1. Mr Colin Harman on behalf of the concerned residents of Kurtzes Road, Hamilton – Requesting upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road between W Schultz’s Road and Chatsworth Road Hamilton – D/19/9454

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission:

Mr Harman has provided a submission and petition to upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road, Hamilton – Requesting upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road between W Schultz’s Road and Chatsworth Road Hamilton due to an increase in traffic, residential properties and multiple subdivisions.

Officer Comments:

As part of a submission to the 2016/2017 budget Council resolved for Officers to undertake further investigations and option for the upgrade of Kurtzes Rd.

In September 2016 Council was represented with a report and resolved for Officers to investigate interest in a Special Charge Scheme (SCS). The resolution at this meeting was:

Council Approve:

- Under Section 163 Special Rate and Special Charge scheme of the Local Government Act 1989, initiate an upgrade of Kurtzes Road from a gravel road to a 4 metre wide sealed road (excluding drainage upgrade):

- If the Section 163 charges are agreed to with the affected property owners that Council fully fund the drainage upgrade;

- If the Section 163 charges are agreed to with the affected property owners that Council’s proportion of funding be sourced by cancelling an existing 2016-2017 roads capital project and replacing it with Kurtzes Road.

- If the Section 163 Special Rate and Special Charge Scheme, of the Local Government Act 1989, are not agreed to with the affected property owners that Council do not proceed with the upgrade of Kurtzes Road.

(Ordinary Meeting of Council – 14 September 2016)

Council undertook consultation in regards to the upgrade of Kurtzes Road via a SCS. Consultation with the residents of Kurtzes Road overwhelming responded that they did not want to pay for the upgrade of the Road. A report was presented with a report in May 2017 and resolved the following:

- That Council does not proceed with the upgrade of Kurtzes Road.

(Ordinary Meeting of Council – 24 May 2017)

2. Mr David Robertson on behalf of the Coleraine Sportsground Committee of Management - request to Councillors to consider allocating $100,000 in the 2019/20 Budget for tennis/netball/hockey facility at Turnbull Street Coleraine – D/19/15408
A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

**Summary of Submission:**

After the 2016 flood event in Coleraine the tennis courts and other sporting facilities were destroyed. A combination of Federal funding, the Southern Grampians Shire Council and the Coleraine community contributions would cover the replacement/upgrade of the Turnbull Street tennis/netball/hockey courts. The total works were estimated at $1.1 million and the Committee are confident they can complete the works for around $600,000. They community already have $365,000 for the works and could raise another $123,000 and would like the Council to match this $123,000 to complete the project.

**Officer Comments:**

The Turnbull St facilities were damaged in the 2016 Storm and Flood event. The courts are a Council Asset and were insured. Council settled the damage claim with our insurer for $365,000.

Council also received Category C funding where some of these funds were allocated to the Turnbull St courts. Council undertook some option analysis for what could be achieved with various investments. In discussions with the Sports Ground Committee, they preferred that the extra money from Cat C be diverted from Turnbull St site to provide better facilities at Silvestor Oval netball/tennis courts.

Officers advised that this would mean that Council only has $365,000 in order to repair the damage caused from flooding.

Council provided an estimate for several solutions which was developed prior to the reallocation of the Cat C funding. The full rebuild was estimated to be in excess of $1.2M. The Sports Ground Committee was committed to a full rebuild and have undertaken some work on their own to estimate the project.

A presentation to Council was given on the 22 May 2019 at a briefing to advise the Sports Ground Committee proposal and comparison to Councils estimate.

3. Mr Ian Overall - Requesting upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road between W Schultz’s Road and Chatsworth Road Hamilton – D/19/20042

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

**Summary of Submission:**

Mr Overall has provided a submission to upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road, between W Schultz’s Road and Chatsworth Road Hamilton due to an increase in the volume of traffic and residential properties being built in the area. Over the year there has been increased corrugation and many potholes in the road. As per Council’s Standardised Infrastructure Design Manual, it gives clear guidelines to upgrade and seal a gravel road if there are 50 traffic movements per day.

**Officer Comments:**
See previous comments.

The Infrastructure Design Manual does talk about upgrades if there are Traffic movements greater than 50 vehicles per day. This standard as always is subject to budget constraints. Council's road assets as of the last condition inspection required an additional $9M to get the assets within the intervention standard set by Council.

4. Mr Jamie Baulch – Cavendish Recreation Reserve Inc. – Replacement of current amenity facility – D/19/31466

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission:

Mr Baulch, on behalf of the Cavendish Recreation Reserve, are in the process of replacing the current amenity facility at the Reserve and have successfully obtained funding through Pick My Project. The Committee of Management would like to enhance more aspects of the project and provide an amenity facility which is of high standard and meets all the current and future needs of all user groups and are requesting financial assistance from the Council for $40,453.00.

Officer Comments:

Representatives of the Cavendish Recreation Reserve made a submission to the 2018/19 budget. At that stage the project was still being planned and Council expressed general support for the upgrade of the amenity facility. Since then the community has been successful in securing funding from the State and via community fund raising. Therefore the request this year has more detail and a specific dollar request. The amenity facility is a State owned asset administered by a community Committee of Management.

5. Mr Paul Battista, Current Rating Proposal 2019/20 – D/19/39377

A representative DOES NOT wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission:

Mr Battista would like Council to get “Back to Basics” and not waste taxpayers money on projects such as Cox Street and the new Art Gallery. Council needs to go where the new jobs will be created and a good return for the ratepayers/community can be found. Recycling and waste are major issues therefore Council should step up and look at their facilities to value add with our own recovery / recyclables.

