Infrastructure and Development Contribution Framework

146

Prepared for Whitehorse City Council

July 2021





Contents

1.0) Introduction				
	1.1	Purpose	6		
	1.2	Study Area	6		
	1.3	This Report	7		
2.0	Infra	structure Funding Mechanisms	8		
	2.1	Definitions			
	2.2	Context of Development Contributions	8		
	2.3	Funding Sources in Overview	9		
3.0	Plan	ning Permit Conditions	11		
	3.1	Overview			
	3.2	Planning and Environment Act 1987			
	3.3	Subdivision Act			
	3.4	Common Law and Selected Cases	12		
	3.5	Example: City of Melbourne			
	3.6	Floor Area Uplift (FAU) Bonus System of Contributions	15		
	3.7	Victorian Planning Authority Growth Area Permit Conditions			
	3.8	Voluntary Urban Stormwater Offsets Scheme			
	3.9	Example in Whitehorse			
4.0	Deve	lopment Contributions Plan			
	4.1	Overview			
	4.2	Development Contributions Legislation, Directions and Guidelines			
	4.3	Collecting Agencies and Development Agencies			
	4.4	Auditor General Review of Development Contributions			
	4.5	Auditor General Managing Development Contributions (2020)			
	4.6	Annual Reporting	23		
	4.7	Rationale for the Distinction of DIL and CIL			
	4.8	Administration of DIL and CIL	25		
	4.9	Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP)	25		
5.0	DCP	Benchmarking	26		
	5.1	Introduction			
	5.2	Darebin			
	5.3	Moreland			
	5.4	Melbourne			
	5.5	Brimbank	29		
	5.6	Banyule	30		
	5.7	Yarra			
	5.8	DCPs in Preparation			
	5.9	DCP Implications for Whitehorse	32		

6.0	Open Space Contributions			
	6.1	Overview	33	
	6.2	Legal Framework	33	
	6.3	The Concept of Need	33	
	6.4	Use of Open Space Contributions	34	
	6.5	Planning Scheme Provisions	34	
	6.6	Deriving an Appropriate Contribution Amount	35	
	6.7	Relationship to Other Funding Mechanisms	38	
	6.8	Open Space Levy Implications for Whitehorse	38	
7.0	Cash	Cash in Lieu of Parking Provision		
	7.1	Overview	39	
	7.2	Parking Overlay	39	
	7.3	Planning Practice Note 57: The Parking Overlay	40	
	7.4	Example Cash in Lieu Schemes	41	
	7.5	Cash in Lieu - Car Parking Scoping Study 2010	41	
	7.6	Cash in Lieu of Parking Implications for Whitehorse	42	
8.0	Polic	cy and Strategy Review	43	
	8.1	Overview	43	
	8.2	Whitehorse Vision 2020 – Community Plan	44	
	8.3	Planning Scheme and Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS)	45	
	8.4	Plan Melbourne	46	
	8.5	Recent Major Transport Projects	46	
	8.6	Affordable Housing Policy 2010	46	
	8.7	Arts and Culture Strategy 2014-2022	47	
	8.8	Asset Management Policy 2017	47	
	8.9	Box Hill Activity Centre Transit City Structure Plan 2007	48	
	8.10	Box Hill Central Activities Area Car Parking Strategy 2014	48	
	8.11	Box Hill Infrastructure Contributions Plan (Stage 1) Scoping Study, August2017	49	
	8.12	Box Hill Metropolitan Activity Centre to 2036 Draft Structure Plan 2020	49	

8.16	Box Hill Urban Realm Treatment Guidelines 2020	51
8.17	Box Hill MAC Integrated Transport Strategy 2020	51
8.18	Burwood Heights Activity Centre Structure Plan 2006	52
8.19	Burwood Village Neighbourhood Activity Centre 2008	52
8.20	City of Whitehorse Adopted Budget 2020-2021	53
8.21	City of Whitehorse Budget 2021-2022	53
8.22	Council Plan 2017-2021	53
8.23	Housing Strategy and Neighbourhood Character Review Project 2014	54
8.24	Whitehorse Housing Strategy April 2014	54
8.25	Neighbourhood Character Study 2014	54

	8.26	Neighbourhood Activity Centre Urban Design Guidelines 2014		
	8.27	Indoor Sports Facility Feasibility Study 2020	55	
	8.28	Interim Urban Forest Strategy 2018-2021	55	
	8.29	MegaMile West and Blackburn Activity Centres Urban Design Framework 2010	55	
	8.30	Mitcham Station Precinct Built Form and Public Realm Guidelines 2012	56	
	8.31	Municipal Early Years Plan 2014-2018		
	8.32	Municipal Wide Tree Study 2016	57	
	8.33	Municipal Youth Plan 2014-2018	57	
	8.34	Nunawading MegaMile Structure Plan 2008	57	
	8.35	Nunawading/MegaMile/Mitcham Structure Plan Background Review 2018	57	
	8.37	Pavilion Development Policy 2019	59	
	8.38	Policy for Special Rate/Charge Schemes in Retail/Commercial Precincts or Centres		
		2014	59	
	8.40	Road Safety Strategy 2013	59	
	8.41	Special Charge Scheme Policy	60	
	8.42	Student Accommodation Strategy 2018	60	
	8.43	Summary Asset Management Plan 2020	61	
	8.44	Tally Ho Urban Design Framework 2006	61	
	8.45	Tally Ho Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines 2015	62	
	8.46	Whitehorse Cycling Strategy 2016	62	
	8.47	Whitehorse Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) Policy for Council Buildings an Infrastructure 2021	d 62	
	8.48	Whitehorse Health and Wellbeing Plan 2012-2021	62	
	8.49	Whitehorse Industrial Strategy 2011	63	
	8.50	Industrial Precincts Implementation Project – Urban Design Guidelines 2011	63	
	8.51	Industrial Precinct Review 2019	64	
	8.52	Whitehorse Integrated Transport Strategy 2011	64	
	8.53	Whitehorse Open Space Strategy 2007	64	
	8.54	Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011	65	
	8.55	Whitehorse Recreation Strategy 2015-2024	65	
	8.56	Whitehorse Sustainability Strategy 2016-2022	66	
	8.57	Whitehorse Urban Biodiversity Strategy 2014-2024	67	
	8.58	Whitehorse Waste Management Strategy 2018-2028	67	
	8.59	Other Documents	68	
	8.60	Policy and Strategy Implications for Infrastructure and Development Contributions.	68	
9.0	Deve	lopment Conditions and Projections	59	
	9.1	Population Context	69	
	9.2	Demographic Context	69	
	9.3	Economic Context	70	
	9.4	Development Areas	70	
	9.5	Development Conditions	72	

	9.6	Impact of COVID-19 on Future Development and Planning	. 74
	9.7	Residential Dwelling Projections	. 74
	9.8	Residential and Non-Residential Floorspace Projections	. 75
	9.9	Development Implications for Infrastructure and Development Contributions	. 77
10.0	Infras	structure Projects	78
	10.1	Overview	. 78
	10.2	Summary of Projects	. 78
	10.3	Cost Estimate Date and Indexation	. 79
	10.4	Location of Projects	. 79
	10.5	Potential Additional Projects	. 80
	10.6	Infrastructure Implications for Whitehorse	. 81
11.0 Analysis Areas		rsis Areas	82
	11.1	Overview	. 82
	11.2	Area Types	. 82
	11.3	Analysis Areas in Whitehorse	. 84
12.0	Finan	cial Considerations	85
	12.1	Overview	. 85
	12.2	Cost Apportionment Example	. 85
	12.3	Potential Cost Recovery from a DCP	. 87
	12.4	Guide to the Community Infrastructure Levy Cap	. 87
	12.5	Potential Financial Outcomes for Whitehorse	. 88
	12.6	Costs to Support a DCP	. 88
	12.7	Summary of Financial Implications for Whitehorse	. 89
13.0	Sumn	nary and Recommendations	90
	13.1	Overview	. 90
	13.2	Open Space Levy	. 90
	13.3	Cash in Lieu of Parking Provision	. 91
	13.4	Development Contributions Plan	. 91
	13.5	Development Projections	. 91
	13.6	Infrastructure Projects	. 91
	13.7	Analysis Areas	. 92
	13.8	Potential Cost Recovery from a DCP	. 92
	13.9	Commitment to Deliver	. 92
	13.10	Conclusions	. 93
Attach	ment 1	L - Preliminary DCP List	94

HIIIPDA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

This document provides an Infrastructure and Development Contributions Framework (IDCF) for the City of Whitehorse.

