

Public Submissions – Summary of Responses

Draft Budget 2023–24

Draft Finance Plan 2023–2034

BOROUGH OF QUEENSCLIFFE



Please note that the responses provided below reference the draft budget and not the final budget of Council. Council has received these submissions for the draft budget which was placed for public exhibition in April 2023.

Council has incorporated some changes to its 2023–24 budget and please refer to the agenda paper on the 2023–24 final budget (Agenda, 28 June 2023 Ordinary Council Meeting) to note changes that have been incorporated to the 2023–24 budget. However, where possible, references have been made in Council’s responses (below) for the subsequent changes made to the 2023–24 budget.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers’ Initial Comments for Councillors’ Reference Only
1	Submitter 1	Liquidity	
		<p>1. Funds Carried Forward 23/24 reduce by \$770,000 (p 66)</p>	<p>Pages 66 to 67 in the draft budget detail the projects carried forward from 2022–23 which are planned to be completed during the 2023–24 financial year. As a result, Council will use cash kept in respective existing reserve accounts specifically for these projects.</p> <p>A full list of reserve balances is provided on page 13 of the draft budget.</p> <p>As stated in the draft budget, Council has a healthy general reserve balance of \$1.1 million (equivalent to 10% of recurrent operating expenses) and a healthy asset renewal reserve balance of \$1.3 million (almost 100% of annual depreciation expenses).</p> <p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only																								
		<p>2. Statement of cash Flows includes \$4,000,000 Proceeds from Sale of Investments -from initial source the Sale at Murray Road-when this line item is removed- Cash & Cash equivalents are then \$1,746,000 Draft 23/24 ie \$1,148,000 less than 22/23 P 40</p>	<p>The explanation for the \$4 million figure is provided on page 68 of the draft budget (note, 4.4.2 Net cash flows used in investing activities).</p> <p>The \$4 million reflects the reclassification of term deposits from other financial assets to cash and cash equivalents during the year when reinvested in term deposits with less than 90 days of maturity. The \$4,000,000 is not proceeds from the sale of Murray Road land which was included in the 22/23 accounts.</p> <p>As per the reporting guidelines issued by the Local Government Victoria (the Department of Jobs, Skills, Industry and Regions), any term deposit with more than 90 days of original maturity needs to be identified as other financial assets. Council currently has an elevated balance in Term Deposits with more than 90 days of original maturity to secure higher interest rates.</p>																								
		<p>3. Actually Cash & Investments are expected to decrease by \$1,200,000 P12</p>	<p>In the balance sheet, 'Cash and cash equivalents' and 'Other financial assets' represent the total cash balance of the Council. These positions are summarised in the following table.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1025 852 1955 1289"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1025 852 1404 1027" rowspan="2">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1404 852 1561 962">Forecast Actual 2022-23</th> <th data-bbox="1561 852 1711 962">Draft Budget 2023-24</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1711 852 1955 890">Change</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1404 962 1561 1027">\$'000</th> <th data-bbox="1561 962 1711 1027">\$'000</th> <th data-bbox="1711 962 1845 1027">\$'000</th> <th data-bbox="1845 962 1955 1027">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1090 1404 1145">Cash and cash equivalents</td> <td data-bbox="1404 1090 1561 1145">2,894</td> <td data-bbox="1561 1090 1711 1145">5,746</td> <td data-bbox="1711 1090 1845 1145">2,852</td> <td data-bbox="1845 1090 1955 1145">99%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1153 1404 1209">Other financial assets</td> <td data-bbox="1404 1153 1561 1209">6,500</td> <td data-bbox="1561 1153 1711 1209">2,500</td> <td data-bbox="1711 1153 1845 1209">(4,000)</td> <td data-bbox="1845 1153 1955 1209">(62%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1217 1404 1289">Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits</td> <td data-bbox="1404 1217 1561 1289">9,394</td> <td data-bbox="1561 1217 1711 1289">8,246</td> <td data-bbox="1711 1217 1845 1289">(1,148)</td> <td data-bbox="1845 1217 1955 1289">(12%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Description	Forecast Actual 2022-23	Draft Budget 2023-24	Change		\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	%	Cash and cash equivalents	2,894	5,746	2,852	99%	Other financial assets	6,500	2,500	(4,000)	(62%)	Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits	9,394	8,246	(1,148)	(12%)
Description	Forecast Actual 2022-23	Draft Budget 2023-24	Change																								
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	%																							
Cash and cash equivalents	2,894	5,746	2,852	99%																							
Other financial assets	6,500	2,500	(4,000)	(62%)																							
Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits	9,394	8,246	(1,148)	(12%)																							

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only															
			<p>Represented in</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1025 229 1955 432"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 229 1406 293">Discretionary reserves</td> <td data-bbox="1406 229 1561 293">7,353</td> <td data-bbox="1561 229 1711 293">6,583</td> <td data-bbox="1711 229 1843 293">(771)</td> <td data-bbox="1843 229 1955 293">(10%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 293 1406 357">Operating cash</td> <td data-bbox="1406 293 1561 357">2,040</td> <td data-bbox="1561 293 1711 357">1,663</td> <td data-bbox="1711 293 1843 357">(377)</td> <td data-bbox="1843 293 1955 357">(18%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 357 1406 432">Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits</td> <td data-bbox="1406 357 1561 432">9,394</td> <td data-bbox="1561 357 1711 432">8,246</td> <td data-bbox="1711 357 1843 432">(1,148)</td> <td data-bbox="1843 357 1955 432">(12%)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Please refer to the comments provided above under 1.1 of the officers' comments in response to the submissions by Submitter 1 which outlines the reasons for the reduction of \$771,000.</p> <p>In addition to the information above, operating cash represents:</p> <ul data-bbox="1081 655 2002 799" style="list-style-type: none"> • cash required to settle Council's net dues (liabilities) at the balance sheet date; • any excess operating income of the current year; and • funds that have not been spent in previous financial years. <p>Council has the option to use those excess funds for one-off projects or to place them in general reserve.</p> <p>Accordingly, Council had proposed to use \$377,000 of operating cash to fund some of the new one-off operating and capital projects included in the draft budget.</p> <p>The operating cash balance is different to the general reserve mentioned under 1.1 above.</p>	Discretionary reserves	7,353	6,583	(771)	(10%)	Operating cash	2,040	1,663	(377)	(18%)	Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits	9,394	8,246	(1,148)	(12%)
Discretionary reserves	7,353	6,583	(771)	(10%)														
Operating cash	2,040	1,663	(377)	(18%)														
Total cash in operating bank account and term deposits	9,394	8,246	(1,148)	(12%)														
		4. in support of above Comprehensive Income reduces from \$535000 23/24 to \$441,000 in 24/25 P37	It appears that there is a typing error made by the submitter as comprehensive income does not show the figures referred to in Submitter 1's submission. We have assumed that Submitter 1 is referring to the "Other income" figure shown on the Comprehensive Income Statement. However, neither <i>comprehensive income</i> nor <i>other income</i> provide an accurate picture of the movement in liquidity position especially in the case of financial statements for Local Government (LG) entities.															

