result in additional charges being incurred, often without warning. Additionally all Apps should be logged out of prior to overseas travel as Apps will continue to search for updates while active.

A further amendment to the policy is proposed to raise awareness of the requirement to pay for private use of Council provided equipment:

- **Part 2 Provision of Facilities**
  2.1 Communications Equipment and Furniture
  It is proposed to amend the Note following this clause to read:

  *Note: Councillors to pay for private use of equipment provided including phone calls and international roaming charges. (See 3.1)*

**Draft Amended Policy**

The reviewed policy incorporating and highlighting the proposed amendments is included in the Attachments.

**Public Exhibition**

Councils are required to review their councillor expenses and facilities policies on an annual basis. The guidelines issued by the Office of Local Government requires that public notice be given prior to the annual policy adoption process, even if the proposed amendments are not substantial.

We are required under s. 253 of the Local Government Act to place the policy on public exhibition for a period of 28 days. The policy and any submissions will be reported back to Council at the completion of the public exhibition period.

**Conclusion**

Our policy on the Payment of Expenses and Provision of Facilities to Councillors has been reviewed and some amendments are proposed. It is recommended that the policy including the proposed amendments be placed on public exhibition for 28 days to allow for submissions to be made.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

THAT the amended policy on Payment of Expenses and Provision of Facilities to Councillors be endorsed for the purpose of public exhibition.
4  INTERNAL AUDIT COMMITTEE

FILE NO:  A-46-4 PT5
Attachments:  Minutes of Meeting on 26 August 2014  View
REPORT BY:  DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Summary:
The minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 26 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Effective Governance.

Report:
The minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 26 August 2014 are provided in the Attachments.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Internal Audit Committee meeting held on 26 August 2014 be endorsed.
Summary:
The NSW Public Libraries Association was formed in July this year as the result of an amalgamation between the NSW Metropolitan Public Libraries Association and Public Libraries NSW to represent libraries across the state. Councils are asked to nominate an elected representative to the newly formed association.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the budget. The report supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Access to Services.

Report:
In June this year, the NSW Metropolitan Public Libraries Association and the Public Libraries NSW (the country association) voted to become one Association.

The new association, NSW Public Libraries Association, was ratified in July and is now functioning with an interim Executive until the inaugural Annual General Meeting is held in November 2014.

The new association provides councils and library services across the State the opportunity to speak with one voice to continue to advocate for sustainable State funding. It also helps position public libraries as vital community services and to take a lead role in policy setting for public libraries.

Key objectives of the association include lobbying and advocacy, encouragement of innovation and the formation of strategic partnership, as well as support for collaborative projects.

The prime focus of the association is currently the funding campaign which is seeking to increase the level of funding contributed to libraries by the State government.

Association membership
The NSWPLA Application for Membership provides for the nomination of:

- One authorised elected representative
- One authorised administrative officer representative
- One authorised library representative

On 27 September 2012, Council resolved that our representative on the NSW Metropolitan Public Libraries Association be Councillor Saleh and Councillor Kebbe be the alternate representative.

Traditionally the ‘library representative’ is the Library Manager in each council and very few councils choose to take up the option of nominating an ‘administrative officer representative.’
Association Executive
Nominations are also now available for executive positions of the new association. Results of the postal ballot for these positions will be announced at the Annual General Meeting in November.

Meetings and Conference
There are three metropolitan and five country zones in the association. Canterbury is part of the Sydney Southern zone. Member councils of this zone are aligned with SSROC.

The constitution of the new association provides the opportunity for elected officials to become involved in the association at a zone level. Metropolitan zones are formed along the lines of the ROCs and therefore our library service is part of the Sydney Southern zone which has the same membership as SSROC.

Zone meetings are held four times a year and the AGM is held at the annual association conference.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT an elected representative be appointed to the newly formed NSW Public Libraries Association.
6 STATE OF THE CHILDREN REPORT

FILE NO: C-72-400

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Summary:
- In 2009 we endorsed the implementation of the UNICEF Child Friendly Cities Initiative, based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which applies to anyone aged up to 18 years.
- A Child Friendly City working group was established to begin working through steps to ensure children’s rights are upheld in our City.
- In order to inform future meaningful policies and strategies for building a child friendly city we needed a sound and current knowledge base in regard to children and their rights in Canterbury.
- The State of the Children Report is based on 12 months of research, interviews, surveys and collation of all relevant information.
- The report recommends that Council support the introduction of a biennial Children’s Summit to meet the UNICEF requirements to engage children in discussions on ways to address their rights.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Health and Safety, Access to Services and Engaged Community.

Report:
Background
In 2009 Council endorsed the implementation of the UNICEF Child Friendly Cities Initiative including the development of strategic plans that acknowledge children’s rights and incorporate child friendly initiatives across Council. The Child Friendly Cities Initiative promotes the articles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and implementation of the Convention led by local Government, at the level where it has the greatest impact on children’s lives, with the goal of improving the lives of children by recognising their rights and creating better communities. These rights relate to all persons under the age of 18 years.

As a first initiative we established a Child Friendly City working group to commence working through the steps in UNICEF’s Framework for Action to ensure the development of a local system of governance committed to fulfilling children’s rights. It was apparent that we needed to undertake some research and talk with children and adults in order to have a baseline of where our City is currently at in terms of children’s rights.

State of the Children
In 2013 we engaged Social Work students from the University of Sydney to support us in this undertaking. Various relevant reports and other documents were reviewed, focus groups were held with children and young people, and separate surveys were developed for children, for families and for service providers. All information collated from these sources has now been written up and is presented in our inaugural State of the Children Report. This report highlights areas where our City is doing well, areas where we could make improvements and
also those areas where there are gaps in our knowledge of how we are doing to uphold the rights of all children in our City. The report has recently been circulated to Councillors.

The State of the Children Report is relevant to all services, agencies, and organisations that work with children and young people in our City, as well as to all families and children themselves. It will be distributed to children’s services, primary and high schools, child and family services, youth services and made available to other services that have interaction with children and youth.

Options to engage in consultation on Children’s Rights

As a result of the development of the State of the Children Report it has been identified that Council will be required to continue to actively advocate for the rights of children and involve children in decision making. A recommendation of the report is to consult with the Youth Council to amend their charter to include all children under the age of 18 and incorporate the role of advocacy through the distribution of information regarding the actions out of the State of the Children Report, and encouragement to uphold the rights of children. This option is compared to an alternative model to provide Council with a means to meet this requirement of a Child Friendly City.

Option A: Engagement through Youth Council

The inclusion of the amendment to the Youth Council charter would be an important step to support our goal in achieving the UNICEF child friendly status, as it would ensure that children have a voice and opportunity to express opinions that are taken seriously at the highest level of local government.

The need for children to be heard was identified in the UN Committee’s Concluding Observations on Australia in 2012, following their review of Australia’s report on our nation’s progress in fulfilling our responsibilities under the Convention. The Committee recommended that Australia ‘continue to ensure the implementation of the right of the child to be heard by promoting the meaningful and empowered participation of children at all levels of government and within the family, community and schools, with particular attention to children in vulnerable situations’ (Children’s Rights Report 2013, Megan Mitchell).