The Framework provides an overarching information base regarding demand for infrastructure and how Council can use infrastructure funding and delivery mechanisms to meet needs over time.

This report includes:

- Assessment of Council policy and strategy directions
- Assessment of demand for infrastructure over approximately 20 years, as identified by population and employment change by area within the municipality, and translated to development units such as dwellings and retail, commercial and industrial floorspace
- Identification of required infrastructure by type, location, service area and cost
- Synthesis and assessment of infrastructure funding and delivery tools that are available to Council and assessment of the capacity of the tools and documentation to meet infrastructure needs over time
- Preparation of planning scheme tools and amendment documentation to exhibition ready standard (provided in a separate report)
- Provision of ancillary models and advice to implement, operate and monitor the tools over time for the life of the chosen mechanism(s) (provided in a separate report)
- Provision of education and advice within Council on the subject matter as the project is developed (provided during mechanism preparation).

This report supports the preparation of strategically justified planning scheme tools and amendment documentation, such as one or more Development Contribution Plans (DCPs) and information to support an update to the open space levy schedule (Clause 53.01 of the Whitehorse Planning Scheme) if needed and supported by Council.

1.2 Study Area

The study area is shown below. Suburbs, the transport grid, activity centres and employment areas provide a sound basis for infrastructure assessment.



Figure 1: Study Area Map



Source: Whitehorse City Council

1.3 This Report

This report provides the following information.

- Overview of infrastructure funding mechanisms
- Planning permit conditions in more detail
- Development Contributions Plans and the related Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICPs) in more detail
- Open space levies in more detail
- Cash in lieu of parking provision in more detail
- Policy and strategy review This includes a review of planning and infrastructure policies and strategies that inform the strategic basis for an assessment of potential application of funding mechanisms in Whitehorse
- Development conditions as at 2020 and projections to 2041
- Preliminary infrastructure needs assessment
- Review of geographic areas for funding mechanism preparation and apportionment
- Financial considerations
- Summary and recommendations.



2.0 INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING MECHANISMS

2.1 Definitions

In planning legislation and practice, infrastructure has a number of specific definitions. Infrastructure is defined in the Development Contribution Guidelines 2007 (Understanding Development Contributions) in terms of works, services and facilities as follows :

- 'Works' are changes to the condition of land and buildings (e.g. construction and earthworks).
- 'Facilities' are public buildings and associated land (i.e. community facilities).
- 'Services' are activities carried out from facilities for community benefit.

Furthermore, investment in infrastructure can be defined as capital works or recurrent expenditure.

- Capital works expenditure is defined to include construction of a new asset, extension or upgrade to an existing asset and replacement of an asset that has reached the end of its useful life. It also includes the purchase of land for an asset.
- Recurrent expenditure relates to maintenance and / or operation of an asset during its scheduled lifespan or the ongoing delivery of services (or programs)
- Infrastructure is defined to include capital works expenditure on works and facilities, but excludes provision of services and recurrent expenditure.

Examples of infrastructure assets that Council provides or manages are roads, paths, drainage systems and community facilities.

2.2 Context of Development Contributions

The mechanisms available to Council to obtain infrastructure works from development proponents via the planning system are typically: planning permit conditions, voluntary legal agreements, development contributions plan (DCP), open space levies and parking precinct plan cash in lieu scheme.

The Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP) system of development contributions as proposed by the State Government is available to only selected areas in the state, these being declared metropolitan Growth Areas. The ICP system may become available to declared precincts in established areas at some point in time, but there has been no confirmed State Government announcement on this as at June 2021.

The figure below provides a summary of the various tools that can be defined as "development contributions".

Other state agency mechanisms also apply to some development settings or in some circumstances, such as the Growth Area Infrastructure Contribution managed by the Victorian Planning Authority and the Infrastructure Recovery Charge managed by Development



Victoria. The Growth Area Infrastructure Contribution is limited to selected outer metropolitan 'greenfield' municipalities and does not apply to Whitehorse. The Infrastructure Recovery Charge has been rarely applied in the state. The Infrastructure Recovery Charge has not been used in Whitehorse and there is no plan to do so.



Figure 2: Overview of Development Contributions

Section 173 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 enables Council to enter into a legal agreement with other parties for any legal purpose.

A legal agreement can be used to clarify and / or enforce a planning obligation or a voluntary arrangement. A development proponent can agree to provide or pay for off-site (public) infrastructure for example, but cannot be compelled to do so unless a justified planning requirement applies.

Typically, the scope to negotiate an agreement for infrastructure provision is greater under a planning scheme amendment process and more limited under a planning permit process.

2.3 Funding Sources in Overview

Local government has access to other funding options via local rates and grants made by state and Commonwealth government. Sales of assets can be another option.

Within the realm of rates, Council can utilise Special Rate and Charges in some circumstances. This is not a development levy but rather an additional rate for a period of time to help pay for a specific matter such as drainage scheme, or road construction or activity centre marketing.









3.0 PLANNING PERMIT CONDITIONS

3.1 Overview

This section of the report considers use of planning permit conditions for infrastructure delivery. Council can require development proponents to deliver infrastructure on public land in the vicinity of their development sites, as a condition of development approval, in some circumstances.

3.2 Planning and Environment Act 1987

Section 62 of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 specifies the type of conditions that can be included within permits.

The Act states that the responsible authority must include any condition which the planning scheme or a relevant determining referral authority requires to be included, as long as it does not contradict a registered property title covenant.

The responsible authority may include any other condition that it thinks reasonable including things to be done to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

Infrastructure conditions are usually used for:

- An approved development contributions plan (DCP).
- An open space contribution pursuant to a schedule to clause 53.01 (if one applies) or the joint operation of the Subdivision Act 1988 and planning scheme clause 53.01.
- Requiring specified works, services or facilities to be provided or paid for in accordance with an agreement via a Section 173 agreement.
- Specified works, services or facilities that the responsible authority considers necessary to be provided on or to the land or other land as a result of the grant of the permit.

A condition for provision of infrastructure or payment for the provision of infrastructure is generally limited in the last listed option, and all such conditions can be appealed to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) for a review under Section 80 of the Act.

3.3 Subdivision Act

Part 3 of the Subdivision Act 1988 covers construction and maintenance of works. The works may generally relate to on-site works and those abutting and connected to the site such as drainage, road and pavement works.

The construction of the works may be executed by a Section 173 agreement with the responsible authority and / or referral authority.



