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1. MEETING OPENING

1.1 Present & Apologies

2. DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

2.1 Conflicts of Interest

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Confirmation of Minutes – Wednesday 17 February 2016

Recommendation:

That the Place Making Advisory Committee confirm the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 17 February 2016.
4. INFRASTRUCTURE REPORTS

4.1 Development Services Schemes and Drainage Strategy within the Ballan Township - Melbourne Water Proposal

Introduction

Author: Sam Romaszko
General Manager: Phil Jeffrey

Background

Melbourne Water (MW) is responsible for waterway management, regional drainage and floodplain management within its drainage boundary in the Greater Melbourne area that includes the Bacchus Marsh and Ballan Townships.

An investigation of main drainage catchments within the Ballan Township has been undertaken, with three Development Services Schemes (DSS) and one Drainage Strategy (DS) put forward to Council for consideration. These have been developed to support future development as identified in the Ballan Structure Plan and are listed below;

1. Ballan North West DSS
2. Ballan South West DSS
3. Gillespies Lane DSS
4. Gosling Street Drain DS

DSS are prepared by MW in catchment areas greater than 60 hectares which enable appropriate planning of drainage infrastructure necessary to ensure future urban development meets the current MW standards for flood and environment protection in a timely, environmentally sensitive and cost effective manner. The plans identify drainage infrastructure and stormwater quality treatment facilities which will be required to service properties for future urban developments.

There are a number of schemes and strategies already in place within the municipality, including;

- Cairns Drive, Darley DSS
- Masons Lane, Bacchus Marsh DSS
- Griffith Street, Maddingley DS

Drainage infrastructure associated with each DSS is constructed as land is subdivided and developed. Conceptual design and developer contribution rates provide landowners and developers clarity on the drainage requirements and associated costs. MW has prepared conceptual design and a preliminary contribution rate for each of the proposed schemes, with the preliminary contribution rate detailed below. This rate is based on the cost of building the required drainage infrastructure identified in the conceptual design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed DSS</th>
<th>Preliminary Contribution Rate (per ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North West DSS</td>
<td>$66,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West DSS</td>
<td>$113,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespies Lane DSS</td>
<td>$113,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large infrastructure items within each DSS including retarding basins and wetland systems are typically owned and maintained by MW.

If Council did not support MW’s offer of the proposed DSS within the Ballan Township, the result will be small localised stormwater management systems that will ultimately fall into Council ownership. Developers will be required to detain their runoff and construct stormwater quality treatment systems within their development boundary to meet the requirement of Clause 56.07 of the Victoria Planning Provision. This is likely to result in the construction of many small scale drainage assets on each property and will become the responsibility of Council to own and maintain.

The advantage of a DSS is that MW with its significant resources and expertise in flood mitigation and stormwater management would be involved in the design and construction process and that some assets created will become its maintenance responsibility.

In a DS all drainage works required to service future developments are identified while providing flood protection and meeting water quality targets. Works identified in the Gosling Street Drain Upper area catchment will assist in alleviating flooding downstream. Given the catchment area is less than 60 hectares, MW propose the strategy be used as a guide and implemented by Council as resources permit.

Formal consultation with landowners and stakeholders has been undertaken, along with workshops with Council staff to review the MW proposed schemes and strategy, review of proposed asset ownership and impacts this may have into the future.

Feedback provided to MW regarding the proposals includes:

- Possible consolidation/rationalisation of proposed assets that are likely to end up in Council ownership
- Consideration of stormwater harvesting opportunities within the schemes to irrigate future recreation and open space
- Request for review to be undertaken of the Gosling Street Strategy for possible inclusion in the Gillespies Lane DSS

Proposal

As part of MW’s DSS implementation process, MW requires MSC ‘in principle’ written agreement on the design intent of these DSS, approval to implement the DSS as development occurs, and to accept ownership and ongoing maintenance responsibility for the proposed drainage assets that service a catchment of less than 60ha for these Schemes. The proposal is for assets to be transferred to Council as each stage of the Scheme infrastructure works are constructed. The timing of this could be many years away.