Borrowings will double the Budget to $3.489 million, does this mean Council is expending beyond their means and how long will this take to pay back and at what cost to the ratepayers?

Officer Comments:

Council has committed to a continual process of fiscally responsible budgeting and strategic planning. This has been demonstrated by a rolling cycle of service reviews and a review of the Long Term Financial Plan impact as part of the decision making process.
6. Mr Daryl O'Flaherty – Funding for Rehabilitation of Doling Road Hamilton – D/19/45129

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission:

Mr O’Flaherty would like to see the gravel part of Doling Road between Millers Road to 356 Doling Road sealed due to numerous potholes and slippery and muddy when wet to drive on. On a regular basis B Double transports and oversized machinery are using this road and are causing more damage to the road. He would like to see some funding out of the 2019/20 budget for the upgrade of this section of road.

Officer Comments:

In July 2018 a deputation was made at the 11th July Ordinary Meeting of Council. The deputation was referred to Officers and a report was delivered to the 12th December 2018 Ordinary Meeting of Council.

The report detailed options and costs for undertaking the sealing of Doling road. It highlighted the cost the section from Millers Road to 356 Doling Road (510m) which is already sealed out front of the property.

Council resolved to:

1. That Council not approve upgrading Doling Road and continue to undertake regular routine maintenance.

2. That an upgrade to Doling Road be considered and reviewed in the 2019/2020 budget deliberations.

Doling Road was considered in the Budget 2019-2020 but did not gain funding due to other priorities in the budget.

7. Mr John Lyons – Dispute in Increase in Rates for Rural Properties – D/19/46725

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission:

John, Joan and Kym Lyons believe the Draft Budget does not deliver fairness to rural ratepayers with the large increase in the amount raised by general rates from rural land. Rural land rate collection is forecast to rise by 12.35% whilst other land classes fall by 7.34%, 13.53% and 7.4%. That is not delivering fairness and many services provided by Council to Hamilton residents are severely limited to rural residents due to time and distances to travel over poorly maintained roads.

Officer Comments:

The calculation for levying rates is based on a combination of the property valuation (established by the Valuer General) and the rate in the dollar which is set by Council. The draft budget was prepared on preliminary valuations which have subsequently been revised. However, any apparent disproportionate increase in rates levied would only occur if the property valuation had also increased. This current taxation process is set
down in the Local Government Act 1989. Both the act and the process are currently under review by the State Government.

8. **Tarrington Progress Association – Request for Extension of the existing formed gravel walking track in Tarrington – D/19/46754**

A representative **DOES** wish to speak to submission.

**Summary of Submission:**

The length of track required is approximately 1.5km with an optional extension of 400m on the eastern side of the Tarrington Oval – approximate distances:

1. Walkenhorst Road – 1000m
2. Tarrington Strathkellar Road Oval West – 300m
3. Tarrington Strathkellar Road Oval North – 200m
4. Tarrington Strathkellar Road Oval East – 400m

**Officer Comments:**

At the recent meeting a Tarrington it was raised in that forum that the footpaths were a concern to the residents. Council agreed for Officers to go out and discuss the concerns with the residents. Assets Officers have been out and undertaken some preliminary discussions and estimates. The works would be a sealed footpath (gravel and seal) and preliminary estimates are for $56,500.

This proposal is in keeping with the Tarrington Structure Plan which states under 4.5.2 Provide additional pedestrian infrastructure throughout the town (including continuous sealed footpaths to the main street core), allowing access to the civic, commercial, educational, religious and recreational nodes, as well as providing better opportunities for informal exercise such as walking prams.

Under 4.6.2 As the density of development on Walkenhorst Road increases (based upon existing land subdivision), consider the installation of a footpath along the south side of the road to link Walkenhorst Road to the rest of the town.

There are several options available to Council in regards to this submission:

1. Council fund the new footpaths
2. Council fund the works through a Special Rates and Charges Scheme
3. Leave the site as is and not build a footpath

9. **Mr Mark Williams - Dispute in Increase in Rates for Rural Properties – D/19/46576**

A representative **DOES NOT** wish to speak to submission.

**Summary of Submission**

The proposed way of setting rates is unfair in that rural rates are being increased by 12% and that residential rates are being decreased. He believes that rural landowners are being asked to pay an unfair proportion of rates and are also getting less access to programs that the shire runs.
Officer Comments:

The calculation for levying rates is based on a combination of the property valuation (established by the Valuer General) and the rate in the dollar which is set by Council. The draft budget was prepared on preliminary valuations which have subsequently been revised. However, any apparent disproportionate increase in rates levied would only occur if the property valuation had also increased. This current taxation process is set down in the Local Government Act 1989. Both the act and the process are currently under review by the State Government.

10. Mr Andrew Rentsch – Good Shepherd College School Council – Bike/Walking Path – Petschels Lane/Mount Napier Road Hamilton – D/19/46822 & Additional Information – D/19/48856

A representative DOES wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission

The Good Shepherd College School Council request the development of a bike/walking path, from the intersection of Petschels Lane Hamilton, along the Mount Napier Road, to the entry driveway of the Good Shepherd College Hamilton.

Officer Comments:

Good Shepherd College is a private school located approximately 1.5km outside of the 80kph signs on Mt Napier. The path is not in keeping with the structure plan for Hamilton.