3.4 Common Law and Selected Cases

The state government's Development Contributions Guidelines (Version: 5.9, 2007) nominates important cases regarding conditions on permits. The Guidelines state that the common law tests for a planning permit condition requires the condition:

- "To be reasonable
- To relate to the planning permission being granted
- To fulfil a planning purpose, and
- To accurately convey its intended effect and avoid uncertainty and vagueness."

Development contributions conditions and permit conditions have been further tested in a number of cases including:

- Eddie Barron Constructions Pty Ltd v Shire of Pakenham & Anor (1990, 6 AATR 10).
- Rosemeier v Greater Geelong City Council (No.1, 1997, 20 AATR 86).
- Curry v Melton Shire Council (Supreme Court, 2000, VSC 352).
- Christian Brothers Vic Pty Ltd v Banyule City Council (2001, VCAT 2120).
- Cameron Manor Pty Ltd v Mornington Peninsula Shire Council (2007, VCAT 1822).

An important case on development contributions is the Eddie Barron Constructions Pty Ltd v Shire of Pakenham case. Whilst the case has been central to framing DCP legislation, it is likely that key principles from the case would also be considered in an assessment of reasonableness with respect to planning permit conditions for infrastructure. The key principles are:

- Need Is there a proven need for the infrastructure created by the development?
- Nexus Is there a nexus between the development and the infrastructure?
- Equity Is the cost of the infrastructure apportioned fairly amongst all development sites that have a nexus with the infrastructure?
- Accountability If cash is paid, will the money be used for only the purpose it was collected?

Another case of note is Christian Brothers Vic Pty Ltd v Banyule City Council. That case deals with the validity of conditions for off-site and not abutting works, services and facilities. In this case road works were required in a location detached from the development site. It was determined that such conditions can be valid if required for the development.

The case history indicates that a planning permit condition for infrastructure provision or payment can be used in the circumstances where the infrastructure is justified and located within the proponent's land or located on abutting land or reasonably connected to the proponent's land.

Infrastructure that is remote from the proponent's site (i.e. not on or abutting the land) would generally require an approved planning scheme basis to be validly imposed such as via an



approved DCP, open space contribution or approved parking precinct plan cash in lieu scheme for example.

The case history has also addressed the issue of 'double dipping'. Application of a DCP levy cannot be imposed in addition to a condition to construct a DCP item. If the DCP item is constructed, an off-set for the works must be made in the DCP levy.

Cases have also considered the validity of permit conditions requiring payment of DCP levies where the DCP is not approved (i.e. not included in the Planning Scheme). VCAT has found that such conditions are invalid.

On the basis of the above information, the use of conditions appears to be limited or in most cases unlikely to be enforceable for works 'remote' from the development site unless a DCP or other such mechanism applies, or if a proponent voluntarily agrees via a section 173 legal agreement.

A council is likely to require a policy or strategy to be prepared and adopted for a planning permit condition scheme to be operational other than standard conditions. Incorporating a policy or strategy in the Planning Scheme is also likely to be required for the approach to have maximum weight.

3.5 Example: City of Melbourne

The City of Melbourne provides an example of practice in relation to off-site conditions for streetscape works.

It is understood that some three or four decades ago the City of Melbourne introduced an Interim Development Order (IDO) to manage development that was occurring at the time. The IDO included the option for development proponents to enter into an agreement with the Council for development bonuses in exchange for delivery of public works such as streetscape works. Streetscape works were nominated in Council policy and strategy and standards were nominated by Council via urban design and engineering documentation. This included conditions to provide bluestone paving and street furniture adjacent to CBD properties which were subject to development and the permit process.

In 1998, the density bonus controls were removed from the Melbourne Planning Scheme but the practice of requiring off-site conditions remained in force.

The current Melbourne Planning Scheme lists various policies for infrastructure and open space however the detailed specifications and requirements are nominated in separate documentation held within Council teams that provide direction on required works.

Relevant policy in the Melbourne Planning Scheme with respect to infrastructure requirements includes:

 21.10 Infrastructure - This clause sets the general direction for the need for new infrastructure: "Growth and development in the municipality will require a matching provision of infrastructure. The expansion and upgrading of roads, utilities, community



facilities and public open space will be required to service the growth of resident, worker and visitor populations.

- 21.13 Urban Renewal Areas The various growth precinct policies also nominate at a general level provision of infrastructure to support growth and change.
- 22.26 and 53.01 Public Open Space Contributions These clauses provide specific reference to contributions for open space: This policy applies to all development applications that include an application for subdivision that would trigger an open space contribution under Clause 53.01.

Current permit conditions are understood to be executed via primarily the Part 3 of the Subdivision Act 1988 where both a planning permit and subdivision permit are required. Both permits nominate the provision of public work.

Council requires developers to apply the most current standards for improved works such as tree planting conditions, widening footpaths and new stainless steel street furniture. However, Council will generally not detail the public works in the permit conditions, but rather refer to secondary documents and nominate that plans are to be detailed to the satisfaction of Engineering Services.

Council use an internal protocol to ensure that permits are issued or stamped only after public realm information is supported by teams such as Urban Design, Parks and Engineering.

An example of public work conditions within a subdivision permit is shown below.

- "The road adjoining the site along Fawkner Street must be reconstructed together with associated works including the reconstruction or relocation of services as necessary at the cost of the developer, in accordance with plans and specifications first approved by the Responsible Authority Engineering Services. All necessary approvals and permits are to be first obtained from Council and the works performed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; Council's Manager Engineering Services.
- The footpath(s) adjoining the site along the street must be upgraded and reconstructed in sawn bluestone together with associated works including the reconstruction of kerb with 300mm sawn bluestone and channel with 250mm sawn bluestone gutterstones and/or services as necessary at the cost of the developer, in accordance with plans and specifications first approved by the Responsible Authority – Engineering Services. All necessary approvals and permits are to be first obtained from Council and the works performed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; Council's Manager Engineering Services.
- Existing street levels must not be altered for the purpose of constructing new vehicle crossings or pedestrian entrances without first obtaining approval from the Responsible Authority Engineering Services. All necessary approvals and permits are to be first obtained from Council and the works performed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; Council's Manager Engineering Services.



A review of the current lighting levels adjacent to the subject land and lighting design must be submitted to Council for approval. Lighting design must meet AS1158 category P3 requirements as a minimum. CitiPower approved LED luminaries and poles must be incorporated in the lighting design. All public lighting must be on an unmetered system complying with CitiPower rules and regulations. All necessary approvals and permits are to be first obtained from Council and the works performed to the satisfaction of the Responsible Authority; Council's Manager Engineering Services."

It is understood that the Melbourne conditions are generally well accepted and that few appeals have been lodged. This is likely to relate to:

- The long-term application of the conditions and related design standards.
- A relatively high land value environment in the municipality, with the cost of meeting conditions being relatively low in relation to overall property value.
- The works being in proximity to the site would be considered to add value to the property.

It is possible that application of the same approach in a setting where the works have not been previously used in conditions and where property values are lower may attract a higher rate of objections and appeals. This could apply to parts of Whitehorse but it would depend on the nature of conditions proposed, their cost and potential to add value to a development. The prospect of contestability would be magnified if the works are remote from the site and deemed to add no or little value to it.

3.6 Floor Area Uplift (FAU) Bonus System of Contributions

The Minister for Planning re-introduced plot ratio controls for central Melbourne (via Melbourne Planning Scheme Amendment C270). The controls provide an 18:1 site plot ratio control for the Hoddle Grid, Southbank and Shrine precinct. This means floorspace of a building should not exceed 18 times the area of the site, nominally equating to 18 levels when a site is built to the boundary.