The implementation of DSS within MW drainage boundary is common practice. MW administer the implementation and construction of works associated with the DSS, and generally accept asset ownership and maintenance responsibility for large infrastructure items such as wetland and bioretention systems. Given this, it is proposed MSC provide MW in principle agreement to the three DSS below;

1. Ballan North West DSS
2. Ballan South West DSS
3. Gillespies Lane DSS
The Gosling Street DS proposed by MW was originally incorporated into the Gillespies Lane DSS. Following initial discussions with property owners, the scheme proposal was going to significantly impact on a number of property owners that would see their properties primarily used for stormwater detention and water quality treatment. As a result, property owners would see their land valued by MW at a marginal rate and compensated accordingly, as opposed to achieving land values associated with owning developable land.

Given the impact on property owners, MW has proposed to separate the Gosling Street catchment from the Gillespies Lane catchment and provide a DS that has been designed to alleviate flooding in the downstream Gosling Street river corridor. This catchment area is now less than 60 hectares, resulting in MW proposing the strategy be implemented by Council, with future asset ownership and maintenance also the responsibility of Council.

Within this DS there is significant infrastructure required at high cost, including the lowering of a culvert under the railway line that is not practical. Implementation will be difficult to achieve given the Haddon Drive industrial precinct is already developed and it is unlikely that Council would ever implement the full outcomes.

**Policy Implications**

The 2013-2017 Council Plan provides as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area</th>
<th>Enhanced Natural and Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Ensure current and future infrastructure meets the needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Construct physical infrastructure to appropriate standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal is consistent with the 2013-2017 Council Plan.

**Financial Implications**

There are no direct financial implications associated in receiving this report.

There are costs associated with DSS that are incurred by developers and fund drainage infrastructure identified within each specific DSS. The preliminary contribution rate of the three proposed DSS range from $66,031 to $113,843 per hectare.

In the event DSS were not implemented by MW, developers will be required to detain their development runoff and construct stormwater quality treatment systems within their development boundary to meet the requirement of Clause 56.07 of the Victoria Planning Provision. The cost of this has not been quantified and developers may lose developable land area as a result of providing individual stormwater treatment systems within their property.

The receipt of the proposed Gosling Street DS would see Council incur costs should we choose to implement the strategy objectives. However, as identified within this report, there are a number of components that are impractical to deliver on the ground.
Risk & Occupational Health & Safety Issues

There are no irregular Risk and Occupational Health and Safety issues identified in this report.

Communications Strategy

There is no communication required as a result of this report other than notification to Melbourne Water of Council’s position on this matter.

Melbourne Water has undertaken its own consultation with affected land owners.


In developing this report to Council, the officer considered whether the subject matter raised any human rights issues. In particular, whether the scope of any human right established by the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities is in any way limited, restricted or interfered with by the recommendations contained in the report. It is considered that the subject matter does not raise any human rights issues.

Officer’s Declaration of Conflict of Interests

Under section 80C of the Local Government Act 1989 (as amended), officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

General Manager – Phil Jeffrey
In providing this advice to Council as General Manager, I have no interests to disclose in this report.

Author – Sam Romaszko
In providing this advice to Council as the Author, I have no interests to disclose in this report.

Conclusion

As part of MW’s DSS implementation process, MW requires MSC ‘in principle’ written agreement on the design intent of these DSS, approval to implement the DSS as development occurs, and to accept ownership and ongoing maintenance responsibility for the proposed drainage assets that service a catchment of less than 60ha for these Schemes.

The implementation of DSS within MW drainage boundary is common practice. Council has a number of other DSS in place within the Bacchus Marsh Township. It is proposed MSC provide MW in principle agreement to the three DSS below;

1. Ballan North West DSS
2. Ballan South West DSS
3. Gillespies Lane DSS

The DS proposed includes the requirement of significant infrastructure to be constructed at high cost, including the lowering of a culvert under the railway line. Implementation will be difficult to achieve given the Haddon Drive industrial precinct is already developed. Given this, it is proposed that Council receive the DS for consideration and manage Clause 56.07 requirements through the planning process
that will require each development to detain and treat stormwater within their property boundary.

