

Ordinary Meeting of Council 1 July 2020

The following statements were submitted prior to the meeting. Submissions made live during the meeting include some variations and can be listened via our live stream webpage:

<http://webcast.portphillip.vic.gov.au/archive.php>

Anne Gawenda – Item 7.1 Petition Response – Request for Removal of Tree, Wordsworth Street, St Kilda

We are very disappointed to say the least that the recommendation for our petition to remove the tree, be denied

The denial according to the statement is based on the policy that removal of a tree is only approved when there is no other viable option. The assessment states that a viable option in this case is to prune the tree to limit the tree material falling into the courtyard during shedding season.

This is no solution at all. It is a tall and bushy tree which looms over our courtyard. On any even slightly windy day the spores from the tree cover our courtyard surfaces. As a result, we cannot hang out washing and we cannot sit outside with our family including our grandson who has allergy and skin issues and for at least 6 months of the year our courtyard is completely unusable. All of this is made much more difficult for us older people in this time of COVID

We are sure that your arborist department would confirm this because the arborist we spoke to confirmed it. Christian Renaud told us that he would support the petition and that he himself would not buy a house with this tree outside it as it is outside our house.

You concede that there are health implications with this tree. You say that..." this species can cause allergic reactions and skin irritations." This is exactly what we argued and asked for the removal of the tree on that basis and on the basis of the discomfort and pain caused by these sharp spores.

Our grandson suffers from severe allergies and has skin issues. He also has asthma. While you say, there is no evidence of an asthma effect that is no proof that there isn't one. As for scientific research, which you say could change your policy, surely you are not suggesting that we should undertake this research. That is your responsibility. And to err on the side of caution you should accept that it may have an asthma effect.

The fact is that you are responsible for the planting of these trees and that it is therefore your responsibility to develop scientific evidence when your rate payers tell you that it is having health effects.

We have done what was suggested to us by Christian Renaud when we spoke to him and limited our petition to the particular tree causing us problems. We set out our unique circumstances.

We did this so that the trees would not become a wider issue. Clearly you believe these trees are a problem as you have stopped planting them.

This is not about the greening of Port Phillip, which we entirely support. We would welcome a replacement tree. But this particular tree is about our health and wellbeing and we cannot just let this recommendation stand.

We would like you to understand that this tree has a huge impact on our lives.

Some of the explanation for the recommended denial of our petition is quite outrageous.

We urge you to reject this recommendation to deny our petition.

Anne and Michael Gawenda

John Sutherland – Item 7.2 Petition Response - Request – Traffic Safety Issues at Intersection of Kerferd Road, Montague Street and Herbert Street, Albert Park

Hello,

I would like to reply to the council regarding the officer recommendations that have been put forward in agenda Item 7.2 - Traffic safety issues at the intersection of Kerferd Road, Montague Street and Herbert Street, Albert Park.

Though I have been a rate payer in the City of Port Phillip for 10 years, this is the first time I have been significantly moved on a matter that I felt it was my duty on behalf of residents to bring it to council's attention.

In doing this, I did not know what to expect.

From this perspective, I would like to highlight the complete professionalism that I have been afforded by all City of Port Phillip staff that I have corresponded with.

Rebecca Purvis and Emily Williams from the CEO's office explained in simple terms the process to have an agenda item included and how to join a meeting.

I then met with Head of Major Transport Projects, John Bartels and Senior Traffic Engineer, Thomas Mason on site at the intersection and was immediately impressed by their understanding of the problem and the thought that they had given potential solutions.

The recommendations that they have put forward for council consideration tonight are highly commended by myself and other petitioners. Once implemented, they will alleviate all concerns raised in the petition and make Albert Park a safer place to live.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity to bring this important issue to council's attention and I hope the officer recommendations can be implemented as soon as possible.

Thank you

Georgina Tsolidis – Item 9.1 Acceptance of the Older Persons Consultative Annual Report 2019 and Extension of Membership

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the passing of Lesley Greagg who died 25 June. Lesely was a founding member of the OPCC and continued as an active member until her death. She provided many insights about issues that affect older people within Port Phillip including, those living alone. She will be missed.