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only																																				
		Income Statements																																					
		<p>5. While accepted that non recurring items in 22/23 would reduce comprehensive result for income statement 22/23 to circa \$1,300,000 22/23 While Draft 23/34 is \$427,000 ie Reduction of \$873,000 in forecast year P 37</p>	<p>Council is required to follow general-purpose financial statements provided by the State Government when presenting the draft budget.</p> <p>The comprehensive Income Statement is misleading in the Local Government context as it includes capital grants from other levels of government as an income item.</p> <p>The following table provides a comparable breakdown of the total comprehensive result:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1025 563 2024 1326"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1025 563 1624 715">Comprehensive Income Statement</th> <th data-bbox="1624 563 1767 715">Forecast Actual 2022–23 \$'000</th> <th data-bbox="1767 563 1917 715">Draft Budget 2023–24 \$'000</th> <th data-bbox="1917 563 2024 715">Note</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 715 1624 842">Total comprehensive result (page 37 draft budget)</td> <td data-bbox="1624 715 1767 842">1,999</td> <td data-bbox="1767 715 1917 842">427</td> <td data-bbox="1917 715 2024 842"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 842 1624 882"><u>Adjusted for</u></td> <td data-bbox="1624 842 1767 882"></td> <td data-bbox="1767 842 1917 882"></td> <td data-bbox="1917 842 2024 882"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 882 1624 922">Grants – capital (non-recurrent)</td> <td data-bbox="1624 882 1767 922">(2,239)</td> <td data-bbox="1767 882 1917 922">(1,417)</td> <td data-bbox="1917 882 2024 922">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 922 1624 962">Net gain on disposal of PPE and infrastructure</td> <td data-bbox="1624 922 1767 962">(735)</td> <td data-bbox="1767 922 1917 962">(35)</td> <td data-bbox="1917 922 2024 962">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 962 1624 1002">Timing of recurring operating grants</td> <td data-bbox="1624 962 1767 1002">539</td> <td data-bbox="1767 962 1917 1002">136</td> <td data-bbox="1917 962 2024 1002">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1002 1624 1074">Non-recurrent operating expenses (net of one-off operating grants)</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1002 1767 1074">331</td> <td data-bbox="1767 1002 1917 1074">806</td> <td data-bbox="1917 1002 2024 1074">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1074 1624 1145">Waste management cost to be recovered in future years</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1074 1767 1145">64</td> <td data-bbox="1767 1074 1917 1145">27</td> <td data-bbox="1917 1074 2024 1145">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1025 1145 1624 1326">Total comprehensive result after adjusting for non-recurring income and expense items and the timing of recurring income and expenses items</td> <td data-bbox="1624 1145 1767 1326">(40)</td> <td data-bbox="1767 1145 1917 1326">(56)</td> <td data-bbox="1917 1145 2024 1326"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Comprehensive Income Statement	Forecast Actual 2022–23 \$'000	Draft Budget 2023–24 \$'000	Note	Total comprehensive result (page 37 draft budget)	1,999	427		<u>Adjusted for</u>				Grants – capital (non-recurrent)	(2,239)	(1,417)	1	Net gain on disposal of PPE and infrastructure	(735)	(35)	2	Timing of recurring operating grants	539	136	3	Non-recurrent operating expenses (net of one-off operating grants)	331	806	4	Waste management cost to be recovered in future years	64	27	5	Total comprehensive result after adjusting for non-recurring income and expense items and the timing of recurring income and expenses items	(40)	(56)	
Comprehensive Income Statement	Forecast Actual 2022–23 \$'000	Draft Budget 2023–24 \$'000	Note																																				
Total comprehensive result (page 37 draft budget)	1,999	427																																					
<u>Adjusted for</u>																																							
Grants – capital (non-recurrent)	(2,239)	(1,417)	1																																				
Net gain on disposal of PPE and infrastructure	(735)	(35)	2																																				
Timing of recurring operating grants	539	136	3																																				
Non-recurrent operating expenses (net of one-off operating grants)	331	806	4																																				
Waste management cost to be recovered in future years	64	27	5																																				
Total comprehensive result after adjusting for non-recurring income and expense items and the timing of recurring income and expenses items	(40)	(56)																																					

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			<p>Notes:</p> <p>1: Grants – capital is based on the capital projects Council undertake and non-recurring in nature</p> <p>2: Net gain on disposal of PPE and infrastructure, represents accounting profit/loss of fixed assets disposals and sporadic in nature</p> <p>3: Council received 95% of the 2022–23 Financial Assistance Grant (FAG) allocation and 19% of the 2023–24 FAG allocation, in advance at the end of the 2021–22 financial year. As per the Australian Accounting Standards, Council needs to recognise FAG as an income when it is received as there are no specific funding obligations attached to FAG. Further, the Council has received full allocation of the Road to Recovery grant (recurring) for four years including the 2023–24 financial year at the beginning of the 4-year grant funding period.</p> <p>4: Non-recurring operating expenses, as mentioned under 1.3 above, Council use cash in specific reserve accounts and any excess operating projects to carry out one-off projects which will bring benefit to the community. These are one-off projects and will not create ongoing cost commitments for Council.</p> <p>5: Council manages waste management operations as a full cost recovery service. However, Council has decided to phase the process of achieving the full recovery status over a number of years. Council will temporarily fund a part of the operational cost until those costs are recovered in full in future years.</p> <p>Council officers consider, that due to the scale of the organisation and the annual budget, presenting an operating result on an ongoing basis reflects the true financial sustainability of Council.</p> <p>The purpose of providing a reconciliation of the Underlying Operating Result as determined using the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF) and the measure identified in the Council Plan is for the same purpose as explained above.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			<p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023. Those changes have impacted the results explained above.</p>
		<p>6. Employee costs appear to be forecast at 10% increase in draft budget 23/24(\$5.439M)- While income is capped at 3.5% p58</p>	<p>In addition to the increase in employee cost associated with the EBA increase and super guarantee increase, Council has proposed to allocate additional dedicated staff resources to key initiatives of Council as outlined in note 4.1.7. to the financial statements (pages 58 and 59 of the draft budget).</p> <p>However, Council has decided not to create the new administrative position proposed in the draft budget and not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role. As a result, the final budget projects employee cost for the 2023–24 year to be increased by \$324,000 (6.5%).</p> <p>This increase is mainly made up of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual EBA increase – 3.0% • Dedicated additional staff resources – 1.3% • Increase in employee cost due to band progression during the year (EBA) – 0.9% • Superannuation guarantee increase – 0.5% • Increase due to underestimated 2022–23 employee cost – 0.5%
		<p>7. Term Deposits are less than Inflation & will erode purchasing power ongoing- Are their alternatives ? eg Additions to Infrastructure Caravan Parks</p>	<p>Council has assumed an average interest rate of 3.6% for the 2023–24 financial year. Council will always try to optimise interest income on its Terms Deposits when investment decisions are made in line with the Council policy, Investment of Available Funds (CP011).</p> <p>Any change in the interest rate assumption is made after a budget performance review and reflected in an updated budget forecast at each quarter.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			Council has allocated a budget provision to initiate a development of Golightly Development Engagement Plan with the intention of investing in amenities of the Golightly caravan park to generate additional income streams.
		8. Qualitative - Analysis impact of State Government proposed restraints – Increase Wages for Aged Care Workers -needs some input p56	Council aged-care staff are covered by Council's EBA. The current EBA rates are above the award rate. As a result, the Council does not foresee an immediate financial impact.
		9. Methodology for Consultations costs including one off \$350,000 & approval limit caps would be welcome	As summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023, Council has reviewed the budget allocation and limited funding to the implementation of the first stage of the Golightly Development Plan and engagement project in 23/24. This new budget allocation is \$50,000.
		10. In summary it would appear reduction in Current asset is – (term Deposits) is necessary to Fund the Proposed Budget 23/24- not sustainable	Please refer to the comments provided above under 1.3 of the officers' comments in response to the submissions by Submitter 1.
2.	Submitter 2	<p>1. Recommendations regarding the rehabilitation of the Moonah woodlands behind the Rip View Carpark.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BMX track continues to significantly damage the Moonah woodland behind the Rip View carpark which has significant remnant plant species and it needs to be relocated outside of the park. • The area requires rehabilitation and the Friend of Buckley Park recommend that Council form a Working Group to develop a Rehabilitation Plan. • Friends of Buckley Park would like to participate in the Working Group and assist with the development of Rehabilitation Plan. 	It is anticipated that a coordinated weed management advisory forum will be formed in 2023/24 to assist in coordinating the efforts of Council, environmental groups and community volunteers in the management of weeds within coastal crown land. Council would be pleased to consider the Friends of Buckley Park as a participating stakeholder in the proposed forum.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>2. Observations and action regarding the co-ordination and effective enforcement of dog control and other activities on the ocean beach between the lighthouse and 4W.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council's current regulations and signage about dog controls and other public activities on the ocean beach including hooded plover breeding areas and public safety, are not currently effective nor coordinated with CoGG. • People generally would like to do the right thing and abide by regulations, and learn more about the place they love and contribute to its wellbeing, but the current signage and information is not clear or enforced. • Proposed Action: The Friends of Buckley Park (Bellawiyn) would like to be included in Council consultation processes as a stakeholder and resource towards the development of co-ordinated education programs and materials, signage and regulations about dog control and other activities that affect the safety of the coastal dune eco-system, its plants and wildlife within the Borough. 	<p>Council officers are in the process of updating new dog restriction signage for beaches following the recent review of our dogs on beach restrictions. We have been working with Parks Victoria to ensure both agencies signage is informative, accurate and in the right locations. Borough of Queenscliffe (BOQ) officers and Parks Victoria Rangers also worked collaboratively over the summer period to increase visibility and enforcement of dog restrictions on our beaches and support for hooded plover breeding.</p> <p>BoQ officers liaise with their counterparts at the City of Greater Geelong about dog restrictions on the Back Beach where the Council boundaries cross to ensure consistent dog restrictions as much as possible noting BoQ's stronger beach dog restrictions over the summer period.</p> <p>Officers are happy to work with The Friends of Buckley Park (Bellawiyn) as a stakeholder to improve dog restriction compliance and education among the community.</p>
		<p>3. Managing invasive weed species. Introduced invasive weed species continue to be a significant problem in Buckley Park (Bellawiyn) and the Park's bio-link areas within the Borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Action: 	<p>Council would be pleased to consider the Friends of Buckley Park as a participating stakeholder in the proposed coordinated weed management advisory forum.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>The Friends of Buckley Park (Bellawiyn) would like to be included in Council consultation processes towards the development of a Vegetation Management Plan for the Borough in relation to protection of the coastal dune system, the park itself and all bio-link areas.</p> <p>A Contractor to manage weeds frequently at Council cost...</p>	