Recommendation;

That the Place Making Advisory Committee;

1. Requests officers provide in principle support to the three Development Service Schemes listed below;
   a. Ballan North West DSS
   b. Ballan South West DSS
   c. Gillespies Lane DSS

2. Requests officers to receive the Gosling Street Drain Drainage Strategy proposal.
4.2 Community Survey – Greenwaste Disposal

Introduction

File No.: 16/05/005
Author: Glenn Townsend
General Manager: Phil Jeffrey

Background

The Moorabool Waste Management & Resource Recovery Strategy sets the direction for future management of waste by Moorabool Shire over the next 5-10 years. One of the recommendations within the implementation plan is to investigate options for a greenwaste collection service, which is currently not provided by Council. The survey of residents and resolution of Council’s position in relation to greenwaste is also a key action included within the 2015 Council Plan.

Transfer stations currently divert an estimated 1,000 tonnes of garden organics per year. The main opportunity for diverting organics from landfill is the introduction of a kerbside organics service. It is estimated in the order of 45% of kerbside garbage is garden and food organics, representing in the order of 1,800-1,900 tonnes of landfilled waste each year. As the population grows and new gardens mature, there will likely to be more organics available.

The provision of a greenwaste service was considered at the Place Making Advisory Committee in August 2015, and it was resolved to undertake the community survey in order to receive feedback on the level of demand, to assist Council in making an informed decision.

The survey was undertaken over a period of four weeks, and available to the community electronically (via Have Your Say Moorabool) as well as in hard copy (distributed in Moorabool Matters).

Community Survey

498 survey responses were received from members of the community, with 69% of respondents identifying themselves as living within an urban township (ie. Bacchus Marsh or Ballan). A copy of the detailed survey results are provided in attachment 4.2.

The following question was posed as part of the survey with regard to greenwaste disposal:

The introduction of a kerbside greenwaste collection, if this were offered by Council, would be on a full cost recovery basis with the associated charge added to your Rate & Valuation Notice. Given this please select one of the following.

Option 1: A kerbside collection (240L bin) at a cost of approximately $60-90 per annum.
Option 2: Continue to use Council’s transfer stations, paying the associated gate fees.
Option 3: Make my own arrangements (ie. composting, mulching etc).
Option 4: I would not utilise a greenwaste service.
**Option 5: Other (please specify).**

The responses received indicate support for a kerbside collection, with 55% of responses indicating that they would utilise a service provided by Council. The majority of those responses were provided by residents within urban areas.

Feedback from the community within rural living and rural/farming areas, suggests a very low take up rate, with the majority of residents noting that they would not utilise a service and would make alternative arrangements for the disposal of greenwaste.

**Servicing Options**

In preparing this report, Officers considered a number of key options:

1. **Provision of a Compulsory Service within Urban Areas**

   Across the Bacchus Marsh and Ballan areas, there is approximately 7,950 residential properties that would be included on such a service. This option would create a three bin kerbside collection system for urban areas, with greenwaste collected on the opposite fortnight to recycling. A 240L greenwaste bin would be provided for each application, at an estimated cost of $140.

   A compulsory service charge would be applied to all rateable properties in the urban areas of Bacchus Marsh and Ballan, as part of their annual Rate and Valuation Notice.

   An overview of costs and cost implications is provided in the financial section of this report.

2. **Provision of a Non-Compulsory Service within Urban Areas**

   This option would create an optional three bin kerbside collection system for urban areas. Ideally, greenwaste would be collected on the opposite fortnight to recycling, however some alternate scheduling may need to occur subject to the number of properties included on the service. A 240L greenwaste bin would be provided for each application, at an estimated cost of $140.

   A service charge would be applied to all properties in the urban areas of Bacchus Marsh and Ballan that opt in to the service as part of their annual Rate and Valuation Notice. Properties would need to be part of the service for a minimum 12 month period.

   Typically a well promoted non-compulsory service would attract a take up rate of around 40% and as such it would be expected that approximately 3,200 properties within the urban areas of Bacchus Marsh and Ballan could take part in a service. The survey results generally support this figure.

   An overview of costs and cost implications is provided in the financial section of this report.

3. **No Service**

   This option involves no change to Council’s existing collection services and the use of transfer stations or other alternative arrangements would remain.
Disposal Options

It is estimated that a compulsory service would yield approximately 2,110 tonnes per annum, and a non-compulsory service approximately 845 tonnes per annum, depending on the take up rate.

A number of options have been investigated, including processing facilities at Epping and Brooklyn. There is a proposal for a new facility to be established in Moorabool at Mount Wallace and if a service is endorsed, this option would be the preferred outcome.