The predominate mode of transport to the school is either by bus or private vehicle due to the location of both the school and students who travel some distance to get to the school. It is estimated that number of students who would use this path would be low. Other than the school there is no link to any other sites with the path.

Within the shire maintenance of our existing network has been prioritised with new footpaths requiring co-contributions.

Council does have several options:
1. Council fully fund the footpath
2. Council fund it 50-50 with Good Shepherd
3. Council ask Good Shepherd to fully fund the footpath


A representative DOES NOT wish to speak to submission.

Summary of Submission

- Review the Rating Policy
2019/20 Draft Budget Submissions

- The budget provides for the implementation of Recreational Vehicle (RV) Friendly Shire wide policy for parking and dump sites for the purpose of satisfying community demand for RV parking and dump sites in their townships.

- That the Pedrina Park Hockey Clubroom Project be given priority and major project status and be delivered in the next six months of council and immediate work commence.

- That the Southern Grampians Shire Council ensure that they work with the Cavendish Recreation Reserve Committee to support and ensure the most efficient planning of the Amenities Upgrade project.
20\textsuperscript{th} January 2019

Mr. Michael Tudball  
Chief Executive Office  
Shire of Southern Grampians  
Brown Street  
HAMILTON VIC 3300

**Submission to Southern Grampians Shire Budget 2019/2020**

Dear Mr Tudball

Please find enclosed a submission to upgrade and seal Kurtzes Road Hamilton between W. Schultz Road and Chatsworth Road Hamilton.

Please also find enclosed a Petition and Photos to support the Submission.

This Submission is lodged on behalf of myself as a property owner in Kurtzes Road and other concerned property owners in Kurtzes Road as well as concerned property owners in adjacent subdivisions.

This area is within the Urban Growth boundary of Hamilton. As recently as ten years ago, the area of W Schultz Road and Kurtzes Road was mainly used for farming with only a few residential properties. In recent years there has been multiple subdivisions creating around 35 to 40 new house lots and no doubt more subdividing in the future will occur. As a result to now there has been over twenty new houses and the Glenvale School built. Also two more have started building and three more lots have current permits to build.

A recent traffic count from the 15\textsuperscript{th} Nov to 23\textsuperscript{rd} Nov 2018 recorded an average of 92 Vehicle Trips per day (vpd) along this section of Kurtzes Road.

With most likely five new homes built in this area by the end of 2019, this section of road could have approx. 110 to 120 vpd. We believe with this high volume, it is not possible to maintain a gravel road to a satisfactory condition.

In 2011 Southern Grampian Shire (SGS) adopted a Standardised Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM) along with several other Shires in the South West Region of Victoria. As tabled in the IDM a Rural Access road with over 50 vpd triggers an upgrade to a 4m seal. We predict by the end of 2019 we will have well over twice that volume of traffic.

SGS classed this section of Kurtzes Road as a Rural Access Road even though it stretches along eleven Rural Living properties to the west ranging in size from 0.8 ha to 2ha within the Urban Growth Zone of Hamilton.
2.

Of the eleven properties that Kurtzes Rd runs along there are five with houses, one with the Glenvale School, five lots are vacant (one of which has a permit to build and intends to commence building in the very near future).

There is a floodway over this section of road which is impassable at some times of heavy rain. As a result, this road is not an all-weather road which SGS has already identified as requiring upgrading.

Upgrading and sealing this section of road would:

- Become an all-weather road.
- Greatly reduce health aspect from clouds of dust over residents, school students, staff etc.
- The vacant blocks in the area would be more appealing to buyers which would improve growth and employment for the area.
- Improve safety conditions for driving.
- General improvement in environmental surroundings.
- Give local residents a stable and safer road to drive, walk, run and bike ride.

The attached photos show the poor condition that the road becomes. Due to the very high volumes of traffic for a gravel road it is often corrugated with large potholes resulting in regular maintenance needs which is quite often slow to be acted upon. These conditions make driving an unpleasant experience with the increased risk of accidents and vehicle damage.

The petition shows support for this road to be sealed and is documented proof of the opinions of the ratepayers who live in and around this area.

On the 2/2/2016 a Business Case Part 2 for this section of Kurtzes Rd was Approved by SGS.

A vehicle count in May 2015 resulted 55-60 vpd for this section of road. The Business Case’s Preferred Option back then was to Seal the road and upgrade the Stormwater Drainage System. With the comments ‘This road has reasonable traffic compared to other rural sealed roads. This section of road is currently unsealed, narrow and needs regular maintenance. The road side stormwater drainage is not efficient.’

The case for sealing Kurtzes Rd is much stronger now and will be even stronger in 12 months’ time. We ask that now is the time to commit to upgrading and sealing this section of road.

Colin Harman on behalf of the concerned residents of Kurtzes Road Hamilton
COLERAINE SPORTSGROUNDS COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT

BUDGET SUBMISSION 2019/20

Background:
Along with a wide range of sporting and community groups, our Committee made a brief verbal submission to the Council on 13th February 2019 in relation to the draft Recreation & Leisure Strategic Plan. The main purpose of our submission was to ask the Councillors to consider allocating $100,000 in the forthcoming 2019/20 shire budget specifically for the tennis/netball/hockey facility at Turnbull Street situated adjacent to the skate park.

This document is now officially submitted from the above committee and we request that our funding proposal be considered seriously as part of the 2019/20 budget planning cycle which is now well advanced.