3	Submitter 3	<p>What for and Why > 2 Cabins in QTP are in a very bad condition and somewhat "rotting". (Photos can be supplied) Just this weekend customers refused to use one of these cabins. Comment - Not a good look for BoQ!</p> <p>One of these cabins also has a Mice infestation! These 2 cabins have been <u>overlooked for years</u> without a replacement plan.<i>(please do not overlook any longer) - [In a commercial world, these cabins would have been replaced years ago, before they got into this bad condition]</i></p> <p>They also would have been 'written-off' the books many years ago.</p> <p>How > the replacement of these cabins (Assets) can be achieved through the land sale funds - as these are <i>income producing</i> with good ROI and therefore fit the purchase criteria.</p> <p>When > the replacement should be planed for this coming budget year, earlier the better to take advantage of the ROI. (Better ROI can be achieved with these NEW cabins as they can attract a better rental)(3-5 years return)</p> <p>Cost > i have roughly estimated that the purchase of 2 new cabins would be around \$120k each and the</p>	<p>Council has not yet finalised the Queenscliffe Tourist Park Operational review and your comments will be considered as a part of the operational review process.</p> <p>Council acknowledges the condition of the cabins in question. Council has retained those cabins to provide pet friendly budget accommodation options. Council currently looking at options for replacing or providing alternative budget accommodation options.</p> <p>The budget reflects feedback/input from various stakeholders such as members of the community, community organisations, Councillors, officers responsible for relevant areas, recommendations/requirements of other strategic and operational plans of Council etc. and not necessary views of the finance team (accountant).</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>balance of say \$300k be for the instalation and furniture > of course these would need to be properly costed, but at this time i simply provide a rough educated guess in which to review this proposal. Purchase costs are not getting any cheaper, therefore now would seem better that later.</p> <p>Summary > It is easy for the designer (accountant) of Budgets to overlook some matters, especially if there is no knowledge of matters. Therefore i wish to raise this matter then perhaps plans can be put in place to act on such an overdue issue and duty of care of BoQ assets.</p>	
4	Submitter 4	<p>1. There have been a number of occasions over the last 10 years when the functioning and sustainability of the small Queenscliff Borough Council have been of serious concern to the Borough ratepayers. Just as they are now. Many years ago, local residents and councillors employed a chair person or mediator, and workshopped a way forward for the Borough. The first of the more recent concerns was the proposal to sell the Murray Road land, considered in 2015, when a Development Plan Report was presented to Council in that year. Later, when the decision was made to sell the land, local organisations and individuals objected to the proposal, largely on the grounds that you do not sell an appreciating asset to fund operating expenses. And if the borough is unsustainable, we need to look at the many reasons why.</p>	<p>Ten years ago, the Council had close to \$1 million in loans on its balance sheet and just \$50,000 balance in the general reserve account.</p> <p>Today, Council's balance sheet is debt free and there is \$1.1 million in its general reserve account.</p> <p>Neither the draft budget nor draft financial plan indicate that the Borough is not financially sustainable based on the current operating model.</p> <p>Sales proceeds from the Murray Rd land are kept in a separate reserve account, to be used as per the Council policy "Sale, Exchange or Transfer of Council Land," CP044.</p> <p>\$350,000 from land sales proceeds are allocated in the draft budget for the Golightly Development Engagement Plan with the intention of identifying options/projects that will generate additional revenue streams for Council. However, as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023, Council has reviewed the budget allocation and limited funding to the implementation of the first stage of the Golightly Development Plan and engagement project in 23/24. This new budget allocation is \$50,000.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>If the Council is unviable, then it is time to look at reducing operating expenses, (collectively) addressing the problems or bottlenecks we have in advancing the backlog of capital works program, and finding a way forward.</p>	<p>The draft budget and draft financial plan do not include any allocation of sales proceeds from the Murray Rd land, to fund operating expenses.</p>
		<p>2. 2023 – 2024 Draft Budget - Dramatic escalation in proposed staffing costs These two figures jump off the page. A 3.5% rate increase would improve council revenue by a figure of \$243,000, against an unsustainable increase in staff costs by a whopping \$473,000</p>	<p>In addition to the increase in employee costs associated with the EBA increase and super guarantee increase, Council has proposed to allocate additional dedicated staff resources to key initiatives of Council as outlined in note 4.1.7. to the financial statements (pages 58 and 59 of the draft budget).</p> <p>However, Council has decided not to create the new administrative position proposed in the draft budget and not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role. As a result, the final budget projects employee cost for the 2023–24 year to be increased by \$324,000 (6.5%).</p> <p>This increase is mainly made up of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual EBA increase – 3.0% • Dedicated additional staff resources – 1.3% • Increase in employee cost due to band progression during the year (EBA) – 0.9% • Superannuation guarantee increase – 0.5% • Increase due to underestimated 2022–23 employee cost – 0.5%
		<p>3. It is clear there is no project management capability within the council administration. In addition to a substantial increase in staff costs, sits a \$100,000 project management cost for the PL Defence and Maritime Precinct development. There are many other consultancies buried within the figures for other work contemplated for this financial year. There is little work being done through to completion. Long term residents have been well aware of the financial constraints we face each year. Those newer</p>	<p>The completion of the Point Lonsdale Defence and Maritime Precinct project (Point Lonsdale Lighthouse Reserve Development – Stage 2) is not identified in the Borough's Council Plan's objectives and Council's on-going renewal projects for Council's existing assets. As such this project is additional to Council's planned resource levels and an allocation has been made to the project using grant funding which included conditions requiring the appointment of an external project manager.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>residents, with ideological and sociological aspirational projects, are not well versed on the significant financial constraints under which the QBC operates.</p>	
		<p>4. \$180,000 - install heating and cooling to the Town Hall. Response to enquiries, with councillors or council staff, suggest two reasons for the need for this expenditure. (1) The first suggested it was as a result of the need to discontinue the use of gas, as a part of the Climate Emergency Response Plan. i.e. the removal of the heating. (2) The second suggested the removal of the gas heaters was at the request of the Queenscliff Music Festival committee, at the time of their grant funded project to equip the Town Hall to accommodate the gig economy throughout the year</p> <p>how then were the removal/reinstallation costs prioritised against other works in the community that many would suggest are of more urgent need for the safety of the community, than the replacement of the gas heaters?</p> <p>that the gas heaters were removed at the request, or now to accommodate patrons of the Town Hall gig events, perhaps it is time for the Queenscliff Music Festival to step up and support the broader community and fund the necessary heating and cooling proposed in this council budget. The QMF has been given enormous support across several decades, and while they financially support musicians, and</p>	<p>A collaborative project undertaken with the QMF has been completed to optimise the utilisation of the Town Hall. This has resulted in the upgrade of sound equipment and provision of new audio-visual equipment which is available to the community (including groups like the local schools, the Queenscliff Literary Festival, The Lighthouse Theatre group, Queenscliff Film Festival to name a few).</p> <p>The equipment installed to date has been funded through grants obtained by the QMF and direct contributions made by QMF. Council appreciates the productive partnership with the QMF which has enabled the upgrade of community infrastructure.</p> <p>The replacement of Town Hall heating is considered to be a basic renewal requirement and is consistent with the responsibilities of managing community facilities of this nature.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>small donations to many volunteer groups with funding, it is time to look at their ability to return some of that support to the Borough as a community wide project (as opposed to smaller contributions to many local organisations) to ensure the future sustainability of the Borough of Queenscliff.</p> <p>What income has been received from the QMF Town Hall gigs since their inception?</p>	
		<p>1. Proposed \$10,000 Donation to the Lighthouse Arts Collective (a once only support). Could the need for this support in any way be considered to be as a result of the competition for patrons (on the off or shoulder season), with the more recent establishment of the Town Hall gigs?</p> <p>These comments should not be construed as negative comments against the Arts Collective, but as a realistic look at the quite dire financial position of the smallest local government area in Australia, and our inability to complete projects, or maintain our surrounds to a satisfactory level.</p>	<p>As summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023, Council has revised the draft budget and removed this one-off operating initiative.</p>
		<p>2. Murray Road Shared Path has been on the radar for some years now. I believe Jane Abbot has researched this topic widely, along with Joan Lindros. It would appear a concept design could be achieved at a fraction of the \$60,000 proposed in this draft budget.</p>	<p>A nominal amount has been allocated for the development of concept design options and engagement with the community. The nominal amount recognises the site has some level of complexity given the existing vegetation and assets within the road reserve, the adjacent environment, and likely differing views about an acceptable solution within the community.</p>
		<p>3. Golightly Park and the proposed \$350,000 needed. The QCA recently outlined a prior</p>	<p>Although the consultant has completed their review of the "Queenscliffe Tourist Parks – Management and Operation Review," the overall initiative is still in</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>community engagement on proposed plans for Golightly Park. The engagement feedback seems to have been overlooked in favour of a consultancy conducted by an operator whose experience is predominantly in the tourism sector in much warmer climates. While the consultancy was made public, feedback has not been requested from the community. One wonders why it was necessary to spend yet again on such a consultancy, given the prior and recent engagement.</p> <p>\$350,000 of Murray Road proceeds, is not in tune with the requirement to maintain the value of the asset, or to invest in a project that provides income equal to or greater than would have been the case if Murray Road had not been sold. Golightly Park is a Crown Land project, funds earned on Crown Land are spent on Crown Land. Murray Road land was privately owned by the Borough.</p>	<p>progress. The budget funding allocation addresses the process to move from concept to development.</p> <p>Council has reviewed the budget allocation and limited funding to the implementation of the first stage of the Golightly Development Plan and engagement project in 23/24. This new budget allocation is \$50,000.</p> <p>Approximately 70% of the land is owned by the Borough of Queenscliffe and therefore is freehold land while the balance of land at around 30% of the park is Crown Land.</p> <p>Any investment in the upgrade of park amenities using the sales proceeds from Murray Rd land will be primarily concentrated on the areas owned by Council.</p>
		<p>8. Adaptive Re-use of P1 huts and other PL&DMP – in the context of Golightly Park. While I can certainly understand Council's reluctance, given the significant constraints on our limited revenue, to proceed with a discussion around the adaptive re-use of the P1 huts, and the potential ongoing expenses that may be incurred in adding the huts and the Reserve to the Asset Management list; from a resident perspective, as long as Golightly Park is left unremediated, and inactive throughout most of the year, then the argument is not that the Council cannot afford to maintain the huts on Crown land, it is that</p>	<p>This observation is noted.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		the Council cannot remediate and operate a tourism centre to provide the necessary revenue to support Crown land expenses.	