Given the estimated quantities of greenwaste that is routinely disposed of in waste bins, it is anticipated that the provision of a greenwaste service would reduce the amount of waste to landfill, an objective also supported by State and Federal waste policies.

Bin Supply

240L greenwaste bins would be required to be provided by the property owner, and would be available for purchase through Council for a one off cost of approximately $140 to minimise the up-front cost of the service to Council.

Proposal

Based on an analysis of the above, it is recommended that Council implement a fortnightly optional kerbside greenwaste collection in the urban areas of Bacchus Marsh and Ballan (option 2). To establish the long term viability of providing the service, it is recommended that a trial period apply initially, and that residents who apply to utilise the service be required to commit for a minimum of twelve months. It is recommended that the trial period continue until the end of Council’s existing waste contracts, being end June 2019.

Nearing completion of the trial period, a further report would be presented to Council outlining the success of the trial, and consideration to providing a continued service.

It is likely that there may not be full cost recovery in the initial phase of implementation of the service, until a critical number of tenements is reached.

Council’s Waste Policy will also require amendment to reflect the provision of a new service.

Implementation

Subject to Council approval, it is anticipated that a new service could commence in January 2017 and continue until June 2019 to align with other waste contracts, should the service continue.

A community education program would also be undertaken prior to implementation, to ensure that residents are aware of the availability of the service, in addition to the types of materials that can be placed in bins.

Policy Implications

The 2013-2017 Council Plan provides as follows:
Key Result Area: Enhanced Infrastructure and Natural and Built Environment

Objective: Effective Management of Municipal Waste and Recycling

Strategy: Implement the Waste Management Policy and Strategy

The proposal to implement a kerbside greenwaste service in the urban areas of the Shire is consistent with the 2013-2017 Council Plan.

Financial Implications

A cost table for option 1 and 2 has been prepared to outline the costs associated with the service. The costs assume $1.20/lift/tenement plus $1.40/tenement for transport, in addition to $65/tonne process fee with each property producing 266kg/annum.

1. Provision of a Compulsory Service within Urban Areas

7950 tenements x $2.60 (lift/transport) x 26 (fortnightly) $537,420.00
+ 2110 tonnes/annum x $65.00/tonne $137,150.00
Total estimated cost per annum $674,570.00

2. Provision of a Non-Compulsory Service within Urban Areas

3200 tenements x $2.60 (lift/transport) x 26 (fortnightly) $216,320.00
+ 845 tonnes/annum x $65.00/tonne $54,925.00
Total estimated cost per annum $271,245.00

The above estimates equate to an additional charge of approximately $85.00/tenement/annum.

In addition to the above, officers would also intend on seeking grant opportunities as they arise, to assist with the implementation, however it is noted that no current grants are open for application.

Risk & Occupational Health & Safety Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Identifier</th>
<th>Detail of Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Control/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OH&amp;S</td>
<td>Manual handling risks</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collection process is fully automated. Contractors to have OH&amp;S systems in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Low take up of service (number of services is below anticipated)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Appropriate financial controls in place for the trial period. Initial implementation expenses to Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications Strategy

An extensive consultation period was undertaken during late 2015 to help inform community views on the provision of a greenwaste service.

Should Council resolve to proceed with the proposal, advertisements would be placed in local media and Council’s online forums, seeking applications from the community to apply to receive a service.

Ongoing, the service would be promoted via Council’s regular communications including online, social media and through Moorabool Matters.


In developing this report to Council, the officer considered whether the subject matter raised any human rights issues. In particular, whether the scope of any human right established by the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities is in any way limited, restricted or interfered with by the recommendations contained in the report. It is considered that the subject matter does not raise any human rights issues.

Officer's Declaration of Conflict of Interests

Under section 80C of the Local Government Act 1989 (as amended), officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

*General Manager – Phil Jeffrey*
In providing this advice to Council as the General Manager, I have no interests to disclose in this report.

*Author – Glenn Townsend*
In providing this advice to Council as the Author, I have no interests to disclose in this report.

Conclusion

One of the recommendations within Council’s Waste & Resource Recovery Strategy is to investigate options for a greenwaste collection service, which is currently not provided by Council. The survey of residents and resolution of Council’s position in relation to greenwaste is also a key action included within the 2015 Council Plan.