The explanatory note for the mechanism states that the average site plot ratio for Melbourne and Southbank applications under the previous discretionary planning model delivered an average plot ratio of approximately 35:1 over the four years to 2015 with post-2015 examples being approximately 38:1.

The primary basis of the plot ratio control is stated as providing the planning system with greater control over development and amenity outcomes. An important objective is to increase the amount of private open space on development sites and air space between buildings.

The default plot ratio tool provides a mechanism to negotiate a 'contribution' from developers in exchange for bonus floorspace above the 18:1 ratio. This is a common approach used in other jurisdictions where a share of the land value uplift of allowing bonus floorspace is paid to the authority in the form of cash or agreed public benefits in the area.



The nominated Melbourne formula is: Additional Floor Area = Extra Commercial Value = 10% Public Share = Value of Public Benefit to be provided.

The public benefits may include streetscape and open space works in the vicinity of the site, provision of community facilities and affordable housing.

The Panel report that considered the Minister's proposed amendments supported the use of the 18:1 ratio for urban design and planning purposes but recommended the abandonment of the proposed FAU Scheme on the basis it was deficient on a number of matters including that it had no clear legislative basis within the realm of development contributions, amongst other concerns.

Despite this, the Minister for Planning adopted the approach in principle albeit noting that it would be based on agreed public benefits with the responsible authority and proponent.

3.7 Victorian Planning Authority Growth Area Permit Conditions

The Victorian Planning Authority provides guidance on the use of permit conditions for infrastructure in the document 'Growth Area Model Planning Permit Conditions – A Manual for Implementation'.

Whilst this document does not apply to Whitehorse (it was prepared for outer metropolitan 'greenfield' municipalities), it does provide planning practice principles that are applicable to all development settings.

This document was developed to assist growth area councils when issuing planning permits for subdivision and provides a standard set of conditions to be used to implement precinct structure plans.

This essentially states that off-site conditions should be governed by a structure plan, infrastructure plan and linked to a DCP or other similar tool. Any other specific off-site conditions are assessed on a case-by-case basis and need to relate to works, be on abutting land or connected to the proponent's land and be deemed reasonable, such as to fulfil a planning outcome for the area.

3.8 Voluntary Urban Stormwater Offsets Scheme

A stormwater offset scheme enables developers to offset all or part of their stormwater requirements through a financial contribution paid to council. The contributions are used to fund Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) projects that are in addition to planned WSUD works that are funded via rates revenue and / or a DCP. The offsets cover the entire lifecycle of the asset.

Councils that have introduced such schemes include Kingston and Moonee Valley. In the Moonee Valley example, a development proponent can offset up to 20% (maximum) of their on-site stormwater requirements through a financial contribution to council. Council allocates the funds to deliver large-scale WSUD projects that deliver an equivalent stormwater quality benefit.



The introduction of such a scheme in Whitehorse could be established in conjunction with a DCP for WSUD and drainage projects. This would need to be prepared on the basis that any WSUD projects in a DCP provide a base level of provision that is needed for the community. The offset scheme would cover case by case matters and address WSUD projects over and above the base provision.

3.9 Example in Whitehorse

An example of a condition for off-site (and in this case abutting) works is the intersection construction on Middleborough Road for the Brickworks development in Burwood East. The need for the intersection is 100% generated by the development site and therefore the full cost is appropriately allocated to the development site. This scenario can also apply to other works like drainage, paths and other road and public transport works.

Figure 4: Intersection on Middleborough Road, Burwood East



Source: Nearmap



4.0 DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS PLAN

4.1 Overview

A development contributions plan (DCP) is enabled by Part 3B of the Planning and Environment Act 1987. DCP contributions are mandatory cash payments (but can be taken as land and / or works in lieu of cash payments if Council agrees) for off-site or shared infrastructure works that are pre-planned and scheduled to be delivered by Council.

DCP works tend to be larger scale works that serve suburb size catchments and are preplanned.

4.2 Development Contributions Legislation, Directions and Guidelines

The legislative and policy framework for implementing a DCP is governed by three main documents:

- Part 3B of the Planning and Environment Act 1987.
- Ministerial Direction on the Preparation and Content of Development Contributions Plans and Ministerial Reporting Requirements for Development Contributions Plans (October 2016).
- Development Contributions Guidelines (2007).

A DCP is legally enforceable when it is incorporated into a planning scheme as an overlay. The DCP Overlay (DCPO) is a summary of a DCP report which becomes an incorporated document under clause 72.04 of the planning scheme.

The DCP specifies contributions development proponents are required to make as cash payments (or land and / or works in kind) to Council (after a planning permit and / or building permit is issued) to help pay for nominated infrastructure items from a specified DCP area. If a development proposal is refused there is no requirement to pay a DCP levy.

A DCP can cover any form of capital works infrastructure investment, including roads, paths, drainage, community facilities, open space and land purchase. Councils can decide whether to use open space levies (clause 53.01) or a DCP for selected open space contributions but cannot use both tools for the same open space projects. A council can however use both mechanisms for open space as long as the open space projects that form the basis for the relevant tools are different.

Under a DCP the default contribution method is cash payment but Council can, at its discretion, accept land and/or works in lieu of cash contributions if it agrees.

A DCP must list the infrastructure Council will build over the life of the DCP. The contribution amount is directly linked to the list of committed infrastructure projects, irrespective of whether projects are fully funded or partially funded by a DCP.



A DCP will collect levies based on development that requires a planning and / or building permit. It does not collect levies from development that has been constructed (and obtained required permits) prior to the DCP becoming legally operational (via gazettal of a DCP overlay in the Planning Scheme). This means that a DCP will have a funding gap in proportion to the amount of existing development compared to total projected development at the end of the DCP planning horizon. A DCP in an established area setting that is experiencing infill development may typically recover 10% to 30% of the cost of infrastructure via a DCP (depending on the quantum of future development and how accurate development projections are).

In a greenfield precinct or brownfield precinct, which will be completely developed or redeveloped in the future, a DCP could potentially recover 100% of the cost of infrastructure.

Council must use the contributions for the purpose it was obtained. If the contribution is cash, Council must credit the money to a separate DCP account and deliver the infrastructure project or projects listed in the DCP within the timeline specified in the DCP.

On this basis, the accountability provisions in a DCP are strong. There must be a clear nexus between development sites making use of (or deriving benefit from) infrastructure, payment of DCP charges and receiving infrastructure within a specified period of time.

Should Council resolve not to proceed with an infrastructure project listed in a DCP, the funds collected for the item can be used for the provision of additional works, services and facilities as approved by the Minister responsible for the Planning and Environment Act 1987 or be refunded to owners of land subject to the infrastructure charges. It is unclear whether this would always require an update to the incorporated document through a planning scheme amendment process.

The method to prepare a DCP is stated in detail in the 2007 Guidelines. The steps are summarised in the following extract from the Guidelines. Essentially, the key steps are to:

- Identify infrastructure that is required to service an area or areas or the municipality.
- Identify development and projected future development in the area that will make use of the infrastructure (based on strategic or structure plans and Planning Scheme).
- Apportion the cost of the infrastructure across all anticipated existing and future users of the infrastructure using the method specified in the Guidelines.
- Summarise the information in tables that show:
 - Levies that are required to be paid by development within an area.
 - The infrastructure that the levies are based on and will be delivered within a specified period of time.