		9. \$15,000 Needs analysis for child/family services and facilities, potential youth taskforce. This surprises me, in a community with a much older demographic, and a small younger community well catered for with sporting organisations. If you found there was a need, what would or could you do about that need within the constraints of our tight revenue conditions and with the backlog of works?	<p>If a need were identified through the analysis Council would need to review existing services to ensure we were providing the services most needed by our community.</p> <p>Council would also need to identify existing funding opportunities for the type of community infrastructure required to provide specific child/family services.</p> <p>However, as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023, Council has revised the draft budget and reduced the budget allocations to \$5,000 intending to carry out some work through the current programs.</p>
		10. \$15,000 Wadawurrung cultural and heritage review/assessment. What are we reviewing. Cultural Management research and documentation was undertaken some years ago. What is it that is being reviewed at this time, and for what pressing reason?	Council has allocated this money to the Wadawurrung Traditional Owners Aboriginal Corporation, which aligns with Council's Climate Emergency Response Plan and its Coastal Marine and Management Plan. It will enable Wadawurrung to complete a cultural values assessment for all marine and coastal land in the Borough and identify actions to heal Country and restore cultural landscapes.
		11. \$44,500 to undertake a beach marker condition assessment (70% grant funded). Is this otherwise known as a water safety risk audit, conducted annually as required, and completed by specialists from Life Saving Australia? Or is it a completely different project. If it is the water safety risk audit, The PLSLSC agree with the need for this work to be completed	The scope of this project is similar to the project proposed by the Submitter in previous budgets.
		12. \$20,000 for signage and continuous needs analysis for Hesse Street toilet. How much does a sign cost? How do you propose to analyse the situation to the tune of \$20,000?	As summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023, the budget allocation in the draft budget has been reviewed and reduced to \$10,000. The project will first focus on reviewing the public toilet strategy of the Council.
		13. Signage – Wadawurrung and other heritage signage, including signage that has been	This recommendation is noted.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>installed over last 12 months. It has been a constant in feedback over the last several terms of Council that we need a signage design and placement policy. A policy should be prepared ahead of the installation of Wadawurrung signage, and as a part of the signage component of the Point Lonsdale Defence and Maritime Precinct project.</p>	
		<p>14. Grant funding opportunities There is a lot of work in the pipeline, under discussion, and no advancement as no funds available. As an example - Royal Park oval and other works. On the oval fencing itself, separate to any other works, there have been several recent opportunities for sports grant funding – and it would appear, no applications made. Why? It appears to me a lost opportunity to get the badly rusted fence replaced</p>	<p>Council resolved to the defer the Royal Park project. Other projects then became the focus officers' work.</p>
		<p>15. The State of the State in past years our local member Lisa Neville has always looked after the Borough. While she withdrew the funding from DQ, she wanted it to stay in the Borough. For those who are not aware, there was an amount of \$970,000 for signage and story-telling around Queenscliff (not the Borough) as a part of DQ. A staggering amount in hindsight. And withdrawn. We will not see numbers like that again in the future. There was an equally staggering loss of \$1m dollars by the previous council, and there are long memories at both State and Federal level, and locally.</p>	<p>This observation is noted.</p>
5	Submitter 5	<p>1. 3.5% lift in our municipal rates and a 7.3% rise in waste collection charges for householders.</p>	<p>Searoad Ferries do pay rates at commercial rates and there is a significant increase with the inclusion of the new ferry terminal.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Ratepayers rarely complain about rate increases (Council always increases to the Govt limit) and our ever-rising waste charges. It always surprises me that 2 of the largest Borough enterprises pay relatively little or nothing in terms of their contribution to the financial wellbeing of the Borough – these being the Commonwealth army bases and The Ferry Operation which is now the largest in Australia apparently.</p> <p>Some Queenscliff ratepayers, such as myself, were stung by the degrading of our nearby parkland (Victoria Park) in recent times. Ratepayers who pay our dues year in and year out should be afforded greater respect I believe. It would be nice if Council finished the central section tree restoration this coming year. We have yet to see Council's latest plan which hopefully complements the recent perimeter plantings undertaken by the community.</p>	<p>An updated Victoria Park Planting Plan will be presented to Council in July.</p>
		<p>2. The size of the deficit we are facing</p> <p>There is much debate about this given Council's budget is indicating \$56,000 deficit or break-even whilst others, including some with financial backgrounds, are saying it will be \$990,000 if the full list capital works for 2023–24 is approved. Assuming the latter there needs to be no new staffing, limitations on the use of consultants (and some contractors) and only selected capital works projects that are affordable or government funded. The exception being initiatives such as Disability</p>	<p>Numerous sections of the draft budget, detail the projected underlying result as determined using the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF). On this basis the projected underlying result for the 2023–24 year is a deficit of \$990,000 (-7.9%). This information is clearly stated on pages 9, 10 and 76 of the draft budget papers.</p> <p>On page 9 of the draft budget papers officers set out how the LGPRF based underlying result is impacted by the timing of recurrent operating grants (especially Federal Assistance Grants), non-recurrent operating grants and non-recurrent operating expenses included in the budget of a particular year.</p> <p>As a result of this, Council officers consider the underlying result is more meaningful and presents a more accurate picture of the ongoing, annual financial</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Action Plan, Child/family services and facilities review and continued funding for aged care services in the Borough.</p>	<p>position of Council over time, when it excludes the impact of non-recurrent operating income and expense items, and, where applicable, is adjusted for the timing of recurrent operating grants. In other words, the Council plan measure tries to explain and account for the key drivers of the LGPRF based underlying result.</p> <p>The \$990,000 deficit figure is generated predominantly from budget allocations for one-off projects. These are projects that will be undertaken over a one- or two-year period.</p> <p>The money to fund these projects does not come at the expense of the funds that are allocated each year to run the business – these being recurring operational expenses and funds allocated for asset renewal requirements.</p> <p>Council has an option to use those funds for one-off projects or to place them in general reserve.</p> <p>Because they are one-off projects, they don't become recurring operation expenses and impact the longer-term financial position of Council. As result, taking into account that the money for the one-off projects is not additional to the funding recurring commitments, the projected underlying result in the draft budget papers, based on the Council plan measure, is a deficit of \$56,000.</p> <p>While undertaking these one-off projects, Council neither draws down money from its general reserve nor its budget for borrowings.</p> <p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023. Those changes have impacted the results explained above.</p>
		<p>3. The need to trim the capital works program in accordance with the deficit</p>	

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Some planned works seem to be carried over from previous budgets and go on for years e.g. CMMP, PLMDP, toilet blocks, Planning Scheme Reviews and Amendments. As a ratepayer I often wonder if Queenscliffe Council have too many projects happening together, including priority projects, and if it wouldn't be wiser to focus on a few in one year and do them well, then move on to others in following years.</p>	<p>Council has included a modest new capital works program in the 23/24 budget; this will enable to finish projects underway.</p>
		<p>4. Personally, I would like to see Victoria Park, Shortland's Bluff, PLMDP and the CMMP completed. I think the ATS (30km/h proposal and proposed street alterations) need to be reviewed (say 40km/h) and the ATS re-issued with some haste. I would also like to see a safety pathway installed from Hesse Street to the boat ramp. I have virtually given up on ever seeing a protected tree register for the Borough's streets and parklands (I still have a copy of Council's expensive consultant's report at hand if any Councillor wants to read it – old Point Lonsdale Streets feature heavily and are deemed significant for their tree coverage). Also there doesn't seem to be any provision in the budget for the implementation of the Bellarine DAL/SPP when approved.</p> <p>The great success story of this financial year has been the refurbishment of the former Toch H Huts at PLMDP which has been a long running saga for Point Lonsdale residents. We need to build on this with the additional \$1 million State funding and really make a nice job of it. Then we should then get them used by local groups.</p>	<p>Council notes these observations.</p> <p>The Hesse Street Boat ramp connection is planned, approved, and will commence construction early in the 23/24 Financial Year.</p> <p>The first stage of the Distinctive Areas and Landscape Planning Policy (DAL/SPP) implementation will be undertaken by the Minister for Planning. Once the ministerial amendment is approved and in place, Council will be able to plan for a proceeding and supplementary planning scheme amendment to address specific local matters.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>5. Councillors/Officers seem determined to proceed with Golightly Development Engagement Plan which at \$350,000 which seems an excessive amount to begin the project. We are told a safari style tent development along the coastal strip at Golightly Caravan Park has a much greater income raising potential than single site camping fees. Should this development materialise, after due consultation with all parties, then Council should consider returning the eastern section of our former Botanic Park (Victoria Park) to public parkland as a trade-off. Also I don't understand what exactly the carry-over \$350,000 is for at Royal Park – I read this somewhere in the document.</p>	<p>Council has reviewed the budget allocation and limited funding to the implementation of the first stage of the Golightly Development Plan and engagement project in 23/24. This new budget allocation is \$50,000.</p> <p>The funds Council allocated in its 2021–22 budget for Royal Park oval upgrade is held in a reserve account for future use.</p>