Project Detail:
Following the Black Saturday bushfire in 2009 the Coleraine community was fortunate enough to be given funding for two synthetic grass tennis courts by a Melbourne radio station plus some significant local funding. Unfortunately another disaster hit Coleraine in October 2016 when severe floods raged through the town which destroyed the tennis courts and many other sporting facilities.

Within a short time frame the Federal Government allocated $1.76 million to replace the infrastructure damaged or destroyed by these floods across the shire. The majority of this funding was directed to Coleraine as we were the worst effected town.

From this disaster in 2016 arises an opportunity for the shire and the community of Coleraine to rebuild these very important sporting facilities in Turnbull Street with a three way partnership involving the Federal Government funding and contributions from the shire and the Coleraine community. The insurance company settlement is also added to this funding partnership. This is an opportunity not to be missed as Coleraine can be set up with state of the art sporting facilities, not only for today but for generations to follow.

The present situation is that the netball courts at Silvester Oval are being replaced with flood recovery funds at a budget of $500,000. The shelter sheds were removed from the original plan so the project would come inside Flood Recovery budget, the $150,000 budget item is now being funded by the local community. The proposed works at the Turnbull Street tennis/netball/hockey courts is being mainly funded by an insurance company payout of $365,000. The initial quotation organised by the shire for the Turnbull Street facilities came in at $1.1 million, however our committee are very confident that we can complete the proposed works for about $600,000. This will be detailed in our budget figures in the next section.

The central point of our submission is that we already have $365,000.....we need an additional $245,000 to complete the project.....our community will raise $123,000.....so we request that the shire match our $123,000.

The total project cost of $600,000 does not include the clubhouse, however, this facility should be on the Recreation & Leisure Strategic Plan to be completed when funds are available.

Importantly, we are very confident that we can muster the local expertise in our catchment district to successfully manage the initial stages of this project. This would involve the preparation of the site ready to pour the concrete slab. We could also manage the drainage as we have already identified an existing drainage pit. The laying of the synthetic grass, lighting and fencing would be carried out by properly qualified experts.

By way of explanation, the main usage of these Turnbull Street facilities will be by the tennis club for competition and practise. However, the hockey club and junior netball clubs will also practise on the synthetic surface and will need to have lines drawn for that purpose. We have attached a digital impression of what this facility will look like at completion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Construction Details</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site establishment</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geotechnical report for new light pole fittings</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design (concept and detailed) drawings and specifications</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Removal and disposal of asphalt surface, fencing, lighting &amp; shelters</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excavate and stockpile 250 mm type A fill – 63 m x 35 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In-situ stabilisation to 350 mm with 5% cement</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Place 250 mm type A fill 63 m x 35 m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>140 mm concrete slab including spoon and edge drains</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1200 mm root barrier to south and east ends</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stormwater drainage outfall and sub-soil drainage to full perimeter</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tennis court infrastructure</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Final surface grading</td>
<td>$Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Synthetic grass surface including line markings for tennis &amp; hockey</td>
<td>$75,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Install shelters on concrete slabs 16.2 x 3.8</td>
<td>$Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Install 3.6 m black PVC coated chain mesh fence</td>
<td>$51,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Perimeter lighting</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td><strong>$602,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note: We have used a local qualified construction/mining Engineer to rework the original budget figures provided by iDwala for a total original budget of $1,180,960*

Submitted on behalf of the Coleraine Sportsgrounds Committee of Management.

__________________________
David Robertson
Authorised Committee Member

21st February 2019
7th March 2019

The Chief Executive Office
Shire of Southern Grampians
Brown Street
HAMPTON VIC 3300

Dear Mr Tudball

RE: Submission for the 2019/20 SGSC Budget

I would like to make a submission to upgrade and seal the section of Kurtze’s Road between W Schultz’s Road and Chatsworth Roads, Hamilton.

This area has seen many houses built in recent years raising the average traffic volume from 60 vehicle trips per day in 2015 to 92 average vehicle trips per day counted in Nov 2018. This section of road currently accesses ten rural living properties plus the Glenvale School and two rural properties as well as through traffic.

The Rural Living properties are within Hamilton’s Urban Growth boundary.

Traffic volumes will further increase with many more vacant lots (some with current building permits) available on this and adjoining roads.

Over the past year this section of road has been continually corrugated with many potholes and in my opinion has not been able to be maintained to a suitable standard for road users and residents.

There is already a 70m sealed floodway within this road leaving approx. 730m unsealed.

Council has recently adopted a Standardised Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM). The IDM gives clear guidelines for development of infrastructure. As tabled in the IDM, 50 traffic movements per day is the trigger to upgrade and seal a gravel road.

I believe Council’s Road Management Plan is not designed to maintain a gravel road with 92 average vehicle trips per day accessing and driving past residential properties.

Sealing this section of road would contribute to population growth, employment and personal health and wellbeing of the residents and school children.

Yours sincerely

Ian Overall Ph 0423781996 email - soverall@bigpond.net.au
25 E.Gibbons Rd
HAMPTON 3300
To CEO, Mr. Michael Tudball,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Cavendish Recreation Reserve. As you are aware we are in the process of replacing the current amenity facility at the Reserve and have been successful in obtaining funding through Pick My Project.

We have been working on our budget for the project and believe there is an opportunity to enhance the long-term sustainability and environmental aspects of this project if we are able to invest more capital into the project at this current time.

Pick My Project funds will cover the cost of the erection and fit out of the building itself, but we believe there are a couple of elements which could be improved on and it would seem timely to do them while the construction phase is occurring.