Figure 5: DCP Preparation Method for a Full Cost Apportionment (FCA) DCP



Source: Development Contribution Guidelines (2007)



4.3 Collecting Agencies and Development Agencies

Two agencies are involved in the operation of DCPs: Collecting Agencies and Development Agencies.

The Collecting Agency is responsible for collection of DCP levies and the Development Agency is responsible for delivery of DCP infrastructure.

In most cases a Council performs both roles. However, in some circumstances, the roles can be split between agencies such as where the Council is the Collecting Agency for works to be delivered by a state agency.

4.4 Auditor General Review of Development Contributions

In 2009 the Victorian Auditor General prepared a report on the *Use of Development Contributions by Local Government*. The objective of the audit was to:

- "Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of councils' management of development contributions;
- Whether they had effective arrangements for managing, monitoring and reporting on the collection and use of development contributions; and
- Whether they effectively used development contributions to deliver planned infrastructure."

The audit was based on a review of three sample councils that operated development contribution plans in the 2008-09 year: Port Phillip, Surf Coast and Wyndham.

The audit concluded that there is a lack of transparency in the use of development contributions and as such there is little assurance that the system is operating as intended. This means that councils may or may not be allocating contributions efficiently and effectively. The audit was not able to clearly distinguish contribution details in annual reports.

The audit did, however, find each council had appropriately used development contributions to deliver infrastructure they had committed to and all councils identified aggregate development contributions revenue in their annual reports. The audit made a number of recommendations. The following are relevant for a potential DCP:

- "Councils should review and, where necessary, enhance the effectiveness of controls to make sure that development contributions due are collected.
- Councils should assure that contributions have been used for their intended purpose by:
 - Identifying the standards and delivery time frames for infrastructure commitments contained within voluntary agreements and DCPs.
 - Transparently identifying within council budgets and capital works programs the infrastructure commitments arising from all development contributions.
 - Accurately and regularly reconciling contributions collected and expended, including delivery of associated infrastructure against that planned.



- Councils should strengthen local governance arrangements for development contributions by:
 - Timely reporting to senior management on the collection and use of development contributions and delivery of infrastructure commitments against that planned.
 - Systematically identifying and managing all risks to the delivery of infrastructure associated with development contributions.
 - Assigning management responsibilities for the coordination and oversight of the management of development contributions.
- Councils should clearly report on the collection and use of development contributions revenue in their annual reports, as well as report on the associated infrastructure delivered against that planned."

In response, the State Government issued the 2016 *Ministerial Direction on the preparation and context of Development Contributions Plans and Ministerial Reporting Requirements for Development Contributions Plans* (Ministerial Direction) to provide for more detailed and consistent monitoring and reporting of DCPs in line with the Auditor General's recommendations.

4.5 Auditor General Managing Development Contributions (2020)

In this audit, the VAGO assessed three programs and one other legal instruments used to provide development contributions. The Auditor General assessed Growth Areas Infrastructure Contribution (GIAC) DCPs, Infrastructure Contributions Plans (ICP) and legal agreements.

The review examined the following councils: Cardinia, Golden Plains, Melton; and Whitehorse.

Whitehorse does not have a DCP whereas Cardinia, Golden Plains and Melton have DCPs associated with growth area Precinct Structure Plans. None of the councils examined had an established whole of municipality DCP.

The review concluded:

"The ICP program's implementation is delayed. DELWP and VPA's effort to implement the ICP program has reduced its focus on addressing the existing issues with the DCP program, which remains unnecessarily complex, costly and time-consuming for councils to use."

With respect to DCPs the review found:

- "The DCP program carries significant barriers and risks for councils. Only 24 councils collected contributions through a DCP in 2017–18 or 2018–19, despite all 79 being able to create one. Issues include the:
 - Cost of developing a DCP;
 - Time it takes to develop and have a DCP ministerially approved;
 - Complexity of DCPs and the expertise required to manage them effectively;



- Financial risks of entering into a DCP. For example, a DCP locks in councils to deliver infrastructure projects, even if development does not proceed and the council cannot collect levies."
- "These barriers and risks mean that some councils do not want to participate, leaving them without a formal program to obtain development contributions and therefore missing opportunities to fund community infrastructure in this way. DELWP has not advised the government about ways to address this."

The report recommended that DELWP simplify the DCP program and provide updates guidance and ongoing support to build councils' capacity.

4.6 Annual Reporting

A council is required to provide for regular monitoring, reporting and review of the monies received and expended in accordance with a DCP through financial statements as defined in the 2016 Ministerial Direction.

The direction states that:

- "A report must be prepared each financial year and given to the Minister for Planning within 3 months after the end of the financial year reported on.
- If the collecting agency or development agency is a municipal council, the report must be included in the report of operations contained in the council's annual report prepared under the Local Government Act 2020.
- A collecting agency must report on:
 - Any infrastructure levy paid to it under Part 3B of the Act in a financial year in accordance with Table 1 in the Annexure; and
 - Any land, works, services or facilities accepted by it in a financial year in accordance with Table 2 in the Annexure.
- If a development contributions plan is approved on or after 1 June 2016, a collecting agency must report on the total amount of infrastructure levies paid to it, the total amount of land, works, services or facilities accepted by it, and the total amount of infrastructure levies expended by it under Part 3B of the Act in accordance with Table 3 in the Annexure.
- A development agency must report on:
 - Its use of any land, works, services or facilities accepted as works in kind under section 46P of the Act; and
 - The expenditure of any infrastructure levy paid to it under Part 3B of the Act; in accordance with Table 4 in the Annexure."



4.7 Rationale for the Distinction of DIL and CIL

A DCP levy is made up of two components:

- Development Infrastructure Levy (DIL).
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

This distinction is specified in the Planning and Environment Act 1987, Ministerial Directions and DCP Guidelines.

The distinction reflects government policy at the time DCP legislation was first enacted in 1995 (in the Planning and Environment Act 1987) and has been retained ever since.

The rationale is that it is appropriate for councils to levy contributions for 'development infrastructure' as early as possible (i.e. planning and / or subdivision permit stage) and to the extent strategically justified (i.e. uncapped).

Development infrastructure refers to 'basic' works that are deemed important for health and safety (such as roads, paths, drains and land for public purposes).

The DIL will usually (if not always) be apportioned to all types of development, such as residential retail, commercial and industrial development.

However, the policy position is that councils should only levy for community infrastructure when people are moving into the area and thus the CIL is limited to only the building permit stage for a dwelling. The CIL is also capped by state government to limit council use of CIL levies.

The cap is imposed by the Section 46L of the Act and is currently set at \$1,225 (2021-212 value) and will be adjusted on 1 July each year in accordance with the formula outlined in Section 46LA. The CIL cap has been part of the DCP since the introduction of Part 3B in 1995.

The CIL will usually (if not always) be apportioned to only residential development (reflecting local community demand for facilities).

Community infrastructure generally refers to buildings and facilities that deliver social and community services. The DCP Guidelines define community infrastructure as "projects involving the construction of all other buildings or facilities used for community or social purposes."

In the early 2000s, a group of growth area councils made a case to the then Minister for Planning that early years facilities are basic infrastructure and should be classified as DIL. The Minister agreed and listed such facilities (i.e. maternal and child health care facilities, kindergartens and child care facilities) as DIL in the Ministerial Directions.

An outcome of the distinction is a degree of complexity in DCP preparation and operation.



4.8 Administration of DIL and CIL

Section 46N(1) of the Planning and Environment Act 1987 sets out that in order to collect the DIL component of a DCP, the responsible authority must include a condition in the permit that the DIL is paid within a certain time or an agreement to pay it be entered into. The only exception to this is where a planning permit is not required. Under this situation, the DIL is still payable and section 24(1)(d) of the Building Act comes into play.