6	Submitter 6	<p>We are very disappointed about Council's draft 2023-2024 budget.</p> <p>We continue to pay much more than other parks in the area, with our annual fees thousands of dollars extra than all the Borough of Queenscliffe parks. With four adult children, we are also required to pay extra for them too and usually they only stay for a few days during Christmas. Shouldn't all the immediate family members be included in the exorbitant fees?</p> <p>In comparison to other parks, our amenities are sparse with no allocation for capital improvements to Golightly. Other parks have newer amenities with a communal kitchen and barbecue area. Short-stay visitors at Golightly will often ask where the other facilities are for cooking eg microwave and are astounded when told there are none.</p>	<p>Council is in the process of developing a governance structure for each park as a part of the ongoing operational review process. Council has made changes to the fees and charges in the Budget papers and subsequently the rules and regulations for Golightly Park to allow immediate family members to stay without extra fees being required.</p> <p>Council will soon start a process to develop a Golightly Development Engagement Plan based on the recently commissioned "Queenscliffe Tourist Parks Management and Operation Review" with the intention of identifying options/projects to upgrade of park amenities using the sales proceeds from Murray Rd land.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>We have had so much of council money spent on studies regarding future use and still, after all this time, nothing has been decided. Why do we need another one? Golightly park users contribute so much to the local economy and our rates are an excellent source of income to the Borough, please reconsider Council's draft budget.</p>	
7	Submitter 7	<p>1. I have briefly reviewed the suggested budget and note that money has been allocated to employ new staff. Especially an executive assist for \$126K.</p> <p>The issue I have, that even though there is plenty of staff we never hear from them. I wonder how much time they spend in the community talking to ratepayers. It appears some talk to business more often and as we have run a number of businesses we appreciate this.</p> <p>In my previous life I spent considerable time talking to customers, at the direction of the Board and senior management. My mission was take the message back to middle management and very often it needed a change in culture. A change to an increased focus on customers and less focus on agreeing with the boss. More often than not it was management by fear, which in the end results in less contact with customers.</p> <p>The BOQ recently employed an environmental officer. As active weed warriors we would have thought there would have been some contact. No contact and we know that you can't pull</p>	<p>Council has decided not to create the new executive assistant role position proposed in the draft budget and not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>weeds from behind a desk. We do not need any more employees at BOQ Head office.</p>	
		<p>2. As the BOQ expects to run at a loss again! A complete and independent review by experienced professionals is critical. I am suggesting to all Councilors that they do not pass the draft budget in its current form. Lets have an independent review. I am circulating this email to all Councilors and locals who indicate that they share our concerns.</p>	<p>Council is in a much better financial situation compared to where it was 10 years ago. Ten years ago, Council had close to \$1 million in loans on its balance sheet and just \$50,000 balance in the general reserve account.</p> <p>Today, Council's balance sheet is debt free and has \$1.1 million in its general reserve account.</p> <p>The \$990,000 deficit figure in the draft budget is generated predominantly from budget allocations for one-off projects. These are projects that will be undertaken over a one- or two-year period.</p> <p>The money to fund these projects does not come at the expense of the funds that are allocated each year to run the business – these being recurring operational expenses and funds allocated for asset renewal requirements.</p> <p>In addition to any excess operating income from the current year, the money to fund the one-off projects is sourced from funds that have not been spent in previous financial years. For example, money from asset sales, operational savings, or projects that have not proceeded. Council may also generate savings when a grant is received for an asset renewal project.</p> <p>Council has an option to use those funds for one-off projects or to place them in general reserve.</p> <p>Because they are one-off projects, they don't become recurring operation expenses and do not impact the longer-term financial position of Council. As a result, taking into account that the money for the one-off projects is not additional to the funding recurring commitments, the projected underlying result in the draft budget papers, based on the Council plan measure is a deficit of \$56,000.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			<p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023. Those changes have impacted the results explained above.</p> <p>While undertaking these one-off projects, Council neither draws down money from its general reserve nor its budget for borrowings.</p>
8	Submitter 8	<p>1. We have been stating for over 23 years the financial divide continue to grow between Parks. This year, you are proposing that Golightly annual site holders are to pay up to \$3,442.00 more than other Park site holders. This divide is unjustified and totally unfair, especially given no capital has been expended on any facility upgrades. Your proposed increase of 3.5% across board significantly contribute to the great divide. (Per previous years). We request that Golightly annual site holders receive the same increase as your onsite cabins, which is 0%.</p>	<p>Council believes that the 3.5% increase proposed in the draft budget is reasonable considering the anticipated cost escalations of Council's operations due to the prevailing economic conditions (CPI 7.0% , Over the twelve months to the March 2023 quarter). Operational costs of the parks are expected to increase by more than 3.5%.</p> <p>Unlike other caravan parks Council manages, approximately 70% of the land is owned by the Borough of Queenscliffe and therefore is freehold land whilst the balance of land at around 30% of the park is Crown Land. Further, most of the sites are on annual permits limiting Council's ability to use those sites differently.</p> <p>As a result, the annual permit fees of Golightly Park need to reflect the return the Council would otherwise have earned if the Council-owned land had been used otherwise.</p> <p>The current valuation of the land owned by the Council is \$5.4 million, applying the prevailing interest rate (4.5%), the Council should be earning a return closer to \$243,000 minimum.</p> <p>Page 17 of the draft budget indicates that the surplus attributable to Golightly Park based on % of income would be approximately \$204,000 in 2023–24 and increase to \$224,000 by 2026–27.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>2. Why are all sites 3.5% and cabins are 0%.</p>	<p>Council has benchmarked its tourist park fees with similar parks in the region. As a result, a new weekend tariff (Friday & Saturdays) for cabins has been proposed. The Sunday to Thursday tariffs are based on the 2022–23 financial year cabin rate and therefore show as a 0% increase.</p>
		<p>3. For the past 2 years we have requested the below: Given the high fees that are applicable only to Golightly, we request that annual permits should include the following visitors;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The owners of a van - Any person from the owner's immediate family -The above comes with a few strict conditions, such as - The number of people staying in a van at any one time must not exceed the number of people the van can sleep - Queenscliff Tourist Parks must be advised whenever people from within the family group are going to stay at the van. - The existing restrictions about the number of days that the van can be used remain <p>- There is to be no sub-letting The Council's pervious response was that this would be investigated as part of the operational review, however, there was no reference, and it was ignored in the last year's budget process. Again, we request tis as part of the Council's 2022-2023 draft budget submission process.</p>	<p>Council has not yet been able to finalise the development of a governance structure for each park as communicated earlier. Council will consider making changes to accommodate some of these requests as they relate to the rules and regulations for Golightly Park.</p>
		<p>4. Over the past 20 years, Council has conducted approximately six reviews on the future use of Golightly Caravan Park. Nothing has resulted. We note that you are proposing yet another review at a cost of \$350,000 (Funds from the sale of Murray Road). Surely, there have been</p>	<p>Council will soon commence a process to develop a Golightly Development Engagement Plan based on the recently commissioned "Queenscliffe Tourist Parks. Management and Operation Review" with the intention of identifying options/projects to upgrade of park amenities using the sales proceeds from Murray Rd land.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>enough reports and consultants. The Council has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on consultants and reports, yet nothing has been delivered. The community has spoken and been very clear with the message that Golightly Caravan Park is critical to the economy, to tourism and they want it to stay.</p> <p>GCPRAI have presented endless proposals to Council over the past twenty years. All have been ignored. Please refer attachments to this submission which is a copy of the business plan presented any years ago. We firmly believe that funds should be invested in doing something, not another report to add to the numerous ones that have been previously commissioned.</p>	<p>Council will certainly engage with all stakeholders especially GCPRAI to identify suitable options/projects.</p>
9	Submitter 9	<p>yet again proposing to increase in fees for Tourist Park by 3.5%, yet there is zero investment in the amenities in the park. The Fees in GoLightly Tourist Park continue to rise and currently they are in the order of 30% higher than any of the other Borough Tourist Parks. Over this Same period there has been investment in facilities in the Recreation Park and Royal Park.</p> <p>I also note that Council is proposing No fees for the Cabins that Council has installed at the Recreation Tourist Park. It does seem to be ironic in the least, that for Council funded assets there is zero increase, and then Council uses the occupancy rates of these Cabins as reason to promote more Cabins across the Borough. Instead, Council can impose an increase of 3.5% to all Golightly Tourist Park fees.</p>	<p>Council believes that the 3.5% increase proposed in the draft budget is reasonable considering the anticipated cost escalations of Council's operations due to the prevailing economic conditions (CPI 7.0%, over the twelve months to the March 2023 quarter). Operational costs of the parks are expected to increase by more than 3.5%.</p> <p>Unlike other caravan parks Council manages, approximately 70% of the land is owned by the Borough of Queenscliffe and therefore is freehold land while the balance of land at around 30% of the park is Crown Land. Further, the majority of the sites are on annual permits limiting Council's ability to use those sites differently.</p> <p>As a result, the annual permit fees of Golightly Park need to reflect the return the Council would otherwise have earned if the Council-owned land had been used otherwise.</p> <p>The current valuation of the land owned by the Council is \$5.4 million, applying the prevailing interest rate (4.5%), the Council should be earning a return closer to \$243,000 in minimum.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Over the past 20 years there have been at least 5 consultants commissioned by the Borough to report on the best method to improve the operation of Golightly Tourist Park or review the operation of the Boroughs' Tourist Parks. Each Consultant has made their respective recommendations but No action has ever been taken by Council to implement any of these recommendations. Within this draft budget there is a further allocation of \$350,000 for yet another study, this time "Development of a Development and Engagement Plan".</p> <p>I request,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For Council to immediately implement a Borough wide consistent approach for Tourist Park fees. 2. Consider some capital investment into GoLightly Tourist Park to improve the facilities. 	<p>Page 17 of the draft budget indicates that the surplus attributable to Golightly Park based on % of income would be approximately \$204,000 in 2023–24 and increase to \$224,000 by 2026–27.</p> <p>Council will start a process soon to develop a Golightly Development Engagement Plan based on the recently commissioned "Queenscliffe Tourist Parks – Management and Operation Review" with the intention of identifying options/projects to upgrade of park amenities using the sales proceeds from Murray Rd land.</p> <p>Council will certainly engage with all stakeholders especially GCPRAI to identify suitable options/projects.</p>