In recruiting children from Year 6 in Primary School to the Youth Council we would be supporting these children in consolidating their learning under the Key Learning Area of Human Society and Environment. The goal of this program is ‘to develop in students the values and attitudes, skills, and knowledge and understanding that:

- enhance their sense of personal, community, national and global identity;
- enable them to participate effectively in maintaining and improving the quality of their society and environment.’ (NSW Department of Education and Communities website)

This change would also allow for supportive mentoring opportunities between the older and younger/newer members of the group, providing the older youth opportunities to develop attitudes and skills necessary for mentoring others, as acknowledged by those at the Youth Council meeting on 8 July 2014. The Youth Council would be a platform for the voices of children and young people to understand and promote their own rights.
A presentation was made to the Youth Council on 8 July 2014 where the Youth Council supported the amendment to the Youth Council charter to include children, by amending the community representation from “between 12 and 25 years of age” to “up to 25 years of age”, to include children under 12. Council has subsequently adopted the minutes of the Youth Council excluding the recommendation to amend the Youth Council charter. If this recommendation is not supported we need to have another option for ensuring the opinions of children are heard and considered by Council.

Option B: Engagement through Children’s Summits
Another option to ensure that we uphold the right of children to participate in decision making would be to hold a biennial Children’s Summit, with groups of children of varying ages across all areas of Canterbury. The Summit would provide an alternative platform for the voices of children and involve similar consultation as was undertaken for this first Children’s Report including focus groups and surveys with children and young people, including those on Youth Council.

This option would enable a larger number of children and young people to have a voice, and could also aid in further promoting their rights within the broader community, as schools and other agencies would be included in the process. Within this option we could also promote mentoring opportunities, with young people assisting in consultation with younger children. To ensure we meet the UNICEF requirements of taking children’s opinions to the highest level of local government a report on the Summit would then be presented back to the Youth Council and to Council.

Conclusion
The Child Friendly City Initiative has been gaining momentum around the world and in recent times has become a major focus for many local governments in Australia. Given that we resolved to implement this initiative in 2009 we are now seeking a further resolution to enable us to move forward with this. It is recommended that Council endorse the option of implementing a biennial Children’s Summit.

As a result of the completion of the State of Children Report, registration of interest has been made to UNICEF for consideration to be given to the City of Canterbury becoming a ‘Child Friendly City’. UNICEF is currently trialling a Child Friendly City model within South Australia, with only one other city within Australian being confirmed as a Child Friendly City, being Bendigo, Victoria. Should we have this title bestowed upon us, the City of Canterbury would be the first Child Friendly City recognised in New South Wales.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT
1. The 2014 City of Canterbury State of the Children report for distribution to other agencies as outlined in this report be endorsed.
2. The introduction of a biennial Children’s Summit be endorsed.
7 INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 AUGUST 2014

FILE NO: I-30-9 PT4
REPORT BY: RESPONSIBLE ACCOUNTING OFFICER - (GROUP MANAGER FINANCIAL SERVICES)

Summary:
- This report includes a Performance Report on investments.
- Also contained in the report is a statutory report on investments submitted pursuant to the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005.
- It is recommended the report be noted.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report provides an update on our investments and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Healthy Finances and Effective Governance.

Report:
Performance Report
Management of our investment portfolio is a critical and complicated process, the success of which is dependent upon achieving an appropriate balance across a number of factors. Performance for this period in relation to each of these is outlined below.

Total funds available for investment this period were $59,000,000. Whilst the economic environment continues to be difficult, investment earnings are being maintained at anticipated levels and in line with budget forecast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds invested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of available cash invested</td>
<td>≥ 80%</td>
<td>73% x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of available cash held at bank</td>
<td>≤ 20%</td>
<td>27% x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
These KPI’s were not met due to the timing of cash receipts just before month end. These funds were subsequently invested in early September; restoring the balance between cash and investments.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted investment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual rate greater than benchmark (BBSW)</td>
<td>≥ 2.59%</td>
<td>2.63% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AFMA BBSW Rate: Average Mid-90 day return.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actual rate equal to or greater than Budget rate</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>3.37% ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment | Council’s average investment rate is adversely impacted by the investments that are not earning interest. The weighted average investment rate for Council’s term deposits and 11am account is 4.01%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest earned</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interest earned this period</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$231,678 ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product profile</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Funds held in term deposit</td>
<td>≥ 25%</td>
<td>85% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funds held in any other one product</td>
<td>≤ 40%</td>
<td>3% ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number of different investment terms used</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>6 ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funds held in 360+ day term</td>
<td>≤ 60%</td>
<td>53% ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment by institution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Funds invested through banks</td>
<td>≥ 50%</td>
<td>58% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funds invested in any other single institution type</td>
<td>≤ 20%</td>
<td>8% ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bank Bill Swap Rate - AFMA BBSW Rate: Average Mid - 90 day return http://www.afma.com.au
Average Investment Rate

Corrective action was taken by increasing our investments in September.
Interest Earned Compared to the Annual Budget

Investment By Institution

- Banks: 58%
- Building Society: 24%
- Credit Union: 10%
- Investments: 8%
This graph shows the maturity profile of our investments and highlights that we have an increased exposure to “interest rate” risk due to the quantum of investments that will be reinvested in the period June 2014 to December 2014. In the future investment maturity will be spread more evenly over a two year timeframe.

**Status of Collateral Debt Obligations (CDOs)**

At the time of the 2008 global financial crisis, we held $9m in CDOs. Since that time CDOs totalling $6m have matured.

The remaining CDOs held by Council are as follows:

- Nexus Bond Limited [Nexus] – Invested $1.5m on 28 March 2003 and is due to mature on 23 June 2015; and
- Aphex Pacific Capital [Glenelg] - Invested $1.5m on 13 June 2006 and is due to mature on 22 December 2014.

The following is a review of the current status of these CDOs:

- The return of the principal invested for Nexus is supported by a capital guarantee and is not considered at risk. The current value of this investment is $1.4m and it is expected that the market value will continue to increase as the period to maturity shortens. This investment is no longer earning any investment income; and
- The Glenelg CDO is not supported by a capital guarantee therefore further defaults by other parties to the investment could result in the reduction in the capital value of the investment. Glenelg is currently valued at $1.44m and it is expected that the market value will continue to increase as the period to maturity shortens. For the quarter ended 23 June 2014, Glenelg earned 4.41% per annum based on our $1.5m investment or 6.53% per annum based on the current market value.
It is proposed to maintain our hold until maturity strategy for these investments.

**Maturity of Capital Protected Notes (CPNs) and CDOs**

In the next 6 months, including the Glenelg CDO, $5M in CDOs and CPNs will mature.

This leaves $1.5M still outstanding of the grand-fathered investments. These investments are all capital guaranteed and will mature in the second half of 2015.

**Statutory Report**

Clause 212 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 stipulates that a written report is to be presented at each ordinary meeting of Council detailing all money that Council has invested under Section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993.

The following information is presented in accordance with the legislative requirements.

- **Income Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income to Date</td>
<td>409,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Interest Income for the Year</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Interest Income (Year to Date)</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income Surplus (Deficit) Actual -to- Budget</td>
<td>184,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent Surplus (Deficit) Over Budget</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance Cash And Investments</th>
<th>Interest Income</th>
<th>Monthly Return</th>
<th>Quarterly Return</th>
<th>Annual Return</th>
<th>Two Years Return</th>
<th>Three Years Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28/02/2014</td>
<td>69,048,899</td>
<td>154,801</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2014</td>
<td>66,991,741</td>
<td>181,134</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/04/2014</td>
<td>63,341,571</td>
<td>164,700</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/05/2014</td>
<td>67,860,891</td>
<td>170,672</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2014</td>
<td>66,244,872</td>
<td>295,321</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/07/2014</td>
<td>62,848,806</td>
<td>177,971</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/08/2014</td>
<td>80,383,060</td>
<td>231,678</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table details our investment performance over a range of investment periods. The investment returns are calculated on our total cash and investment balance at the end of each month which includes our non-interest earning investments.