Section 24 (1) (d) of the Building Act requires that a building surveyor must not issue a building permit if the building permit will be inconsistent with the planning permit. So provided the relevant planning permit has a requirement (i.e. condition) for payment of the DIL, it can be required through the Building Act. If a planning permit is not required but the obligation to pay the DCP exists, such as a new single dwelling on a lot greater than 300 sqm, then a building permit cannot be issued until the DCP levy is paid.

In either event, the introduction of a DCP should be accompanied by a notification and education program for local and regular private building surveyors.

The CIL is payable prior to the issue of a building permit.

4.9 Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP)

An alternative development contributions model to DCPs is the ICP model, which is similar to a DCP system. The ICP model applies to declared precincts.

The main difference with the ICP system is that levies are pre-set by the state government. The levies can be used within the ICP area on allowable items. This is a list of infrastructure (like or the same as a DCP list) which forms the basis for the ICP. A council can seek to adopt a higher than standard levy by seeking to adopt a supplementary levy in situations where the standard levy is not sufficient to meet costs.

The DCP system on the other hand is required to calculate a levy based on information collated in the DCP preparation process. The Guidelines for a DCP are complex, and as such the DCP process can be complex.

As noted above, at the time of this report's preparation, the ICP model is limited to metropolitan growth areas.

The ICP system may be applied to declared precincts within established areas in the future.

5.0 DCP BENCHMARKING

5.1 Introduction

The following established area councils have adopted or are preparing DCPs, these being:

- Darebin which has been operating a municipal wide DCP for over 10 years.
- Moreland which introduced a municipal wide DCP in 2015.
- Melbourne which sought to introduce two area-specific DCPs in 2014 but abandoned the process due to a Planning Panel recommending the Amendment be abandoned.
- Brimbank which introduced a Sunshine activity centre DCP in 2015 and a municipal wide DCP in 2018.
- Banyule which introduced a municipal wide DCP in 2019.
- Yarra which introduced a municipal wide DCP in 2021.
- Municipal-wide DCPs current in preparation: Moonee Valley, Maribyrnong, Darebin, Stonnington and potentially other municipalities.

5.2 Darebin

The City of Darebin has operated a municipal wide DCP since 2004. The DCP nominated a timeframe of 10 years.

The DCP was designed on the basis of an early version of the DCP Guidelines and sought a strict interpretation of user pays principles by using the smallest possible spatial unit for analysis area definition: ABS Census Collection Districts. As a result, the DCP contains 227 separate charge areas.

All development types - residential, retail industrial and commercial - were included in the DCP.

The DCP also sought to include a highly detailed and comprehensive list of infrastructure projects, drawn from a 10-year capital works plan. The initial DCP identified 879 infrastructure projects to be delivered over the course of the 10-year plan. The estimated cost of the nominated projects was identified as just over \$64 million. The bulk of these projects were road projects, accounting for around two-thirds of the total infrastructure cost and 80% of the total number of projects identified in the 2004 DCP.

The levies range from \$42 to \$3,977 per residential dwelling with the average charge being around \$850.

Levies for development exempt from paying the CIL vary from \$2 to \$3,941 per demand unit, with an average of \$690.

In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

• Commit \$64,364,342 in expenditure (being the total cost of infrastructure in the DCP).



 Collect \$4,899,033 from development, which equates to approximately 8% of committed infrastructure cost (or estimated 92% funding gap).

An audit of the DCP was undertaken in 2015 to determine the status of the funding tool. It concluded that the DCP had raised more funds than was initially anticipated. This occurred for three reasons namely:

- Council did not deliver some projects nominated in the initial infrastructure projects list.
- Development in some areas of the municipality exceeded the development projections shown in the DCP.
- External funding was used to deliver some projects in the DCP.

External funding was received by way of government grants and the Federal Government Road to Recovery program. Non-delivery of some infrastructure within the DCP was attributed to:

- The slower than anticipated depreciation of infrastructure assets, meaning that assets that were expected to be replaced were no longer required to be replaced.
- The introduction of new standards, which meant that some assets could not be delivered to the standard specified within the original DCP.

It is understood that the Darebin DCP is the most detailed and complex DCP in Victoria by having 227 areas and 879 projects covering all land use categories.

While the Council was able to effectively operate the funding tool, key issues related to difficulty in provided accurate development projections for very small areas and difficulty in specifying up-front a highly specific infrastructure delivery program.

5.3 Moreland

The Moreland DCP was implemented in 2015. The DCP covers the whole of the municipality with 12 charge areas being suburb boundaries. The sizes of the charge areas were noted by a Planning Panel as being appropriate - small enough to avoid unnecessary cross subsidisation, yet large enough to avoid unnecessary complexity in the preparation and administration of the DCP. The areas also align with an approved open space levy scheme which uses variable rates for the same 12 areas.

The DCP applies to residential, commercial and industrial development. Exemptions are made for certain land uses such as non-government schools and developments where there is no net increase in demand arising as a result of the development (e.g. one for-one residential development). Council has flagged that it will review the list of exemptions to consider adding uses like charities or similar uses in the next review of the DCP.

The total levies of the DCP range from \$324 to \$1,460 per residential dwelling for both CIL and DIL, from \$402 to \$4,239 per 100 sqm for leasable commercial floorspace and from \$85 to \$837 per 100 sqm for industrial floorspace.



The total infrastructure included in the DCP is 842 projects drawn from a 10-year capital works list. The projects are primarily in the categories of roads, drainage and community facilities.

In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

- Commit \$114,921,542 in expenditure.
- Collect \$13,957,544 from development, being approximately 12% of committed infrastructure cost.

Moreland Council has appointed a DCP project officer to manage the operation of the DCP on a day-to-day basis. The officer is a trained accountant and reports to the finance directorate. DCP operation is also supported by a planner who provides ad hoc advice on planning and development matters.

Council is maintaining DCP records and is in the process of designing an IT system so that DCP data can be more readily integrated into Council's information systems.

5.4 Melbourne

The City of Melbourne prepared a draft Development Contribution Plan for two growth precincts in the municipality: City North and Southbank. The DCP was proposed to be incorporated into the Melbourne Planning Scheme via Amendment C208.

The DCP is linked to and reflects the intent of the City North Structure Plan and Southbank Structure Plan.

The DCP identified the areas to which the DCP would apply but deviated in the way DCPs are typically prepared "taking into consideration the challenges unique to the City of Melbourne as a growing capital city."

The proposed DCP identified a general and long list of infrastructure projects such as streetscape works, community facilities and sustainability improvements. Specific projects and delivery commitments for those projects were not included in the DCP.

The DCP was forecast to collect approximately \$16.1 million over the 15-year life of the plan. Melbourne City Council indicated a commitment to spend \$60 million in the DCP areas and said it would, over time, nominate what infrastructure projects it will fund using DCP funds and other funding sources.

The DCP was challenged by a number of landholders and developers at a Planning Panel. The Panel concluded the following:

- "the CNSDCP as drafted cannot be understood as a stand-alone document and much of the information that it relies upon was not exhibited with the Amendment.
- The vast majority of the 53 local streetscape projects described in the (associated infrastructure scoping) report are aspirational; not sufficiently justified by traffic or technical analysis and are unlikely to come to fruition within the timeframe of the CNSDCP.