10	Submitter 10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The significant disparity between fees for Queenscliff Recreation Reserve Tourist Park and Golightly Tourist Park. The difference ranges between 33% and 50% higher fees for Golightly Park. <p>NB: From the Draft Budget – Surely the fees for Golightly Park Level C sites are not planned to increase by almost 8% to \$9120.00 (shown as a 0% increase) and is more realistically to be \$8745.00 (a 3.5% increase)</p>	<p>Council believes that the 3.5% increase proposed in the draft budget is reasonable considering the anticipated cost escalations of Council's operations due to the prevailing economic conditions (CPI 7.0%, over the twelve months to the March 2023 quarter). Operational costs of the parks are expected to increase by more than 3.5%.</p> <p>Unlike other caravan parks Council manages, approximately 70% of the land is owned by the Borough of Queenscliffe and therefore is freehold land while the balance of land at around 30% of the park is Crown Land. Further, the majority of the sites are on annual permits limiting Council's ability to use those sites differently.</p> <p>As a result, the annual permit fees of Golightly Park need to reflect the return the Council would otherwise have earned if the Council-owned land had been used otherwise.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			<p>The current valuation of the land owned by the Council is \$5.4 million, applying the prevailing interest rate (4.5%), the Council should be earning a return closer to \$243,000 in minimum.</p> <p>Page 17 of the draft budget indicates that the surplus attributable to Golightly Park based on % of income would be approximately \$204,000 in 2023–24 and increase to \$224,000 by 2026-27.</p> <p>It is a typing error and the proposed increase is 3.5% to \$8,745.</p>
		<p>2. The absence of any allocation for capital improvement for work at Golightly Park, in contrast to the significant upgrade to the various facilities at Queenscliff Recreation Reserve in 2022–23.</p> <p>The reference to a \$350,000 new initiative for a 'Development of a Golightly Development and Engagement Plan' seems an expense that has already been extensively covered with the 6 previous investigations into planned tourist park initiatives.</p>	<p>Council will start a process soon to develop a Golightly Development Engagement Plan based on the recently commissioned "Queenscliffe Tourist Parks – Management and Operation Review" with the intention of identifying options/projects to upgrade of park amenities using the sales proceeds from Murray Rd land.</p>
		<p>3. Under 'Fees and Charges' – 'Tourist Parks' it specifies 'Go Lightly (based on 2 adults & 4 children)'. This would indicate the acceptance of Golightly Park as a family park. Why is it that immediate family members suddenly become chargeable after 17 years of age. Surely the inclusion of immediate family members in the annual fee despite their age would encourage more use and subsequently more money being spent in the Queenscliff Borough.</p>	<p>Council is in the process of developing a governance structure for each park as a part of the ongoing operational review process. Council has made changes to the fees and charges in the Budget papers and subsequently the rules and regulations for Golightly Park to allow immediate family members to stay without extra fees being required.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
11	Submitter 11	1. The 2023/24 budget papers (Page17 Crown Land Management) declares that Golightly Park will return a loss of approx \$210,000 in each of the five years 2022/23- 2026/27 (\$1.0 million in total). This is contrary to the obligations the Council has under its charter to look after the Borough's Assets and maximise the return on its assets to the benefit of the community at large'.	Page 17 of the draft budget indicates that the surplus attributable to Golightly Park based on % of income would be approximately \$204,000 in 2023–24 and increase to \$224,000 by 2026–27.
		2. A formal valuation be obtained for all three parcels of land from an organisation/individual with local knowledge. (In the 2022 Borough's annual accounts, Golightly Park was valued at \$5.4 million, Murray Road at \$1.4 million and Camp Wyuna land unknown).	As per the Option Land valuation as at 30 June 2022. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remainder – 260 Fellows Road (Murray Rd) , 5.39 Ha – \$1.4 million • Golightly Park, 2 Bowen Road, 7,967 m2 – \$5.4 million • Camp Wyuna – 71 & 71A Flinders Street, 3.517 Ha – \$2.9 million
		3. Golightly Park — Put on hold any proposed spending on improvements to the existing facilities. Only spend money on maintaining the current facilities until a decision is made re it's future.	Council notes this recommendation
		4. Murray Road Land — Prepare a plan of the area to determine what is impacted by the Department of Environment embargo of some twenty years ago and get the Department to update their earlier assessment. Should this update reduce the restricted area ,then the balance would be freed up for Council to sell on the open market or alternatively, develop some low cost housing.	The majority of the northern portion of Murray Road cannot be developed because of the biodiversity and ecological classification of the vegetation on the site.
		5. Camp Wyuna Land — This valuation will guide Council in the Lease arrangements it has with the YMCA, Geelong who operate Camp Wyuna.	This land sits within the declared coastal foreshore area and is now subject to the provisions of the Marine and Coastal Act 2018; this would limit development on the land to a coastal dependent use and any updated valuation would reflect these limitations on the site.

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>6. With Council Cash holdings in decline from a Budgeted \$5.746 million in 2023/24 to less than \$1.0 million by 2027/28(4years) and continues to decline over the next 6 years, this begs the question 'Where is the cash going during this period??'</p> <p>The Budget indicates a small surplus of approx. \$500,000 over the same four year period(2023/24 — 2027/28) and a further \$4,4 million surplus over the following six years (see pages 16 and 17 of the Budget papers) It would appear that a \$1.5 million additional revenue from the above Golightly Park proposal would assist greatly, this representing 16.4% of the 2025/26 budgeted 'Rates and Charges' of \$9.136 million.</p>	<p>Council has identified some indicative priority capital projects in its Financial Plan (projections beyond the 2023–24 financial plan). Council usually takes a conservative approach to identifying potential grant income for capital projects in its income statement.</p> <p>As per the statement of Cash Flows (page 40 of the draft budget), projected "Payments for property, infrastructure, plant and equipment" are much higher compared to the projected capital grant income, indicating that Council will use its cash for those indicative capital projects.</p> <p>Those are only indicative projects and grant funding opportunities and community input will be considered before including them in future annual budgets.</p>
		<p>7. I suggest that Council establish a sub - committee, independent of Council but responsible to Council titled' Expenditure Review Committee' where all nonrecurring expenditure exceeding \$100,000 flowing from the Council Plan would be reviewed and endorsed prior to approval by Council. The members of this sub-committee (four persons) should be suitably qualified/experienced to carry out the review task.</p> <p>Such an approval process would also protect any funds on deposit (\$30 million) from any future problematic / ambitious spending activity.</p> <p>There is a precedent for such a committee, as following the amalgamation of Councils in the early 1990s, the State (Kennett) Government of the day directed all the newly amalgamated</p>	<p>This is a matter that could be investigated by Council outside of the current budget process.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Councils (including the 'stand atone' Borough of Queenscliffe) to establish such a committee. This process continued to around the year 2000. I happened to be one of the four persons on the Queenscliff committee.</p> <p>The future of Queenscliff's independence will be determined in part, by it's ability to maintain a financially viable operation with little or no debt. Ensuring its Assets are well maintained and where appropriate maximise the return on these assets will be key to maintaining a financial viability and independence.</p> <p>Contrast this with what is occurring in the Greater City of Geelong.</p>	
12	Submitter 12	<p>1. A council's job is to focus on rates, roads and rubbish. This draft budget appears to offer little to improve these basics but seems to be more aligned with social agendas. Ratepayers want the basics to be done properly and it appears at the moment they are not.</p> <p>Given the current economic situation, namely increasing inflation, interest rates, cost of living, energy and fuel prices, it is disappointing that the Borough wants to pass on a full 3.5% rate increase, which was stated as being in line with the State Government's rate capping framework. Instead of trying to shave spending in the budget to find relief for ratepayers it appears you want to pass on the full increase. Particularly now that the Victorian State Government has increased taxes on families with a second dwelling, of which there would be many within the Borough.</p>	<p>The 2023–24 budget prioritises the following services that Council is required to deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services that the Council is obligated to deliver under various (non-negotiable) legislative requirements (e.g. waste management, street lighting, the appearance of public places, administering the state and local planning schemes etc) • Services that Council delivers under a formal agreement with another tier of government (e.g. aged services, coastal protection, management of crown land, maternal and child health services etc) <p>The cost of the above two categories of services accounts for 86% of the total cash operating expenses.</p> <p>In addition to the above priorities, Council has prioritised asset renewal work over new/upgrade capital work.</p> <p>The provision of these services and activities will be subject to the CPI increase of over 5.0% through the 23/24 financial year (based on RBA projections). The difference between the rate cap and the costs incurred through CPI increases represent the operational savings made by Council in preparing the budget.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>2. The staffing costs are also of concern considering the Borough is one of the smallest Councils in the country, and the budgeted increase in staff costs, in addition to a \$126,000 budgeted for a new position, namely an executive-level administrative assistance officer, key project management and Council governance support is highly concerning. Surely with current staffing levels at the Borough the requirements of this position can be taken on by current employees without the burden of other highly paid positions? In total the increase of employee costs of 9.5% (3.0% increase in line with the EBA and 0.5% super guarantee increase) is worrying for the size of our council.</p>	<p>In addition to the increase in employee costs associated with the EBA increase and super guarantee increase, Council has proposed to allocate additional dedicated staff resources to key initiatives of Council as outlined in note 4.1.7. to the financial statements (pages 58 and 59 of the draft budget).</p> <p>However, Council has decided not to create the new administrative position proposed in the draft budget and not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role. As a result, the final budget projects employee cost for the 2023–24 year to be increased by \$324,000 (6.5%).</p> <p>This increase is mainly made up of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual EBA increase – 3.0% • Dedicated additional staff resources – 1.3% • Increase in employee cost due to band progression during the year (EBA) – 0.9% • Superannuation guarantee increase – 0.5% • Increase due to underestimated 2022–23 employee cost – 0.5%