All Season Capital Protected Note matured on 29 August 2014. The redemption amount at maturity comprised of $1 million of the original investment plus $40,422 which was linked to the performance of four funds at the final valuation date.

- **Investment by Maturity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Investment</th>
<th>Amount Invested ($)</th>
<th>% of Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days up to 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days between 30 – 60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>No. of Days</th>
<th>Amount Invested ($)</th>
<th>% of Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days between 61 – 90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days between 91 – 120</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days 150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days 180</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days 360+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31,000,000</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Record of Cash Movement 31 August 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance as at 31 July 2014</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: New Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Seasons Note (Capital Protected Note)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Withdrawals (returned to cheque account)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Balance 31 August 2014</td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Investment Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Institution</th>
<th>Lodgement Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Management A/c (11am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Bank</td>
<td>31 Aug-14</td>
<td>01-Sept-14</td>
<td>At Call</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Deposit (TD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Direct</td>
<td>17-Sep-13</td>
<td>17-Sep-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING Direct</td>
<td>23-Sep-13</td>
<td>23-Sep-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>17-Jun-14</td>
<td>15-Oct-14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>15-Aug-14</td>
<td>16-Dec-14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>18-Dec-13</td>
<td>18-Dec-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Bank</td>
<td>01-Jul-14</td>
<td>05-Jan-15</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>27-Jun-14</td>
<td>25-Sep-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>20-Jun-14</td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>24-Jul-14</td>
<td>22-Oct-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>14-Jul-14</td>
<td>24-Oct-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>20-Jun-14</td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>14-May-14</td>
<td>28-Oct-14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB Ltd</td>
<td>19-Mar-14</td>
<td>16-Sep-14</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP Bank</td>
<td>18-Sep-13</td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP Bank</td>
<td>18-Sep-13</td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Australia Bank</td>
<td>17-Jul-13</td>
<td>14-Jan-15</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Australia Bank</td>
<td>17-Sep-13</td>
<td>17-Sep-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Australia Bank</td>
<td>15-Aug-14</td>
<td>17-Feb-14</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Union Australia</td>
<td>11-Oct-13</td>
<td>13-Oct-14</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Union Australia</td>
<td>17-Oct-13</td>
<td>17-Oct-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>20-Jun-14</td>
<td>20-Nov-14</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>21-Mar-14</td>
<td>17-Sep-14</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>06-Sep-13</td>
<td>04-Sep-14</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 AUGUST 2014 (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Institution</th>
<th>Lodgement Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>27-Aug-14</td>
<td>27-Feb-14</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Queensland</td>
<td>03-Jul-14</td>
<td>02-Dec-14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank west</td>
<td>22-Jul-14</td>
<td>21-Oct-14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank west</td>
<td>12-Aug-14</td>
<td>12-Nov-14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank west</td>
<td>27-May-14</td>
<td>24-Oct-14</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Permanent</td>
<td>24-Jun-14</td>
<td>23-Sep-14</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Permanent</td>
<td>13-Jun-14</td>
<td>11-Sep-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Permanent</td>
<td>20-Jun-14</td>
<td>18-Sep-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay Australia Ltd</td>
<td>18-Jun-14</td>
<td>18-Oct-14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Bay Australia Ltd</td>
<td>22-Jul-14</td>
<td>22-Jan-14</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZ Bank</td>
<td>20-Jun-14</td>
<td>17-Oct-14</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Bank</td>
<td>19-Sep-13</td>
<td>23-Sep-14</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Bank</td>
<td>20-Sep-13</td>
<td>23-Sep-14</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Bank</td>
<td>19-Mar-14</td>
<td>19-Dec-14</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Bank</td>
<td>19-Jun-14</td>
<td>17-Oct-14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westpac Bank</td>
<td>19-Jun-14</td>
<td>17-Oct-14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community First Credit Union</td>
<td>20-Sep-13</td>
<td>20-Sep-15</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community First Credit Union</td>
<td>20-Sep-13</td>
<td>20-Sep-15</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community First Credit Union</td>
<td>21-May-14</td>
<td>21-May-15</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community First Credit Union</td>
<td>21-Nov-13</td>
<td>21-Nov-14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George Building Society</td>
<td>01-Aug-14</td>
<td>28-Jan-14</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George Building Society</td>
<td>17-Jan-14</td>
<td>20-May-14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George Building Society</td>
<td>02-Jun-14</td>
<td>30-Sep-14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George Building Society</td>
<td>12-Mar-14</td>
<td>10-Sep-14</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Sydney</td>
<td>13-Jun-14</td>
<td>16-Dec-14</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**50,000,000**

Collateral Debt Obligation (CDO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Institution</th>
<th>Lodgement Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aphex Pacific Capital -&quot;Glenelg&quot;</td>
<td>13-Jun-06</td>
<td>22-Dec-14</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>4.41%^^</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexus Bond Limited</td>
<td>28-Mar-03</td>
<td>23-Jun-15</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3,000,000**

Capital Protected Notes (CPN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Institution</th>
<th>Lodgement Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longreach Series 29</td>
<td>28-Sep-07</td>
<td>29-Sep-14</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octagon Ltd 'Emu Notes&quot;</td>
<td>25-Oct-05</td>
<td>30-Oct-15</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2,000,000**

**59,000,000**

* Denotes grandfathered investments which have maturity dates up to 30 October 2015. The impact of the global financial crisis on these investments has resulted in these investments no longer earning any investment income. A review of these investments on 9 February 2012 reconfirmed Council’s “hold-to-maturity” strategy.

^^ Denotes grandfathered investments which continue to earn investment income and have maturity dates up to 22 December 2014. The investment earning and market value of these investments remain subject to the continuing effects of the 2008 global financial crisis. A review of these investments on 9 February 2012 reconfirmed Council’s “hold-to-maturity” strategy.
Report on Council's Investments – Section 625 of the Local Government Act 1993
I hereby certify that investments have been made in accordance with the Act, the Regulations and Council’s Investment Policy.

Record of Quotations
A separate record of quotations is kept.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the report be noted.

FILE NO: R-4-19 PT6

REPORT BY: RESPONSIBLE ACCOUNTING OFFICER - (GROUP MANAGER FINANCIAL SERVICES)

Summary:
- This report provides a progressive summary of the rates and charges that have been rebated to pensioners in the 2013/14 and 2014/15 years.
- For 2013/14 rates and charges, the report seeks Council’s authority to write-off $32,430.07 and recommends that 55% of this amount (ie. $17,836.54) be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act.
- For 2014/15 rates and charges, the report seeks Council’s authority to write-off $2,370,947.81 and recommends that 55% of this amount (ie. $1,304,021.29) be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
In the 2014/15 Budget, provision has been made to subsidise pensioners’ rates and charges to the extent of $2,470,000. Provision has also been made for the recovery of $1,358,500 from the State Government in accordance with the legislation providing for this rebate bringing the net cost to Council to $1,111,500. Pensioner concession claims processed to date are within the budget allocation. This report supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Healthy Finances.

Report:
2013/14 Rates and Charges
Tabled with this report is the second listing of pensioners who have claimed rebates for the 2013/14 rates and charges. The listing incorporates adjustments (if any) which have to be made when a pensioner disposes of a property on which a full year’s rebate has previously been granted (Section 584 of the Local Government Act).