A survey was undertaken to ascertain the community’s view on the provision of a greenwaste service. The results indicate that there is support for a kerbside service in the urban areas of the Shire and that rural areas generally don’t support such a service.

The introduction of a non-compulsory kerbside greenwaste service could be accomplished for a cost of $80-90/tenement/annum and could achieve a take up rate.
of over 40% of urban properties, potentially diverting approximately 845 tonnes of greenwaste from landfill per annum.

Recommendation:

That the Place Making Advisory Committee recommends to Council that:

1. A non-compulsory kerbside greenwaste collection be implemented within the urban areas of Bacchus Marsh and Ballan and that the service be provided for trial period from January 2017 to June 2019.
2. A further report be presented to Council regarding the feasibility for a continued service at least 6 months prior to the completion of the trial period.
3. An amendment to the existing Waste & Resource Recovery Policy be made to include the additional service.
4. Refers the costs associated with the implementation of the service to the annual budget process.
4.3 Community Survey – Hardwaste Disposal

Introduction

File No.: 16/05/005
Author: Glenn Townsend
General Manager: Phil Jeffrey

Background

The Moorabool Waste Management & Resource Recovery Strategy sets the direction for future management of waste by Moorabool Shire over the next 5-10 years. One of the recommendations within the implementation plan is to investigate options for a hardwaste collection service, which is currently not provided by Council. The survey of residents and resolution of Council’s position in relation to hardwaste is also a key action included within the 2015 Council Plan.

Such services are offered by many Councils to provide residents with a way to dispose waste items that do not fit in garbage and recycling services such as obsolete furniture and fittings, building materials, appliances and large branches.

Hardwaste disposal was considered at the Place Making Advisory Committee in August 2015, and it was resolved to undertake the community survey in order to receive feedback on the level of demand for a number of options, to assist Council in making an informed decision.

The survey was undertaken over a period of four weeks, and available to the community electronically (via Have Your Say Moorabool) as well as in hard copy (distributed in Moorabool Matters).

Community Survey

498 survey responses were received from members of the community, with 69% of respondents identifying themselves as living within an urban township (ie. Bacchus Marsh or Ballan). A copy of the survey results is provided in attachment 4.3.

The following question was posed as part of the survey with regard to hardwaste disposal:

*The introduction of a hardwaste service, if this were offered by Council, would be on a full cost recovery basis. Given this, please select one of the following.*

**Option 1:** An on call pick up service (approx. $40-60 per collection)

**Option 2:** Transfer station vouchers issued with Rate Notices (approx. $10-20 added to the notice)

**Option 3:** Continue to use Council’s transfer stations, paying the associated gate fees.

**Option 4:** I would not utilise a hardwaste service.

**Option 5:** Other (please specify).
Whilst the responses received show some support for an on call collection, a high number indicating that residents would more likely utilise transfer station vouchers provided by Council (issued with Rate and Valuation Notices). A preference toward the use of vouchers is evident across urban, rural townships and rural living responses.

However, feedback from the community within rural/farming areas suggests a lower level of support, with the majority of those residents noting that they would not utilise a service.

Servicing Options

There are a number of options available with regard to the disposal of hardwaste:

1. Business as usual

   This is maintaining the status quo of transfer station provision with no dedicated hard waste services. This may not meet the expectations of the community, and does not meet the needs of those with restricted access to transfer station services due to lack of mobility.

2. General precinct collection service.

   This is the traditional system of designating a collection period within collection precincts and allowing set out of waste during this period. Materials are generally set out during the collection period, and may be on nature strips for more than a week before collection.

3. On-call systems, where households book a pick-up service.

   These systems vary in their degree of sophistication from a simple call/email to book, through to on-line survey bookings where users describe the items to be collected prior to booking. Materials are typically set out inside front yards or on nature strips the day the collection is due. These systems generally have lower uptake, but can have very uneven demand over the year, with high demand in spring leading up to Christmas making them harder to resource.

4. Hybrid precinct-on-call system.

   Under these systems, people within a designated precinct are notified for the period of collection in which they can book a service. This concentrates and confines the area and time of each collection and provides incentives for people to clean-up materials for collection.