		<p>3. Another concern is the money being budgeted for reviews, plans and assessments. \$30,000 for the development of a Disability Action Plan, \$15,000 to conduct a needs analysis for child/family services and facilities, potential inclusion of youth taskforce, \$15,000 to conduct a Wadawurrung cultural and heritage review/assessment, \$6,000 to conduct Wadawurrung cultural and heritage awareness training for the community and Council. Why in this current climate are any of these necessary? Once again, the basics are not being done and</p>	<p>Council has a legislative obligation to create some of these plans and assessments e.g. Disability Action Plan. Council notes these observations.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>families are feeling the cost of living pressures, yet the Borough is budgeting for projects that will offer no immediate benefit or relief to the Borough.</p>	
		<p>4. Another concern is the \$10,000 budgeted for the Lighthouse Arts Collective. There are many groups within the Borough that rely on fundraising to support their requirements, Lonsdale Board riders is one of those that do this very successfully and give back to the community. So why should the Lighthouse Arts Collective be supported by the Borough whilst other groups are self sustaining? The time has come to stop the hand outs and let these groups apply for State/Federal government grants, fundraise for themselves and leave the ratepayers monies to deal with the basic requirements of a Council.</p>	<p>Council has revised the draft budget and removed this one-off operating initiative.</p>
13	Submitter 13	<p>The QCA has stated its position in the public letter to the Rip and has been echoed in the urgent Councillor Motion of 24 May, 2023. The primary concern, as raised and confirmed in the QCA meeting with Councillors, CEO and Officers is that operating expenditure is greater than operating income to the tune of \$990,000 for the upcoming year. For a small Borough with limited resources this is a staggering and materially significant amount. The Draft Budget needs to be recast and advertised measures undertaken to put the current</p>	<p>Council has provided a detailed response to the Rip regarding the letter QCA's has sent setting out its assessment of the draft budget.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <p>The \$990,000 deficit figure is generated predominantly from budget allocations for one-off projects. These are projects that will be undertaken over a one- or two-year period.</p> <p>The money to fund these projects does not come at the expense of the funds that are allocated each year to run the business – these being recurring operational expenses and funds allocated for asset renewal requirements.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Draft Budget back into operating surplus. The Draft Budget then needs to be represented to the community for further comment. The fiscal discipline of such a measure has been recognised by a Councillor. To create an operating surplus requires expenditure cuts and/or measures to increase revenue streams. To raid the reserves without proper community consultation reflects poor governance, accountability and engagement. In light of the recent report from LGV and Dept of Jobs, Precincts and Regions it states To remain financially sustainable councils ideally need to record small adjusted underlying surpluses over the medium to long term. In the short term, the QCA recommends it is imperative that this Council run operating surpluses not deficits. Financial viability is a responsibility of Councillors. The Councillors must have the confidence that they fully understand the budget and sign off on actions and strategies that achieve this fundamental financial responsibility</p>	<p>Council has an option to use those funds for one-off projects or to place them in general reserve.</p> <p>Because they are one-off projects, they don't become recurring operation expenses and impact the longer-term financial position of Council. As result, considering that the money for the one-off projects is not additional to the funding recurring commitments.</p> <p>While undertaking these one-off projects, Council neither draws down money from its general reserve nor its budget for borrowings.</p> <p>Numerous sections of the draft budget detail use of reserves for the one-off projects proposed.</p> <p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023. Those changes have impacted the results explained above.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
14	Submitter 14	<p>Waste collection charges</p> <p>1. 7.3% overall increase in waste collection charges for residential properties comprising kerbside waste charge of \$316.52 and public waste collection charge of \$112.72 (public parks and streets) resulting in a total waste charge in 2023–24 of \$429.24 per property. This is now a flat fee charge (was previously based on CIV) which is not capped in the same way as rates i.e. Council is entitled to recoup all costs associated with its waste collection and disposal operations.</p> <p>From a ratepayer perspective there may be a temptation at local government level to load up this charge(s) with as many costs as possible relating to waste collection and disposal. The Association also notes that over 50% of Borough properties are not occupied for most of the year (holiday homes) especially in Point Lonsdale which creates some issues around fairness if they are charged the full rate.</p> <p>There is also an argument that waste collection from public parks (crown land) is largely created by tourist activity (day visitors) and therefore a portion of the net proceeds from fees in 4 crown land caravan parks (some \$700,000 annually) should be used to partially offset the proposed \$112.72 annual waste charge to be levied on residential and other property owners.</p> <p>The Association believes that these increases for non-resident ratepayers will push more to list properties onto short term platforms, instead of</p>	<p>The Borough's kerbside waste services charge is based on a full cost recovery basis and the waste charges are not subject to the rate cap as noted. Costs that can be considered for recovery through waste services charges are regulated.</p> <p>Increases to the Borough's waste charges have been managed through the transition of kerbside waste services and are among the lowest when benchmarked against councils within the G21 region. Council will continue to manage increases to waste management charges while complying with State Government policy and legislation including the mandatory introduction of a glass collection service.</p> <p>However, Council has decided not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role as proposed in the draft budget which has resulted in a \$3.24 reduction in waste management charges for each residential property against the charges proposed in the draft budget.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>the long-term rental market. This along with other recent State Government budget changes will further squeeze the rental market on the Bellarine.</p>	
		<p>Increasing EFT (Staffing Numbers)</p> <p>2. The Association is concerned with further increases in Council staff numbers (47 EFT up from 43 not so long ago),The budget figures suggest more staff are to be hired and existing staff will receive annual increases which is expected to cost ratepayers some \$480,000 more in people costs. The budget specifically lists \$126,000 to appoint a new executive level administration assistant, we also understand that the Manager Community Services position is to be yet to be filled following a recent resignation and possibly another new staffing position is being contemplated. With respect to the new executive level administration assistant the Association believes that this increase in staffing is not needed and no valid business case for this new appointment has been released to the community. If there is a demonstrated need articulated to ratepayers/community, the Association is happy to reconsider its stance on this issue. Some consideration of multi-skilling or staff redeployment might also be considered appropriate by Council.</p>	<p>In addition to the increase in employee costs associated with the EBA increase and super guarantee increase, Council has proposed to allocate additional dedicated staff resources to key initiatives of Council as outlined in note 4.1.7. to the financial statements (pages 58 and 59 of the draft budget).</p> <p>However, Council has decided not to create the new administrative position proposed in the draft budget and not to convert the Waste Management Officer role to a full-time role. As a result, the final budget projects employee cost for the 2023–24 year to be increased by \$324,000 (6.5%).</p> <p>This increase is mainly made up of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual EBA increase – 3.0% • Dedicated additional staff resources – 1.3% • Increase in employee cost due to band progression during the year (EBA) – 0.9% • Superannuation guarantee increase – 0.5% • Increase due to underestimated 2022–23 employee cost – 0.5% <p>FTE forecast for 2022–23 is understated due to temporary staff vacancies. If there had not been any staff vacancies, the FTE forecast for 2022–23 would have been 45.42. There is a 0.84 FTE increase for the 2023–24 year as detailed in note 4.1.7 of the final budget.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>To help repair the budget position we propose delaying or abandoning staffing appointments thereby saving some \$200,000 annually.</p>	
		<p>3. Need to Review the Use and Costs Associated with Consultant Services</p> <p>There is concern in the community with the overuse of consultants and it's often difficult for residents to determine a figure for "external people costs" some of which are apportioned to Services and Materials. As part of this year's budget process, it's pleasing that Council officers have provided an Operational Contractors Spend Report (listing some 19 ongoing contract) detailing costs of \$2,090,112 for the 23/24 Budget up from \$1,943,497 in 22/23. This information will be useful not only for the coming financial year but as a benchmarking tool against future budgets.</p> <p>However, to complete the picture we still need to understand the costs associated with the ongoing use of external consultants. A guesstimate of last year's costs for consultant services is upwards of \$500,000. Based on the projects proposed to be undertaken in 2023–24, which of course is subject to Council approval of the final budget, we estimate these costs will be upwards of \$400,000 in 2023/24. Added to this</p>	<p>Council notes the information requests and the suggested review of the process of establishing project briefs. These matters will be considered by Council outside the current budget process.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>concern residents are often unable to access completed consultant reports commissioned by Queenscliffe Council, even under FOI provisions. As part of the Budget process and ongoing Council operations, the Association therefore recommends that Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the annual cost of hiring external consultants and try to do more of this work in-house. • Make the annual costs of hiring consultants publicly available. • To avoid non-endorsement of consultant reports Councillors must become actively involved in the creation of consultant and contractor briefs and have knowledge of the final tendering process for these activities. • Consider reinstating the Governance and Finance Advisory Committee with community representatives. 	