In summary, the listing below shows a comparison with the previous year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of rate assessments involved this claim</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rate assessments involved in previous claims</td>
<td>9,733</td>
<td>9,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10,053</td>
<td>10,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Council’s share of the cost in this claim</td>
<td>$14,593.53</td>
<td>$20,355.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State Government’s share of the cost in this claim</td>
<td>$17,836.54</td>
<td>$24,879.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount rebated this claim</td>
<td>$32,430.07</td>
<td>$45,235.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014/15 Rates and Charges
Tabled with this report is the first listing of pensioners who have claimed rebates for the 2014/15 rates and charges. The listing incorporates adjustments (if any) which have to be made when a pensioner disposes of a property on which a full year’s rebate has previously been granted (Section 584 of the Local Government Act).

In summary, the listing below shows a comparison with the same period last year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of rate assessments involved this claim</td>
<td>9,716</td>
<td>9,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rate assessments involved in previous claims</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>9,716</td>
<td>9,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Council’s share of the cost in this claim</td>
<td>$1,066,926.52</td>
<td>$1,070,121.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State Government’s share of the cost in this claim</td>
<td>$1,304,021.29</td>
<td>$1,307,925.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount rebated this claim</td>
<td>$2,370,947.81</td>
<td>$2,378,046.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
Amounts rebated to eligible pensioners are required to be written-off under Section 583 of the Local Government Act 1993. Councils are entitled under Section 581 of the Act to seek reimbursement from the State Government of 55% of the amount written-off.

Adoption of the recommendation will complete all statutory requirements in relation to these matters.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT
1. For the 2013/14 rates and charges:
   1.1 The amount of $32,430.07 be written-off against the amount of rates and charges levied upon land owned by eligible pensioner ratepayers.
   1.2 Reimbursement of $17,836.54 be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act 1993.
2. For the 2014/15 rates and charges:
   2.1 The amount of $2,370,947.81 be written-off against the amount of rates and charges levied upon land owned by eligible pensioner ratepayers.
   2.2 Reimbursement of $1,304,021.29 be claimed from the Office of Local Government pursuant to Section 581 of the Local Government Act 1993.
9 93-97 BONDS ROAD, RIVERWOOD: PLANNING PROPOSAL

FILE NO: T-29-159

Attachments: Peer Review Report View

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CITY PLANNING

Summary:

- A planning proposal seeking the rezoning of the subject land from IN1 General Industrial to permit redevelopment for a combination of residential and retail/commercial activities has been received.
- The planning proposal has been assessed by independent planning and economic development consultants.
- Their report concludes that the land is a key industrial/employment site, is part of a much larger key industrial precinct and that the current zoning should be retained.
- It is recommended that the planning proposal not proceed.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:

This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Balanced Urban Development.

Report:

A planning proposal in respect of land at 93-97 Bonds Road Riverwood has been received.

The land is currently zoned IN1 General Industrial under the provisions of Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012. It is part of the much larger Riverwood/Bonds Rd/Belmore Road industrial precinct.

The diagram below shows the site and surrounding land use zones.
Current zoning, height and FSR controls

The proponents are seeking to rezone the land in order to permit a mixed use development comprising residential apartments, retail uses and commercial uses. A maximum building height of up to 34 metres (approximately ten storeys) is being sought, in conjunction with more than 2000 square metres of commercial/retail floor space. The planning proposal suggests that a dwelling yield in the order of 250 to 280 apartments is being sought.

The planning proposal was referred to SGS Economics and Planning for an independent assessment and report. Their report is included in the Attachments.

The SGS report concludes that the planning proposal should not be supported and that the site should retain its current industrial zoning as it is an important and integral part of a regionally significant industrial precinct. Their assessment also concludes that the site is not appropriate for office or retail uses (however, it is noted that retail uses which support the industrial area such as neighbourhood shops, cafes, etc, are already permissible in the IN1 zone).

Further, the site is not located close to a railway station (1.4 km from Punchbowl station and 1.8 km from Riverwood station) and does not support transport orientated development outcomes.

The full conclusion from the SGS report is reproduced below for information:

“Based on this assessment, it is recommended that the site be retained as industrial land in recognition of the continued strategic importance of the industrial precinct in which it is situated, its location within the M5 Corridor with good access to port, airport and intermodal facilities and the potential of the introduction of residential land uses to undermine the integrity and ongoing operation of the industrial precinct.
It is also important to recognise the risk that a rezoning in this case could set a precedent for potential future rezoning proposals for sites within the Riverwood industrial precinct, which would be undesirable given its strategic importance.

SGS’s recommendation to retain the current zoning on this site is in line with previous assessments of the site, for example the Canterbury Residential Development Strategy, which recommended the site be retained as industrial zoned land.

Opportunities for intensification of employment-related uses consistent with the industrial zoning may be explored as per the recommendations within the Building Employment Opportunities in Sydney’s South study.

Since the site does not meet the basic tests for a change from an industrial to a residential land use, we have not undertaken an assessment of residential development feasibility or considered suitable residential built form as part of this study. It is important to note that the planning proposal with a height of 34 metres is considerably greater than the surrounding residential built form controls with a height limit of 8.5 metres."

Given the nature of the assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the SGS report, the planning proposal seeking to rezone this land to permit a mixed use development comprising more than 250 residential apartments in buildings of up to ten or more storeys, plus more than 2000 square metres of commercial and retail floor space cannot be supported.

This is an important industrial precinct and there would also be concern that any rezoning of land in this precinct for what is essentially a major residential redevelopment would lead to further pressure and precedent to rezone other industrial sites in this location, and serve to erode the importance of this industrial precinct. Any residential development of this site is also likely to give rise to complaints from future residents relating to the operation of adjoining and nearby industrial uses, thereby placing further pressure on viability.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
THAT the submitted planning proposal seeking to rezone land at 93-97 Bonds Road Riverwood to permit a mixed use development comprising more than 250 residential apartments in buildings of up to ten or more storeys plus more than 2000 square metres of commercial and retail floor space not be supported.
10  15-33 BRIGHTON AVENUE, CROYDON PARK: PLANNING PROPOSAL

FILE NO: T-29-156
Attachments: Peer Review Report View
REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CITY PLANNING

Summary:
- A planning proposal seeking the rezoning of the subject land from IN2 Light Industrial to permit a residential redevelopment of the site with some additional retail/commercial activities has been received.
- The planning proposal has been assessed by independent planning and economic development consultants.
- Their report concludes that the land is not part of a key industrial/employment area and a rezoning to permit residential redevelopment could be supported.
- Their report, however, also concludes that the level of redevelopment sought is excessive and that if Council supports the rezoning then building heights should be fixed at 11.5 metres (three storeys) and the floor space ratio fixed at a maximum of 0.9:1 in keeping with predominant surrounding land uses and scales of development.
- It is recommended that rezoning the land as R4 High Density Residential, subject to the maximum building height (11.5 metres) and floor space ratio (0.9:1) recommended in the independent consultants report be supported.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Balanced Urban Development.

Report:
A planning proposal in respect of land at 15-33 Brighton Avenue, Croydon Park has been received.

The land is currently zoned IN2 Light Industrial under the provisions of Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012. It is a relatively small and isolated light industrial precinct.

The diagram below shows the site and surrounding land use zones.
The proponents are seeking to rezone the land to R4 High Density Residential in order to permit redevelopment for residential apartments along with some associated retail/commercial floor space. Maximum building heights of up to eight storeys are being sought in conjunction with a floor space ratio of 2.5:1.

The planning proposal suggests that a dwelling yield in the order of 250 to 280 apartments is being sought. More specifically, for the southern half of the site, approximately 155 apartments and 600 square metres of commercial/retail floor space is proposed.