We would like to be able to install a grey water treatment plant to enable us to recycle a fair proportion of our water usage which could then be used for environmental plantings, landscaping and beautification purposes. The installation of a larger 90,000L rainwater tank and pressure pump would capitalize on the current roof space we have available and would make us more self- sufficient and sustainable, and could be used for irrigation purposes if deemed necessary.

An expansion of the proposed concrete paths to enhance the accessibility of the facility to all user groups and persons with all levels of disabilities, as well as native plantings and areas of landscaping would enhance the beautification of the sporting precinct and camp group for all users and tourists to our town.

There is also a space in the facility which could be enhanced to cater for the camp ground users to provide them with laundry facilities to improve the overall functioning of the new amenity facility.
Below is a guide to costs associated with the implementation of the above proposals:

- Waste water treatment plant and fit out: $18,283
- 90,400L Rainwater tank: $8,970
- Pressure pump: $1,200
- Pathways: $5,000
- Landscaping/plantings: $4,500
- Laundry fit out: $2,500

**TOTAL**: $40,453

We as a committee of management are endeavoring to create and provide an amenity facility which is of an extremely high standard and meets all the current and future needs and requirements of all the user groups, visitors to our town and our community.

We would like the Shire to have some involvement in this project, and we hope that you will look favorably on our outlined proposal.

Kind Regards
Jamie Baulch
President.
Budget Submission.

Michael,

Budget submission 19/20 for council to consider.

Happy to present.

Paul Battista
Business owner / ratepayers.
0407480030.

Budget is a requirement of local council each year, it is a important mechanism to allow council to progress and get the Job done for our community but i think this one is a bit different in which some may find a huge hit to the pennies in your wallet.

Councils complain about the rate capping element that the current state government made mandatory on councils which has been in operation for the past 4 year of budgets Southern Grampians is no exception to this as we find our grants drying up (big Problem) and now forced to find efficiencies with in the organisation.

The confusion and problem cracks are starting to occur, mandatory valuations occur every 2 years in which a external approved valuer will make assumptions based on data and average house property capitol improved value. These valuations seem to override any Rate capping instrument and therefore is the hidden underlying questions What rate capping and why extra charges?

Reading through the draft budget i was concerned to see in item 4.1.1d a increase of 8.69% residential and a whopping 31.70% rural this must raise the eyebrows of many farmers particularly when focussed expenditure is not a directive of many daily lives i think its just a big land tax grab.

Rates and charge account for 48% of the revenue raised I urge you to look at how this is spent and make your own judgement of the fairness appropriateness of this, for me "its
It is not a time for wasteful projects such as COX ST with "NO Ring Road" or new art galleries also four years on and flood recovery is still going. Project management seems fraught with issues / delays. I say go where the new jobs will be created and a good return for the ratepayers / community can be found. Recycling / waste is a major issue lets step up and look at our own facilities to value add with our own recovery / recyclables.

Borrowings will double this Budget to $3.489 million does this mean we are expending beyond our means and how long will this take to pay back and at what cost to the ratepayers?

I would urge you to take a look at this budget and ask yourself if this fits into your expectations of a forward thinking Shire. If not make it known!

--

Paul Battista.
 Resident / Ratepayer.
20 May 2019

Mr. Michael Tudball  
Chief Executive Officer  
Southern Grampians Shire Council  
Brown Street Hamilton 3300  
Victoria

Dear Sir.

If I may introduce myself to you my name is Daryl O’Flaherty and I make this submission to the Southern Grampians Shire Council on behalf of my elderly mother and myself. My family has resided at 356 Doling Road Strathkellar since 1922 many things have changed throughout the shire, since this date, but not the gravel section of the Doling Road. When one considers the amount of monies, paid by way of rates, along this road, to the shire I’m at a loss to as why an upgrade in importance on the Shires road improvement priority list hasn’t taken place in relation to the gravel road surface in this period of time.

This is the second time that I have made a submission to the shire, but in the past I’ve brought to the Shires notice on numerous times and in the 1970s my father petitioned the shire and was able to gain the sealing of a small section, in front of our home, so as reduce the amount of dust entering our house and rain water tanks. But even this section is rapidly suffering from lack of maintenance and excess traffic.

But the rest of the road particularly the section between Millers Road and residence number 356 is another matter as in the summer it’s a corrugated, dusty and a slippery surface on which to drive on. Then in winter it reverts to a muddy, potholed and also very slippery surface on which to drive.

In the past year very little maintenance has been carried out although some remedial work was done through the Flood Recovery Scheme but the worst section of Doling Road received only a pothole patch up which is totally inadequate and did not solve the issues of the road surface and as there in poor drainage through lack of formation it is prone to flooding on an annual basis.

In relation to my mother, who is in her 92nd year, she receives on a weekly basis Home Help, three times a week visits by the Western District Nursing Unit and attends regular medical appointments at times four times per week and in the travelling to and from these appointments it is not an enjoyable trip for her. The people who attend to her needs are disgusted with the state of the road and do not look forward to driving on it. These people have raised the matter with their departmental heads.

If indeed an ambulance needed to be called if would be difficult to travel at the required speed so as to assist in the case of an emergency.
As farming operations have changed over the past years there has been an increase of heavy vehicle traffic particularly into the Hartwich property opposite our home and other properties to the north of us as most have changed from grazing to cropping operations. On a regular basis transports of B-Double configuration are travelling on it and the road is not a sanctioned B-Double route. Most of the agricultural machinery is of an oversize configuration and the road is not designed for this.