		<p>4. Spending Review and Capital Works The budget projects a deficit of some \$56,000 (effectively a break-even budget in 2023–24) however at recent civic association meeting with Council residents indicated that if the list of capital works is approved the real deficit could be up to \$1 million requiring Council to dip into its General Fund. We suggest Council review its budget spending, including some of the larger capital works items and priority be given to those projects that already have State and Commonwealth Government funding i.e. the Point Lonsdale Maritime and Defence Precinct (\$1 million),</p>	<p>The proposed capital expenditure will not have a direct impact on the underlying deficit (underlying result). The proposed capital project may have an impact in future years due to additional asset operational and asset renewal demands of new or upgraded assets.</p> <p>2023–24 Draft budget presents underlying results for 2023–24 financial year under two scenarios.</p> <p>A deficit of \$990,000 using the Local Government Performance Reporting Framework (LGPRF) and deficit of \$56,000 using the Council plan measure.</p> <p>Information about the LGPRF based deficit is clearly stated on pages 9, 10, 76 and 78 of the draft budget papers.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>Recreation Reserve lighting upgrade (\$160,000) or those likely to receive Government funding (foreshore fencing works in the Narrows). We understand there is State Government election funding available for the installation of a Neighbourhood Battery (some \$500,000) sometime in the future</p>	<p>On page 9 of the draft budget papers, officers set out how the LGPRF based underlying result is impacted by the timing of recurrent operating grants (especially Federal Assistance Grants), non-recurrent operating grants and non-recurrent operating expenses included in the budget of a particular year.</p> <p>The \$990,000 deficit figure in the draft budget is generated predominantly from budget allocations for one-off projects. These are projects that will be undertaken over a one- or two-year period.</p> <p>The money to fund these projects does not come at the expense of the funds that are allocated each year to run the business – these being recurring operational expenses and funds allocated for asset renewal requirements.</p> <p>In addition to any excess operating income of the current year, the money to fund the one-off projects is sourced from funds that have not been spent in previous financial years. For example, money from asset sales, operational savings, or projects that have not proceeded. Council may also generate savings when a grant is received for an asset renewal project.</p> <p>Council has the option to use those funds for one-off projects or to place them in general reserve.</p> <p>Even if Council decides to go ahead with all these one-off projects, there is no need for Council to draw down money from its general reserve or its budget for borrowings.</p> <p>As stated in the draft budget, Council has a healthy general reserve balance of \$1.1 million (equivalent to 10% of recurrent operating expenses) and a healthy asset renewal reserve balance of \$1.3 million (almost 100% of annual depreciation expenses).</p> <p>Even after the proposed one-off projects, the draft budget predicts a \$27,000 transfer into the general reserve (page 13 and page 66 of the draft budget).</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
			<p>Council officers consider, that due to the scale of the organisation and the annual budget, presenting an underlying result on an ongoing basis (Council Plan based measure) reflects the true financial sustainability of Council and is a more accurate indicator than the LGPRF measure.</p> <p>However, Council has decided to defer/revise the scope of some of the projects proposed in the draft budget as summarised in agenda item 16.2, Ordinary Meeting of Council 28 June 2023. Those changes have impacted the results explained above.</p>
		<p>5. Point Lonsdale Maritime and Defence Precinct (PLMDP)</p> <p>With respect to the Point Lonsdale Maritime and Defence Precinct the Association understand that Council and DEECA have reached agreement over the \$1 million State Government grant and the monies will be used for (1) improving accessibility, (2) restoration of defence structures, (3) providing electricity to the buildings and (4) tidying up the lighthouse surrounds. We also understand that Council will appoint a Project Control Group and Project Manager as part of the redevelopment project.</p> <p>We also understand there will be a separate "design and construct" \$130,000 budget allocation for a new toilet block on the site. The original figure for this project was \$180,000. Given the length of time taken to get the PLMDP rejuvenation this far the Association supports both projects but question whether: (1) \$130,000 (or indeed \$180,000) will be enough to build a fit for purpose replacement toilet block and (2) whether a design and construct tender is</p>	<p>Council still has a total budget allocation of \$180,000 for this project. An amount of \$60,000 is included in the 2022–23 budget/forecast.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>appropriate given the lack of community input into the design and the need for the new facility to be sympathetic with other recently upgraded buildings on the Heritage Victoria listed site.</p> <p>Should State or Federal Government initiate another round of road improvement funding for the Shires we strongly suggest the road into the PLMDP needs to be upgraded. It was originally proposed in 2019 however other priorities took precedence. An upgrading of the PLMDP road would complement the roundabout at the intersection of Point Lonsdale Road and Ocean Road installed some four years ago.</p>	
		<p>6. Active Transport Plan and Associated Projects Following a recent meeting with Council representatives The Association suggested a rethink of their Active Transport Strategy 30km/h proposal so many of the other improvements contained in the document (costing some \$1.6 million over 10 years) are not lost due community angst over one specific strategic issue. We also suggested that Council re-issue a revised ATS for further comment and also release a recent transport relate consultant's report for residents to consider.</p> <p>We understand that the Community Battery (\$500,000), Wadawurrung Cultural Heritage Review and Assessment (\$15,000), Reconciliation Action Plan (\$20,000), Cultural Awareness Training (\$6,000) are part of Council's Reconciliation process and/or</p>	<p>Submissions received through the Active Transport Strategy engagement process are currently being considered. A revised draft of the Active Transport Strategy will subsequently be presented to Council for consideration.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>commitment to the Climate Emergency Response Plan - which is a QCAN initiative.</p>	
		<p>7. Murray Road Shared Path Proposal</p> <p>Council indicated it has a solution for a shared path along Murray Road to the Bellarine Rail Trail and have allocated \$60,000 in the 2023–24 budget for the project. As previously indicated the Association would not like to see the environment compromised in any new option including the existing swales and recommend further consultation with residents who live along Murray Road before any works take place.</p> <p>We are also aware of a fairly simple CoGG solution undertaken in Gertrude Street, Geelong West, pictures of which have been provided to Councillors by a local resident. Councillors also need to recognise residents in Murray Road and McDonald Road are also dealing with a helipad/helicopter application and its potential impact on the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>This budget allocation is for the development of concept design options and engagement with the community. The nominal amount recognises the site has some level of complexity given the existing vegetation and assets within the road reserve, the adjacent environment, and potential differing views of an acceptable solution within the community.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>8. Narrows Bike Park The Budget includes (\$16,000) for design work for the Narrows Bike Park, we understand that the original design will now be reconfigured into one track rather than two and the Department of Transport have agreed in principle for use of the road reserve where the off ramp to Point Lonsdale used to be located. The Borough will continue to work with Government agencies for approval and Bellarine MP Alison Marchant for State funding opportunities.</p>	<p>The observations made by the Submitter in the submission are a fair reflection of the current situation.</p>
		<p>9. Upgrading of Lighting at the Queenscliff Recreation Reserve - Commonwealth Election Commitment The Budget includes a \$160,000 Commonwealth grant for upgrading the oval lighting at the Queenscliff Recreation Reserve which we support. Telstra are also upgrading their 5G mobile phone service which we understand includes a new communications tower to be erected in the reserve. The latest location is thought to be on the south side near the Monahan Centre - we also understand that the upgraded oval lighting could be attached to the mono-tower.</p>	<p>Council notes the observations.</p>
		<p>10. Continuation of the Coastal and Marine Management Plan Following some 2 years of planning, an initial draft report, the recent formation of a CMMP reference group and the hiring of a consultant residents are now waiting for the next version of the CMMP due in July/August. The Budget lists some \$104,000 to complete the work in 2023–24. Based on recent meeting we</p>	<p>The Coastal and Marine Management Plan is being reviewed and re-drafted in response to submissions to the draft CMMP public consultation period, which concluded in February 2022. The engagement of a consultant was a necessary component of the continuation of the CMMP project.</p> <p>The areas that have been declared not to be marine and coastal Crown land, for the purposes of the <i>Marine and Coastal Act 2018</i>, have always been included in the <i>Borough of Queenscliffe Open Space Management Strategy 2018</i>.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>understand that Council managed coastal areas recently excluded from the upcoming Coastal and Marine Management Plan will now be captured in a revised Borough Open Space Policy. Given the coast is so important to us all we look forward to seeing the wording in both the new policy and the revised CMMP.</p>	<p>It is the open space management strategy that is being revised. There is no current project that would result in the drafting of a separate open space policy.</p>
		<p>11. Golightly Caravan Park The Budget includes \$350,000 (10% of the recent \$3.5 million land sale settlement) for a Development and Engagement Plan for Golightly Caravan Park in Bowen Road, Point Lonsdale. Preparatory works will include business and masterplans for the expansion of new facilities (safari type tents) on this prime coastal location, which is part owned by Council. We understand that consultation with current park users and Borough residents will also form part of the process.</p> <p>Our Initial response is that \$350,000 seems an excessive amount to begin this process and should be reviewed. A more detailed list of works with costings would be appreciated. One of the problems with previous Caravan Park Studies of which there has been many, is that are predominately about caravans or accommodation units (or selling the coastal land zoned residential) not about the improving the natural environment.</p>	<p>Council has reviewed the budget allocation and limited funding to the implementation of the first stage of the Golightly Development Plan and engagement project in 23/24. This new budget allocation is \$50,000.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>12. Other Projects</p> <p>The Association would like Council to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some improvements to the oval fencing at Royal Park. • Upgrading of the roadside car parking in Nelson Road adjoining the BCH facility – this is a significant eyesore and additionally this area needs pathways for walking, just like the area between the Eric Toliday Units and the BCH staff carpark which has been rejuvenated in the past few years. • Urgent consideration of an additional public toilet along the coastline between Point Lonsdale and Queenscliff. • A much-needed pedestrian rail crossing and pathway linking Hesse Street to the Bellarine Rail Trail and the Queenscliff Boat Ramp. This safety path estimated to cost \$50,000 was promised in December 2022 as part of the Boat ramp rebuild. • Replacement of 7 or 8 commemorative trees in Ganes Reserve lost during recent flooding. • Completion of tree replanting programs at Shortland's Bluff and Victoria Park. • A masterplan whereby historic gun/military emplacements along Point Lonsdale's and Queenscliff's foreshores are rejuvenated and preserved. This work needs to be planned for soon because when they are too far gone it 	<p>The train line pedestrian crossing and Hesse Street link to the boat ramp is planned, approved, and funded. It should be completed by the end of the first quarter of the 23/24 financial year.</p> <p>Trees will be planted in Ganes reserve to replace the trees lost in flooding.</p>

No.	Name of Submitter	Summary of Question/Comment	Officers' Initial Comments for Councillors' Reference Only
		<p>will be too late to save them. A recent report on military installations commissioned by the Commonwealth would be an excellent starting point.</p>	