The planning proposal was referred to SGS Economics and Planning for an independent assessment and report. Their report is included in the Attachments.

The SGS report concludes that the planning proposal could be conditionally supported as this light industrial precinct is relatively isolated in terms of serving as a business and/or employment hub and has experienced recent decline in this context. While the site is deemed suitable for residential development, the SGS report further concludes that new development should be considered in line with the surrounding built form and character. Preferred locations for high density and high rise development are close to railway stations, which this site is not.

The full conclusion from the SGS report is reproduced below for information:

“The industrial precinct on Brighton Avenue in Croydon Park, currently zoned IN2 Light Industrial is not considered a strategic industrial precinct. The precinct is not part of a larger industrial or freight and logistics concentration and has experienced some decline in regards to use with low employment and vacancies. It is not contributing to significant industry clusters in the Canterbury LGA or surrounding region. The precinct is not assessed as being critical to meeting future employment needs.”
demands in Canterbury LGA or the surrounding region or to the provision of land for population servicing light industrial land uses.

The regional employment context, along with the need to increase housing supply, presents residential as an appropriate use for the site. The site has been identified as suitable for residential land uses as it is located near a local centre and a bus corridor with access to the inner west and central Sydney. However, the development should be considered in line with the surrounding built context and character. The site is not located near a rail station, which could be considered as a preferred location to locate higher density residential forms.

Even though the surrounding residential area is zoned R4 High Density Residential, the planning controls reflect a medium density built form with FSRs of 0.75:1 and 0.9:1 (on the site to the direct east of the subject precinct where there is opportunities for a consolidated site area for redevelopment).

It is recommended that the precinct be considered for change to a non-employment related land use. From a strategic planning perspective, retail uses may be better located in the Croydon Park local centre which adjoins the precinct and this should be considered when assessing development proposals for the site.

This assessment is limited to the proposed zoning and controls for the site. Other development specific impacts (such as traffic considerations, appropriateness of character and scale, and the geographic environment) would need to be considered when assessing development applications for the site. Nevertheless, development feasibility has been assessed to highlight some preliminary considerations when considering the appropriate FSR (or height) controls for the site.

If a residential land use was considered for the site, there are opportunities with a larger site area to incorporate a development with higher FSR into the area. The FSR of 2.5:1 that has been proposed for the site does not appear to be required to make the redevelopment feasible, with our modelling showing that a lower FSR of 0.9:1 and height of 11.5 metres (as per the adjoining site) is sufficient to provide a feasible outcome, and may be more appropriate given the site’s location.”

Given the nature of the assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the SGS report, the planning proposal seeking to rezone this land to permit a residential redevelopment can be supported. It is noted that the SGS report recommends a maximum building height of 11.5 metres and a maximum floor space ratio of 0.9:1, commensurate with surrounding development, as opposed to the 26 metres height limit and 2.5:1 FSR limit sought by the proponents.

It is considered the heights and densities sought by the proponents are excessive given the scale and intensity of surrounding development and therefore the recommendations of the SGS report are supported. It is noted that the SGS report concludes that at a floor space ratio of 0.9:1 redevelopment is commercially viable and there is no compelling reason to increase the FSR further.
It is further considered that specific provision for retail and/or commercial floor space to the amount sought in the planning proposal (600 square metres) is not warranted at this location.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT:
1. The conclusions and recommendations of the SGS report to rezone land at 15-33 Brighton Avenue Croydon Park to R4 High Density Residential and that the maximum floor space ratio be set at 0.9:1 and the maximum building height set at 11.5 metres be supported.
2. A planning proposal be prepared and submitted to the LEP Gateway seeking endorsement to proceed to public exhibition.
11 280-284 BURWOOD ROAD, BELMORE: PLANNING PROPOSAL

FILE NO: T-29-163
REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CITY PLANNING

Summary:
- A planning proposal has been received in respect of land at 280-284 Burwood Road, Belmore.
- The planning proposal seeks to have the land rezoned from R4 High Density Residential to B2 Local Centre. A height increase from 14 to 18 metres and removal of floor space ratio controls is also sought.
- Requests to rezone this land have twice previously been considered by Council. On each occasion Council resolved not to support the rezoning of the land.
- There has been no additional compelling evidence or justification provided that would warrant Council altering its previously held position.
- It is recommended that the planning proposal not be supported.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Balanced Urban Development.

Report:
A planning proposal has been received in respect of land at 280-284 Burwood Road, Belmore.

The site is a former service station at the northern edge of Belmore Town Centre. The proponents are seeking the rezoning of the land from R4 High Density Residential to B2 Local Centre. Also sought is a corresponding increase in height from 14 to 18 metres and removal of FSR controls for the site commensurate with other B2 zoned land.

The location of the site is shown below.
Site history
Under the provisions of Local Environmental Plan 178 (Belmore Lakemba Precinct) the land was zoned Residential 2(a). The equivalent zone under Canterbury Local Environmental Plan (CLEP 2012) would be R3 Medium Density Residential.

In 2010 council adopted a new DCP (DCP 54) for its town centres. A component of the DCP process was the identification of a number of sites on the edge of existing town centres which were seen to be suitable to benefit from an increase in redevelopment potential by virtue of their location.

The public exhibition of draft DCP 54 (Ten Town Centres) was accompanied by a number of suggested locations for expansions to town centres. Relevant to the matter currently at hand, land at 286-294 Burwood Road (to the south of the subject site on the other side of Station Road) and 303-317 Burwood Road (on the eastern side of Burwood Road) was identified in this context, as shown on the map below. The subject land was not part of this.
Previous zoning under LEP 178. Shows extent of additional business zonings under Town Centre Expansions.

A submission to the exhibition of the DCP/suggested Town Centre expansions, sought to have the subject land rezoned to a business zone. This request was not supported by Council, however, a rezoning to a higher density residential zone (R4) with increased heights and density was supported. This was affirmed in a report to Council on 14 April 2011 on Town Centre Expansions which led to a resolution to initiate the rezoning of this land to a R4 zone, 14 metre height and 1.4:1 FSR. This change was subsequently exhibited as part of our comprehensive LEP.

A further submission to the exhibition of the draft comprehensive LEP again sought a business zoning and height/density increases for this site. This second request was also not supported by Council.

**The Planning Proposal**
The submitted planning proposal is seeking the rezoning of the land from R4 High Density Residential to B2 Local Centre. Also sought is an increase in maximum building height from 14 to 18 metres and removal of floor space ratio controls. Broad concept plans for a five storey building comprising ground level retail with four levels of residential apartments above have been provided.
Our comprehensive LEP (commenced 1 January 2013) has already facilitated an expansion to the business zone in Belmore. It extended the B2 zone along western side of Burwood Road to Station Road. Station Road formed a logical edge to the commercial zone along that side of Burwood Road. Opposite, the business zone was extended to an existing purpose built shop which also aligned with Station Road.

It is noted that the R4 zone along the eastern side of Burwood Road benefited from height and density increase to 18 metres and 1.8:1 respectively. It is important to note that this land is served by a rear lane which assists in separation from adjoining residential land uses to the east. It is important to note that this land is also zoned R4. The subject land at 280-284 Burwood Road does not benefit from the greater separation distance afforded by a lane and the adjoining residential development to the west is zoned R3 with lower heights and densities of 8.5 metres and 0.5:1 respectively.

These are mitigating factors which do not lend support for changes to the zoning, height and density of the subject land.