Madam Mayor and Councillors when Doling Road was constructed the traffic consisted of horse and cart, small trucks and small machinery and to the present day nothing has changed with the roads surface other than the sealing in front of our home.

As can be seen on Television the Southern Grampians Shire Council is trying to lift the profile of Hamilton of which I fully support but as Doling is just a short distance from Hamilton and on the weekends there are people driving out on it for a leisurely drive and when fronted with this road I ponder their thoughts and I'm concerned for their safety.

In the recent past I used to regularly have to travel on roads throughout the shire and not once did I ever encounter such road surfaces as I encounter on Doling Road and this I found frustrating as in my opinion there are many roads throughout this Shire in a far better condition and with no residences on them and at times they are no through roads. I am at a total loss to why this is.

So in summation in its present state the Doling road is an unsafe road for all users and badly in need of an upgrade in priority and it's only a the short distance, of some 400 to 500 metres approximately between Millers road to number 356 Doling road.

I would like the shire to consider an amendment to the budget so as to allow the necessary funding for Doling Road to be rehabilitated to a sealed surface so all users can travel in a safe manner on it.

Thank you

Yours Sincerely

DARYL O`FLAHERTY
Submission to Southern Grampians Shire Draft Budget 2019/20

Chief Executive Officer
Southern Grampians Shire Council
Locked Bag 685
Hamilton 3300
council@sthgrampians.vic.gov.au
from
John, Joan & Kym Lyons
Directors Warooka Properties Pty Ltd
668 Dundas Gap Road, Melville Forest, 3315.
Assessment No. 2304, 2027, 1768, 2309, 190, 191, 1764, 1738.
johnlyons7@bigpond.com

In the press release for the 2019/20 Draft Budget on 26 April 2019, the Mayor Cr Mary-Anne Brown stated that the draft budget aims to deliver on a number of key projects in the Council Plan with an operating surplus of $0.761 million and Council was confident that the budget delivered fairness, responsibility and opportunity in equal measure.

John, Joan and Kym Lyons believe the Draft Budget does not deliver fairness to rural ratepayers with the large increase in the amount raised by general rates from rural land. Rural land rate collection is forecast to rise by 12.35% whilst other land classes fall by 7.34%, 13.53% and 7.4%.

The draft budget plans to raise 55.26% of the rates from just 27.6% of the assessments. That is not delivering fairness.

Many services provided by Council to Hamilton residents are severely limited to rural residents due to time and distances to travel over poorly maintained roads. Hamilton has a population of 10170 and the Shire’s population is listed as 16510, indicating that most of the population of the shire is centred in Hamilton not in the rural areas where Council is preparing to increase rates by the greatest amount.

Why are rural ratepayers paying the larger % of the rate base?
Council needs to remember that paddocks do not demand services, people however have a continuing demand for services and should be prepared to pay.

Rate capping does not mean that it is mandatory to increase rates by 2.5%, only that the total rate collection is limited to a 2.5% increase.

Southern Grampians Shire Council is shown in The Weekly Times on 15 May 2019, as having second highest farm rate rise in Victoria. (photocopy next page)

Other Shires have been able to keep farm rate rises lower why is Southern Grampians Council unable to do the same?
We believe there could be several options for setting the rate for 2019/20. Table 1 below shows the draft budget figures.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>2019/20 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>Inc. on 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6940724</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>958.27</td>
<td>6431010</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>887.89</td>
<td>-7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8278234</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2732.09</td>
<td>9300633</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>3069.52</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>299968</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1190.35</td>
<td>259379</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1029.28</td>
<td>-13.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>906810</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2006.22</td>
<td>839738</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1857.83</td>
<td>-7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,425,736</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,830,760</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural assessments as % of total assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural rates $ as % of total rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All rate assessments could be increased by 2.5%, as shown in Table 2.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>Inc. on 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6940724</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>958.27</td>
<td>7114242</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>982.22</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8278234</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2732.09</td>
<td>8485190</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2800.39</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>299968</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1190.35</td>
<td>307467</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1220.11</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>906810</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2006.22</td>
<td>929480</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2056.37</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,425,736</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,836,379</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural assessments as % of total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural rates $ as % of total rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But this would mean a short fall in budgeted total rates of $5619

Table 3 increases only the rural rate and leaves other rate classes with no increase.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate $/assess</th>
<th>Inc. on 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6940724</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>958.27</td>
<td>6940724</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>958.27</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8278234</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2732.09</td>
<td>8683258</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2865.76</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>299968</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1190.35</td>
<td>299968</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1190.35</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>906810</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2006.22</td>
<td>906810</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2006.22</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,425,736</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,830,760</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural assessments as % of total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural rates $ as % of total rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This option would mean a lower rural rate rise than that proposed in the draft budget but still 27.6% of assessments pay 51.6% of rates collected.
A further option is to increase all rate classes by 2.51% and the total rates collected increases by $7262.

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate/assess</th>
<th>2018/19 rates $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Rate/assess</th>
<th>Inc. on 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>6940724</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>958.27</td>
<td>7114936</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>982.32</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8278234</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2732.09</td>
<td>8486018</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>2800.67</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>299968</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1190.35</td>
<td>307497</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1220.23</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>906810</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2006.22</td>
<td>929571</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2056.57</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,425,736</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,838,022</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td></td>
<td>7262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural assessments as % of total: 27.60%
Rural rates $ as % of total rates: 50.40%

The figures in the tables above show how much the rural rates contribute to the Shire’s finances but from a small percentage of the population.