- The projects are not clearly specified in the CNSDCP, nor is the methodology clearly articulated.
- The CNSDCP does not meet the principles of need, equity, accountability and nexus.
- The CNSDCP does not meet the principles of the Development Contributions Guidelines (2007), including those relating to external demand and works in kind.
- The development forecasts upon which the CNSDCP are based are not justified."

The Panel recommended the DCP be abandoned on the basis that it lacks the level of detail and transparency that is reasonably sought by the 2007 DCP Guidelines.

The Panel emphasised that it is reasonable for a contributor to a DCP to be able to discern what infrastructure will be delivered and when. Melbourne City Council did not pursue the Amendment and explored alternative funding options for the areas with the state government.

5.5 Brimbank

The City of Brimbank has two DCPs which are:

- DCPO1 applies to the Sunshine Activity Centre and was incorporated into the Planning Scheme in January 2015 by Amendment C105.
- DCPO2 applies to the entire municipality excluding the Sunshine Activity Centre and was incorporated into the Planning Scheme by Amendment C187 in January 2018.

The Sunshine DCP includes \$37.3 million in cost of open space, kindergarten, roads and urban design works. The DCP is ultimately expected to collect 59.3% of the cost.

There is one charge area for the activity centre and the levy is \$2,567 per dwelling, \$35 per retail square metre and \$27 per commercial square metre.

Developments undertaken by Brimbank Council, social housing undertaken by a registered housing association or government agency or VicTrack are exempt from the DCP. Buildings and works that do not create additional demand units are also exempt.

The Brimbank DCP applies to 19 charge areas.

In total, the DCP comprises 157 projects with a value of \$110.4m (in 2016) that the Council committed to develop between 2016 and 2036. The projects were classified as follows community facilities, paths and roads.

The charges levied by the DCP range from \$807 to \$1,503 per residential dwelling, from \$2 to \$6 per sqm for retail floorspace, from \$1 to \$8 per sqm for commercial floorspace and from \$0.19 to \$0.84 per sqm for industrial floorspace.

Exemptions from the DCP apply to the uses specified in the Ministerial Direction, land where a Section 173 Agreement is in place for the provision of infrastructure and any development that does not create additional demand units.



5.6 Banyule

The City of Banyule is an established municipality located within in the middle ring of Melbourne. The municipality is experiencing development intensification around activity centres, particularly in the southern half of the municipality around Heidelberg and Ivanhoe. In this context a municipal-wide DCP was prepared during 2017/18.

The DCP applies to 24 areas. Projects are classified as serving local, subregional or municipal areas based on their intended purpose.

In total, the DCP comprises 321 projects with a value of \$64.1m. Banyule committed to delivering the projects in the timeline between 2016 and 2036. The projects are primarily in the categories of roads, drainage and community facilities and come from the Council's fouryear capital works program.

In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

- Commit \$64.1 million in expenditure.
- Collect \$9.9 million from development, being approximately 15.6% of committed infrastructure cost.

The levies range from \$459 to \$1,623 per residential dwelling, from \$2 to \$21 per sqm for retail floorspace, from \$0.78 to \$5 per sqm for commercial floorspace and from \$0.53 to \$6 per sqm for industrial floorspace.

The DCP anticipates that Council will collect \$10 million over 20 years with a 16 per cent return.

Exemptions are made for certain land uses such as non-government schools and developments where there is no net increase in demand arising as a result of the development (e.g. one for-one residential development).

The DCP was introduced into the Banyule Planning Scheme by Amendment C115 which was exhibited from February to March 2018. The Panel Hearing was held in June 2018. In August 2018 the Panel report recommended adoption of the Amendment subject to some minor modifications. The Amendment was gazetted on 4 October 2019.

5.7 Yarra

The City of Yarra prepared a DCP that applies to residential, retail, commercial and industrial development. The DCP covers the whole of the municipality with the 11 charge areas being suburb boundaries.

The total infrastructure included in the DCP is 777 projects drawn from an adopted 10-year capital works program. The projects are primarily in the categories of roads, drainage and community facilities.

In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

• Commit \$117.2 million in expenditure.



 Collect \$55.6 million from development, being approximately 31.4% of committed infrastructure cost.

Yarra Council has committed to delivering the projects in the timeline between 2016 and 2036.

The charges levied by the DCP range from \$1,676 to \$3,653 per residential dwelling, from \$3 to \$41 per sqm for retail floorspace, from \$2 to \$41 per sqm for commercial floorspace and from \$1 to \$11 per sqm for industrial floorspace.

Exemptions are made for certain land uses such as non-government schools and developments where there is no net increase in demand arising as a result of the development (e.g. one for-one residential development and no net increase in retail, commercial or industrial floorspace).

The Yarra DCP was prepared in 2017/18. The Amendment (C238) to enable the DCP was placed on public exhibition from late August 2018 to late September 2018. A total of 25 submissions were received. More than half of these submissions supported the DCP.

Part of the conclusions reached by the Panel were:

- Amendment C238 to the Yarra Planning Scheme is strategically justified.
- The DCP has been well prepared, with rigorous processes used to identify the projects to be funded.
- The apportioning of costs between the 11 charge areas and between existing and future users is appropriate.

The DCP and Panel report were adopted by the Council in April 2019 and forwarded to the Minister for Planning for approval. The Amendment was approved on 15 May 2020 and was gazetted on 1 February 2021 based on a COVID related delay to implementation.

5.8 DCPs in Preparation

A number of established area DCPs are in various stages of preparation. These include Moonee Valley, Maribyrnong, Darebin and Stonnington.

The Moonee Valley DCP is in the final stages of approval as at June 2021. The DCP is divided into 18 areas and is planned to operate to 2040. In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

- Commit \$381.1 million in expenditure across 556 projects.
- Collect \$70.8 million from development, being approximately 18.6% of committed infrastructure cost.

The Maribyrnong DCP is in the final stage or approval as at June 2021. The DCP is divided into 21 areas and is planned to operate to 2041. In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

Commit \$147.4 million in expenditure across 199 projects.



 Collect \$40.5 million from development, being approximately 27.5% of committed infrastructure cost.

The Darebin DCP is in post exhibition stage as at June 2021. The DCP is divided into 16 areas and is planned to operate to 2041. In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP was estimated to:

- Commit \$119.8 million in expenditure across 72 projects.
- Collect \$29.2 million from development, being approximately 24.4% of committed infrastructure cost.

The City of Stonnington DCP is in post exhibition stage as at June 2021. It is divided into 9 area and is planned to operate to 2040. In terms of cost commitment and recovery, the DCP is estimated to:

- Commit \$259 million in expenditure across 197 projects.
- Collect \$49.5 million from development, being approximately 19.1% of committed infrastructure cost.

5.9 DCP Implications for Whitehorse

The City of Whitehorse does not currently use a formal planning scheme DCP to help deliver infrastructure.

The municipality is experiencing development similar to other established area councils and is faced with similar infrastructure delivery needs. In concept, Whitehorse could also prepare a DCP similar to those identified above. The ability of the municipality to do this will depend on the specific infrastructure needs that are identified and whether these needs relate to development and are compliant with DCP tests.



6.0 OPEN SPACE CONTRIBUTIONS

6.1 Overview

This section provides an overview of the open space contributions system that applies in Victoria and specifically in Whitehorse and other established area councils. The open space contributions system can operate in tandem with a DCP system and other funding mechanisms.

6.2 Legal Framework

The legal framework for open space contributions is established by the joint operation of the Subdivision Act 1988 and Victoria Planning Provisions.