I would like to formally thank the officers who support the Committee's work and the way this is done with diligence, patience and good humour. Laura Cattapan and Sherridan Green's fantastic work has become even more apparent in these difficult times.

The members of the Committee have a range of experience and expertise and it has been a pleasure working with this group of committed people.

I also wish to acknowledge Councillor Dick Gross for his on-going interest in and support of our work. His involvement illustrates that the Council takes consultation seriously.

The Annual Report has been made available to you and here I'd like to highlight only some of what was achieved in 2019.

This year marks the Committee's 20th anniversary. We began preparations to celebrate this event last year and work continues although we envisage a different type of event to what was originally imagined. Twenty years is an important milestone and one the Council should be proud of as it represents a commitment to listening to a group of often vulnerable members of our community.

Each January the Committee establishes its key objectives for the year. Most particularly I'd like to highlight our aims to;

- Be inclusive of all groups of older residents living in our diverse community,
- Consider how climate change is affecting older residents,
- Monitor the physical environment so that it remains safe and comfortable for older people and
- Maintain governance structures that allow the OPCC's contribution to be effective.

The OPCC strives to be responsive to the Council and the community.

The Committee was directly involved in a number of consultations related to Council business. These are listed in detail in the full report. Here I would like to highlight a few;

- Community bus review
- Housing strategy
- Community safety
- Access and inclusion
- Charter of Ages, Care Rights and Quality Standards
- Libraries
- Public spaces
- Parking
- Fisherman's Bend
- Place making

These consultations have included site visits to Fitzroy Street and a bus trip through Fisherman's Bend hosted by Councillor Voss.

Additionally, the OPCC has responded to issues which have come to us through the wider community. These issues include;

- Parking during the Grand Prix and its impact on older residents
- MSAC and the need for age-friendly facilities
- Climate change and its possible disproportionate impact on older residents
- South Melbourne Market remaining age-friendly
- Exercise parks for older people
- The need for seating in Fitzroy St and the fact that seating remains absent

The OPCC is guided in its work by CoPP policy and the World Health Organisation's Age-Friendly Cities Framework. This means our advice is guided by principles of best practice related to what makes a city user-friendly for older residents.

The Committee has instigated engagement with other bodies most notably the Municipal Association of Victoria (MAV) with the aim of reaching out to committees similar to our

own. This work continues and means we can network across the state on issues of mutual interest.

The OPCC is involved in running activities. In 2019 these included;

Hosting the Embolden Festival with an organisation called Celebrate Ageing, which was an overwhelming success. Over 400 delegates and 61 presentations. OPCC members were actively involved as speakers and participants.

The Seniors Festival is one of our key priorities and an OPCC sub-committee works alongside CoPP staff on the programme. The 'After Dark' element of the programme was expanded so that a broader range of age-groups would be involved. There has also been a concerted effort to co-host events with ethnic minority groups. Over 60 events were organised with 4500 people attending.

The Council grants programme funded more than 26 community groups to run events. This ensures community ownership and therefore on-going relevance of the Festival. We look forward to this funding continuing as it ensures the Seniors Festival remains inclusive.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Council for its on-going commitment to community consultation. Ageing in Port Phillip needs to be a positive experience. This requires appropriate services and amenities. This cohort of residents is likely to increase quickly, after all, ageing is a universal experience.

Paul Littmann - Item 13.1 Delegation to the CEO - Reactivation of Public Space to Support Community & Economic Recovery

The Port Melbourne Business Association is in support of the recommendations as set out in 13.1 Delegation to the CEO' reactivation of public space to support community & economic recovery.

The following statements were submitted prior to the meeting and a summary of the statements were read out during the meeting by the Coordinator Governance.