5. Limited access services.

   Under such as service, the hard waste service might only be offered to those holding valid social service cards such as pensioners and unemployed people who may have difficulty in hauling waste and affording transfer station fees or private collection company services. On-call systems could be used to service areas. The advantage of this approach is that it meets the needs of people who will find it hard to use other services. Costs per serviced household may be higher, but overall costs will likely be considerably lower. A nominal service fee might be considered to partially recover costs and manage demand.
6. Transfer Station vouchers.

Under such an approach, all or some eligible (e.g. pensioners, unemployed) ratepayers will receive annual waste vouchers. Advantages of this approach are: it avoids any public safety issues associated with kerbside set out, and that conditions could be placed on use of the vouchers (for example, only loads separated for recycling are free of charge). Disadvantage of such an approach are: users still have to have access to a trailer to take materials to the transfer stations; the vouchers will reduce revenue from those who are currently willing to use and pay at the transfer stations; provision of vouchers may ‘create’ demand and increase the quantities of waste managed through council facilities because people using mini-skip services may use council facilities instead; and there could potentially be ‘black market’ trading of vouchers by those who do not need them to those who currently pay to use transfer station services - higher administration costs will be incurred if user have to provide identification to ensure the voucher they use is the one allocated to them and not one from another resident.

Advantages / Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection system model</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing/ business as usual</td>
<td>Lower/no cost</td>
<td>Does not meet a possible need or expectations for such a service</td>
<td>Council needs to determine the level of community demand for a service before moving away from the business as usual model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General precinct collection areas</td>
<td>Generally high rate of use, reducing per tonne and per service costs</td>
<td>Greater potential for litter and ‘messiness’/ unsightliness</td>
<td>This is the ‘traditional’ service used in other areas. It can be an efficient way to service many premises, but has inherent inefficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More scope for a dual ‘recycling’ and ‘landfill’ runs to pick over set out items for recyclables before disposal</td>
<td>Some public health risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can get ‘area creep’ where streets neighbouring precinct set out materials even though they are not due for the service</td>
<td>Can create a ‘culture of dumping’/placing materials on nature strips in the expectation they will be collected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can get opportunistic dumpers from outside of collection areas</td>
<td>Can get scavenging disputes over ownership of items, and also traffic hazards from scavengers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can get scavenging disputes over ownership of items, and also traffic hazards from scavengers</td>
<td>Creates expectations of on-going service (hard to take the service away once it has been introduced)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All streets in the collection area need to be inspected, and there is a chance households will set out materials immediately after collection and claimed they have been ‘missed’.</td>
<td>Not well suited to rural or lower density rural residential living properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-call booking</td>
<td>Generally lower costs overall, but due to lower participation and yields</td>
<td>Can have high per service and per tonne unless efficient collection runs can be developed</td>
<td>Levels of participation in such services vary widely from council to council, and depend on how well the availability of services is promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs can be scoped/scaled for efficiency</td>
<td>More administratively complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recyclable items can be identified</td>
<td>Provide less certainty regarding annual cost – if there are many users costs could blow out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households could be directed to ‘Freebay’ and other re-sale and charity options for reusable items so they do not have to use the council service</td>
<td>Demand can be seasonal and uneven, making it hard to resource and meet community expectations of a reasonably prompt service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compatible with user pays service model</td>
<td>Can still get ‘edge’ effect with people seeing set out materials and setting out materials without a booking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoids public health and scavenging issues</td>
<td>This option allows for targeted service provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid precinct-booking service</td>
<td>Avoids/reduces risks associated with seasonal demand, mess, scavenging and public health issues</td>
<td>Can be administratively difficult to identify when those booking systems are eligible for collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentrates period during which particular areas can use the service</td>
<td>May still get ‘edge’ effect with people seeing set out materials and setting out materials without a booking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits the period of set out to no more than a few days</td>
<td>On-line booking could be used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows users to detail items they have for collection so collection can be tailored to their needs</td>
<td>Economies of scale are better, with lower costs per service and tonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In preparing this report, Officers considered the following key options as viable solutions for Moorabool:
1. **Provision of a Non Compulsory On Call Service within Urban Areas**

Across Bacchus Marsh and Ballan areas, there are approximately 7,900 residential properties that may elect to receive an on call service. With an on call service there are still public safety and OHS issues but to a much lesser degree than a general precinct collection when residents place their items on the nature strip for collection. The biggest disadvantage with the introduction of a non-compulsory on call service would be that it needs to be on a full cost recovery basis and this would likely make the service too expensive for most residents.