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>2018/19 value $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Value/assess</th>
<th>2019/20 value $</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Av. Value/assess</th>
<th>Inc. on 2018/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,380,783,000</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>190,637</td>
<td>1,500,738,000</td>
<td>7243</td>
<td>207,198</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,971,254,000</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>650,579</td>
<td>2,596,225,000</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>856,840</td>
<td>31.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>59,429,000</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>235,829</td>
<td>60,001,500</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>238,101</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>176,441,000</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>390,356</td>
<td>191,195,113</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>422,998</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,587,907,000</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td>326,857</td>
<td>4,348,159,613</td>
<td>10977</td>
<td>396,115</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 5 we further question if rural values have risen by 31.7% in just one year as we understand that valuations are now done annually instead of biannually as in the past.

At the last valuation in 2018 we objected to six out of eight assessments and were successful in reducing values. This action reduced our rates by 9.8%.

Is the Council prepared for mass objections if the budget figures are implemented?

The Shire needs to further investigate whether efficiencies in their systems could reduce costs and vigorously pursue both Federal and State Governments for funding that has been cut or promised.

We request that we can support our submission to Council at a special meeting of Council.

John Lyons    Joan Lyons    Kym Lyons
Dear Michael,

Tarrington Progress Association would like to submit the Extension of Gravel Walking Track Project for consideration in the 2019/20 budget. (Submission attached)

This initiative was discussed and minuted at the April Tarrington Community Engagement Meeting – and since Tarrington Progress Association has met with Durga and Rohit on site to discuss the track route and costings.

Tarrington Progress Association would like to thank you for considering their project and awaits your response.

Colin Huf: colin.huf@westvic.com.au / 0417 503 265

Bev Schurmann: redhillkbs@gmail.com / 0438 321 261

Kind regards
Mel

Melanie Russell
Community Engagement Coordinator
Southern Grampians Shire Council

111 Brown Street, Hamilton, Victoria 3300
P: 03 5573 0217 / 0429 035 311

mrusell@sthgrampians.vic.gov.au
www.sthgrampians.vic.gov.au
Community Infrastructure Grants
- Contact: Manager Recreation
Funding designed to assist groups to enhance, improve, or renew physical assets. This could include:
• Assisting in the provision of new facilities;
• The extension or modification of existing facilities;
• The purchase of equipment or major maintenance to existing facilities which is considered by Council to be of a capital nature.

Dear Sir/Madam

The Tarrington Progress Association would like to apply for a one-off grant from Southern Grampians Shire Council for an extension of the existing formed gravel walking track at Tarrington. The length of track required is approximately 1.5km with an optional extension of 400m on the eastern side of the Tarrington oval. Approximate distances of sections of track are listed below:

1. Walkenhorst Rd 1000m
2. Tarrington Strathkellar Rd Oval West 300m
3. Tarrington Strathkellar Rd North 200m
4. Tarrington Strathkellar Rd Oval East 400m

Objectives of walking track extension:
• Safety for school children walking to and from bus stop at Northern end of Tarrington oval, or on Hamilton Highway
• Safety for school children walking to and from Tarrington Lutheran School
• Safety for recreational and fitness walkers and joggers along this well used route, thus promoting healthy lifestyles for local residents
• Safety for young families with children on bikes and scooters
• Links to fitness training space at Tarrington Oval
• Links to existing walking track on southern side of Hamilton Highway which is very well used by walkers, runners and cyclists as it links to Hamilton
• Adds value to the Tarrington History Trail of photos and historical markers displaying the proud heritage of the town’s settlement.

[Signature]

for Tarrington Progress Association

M. 0438 321 261
This is my submission with regards to the draft budget. I believe that the proposed way of setting rates is unfair in that rural rates are being increased by 12% and that residential rates are being decreased. I believe that rural landowners are being asked to pay an unfair proportion of rates and also get less access to programs that the shire runs. An example is the LorWan network which is focused on the Hamilton area and we are outside the area covered.

With regards to the fairness issue rates are being set with no regard for the ability to pay. In my case rates for the last 4 to 5 years are higher than the nett amount that I earn so I am feeling aggrieved that my rates are being increased whereas rates in the township areas are being decreased.

Yours Sincerely

Mark Williams
Andrew Rentsch  
Chairperson  
Good Shepherd College School Council  
297 Mount Napier Road  
Hamilton VIC 3300  
0418 528 406  

27th May 2019

Chief Executive Officer  
Southern Grampians Shire Council  
Locked Bag 685  
Hamilton VIC 3300

Dear Mr Tudball,

Good Shepherd College Hamilton, wish to submit a budget request, for the 2019/20 SGSC budget.

We request the development of a bike/walking path, from the intersection of Petschels Lane Hamilton, along the Mount Napier Road, to the entry driveway of the Good Shepherd College Hamilton.

I, along with Cherie Murrihy, would be willing to be heard in support of our submission.

Thank you for your consideration.

Andrew Rentsch.
RE: BUDGET SUBMISSION – BIKE TRACK TO GOOD SHEPHERD COLLEGE,

To the CEO, Mayor and Councillors of Southern Grampians Shire Council,

Recently we made enquiries as to how we can make Mount Napier Road safer for our children to travel to and from school via bike riding and walking. It was brought to our attention that some of the college students fear for their safety as they ride on bicycles and walk along Mount Napier Road.