It is considered there is no compelling reason to further extend the business zone along Burwood Road, nor has compelling evidence been produced that would warrant Council altering its twice previously affirmed position.

Conclusion
This site has previously benefited from a significant uplift in development potential. The change in zoning to permit residential flat buildings along with increases in height from 8.5 metres to 14 metres and an increase in FSR from 0.5:1 to 1.4:1 represent substantial increases to potential yields.

There can be no question that at these levels viability is an issue. Nor has it been raised by the proponents. Further, there has been no economic justification provided to suggest there is any demand or need to further increase the amount of land in Belmore Town Centre which is zoned for business purposes.

Station Road forms a natural physical conclusion to the northern edge of Belmore Town Centre on this side of Burwood Road. There is no compelling evidence provided that the commercial zone should be extended further northward.

As there is no compelling evidence presented that warrants Council altering the twice previously adopted position on the zoning of this particular site it is accordingly recommended that the planning proposal requesting alterations to the zoning, height and floor space ratio of this site not be supported.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
THAT the planning proposal seeking to rezone land at 280-284 Burwood Road, Belmore from R4 to B2, increase the maximum building from 14 to 18 metres and remove floor space ratio controls not be supported.
12 PLANNING CONTROLS RELATING TO LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENT ALONG MAIN CORRIDORS

FILE NO: T-17-36

Attachments: Recommended Amendments to the Canterbury LEP and DCP 2012 View

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CITY PLANNING

Summary:

- The Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 (CLEP 2012) and Development Control Plan 2012 (CDCP 2012) came into effect in January 2013. In applying the controls contained in these planning instruments, it is clear that there has been significant local interest in the way that taller, more intense buildings transition to lower density residential areas, particularly along our significant corridors like Canterbury Road.
- This report explores the current controls that seek to provide a reasonable transition between larger scale buildings in Business zones and lower scale buildings in Residential zones and recommends that amendments be made to the DCP to improve these built form relationships that occur along our main corridors.
- It also explores the way in which Council resolution on 28 August 2014 (Minute No. 308) regarding rear lane access to these development sites, may be most appropriately implemented.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:

This report has no implications for the Budget and supports our Community Strategic Plan long term goal of Balanced Urban Development.

Report:

Background
The Canterbury Local Environmental Plan 2012 (CLEP 2012) and Development Control Plan 2012 (CDCP 2012) came into effect in January 2013. As is often the case with the introduction of new planning instruments, amendments are now required to improve their performance and to assist in achieving Council’s objectives of balanced urban development. It should be noted that there is a more comprehensive DCP amendment that is currently nearing completion and will be reported to Council in the very near future. However, the subject of this report was deemed important enough to present separately and prior to that more comprehensive work.

Issues
The introduction of the CLEP 2012 and CDCP 2012 generally translated previous planning controls into a more contemporary “Standard Instrument” format. There were, however, several areas where increased development potential was created. Generally, these increases occurred within our business zones generally along the Canterbury Road corridor, in our town centres and within limited areas throughout our neighbourhoods. With the benefit of an extended period of application, it is becoming increasingly clear that the application of the relevant controls for large scale mixed use development, is occurring with some perceptions.
of impact mainly where there is a residential interface, particularly along the Canterbury Road and New Canterbury Road corridors. In addition to these expressions of concern from some adjoining and nearby owners, Council’s Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel has expressed its concern about the manner in which higher density development in the business zones transitions to lower density residential zones.

We have seen a significant increase in the number of applications lodged for more intense development along our main corridors such as Canterbury Road and in our town centres. Some of these applications have attracted a number of objections which express concern about the proximity and impacts of such large proposals to existing, smaller scale developments.

Whilst the revitalisation of our Canterbury Road and New Canterbury Road corridors are supported, the interface issues with residential neighbours needs to be more closely reviewed. At present, our controls generally allow five to six storeys along many parts of the Canterbury Road corridor as well as our town centres. To mitigate adverse impacts, CDCP 2012 requires that a 6m setback is provided to the rear of such new development with a corresponding 45 degree plane to ensure that new development steps back away from smaller scale development. Concern has been expressed that this transition is not adequate. The figure below identifies this control for this type of development as it adjoins “rear” residential neighbours.

![Figure 1: Current DCP control for “rear” setbacks](image)

In addition, there is a control that requires a different setback for the “side” as follows.
Matters to be Resolved
The issues that emerge from the application of these controls since their inception are:

- Whether the current controls provide a reasonable transition between what is generally low scale residential development and large (often six storey) development, along our main road corridors such as Canterbury Road and New Canterbury Road.
- Whether there is a clear enough distinction in the circumstances in which the side and rear setback controls are applied.
- How direct vehicular access to and from our main road corridors can be avoided.

**Built Form Transition between Business zones and Residential zones**
Development within the Business zones along our corridors and town centres is not controlled by floor space ratio, therefore height and envelope controls are critical. Given that the general character of development either to the rear or adjacent to these corridors is generally of a low scale residential nature, there is a need to ensure that this transition is managed as sensitively as possible. It is acknowledged that the current 6m setback may not always be sufficient to provide a reasonable buffer and this is recommended to be extended to provide a more reasonable transition to residential neighbours facing a large development along our main corridors of Canterbury Road and New Canterbury Road.

In addition to this, the current controls lack any requirement for deep soil along this rear setback area. On some allotments, the basement area can extend to the rear boundary with little or no possibility of meaningful screen landscaping that may soften the impact of a large adjoining development. Taking these matters into account, the diagram below indicates an alternative approach that may more suitably soften the transition between large mixed use development and adjoining low scale residential development along these corridors. It provides for a greater level of separation between the proposed larger development and smaller scale existing development. In addition, this provides for a significant degree of deep soil landscaping which will
provide for meaningful screening and softening. This is not currently required and the provision of landscaping at this rear area, is currently provided on an ad hoc basis. To mitigate these reductions, it is also recommended that the front setback above 4 storeys be reduced to 6m as opposed to the currently required 8m.

Figure 3: Proposed new setback controls for setbacks to low scale residential development/zone

It is also recommended that privacy measures be required to protect the privacy of residents in the adjoining/adjacent residential zone.

In addition, it is proposed to reaffirm a side setback to the rear of mixed use development to ensure a reasonable level of sunlight access to adjoining residents, soften the built form and provide a break in what are otherwise extended areas of unbroken building. This would only apply to the rear of mixed use development sites along our main corridors.
Distinction between “rear” and “side” Interface

The DCP distinguishes between rear and side setbacks of mixed use development to adjoining residential development (as shown in Figures 1 and 2 above). This distinction has not been as clear as it should and has resulted in variations in interpretation amongst applicants, particularly for corner allotments. It has always been the objective to allow a less onerous transition for larger development that occurs where there is a zoning change mid-block. For example, for a relatively narrow mid-block site of 12 to 15m, a 6 metre setback with a 45 degree plane extended along its entire length, would significantly reduce the development potential of that site and may therefore be unsuitable. For this reason, the “side” setback and plane control applies to ensure that development potential is not unreasonably diminished whilst retaining a level of transition to lower scale development. This current control, however, is sought to be applied by applicants on corner sites that have the potential to provide a more generous setback to the residential zone, arguing that these are “side” setbacks.

Unfortunately, these interpretations miss the essence of the aim of this control which is to sensitively transition large buildings to smaller scale buildings. To reduce confusion and ensure a greater level of consistency in understanding, the “rear” and “side” distinctions should be replaced with a clearer description of setbacks and plane controls to be applied.