Adrian Jackson – Public Question Time

Comrade Councillors,

1. Will the proposed palm trees outside the Palais hinder the view of the Palais and Luna Park and photo opportunity for tourists and new residents from the embankment near the tram line? Also, possums in palm trees were a concern for some councillors in nearby Catani Gardens in the past. Are we creating a further problem were a possum catcher (killer) will be used and ugly bits of tin placed around the tree trunks to stop or hinder these animals from climbing these new palms? Will little children be in tears as the terrified possum is dragged from the palms by the possum catcher? Also, promoting crowds is a health problem currently and in the future to as the Corona Virus is here forever and is unlikely to be cured just like the flu is every Winter. Also, can the proposed cost to ratepayers be included in all council project promotions that appear on the website?

2. Last week state MP's were caught out using public servants for party political tasks. This resulted, quite correctly, in the sacking of three state Cabinet Minister by the Premier. Why is at least one Port Phillip Council staff member allegedly telling residents that they can't put a political issue poster on their front fences because of bogus heritage overlays claims and that a permit is required. In the 40 years I have lived in Port Phillip I have not hear of such draconian and probably illegal interference in the democratic process. Before and during elections posters appear on fences and shop windows promoting candidates and issues. The government and media would be interested in hearing about this dodgy overbearing behaviour. Please explain.

Mark Richardson – Item 12.1 Planning Scheme Amendment C174 Port (Extension to HO8 – Tiuna Grove, Elwood) – Consideration of Panel Recommendations and Adoption of Amendment

I commend the officer's recommendation to adopt C174 Port which will significantly retain significant streetscape elements of Tiuna Grove. It will be a surprise if any Councillor is not willing to support the recommendation. Nevertheless, Officers, Councillors, residents and more broadly, all ratepayers in the City have expended a great amount of money and time to achieve this outcome. In my view, Council's decision to not accelerate the planned heritage review for Elwood HO8 risks further cost and effort until it is completed. I request Councillors bring forward the planned completion date of the review.

Thank you

Trevor White – Item 15.1 Notice of Motion Cr Gross - Amendment C171port – St Kilda Marina

My question is Whilst community consultation was encouraged during the planning phase for the redevelopment of the St Kilda Marina, given that the community's third-party rights have been removed, it is vital that community consultation continues during the development phase and prior to the new developer gaining the appropriate permits. This would be consistent with the Planning Panel's recommendation 2, which recommends such consultation. Will council adopt the Planning Panel's recommendation in full as printed in their report?

Peter Holland – Item 15.1 Notice of Motion Cr Gross - Amendment C171port – St Kilda Marina

I support Cr Gross' motion that Council accept the Independent Panel's recommendation for the successful marina tenderer to consult with the community and provide a Community Engagement Report as part of its Development Plan. This is significantly better than Officers alternative for consultation with them after a Development Plan has been lodged. The Officers alternative is too little and too late. The immediate neighbours and the public want to be able to talk with the successful tenderer at an early stage so as to be able to have effective input into the planning for the new marina. This consultation should result in a superior development. For example, the current concept for a left-turn-in only and left-turn-out-only T is unwieldy, necessitating U-turns somewhere along the beach road for boats towing trailer boats. Local input may be invaluable in working out a better traffic management arrangement to be part of the Development Plan. The Independent Panel's recommendation reflected the fact that third party appeal rights have been removed and that, while there has been significant consultation up to this point, there is a need for

additional effective consultation in the next stage. The Officers argument that there is a problem with transparency with the Independent Panel's recommendation is far-fetched. The successful tenderer could consult with anybody in preparing its Development Plan, on a selective and private basis. Therefore, the Panel's requirement for a formal consultation process by the developer gives more transparency, not less. At the Council meeting on 17 June, Ms Rosic proposed that the Independent Panel did not realise that it was requiring consultation by the developer rather than by the Council. This is wrong. I attended (on-line) all of the hearing. The expert Panel knew that it was making a brave recommendation for community consultation by the tenderer to help in preparing its Development Plan. The Panel spent a substantial time in the hearings process considering this issue. The expert Panel clearly believed that the Minister could accept its recommendation. Council should therefore support its recommendation for a demonstrably superior consultation process. Port Phillip Council has traditionally prided itself on consulting with its community. I urge Councillors to be bold spirits not timorous souls. You should stand up for your community and adopt the Independent Panel's recommendation for effective community consultation on the St Kilda marina.