It is considered that the only way this option could work is if it was limited to certain months of the year (September for example) and if it was tied into a regional procurement process to create economies of scale.

2. **Provision of Transfer Station Vouchers**

The advantages of this option is that it avoids all disadvantages of a general precinct option which are public health and safety, OHS, scavenging and general untidiness issues associated with a hardwaste kerbside collection service. The biggest disadvantage would be that residents would most likely need to have access to a vehicle and a trailer to take materials to the transfer station.

3. **No Provision of Service**

This option involves no change to Council’s existing collection service and the use of transfer stations or other alternative arrangements would remain.

**Proposal**

Based on an analysis of the above, it is recommended that Council implement a hardwaste service by issue of a transfer station voucher with all Council Rate and Valuation Notices, with an extra charge of $20.

Council’s Waste Policy will also require amendment to reflect the provision of a new service.

**Implementation**

Subject to Council approval, it is anticipated that vouchers could be issued with the 2016/2017 Rate and Valuation Notices in July/August 2016.

A community education program would also be undertaken prior to implementation, to ensure that residents are aware of the availability of the service, in addition to the types of materials that can be disposed of using the vouchers at the transfer station.

**Policy Implications**

The 2013 - 2017 Council Plan provides as follows:

**Key Result Area**

Enhanced Infrastructure and Natural and Built Environment

**Objective**

Effective Management of Municipal Waste and Recycling
Strategy

Implement the Waste Management Policy and Strategy

The proposal to implement a Hardwaste disposal service is consistent with the 2013-2017 Council Plan.

Financial Implications

Based on the loss of revenue through the gate and disposal costs, it is estimated that Council would need to add $20 to every Rate & Valuation Notice issued within the Shire to provide 1 transfer station voucher for the disposal of 1m³ of hardwaste.

Risk & Occupational Health & Safety Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Identifier</th>
<th>Detail of Risk</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Control/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OH&amp;S</td>
<td>Manual handling risks</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collection process is undertaken by contractors with Safe Operating Procedures in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Loss of existing revenue through the gate entry fee</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Officers to monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Liability</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collection process is undertaken by contractors with Safe Operating Procedures in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communications Strategy

An extensive community consultation period was undertaken during late 2015 to help inform community views on the provision of a hardwaste service.

Should Council proceed with the proposal, information and vouchers would be distributed with rates notices outlining types of materials that can be disposed of using the vouchers at the transfer station.


In developing this report to Council, the officer considered whether the subject matter raised any human rights issues. In particular, whether the scope of any human right established by the Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities is in any way limited, restricted or interfered with by the recommendations contained in the report. It is considered that the subject matter does not raise any human rights issues.

Officer's Declaration of Conflict of Interests

Under section 80C of the Local Government Act 1989 (as amended), officers providing advice to Council must disclose any interests, including the type of interest.

General Manager – Phil Jeffrey
In providing this advice to Council as the General Manager, I have no interests to disclose in this report.
Conclusion

One of the recommendations within Council’s Waste & Resource Recovery Strategy is to investigate options for a hardwaste collection service, which is currently not provided by Council. The survey of residents and resolution of Council’s position in relation to hardwaste is also a key action included within the 2015 Council Plan.

A survey was undertaken to ascertain the community’s view on the provision of a hardwaste service. The results conclude that that the majority of the residents that completed the survey were in favour of a transfer station voucher for $20 and these resident were mainly in the Urban and Rural townships.

Recommendation:

That the Place Making Advisory Committee recommends to Council that:

1. A hardwaste service be implemented by issue of a transfer station voucher with all Council Rate and Valuation Notices, with an extra charge of $20.
2. An amendment to the existing Waste & Resource Recovery Policy be made to include the additional service.
3. The costs associated with the implementation of the service be referred to the annual budget process.
5. GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT REPORTS

Nil
6. CLOSED SESSION OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Nil

7. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

Wednesday 20 April 2016

8. MEETING CLOSURE