This report recommends that the distinction between side and rear setbacks between Business Zone development and Residential Zone development be deleted. In their place, the generic controls will be as per Figure 3 above, with the exception outlined in the DCP as follows:

An exception to this control may be considered if the site has a mid-block boundary with a residential zone and otherwise has no other street frontage.
This new approach will also require that the current control which allows a nil setback to a rear lane (clause 3.1.8 (ii)) will be required to be deleted, as this may, in some circumstances, be contrary to the amended setback controls as recommended in this report and the requirement for extended laneways widths.

The specific amendments are described in the replacement page for Canterbury DCP 2012 which is included in the Attachments.

- **Establishment of Laneways**
  As per Council’s resolution on 28 August 2014, a general objective of pursuing access via side or rear means rather than via main corridors like Canterbury Road, is being pursued. However, Council must note that to institute a comprehensive alternative access strategy will require specific plans to be established along with, potentially, a source of funding. There is complexity in pursuing this systematically and comprehensively and we are in the process of conducting this analysis with a view to potentially not only amending the DCP, but also the LEP, as formal reservations may need to be implemented as well as funding options including section 94 contributions, particularly when pursuing compulsory acquisition.

  It is recommended that in the interim, an amendment to the Canterbury LEP 2012, be prepared, which requires that certain matters be considered before access to and from main roads be granted for significant redevelopment of sites. This will provide the time necessary to prepare the comprehensive plans required to enable both the creation of new lanes as well as the embellishment of existing lanes. An amendment to the DCP is also proposed, which as an interim measure, requires that rear lane access be provided. Both the Canterbury DCP and LEP proposed amendments are included in the Attachments.

- **Housekeeping**
  Several “housekeeping” amendments to the DCP are also required to tidy up some of our business controls as they relate to major development along our main corridors. They are:
  - Deletion of control that does not encourage amalgamation (clause 3.1.2, (i)). The intention of this is not clear and serves little purpose.
  - Reinforce the 30m frontage requirement to ensure that development is as efficient as possible and able to deal with impacts on site (clause 3.1.2, (ii)).
  - Deletion of the 9m front setback requirement for ground floor residential development within the table under clause 3.1.8. This was intended to manage front setbacks for straight residential development in the B5 zone, however, the amendment that sought to enable this in the LEP was not accepted by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, which makes this control obsolete.

- **Conclusion**
  With a significant period of application of Council’s revised planning controls, important amendments have been identified as requiring immediate attention. The increased development potential along our main corridors has attracted strong interest from the development industry and whilst this is positive, the management of the sensitive interface between such development and established residential development, is also important. This
RECOMMENDATION:

THAT:

1. A Planning Proposal be prepared and referred to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, to insert new clause 6.8 to the Canterbury LEP 2012 (as attached) to discourage access to and from the roads identified as “SP2” on the Canterbury LEP maps (Canterbury Road, New Canterbury Road, King Georges Road and Bexley Road) for the significant redevelopment of land along these corridors.

2. An amendment to the Canterbury DCP 2012 be prepared and exhibited (see replacement pages at attachment) identifying changes to the Business zone controls as detailed in the attachment and generally characterised by:
   - The deletion of the distinction between “side” and “rear” setback controls for mixed use development between the business and residential zone interface.
   - The reduction of the additional front setback above the 4th storey in the B2 and B5 zone to 3m (table under clause 3.1.8).
   - The introduction of an amended setback profile (Figure 3.4) to better manage the interface between large mixed use development and existing small scale residential development.
   - The reinforcement of a 4.5m side setback to the rear of mixed use development (clause 3.1.8, (vi)).
   - Increased focus on privacy measures, particularly at the business, residential zone interface.
   - The deletion of controls that allow a nil setback to laneways (clause 3.1.8, (ii)).
   - The addition of new requirements that identify the creation of new laneways serving major corridors like Canterbury Road, to have a minimum width of 9m and to have alternative access than such major roads (clause 3.5.6, (vii-ix)).
   - Reinforcement for the need to have a 30m wide frontage for large scale development on our major corridors (clause 3.1.2, (ii)).
   - Deletion of the 9m front setback for residential development in the B5 zone as this is obsolete as identified in the box under clause 3.1.8.

3. The results of these exhibitions be reported to Council outlining any submissions received and any amendments that may be desirable to address such submissions.
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ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1 COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

FILE NO: C-245-2 PT22

Attachments: Minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2014

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Summary:
The minutes of the Community Safety Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 are presented for endorsement.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
The activities of the Community Safety Committee are met by the specific Budget allocation and support our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Engaged Community and Health and Safety.

Report:
The minutes of the Community Safety Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 are provided in the Attachments. The following recommendation is highlighted as it has financial implications.

Funding for Canterbury Domestic Violence Liaison Committee

THAT
1. $5,000 from the 2014/15 Community Safety Committee budget be allocated to the Canterbury Domestic Violence Liaison Committee for the 123 Drive Project, providing assistance to victims towards driving lesson costs.
2. The Muslim Women’s Association provide a report at the conclusion of the project evaluating its effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Community Safety Committee meeting held on 1 September 2014 be endorsed.
Summary:
The minutes of the Disability Access Committee meeting held on 20 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
The activities of the Disability Access Committee are met by the specific Budget allocation and support our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Engaged Community and Access to Facilities and Services.

Report:
The minutes of the Disability Access Committee meeting held on 20 August 2014 are provided in the Attachments. The following recommendations are highlighted as they have financial implications.

Morris Iemma Indoor Sports Centre
THAT
1. The report be noted.
2. $5,000 of the 2014/15 funds that Council provides to the Disability Access Council, be allocated to access improvements from the street to the entrance of Morris Iemma Indoor Sports Centre.

International Day of People with Disability (IDPWD) 2014
THAT
1. The report be noted.
2. $1,000 of the 2014/15 Bulk Vote funds that Council provides to the Disability Access Committee be allocated to the following, for local and regional International Day of People with Disability events:
   - Launch of the Chinese Parents – Children with Disabilities Inc ($500); and
   - Inner West GroovABILITY ($500).

Missed Business Guide Distribution
THAT
1. The report be noted.
2. $500 of the 2014/15 funds that Council provides to the Disability Access Committee be allocated to the purchase of display holders for the missed business guides for the libraries.
RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Disability Access Committee meeting held on 20 August 2014 be endorsed.
3  MULTICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FILE NO: M-62-1 PT7

Attachments: Minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2014

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Summary:
The minutes of the Multicultural Advisory Committee meeting held on 3 September 2014 are presented for endorsement.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:
The activities of the Multicultural Advisory Committee are met by the specific Budget allocation and support our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Engaged Community and Embracing Diversity.

Report:
The minutes of the Multicultural Advisory Committee meeting held on 3 September 2014 are provided in the Attachments. The following recommendations are highlighted as they pertain to policy matters.

MAC Vacancies
THAT
1. The following persons be endorsed for the vacancy on the Multicultural Advisory Committee for the remainder of the term:
   - Ms Pamela Jones, Board member/Auditor of Migrante Sydney Neighbourhood Inc
   - Mr Ganesh Tamang, President of Nepalese Indigenous Nationalities Forum of Australia
2. The remainder of applicants be thanked and be encouraged to re-nominate for the next term of Advisory Committee membership.

THAT
1. Council investigate whether a complaint can be made to the Press Council of NSW regarding the article in the Daily Telegraph.
2. If a complaint can be made, legal assistance be sought in drafting the letter of complaint to the Press Council.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Multicultural Advisory Committee meeting held on 3 September 2014 be endorsed.
4 SENIOR CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FILE NO: S-143-1 PT4

Attachments: Minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2014

REPORT BY: DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES

Summary:

The minutes of the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee meeting held on 21 August 2014 are presented for endorsement.