The college has had significant growth in recent years and this growth is expected to continue. With this we have found a greater need for these facilities as our students seek out healthy lifestyle options. This is largely due to educational programs offered to students understanding the benefits of being active. Programs like ‘Walk to School’ and ‘Genr8 Change’ encourage these health benefits. Good Shepherd College students are also a part of the Human Powered Vehicle (HPV) Racing, which requires students to train through bike riding.

Set on a working farm, Good Shepherd College is located at 297 Mount Napier Road, Hamilton. Currently the speed limit outside the school entrance is 100 km/hr. The safety concerns are extensive without a pedestrian path to the school entrance, the closest path at Petschels Lane intersection is 1.2km from the school gates.

The safety concerns we raise are –

- Our students are vulnerable road users (cycling or walking) aged between 11 years and 18 years old.
- 100 km speed zone stretch directly out the front of the school.
- Mount Napier Road is a shared road for all users from Petschels Lane; pedestrians, students, bikes, cars, trucks, heavy vehicles and school buses with no alternative pathway for walkers or line marking for bike users.
- The time our students require to use the road is peak traffic flow times.
- The road features a large, sweeping bend affecting clear visibility.
- The large, sweeping bend runs down a hill from 60 km to 80 km to 100 km speed zone past our school.
- There is a proposed alternate Heavy Vehicle Route from Petschels Lane onto Mount Napier Road to South Boundary Road.
- Low lying road that is foggy in Winter with very limited visibility.
- Narrow bridge with limited room for cars or trucks to pass bike riders. Walkers have no options other than to walk onto the road and cross on the narrow bridge.
- When exiting the school, students walking, cycling, cars and buses all leave by stopping just past the school gates, giving way to traffic on the left and crossover the road to travel onto Mount Napier Road in the direction of the township. This is a challenge as the school entrance is at the bottom of a hill giving very little warning of what vehicles are approaching at 100 km/hr.
- No speed reduction on this road with bends, crests and fog in winter.
- Vehicle speeds of which pose danger to pedestrians on foot or bike.
- No flashing lights of speed limits for safety or approaching school area.
- Minimal signage to indicate to road users that a school is ahead before the bend.
- Learner drivers attending GSC.
- Major traffic route for GSC school students and staff, RIST employees and Ag Vic Station.
According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, currently in Australia, two thirds (67.0%) of Australian adults are overweight or obese (12.5 million people). For children, it is estimated that 1 in 4 (27%) children and adolescents aged 5–17 are overweight or obese. The statistics are staggering.

School Council would like to continue to encourage students to be active and be able to walk or ride to school but need to ensure this is able to be completed safely.

We are seeking Southern Grampians Shire Council’s support, to make it safer for our children to ride or walk to school. We urge Council to consider:

- A shared bike/walking track.
- Consider road marking for bike riders or potentially a shared track/pathway for walking & riding.
- Additional Signage on Mount Napier Road prior to the bend (from South Boundary Road indicating a school is up ahead)
- Flashing lights due to the fog in winter.

I am happy to meet with you in person to further discuss, my contact details can be found at the top of the letter.

We look forward to meeting you at the budget submission on the 12th June.

Regards,

Andrew Rentsch
Southern Grampians Shire Council

2019/2020 budget submission/ discussion points

Cr Katrina Rainsford

1. Rating Policy
   Twelve month policy of rating existing farming rural, residential and commercial properties on their current 2018/2019 dollar value of rates plus 2.5 % for the 2019/2020 financial year whilst the State Government is reviewing council rating policy statewide.

   New properties entering incurring rates for the first time, including changes such as subdivision, to be rated on the rating policy as per the draft budget 2019/2020.

2. That a budget amount be provided for the implementation of Recreational Vehicle (RV) Friendly Shire wide policy for parking and dump sites for the purpose of satisfying community demand for RV parking and dump sites in their townships

   The RV report requested in the April 2019 Council meeting into considering sites and investigating funding for RV friendly sites needs to have a community consultation component. The best results come from responding to the requests and priorities of community groups i.e. progress/development associations that represent the interests of the townships outside of Hamilton. The Hamilton Regional Business Association could be seen as the major representative organization representing the interests of Hamilton businesses. There may be other partnership groups to work with these organizations.

   If Southern Grampians Shire Council made a funding commitment in the 2019/2020 budget and potential future budgets to roll out RV Friendly facilities across the Shire for community groups to apply for, then the grass roots communities will provide the impetus and preferred location for these faculties.

3. That the Pedrina Park Hockey Clubroom Project be given priority and major project status and be delivered in the next six months of council and immediate work commence utilizing
   - The $150,000 allocated since the last budget for Pedrina Park Public Toilets to extend the Ansett’s Pavilion to include public toilets and change rooms.
   - The $100,000 allocated for two previous years SGSC budgets and included for a third time in this 2019/2020 draft budget be dedicated to delivering the Pedrina Park Hockey Clubroom
   - Work with Glenelg Regional Hockey Association to deliver a facility considered most appropriate and affordable and acceptable to the co funders of the project who two years ago had $100,000 funds dedicated to delivering a Pedrina Park Hockey Clubroom.
   - This project not be delayed for outside fuinding support which instead is directed to other strages of delivering the 2019 Pedrina Park Masterplan.

4. That Southern Grampians Shire Council ensure that they work with the Cavendish Recreation Reserve Committee who are delivering the local 2018 State Government Pick My Project of a Cavendish Recreation Reserve Amnesties block and applied for $40,000 funding support to ensure the most efficient planning of the project to deliver optimal value from the State Government funding and local community support.