Council Delivery Program and Budget Implications:

The activities of the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee are met by the specific Budget allocation and support our Community Strategic Plan long term goals of Engaged Community and Access to Facilities and Services.

Report:

The minutes of the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee meeting held on 21 August 2014 are provided in the Attachments. The following recommendations are highlighted as they have financial implications or pertain to policy matters.

Report on Planning for Carers Week/Canterbury Cares

THAT

1. The Report on Planning for Carers Week/Canterbury Cares be noted.
2. $1,500 of the 2014/15 Bulk Vote funds that Council provides to the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee be allocated to this event as follows:
   ● Bus hire ($800)
   ● Contribution to the Independent Living Centre to cover the cost of the guided tours ($200)
   ● Refreshments for participants ($500)
3. A report on the outcomes of the Carers Week/Canterbury Cares event be submitted to the November 2014 Senior Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

Proposed Budget for Council’s Allocation to the SCAC 2014/15

THAT the proposed Senior Citizens Advisory Committee Bulk Vote Budget 2014/15 as detailed in the table below be endorsed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carers Week/Canterbury Cares Event</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>An excursion to, and guided tour of, the Independent Living Centre in Blacktown on 13 October 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of the 2015 Seniors Week Guide</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>This will allow for 3,000 copies of the guide to be printed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Driver Training and On Road Assessment.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>To be run for up to 40 participants during Seniors Week 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Week 2015 Event – to be determined</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>To be determined as part of Seniors Week planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report on Recruitment for New SCAC Members

THAT
1. The following nominees be endorsed to fill vacant positions on the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee for the term completing in 2015.
   - Lesieli Helu
   - Patricia Graham
   - Bryson Camage
   - Debbie Kelso
   - George Rupesinghe
2. Mr Tung Van Duong be invited to fill the vacancy on the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee for the term completing in 2015, contingent on his resignation from the Multicultural Advisory Committee.

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT the minutes of the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee meeting held on 21 August 2014 be endorsed.
MOTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

49/14 DEFENDING DAY LABOUR IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTOR
FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, U-7-3

Councillor Adler to move
THAT
1. A report be prepared regarding the importance of day labour and job security in the local government sector.
2. Council believes that labour hire or contract staff should not be used to replace local government employees at any local government authority and that any attempt to reduce job security or to replace award based positions in NSW local government should be opposed.
3. Council also believes that labour hire and/or contract labour should not be used to undercut or reduce the wages and conditions of local government employees in NSW.
4. Council writes to the United Services Union advising of this position.

50/14 WESTCONNEX
FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, W-25-7

Councillor Eisler to move
THAT Council
1. Joins Marrickville Council in formally opposing the WestConnex motorway and widening of the M5 East and any other motorway proposal that will have negative impacts on the Wolli Creek Valley's bushland or Tempe Wetlands, and
2. Requests the General Manager to write to the State Government asking them to commit to the preservation of the Wolli Creek Valley's bushland and Tempe Wetlands and to ensure that no roads, or construction of roads, impinge upon these areas.

51/14 PRINCIPLES TO UNDERLIE AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING STRATEGY
FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, H-30-18

Councillor Adler to move
THAT the following principles be adopted by Council to inform the Affordable Housing Strategy currently being developed as a result of the decision made at the Council meeting on 25 July 2013:
1. Every person has a right to adequate and affordable accommodation within a choice of housing tenures. Housing policies should recognise all categories of economic, social and personal need, without discrimination, consistent with the principles of social justice and equity with a mix of housing choices.
2. Housing policy should seek to alleviate housing related poverty by assisting those on low and moderate incomes to achieve home ownership, meeting the cost of public and cooperative housing or facilitating the availability of private rental accommodation.
3. The public housing sector should continue to be developed as a viable and positive
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housing alternative for those with lower and moderate incomes.

4. Aged persons’ accommodation should be provided without discrimination, in a way that meets housing needs and respects the rights and dignity of residents.

5. Design standards should be developed that cater for the specific needs of people with physical, intellectual and psychiatric disabilities.

6. Single people, young people and sole parents should have access to housing assistance programs including public and cooperative housing.

7. Public housing for a broad cross-section of the population should be supported with funding from federal and state revenue and private sources. Public rental stock should be well located, energy efficient, integrated with private housing and well maintained.

8. There should be an adequate supply of appropriate and affordable private rental housing.

9. Flexible and innovative schemes should be considered to assist low and moderate income earners to achieve home ownership.

52/14 CAMPAIGNING FOR COUNCIL WORK TO BE DONE BY COUNCIL WORKERS

FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, U-7-3

Councillor Adler to move

THAT

1. Council believes that labour hire or contract staff should not be used to replace local government employees at any local government authority and that any attempt to reduce job security or to replace award based positions in NSW local government should be opposed.

2. Council also believes that labour hire and/or contract labour should not be used to undercut or reduce the wages and conditions of local government employees in NSW.

3. Council writes to the United Services Union advising of this position.

4. A report be prepared concerning any changes to current policy that may be necessary to achieve the above objectives.

53/14 CAMPAIGNING TO DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF CONTRACT WORKERS EMPLOYED IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SECTOR

FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, U-7-3

Councillor Adler to move

THAT

1. Council believes in the principle that the wages and conditions for workers of companies engaged by councils under contract should be no less favourable than those in the NSW State Local Government Award.

2. A report be prepared concerning any changes that may be necessary to current Council procurement policy to ensure this.

3. Council writes to the United Services Union advising of this position.
54/14 CAMPAIGNING FOR SOLAR PANELS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING DWELLINGS
FILE NO: C-123-6 PT4, H-30-18

Councillor Adler to move
THAT a report be prepared concerning options open to Council to require developments under the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP to equip social housing dwellings with solar panels to reduce electricity bills for tenants.
CLOSED COUNCIL

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1993, it is proposed that the press and the public be excluded from the meeting when the following reports are to be considered for the reasons specified below.

ITEM 1 364 HOMER STREET EARLWOOD: COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

This report is being considered in closed council in accordance with Section 10A (2) (c) of the Local Government Act 1993, as it contains information that would, if disclosed, confer a commercial advantage on a person with whom Council is conducting (or proposes to conduct) business. Disclosure of the information is not in the public interest as it would affect Council’s commercial position in the matter.

ITEM 2 SSROC TENDER FOR PROVISION OF FIRE SERVICES

This report is being considered in closed council in accordance with Section 10A (2) (d) (i) of the Local Government Act 1993, as it contains commercial information of a confidential nature that would, if disclosed, prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it. Disclosure of the tender details may result in commercial disadvantage to parties involved in the tender process. Some information provided to Council by tenderers is provided on the basis that Council will treat it as commercial in confidence. It is not in the public interest to reveal all details of these tenders or the assessment process. Tenderers have provided sensitive information about their operations in the confidence that their details will not be made public by Council. The practice of publication of sensitive information provided by tenderers could result in the withholding of such information by tenderers and reduction in the provision of information relevant to Council’s decision.

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT

1. Council move into closed council to consider reports, together with any late reports tabled at the meeting.
2. Pursuant to section 10A (1)-(3) of the Local Government Act 1993, the media and public be excluded from the meeting on the basis the business to be considered is classified confidential under the provisions of section 10A(2) as outlined above.
3. The correspondence and reports relevant to the subject business be withheld from access to the media and public as required by section 11(2) of the Local Government Act 1993.