The Subdivision Act 1988 enables councils to seek a contribution for open space from some subdivision proponents. The default contribution amount can be up to 5% of land area or cash value of the site value or a combination of both, based on an assessment of need. The relevant sections of the Subdivision Act 1988 are section 18 to 20.

Some subdivisions are exempt from the open space contribution requirement, including two lot subdivisions that are unlikely to be further subdivided and land and buildings that have made the contribution (or deemed to have made the contribution) previously.

The provisions of the Subdivision Act 1988 apply if a requirement for public open space is not specified as a schedule to clause 53.01 of the planning scheme.

The intent of the Subdivision Act 1988 is used to inform the suitability of a proposed schedule to the planning scheme. Key principles of the Subdivision Act 1988 are as follows.

6.3 The Concept of Need

The Subdivision Act 1988 states that a council may make a public open space requirement if it considers that, as a result of the subdivision, there will be a need for more open space. Relevant considerations are:

- The nature of the existing and proposed use or development of the land.
- Any likelihood that existing open space will be more intensively used after than before the subdivision.
- Any existing or likely population density in the area of the subdivision and the effect of the subdivision on density.
- Whether there are existing places of public resort or recreation in the neighbourhood of the subdivision, and the adequacy of these.
- How much of the land in the subdivision is likely to be used for places of resort and recreation for lot owners.
- Policies of the council concerning the provision of places of public resort and recreation.



6.4 Use of Open Space Contributions

The Subdivision Act 1988 requires Council to use any payment towards public open space to:

- Buy land for use for public recreation or public resort, as parklands or for similar purposes; or
- Improve land already set aside, zoned or reserved for public recreation or public resort, as parklands or for similar purposes.

6.5 Planning Scheme Provisions

Clause 53.01 of all planning schemes in Victoria expressly recognises the power of councils to obtain open space contributions under the Subdivision Act 1988, and provides a mechanism for councils to amend the provisions to suit local circumstances via a schedule to that clause.

The main reason for using the schedule is to provide more certainty regarding public open space contributions up-front. The benefits of using a schedule for a council are:

- Avoid the need for case-by-case public open space needs assessment for each subdivision application.
- Eliminate or reduce the potential for appeals to VCAT on the basis of the levy rate selected.
- Provide operational transparency and consistency.
- Increase budget forecasting accuracy with respect to public open space income.

From the perspective of developers, a pre-notified schedule will provide greater certainty regarding required contributions and this can be factored into feasibility assessments.

The clause that applies in Whitehorse is shown below. It is understood that this is based on the 2007 Whitehorse Open Space Strategy (WOSS). The adopted Whitehorse budget for 2021-22 includes funding for a new Open Space Strategy.

Figure 6: Schedule to Clause 53.01 of the Whitehorse Planning Scheme

31/07/2018 VC148	SCHEDULE TO CLAUSE 53.01 PUBLIC OP SUBDIVISION	EN SPACE CONTRIBUTION AND			
1.0 31/07/2018 VC148	Subdivision and public open space contribution				
	Type or location of subdivision	Amount of contribution for public open space			
	The subdivision of land on a strategic site (as defined by the Whitehorse Open Space Strategy or Council or State Government).	Minimum 4%.			
		Contribution rate greater than 4% subject to negotiation of a development plan.			
	All other land	4%			

Source: Whitehorse Planning Scheme Online, June 2021



The schedule within the Whitehorse Planning Scheme currently provides for a 4% open space contribution but this can be higher in some circumstances.

The open space levies that are collected must be set aside in a separate open space levy account and used for open space improvement in the municipality.

Council officers have noted that there is potential to clarify aspects of the schedule.

The reference to 'subject to the negotiation of a development plan' in the current schedule has caused some confusion and could be clarified in a revised schedule. The intent of the reference to development plan is broader than a formal Development Plan Overlay (DPO).

Similarly, reference to identification of a 'strategic site' in column 1 has been questioned. The definition is intended to be broad to encompass sites that may come up through strategic processes. This matter could also be clarified in a revised schedule.

Another element of complexity is the need to strategically justify a contribution greater than 4% on a case by case basis. This may in part relate to the schedule being silent on what the rate could be under different circumstances.

These matters could be clarified in tandem with an update to the WOSS, including review of a fair and reasonable open space contribution rate.

6.6 Deriving an Appropriate Contribution Amount

A significant body of case history has been compiled regarding the development of schedules to clause 53.01 of planning schemes in Victoria. The main lessons of successful planning scheme amendments are as follows:

- Council must have a valid reason for seeking to obtain open space contributions.
- The open space contribution or levy rate must be linked to an assessment of need for open space.

In relation to the first point, it is necessary to justify the reason for collecting contributions for open space. The Minister for Planning, and if required a Planning Panel, will typically want to see that the council has an open space plan or strategy or if focused on an area a structure plan or similar. Proposals that seek differentiated contribution rates for precincts within a municipality need to show the relationship between the differentiated rates and their areas.

An open space strategy will typically need to identify open space works or 'projects' that the council intends to deliver over time. The principle is that if a council has no strategy or clearly stated desire to make new open space capital investments, then there is no need for the contribution to be paid by subdivision proponents.

Based on a review of Victorian Planning Schemes, a number of methods in schedule design can be observed. A summary of the schedules used in 18 inner most municipalities of metropolitan Melbourne is shown in the following table and a brief summary of the philosophy of each method is defined below. This review shows that 17 of the 18 selected councils currently use the schedule to clause 53.01.



Council	Schedule to Clause 53.01	Geographic Coverage	Land Uses	Contribution Rate
Banyule (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% fixed
Bayside (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% fixed for most areas and 5% or more for Strategic Redevelopment Sites
Boroondara (C)	No	-	-	-
Brimbank (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% for Residential and Commercial and 2.5% for Industrial
Darebin (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	2% for 2 additional lots up to 5% for 5 additional lots or more
Glen Eira (C)	Yes	All of Municipality apart from one	All Land Uses	5.7% fixed
Hobsons Bay (C)	Yes	Precinct based	All Land Uses	5% in one precinct and 7.1% in another precinct
Manningham (C)	Yes	All of Municipality apart from a precinct	All Land Uses	5% fixed and 8% fixed in some precincts
Maribyrnong (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5.7% fixed (but potential increase for 10 lot+ subdivisions via land provision)
Maroondah (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% for most of the municipality and 8% for one precinct
Melbourne (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5%, 7.06% and 8% by area within the municipality
Monash (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	2% for Residential 3 lots up to 5% for Residential 6 lots or more and 5% fixed for Commercial and Industrial
Moonee Valley (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% fixed (but potential increase for large subdivisions via land provision)
Moreland (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	2.5% for one suburb up to 6.8% for another suburb (12 suburbs and 12 rates)
Port Phillip (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% fixed for all areas apart from one precinct at 8% (Fishermans Bend)
Stonnington (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	5% fixed for eastern part of municipality, 8% fixed for western part of municipality and a site specific rate
Whitehorse (C)	Yes	Municipal	All Land Uses	4% fixed rate and 4% or more for strategic sites
Yarra (C)	Yes	Municipal	Residential Only	4.5% fixed rate

Figure 7: Overview of Schedules to Clause 53.01 in 18 Selected Planning Schemes

Source: Planning Schemes Online, June 2021

The more recent schedules in the sample above generally adopt:

- Municipal coverage (either one rate or variable rates across the municipality)
- All land use coverage
- A fixed rate around the 5% mark for most areas of a municipality
- A higher rate (such as 8%) or capacity to strike a higher rate (on a case by case basis) for strategic sites.

Further details of methods applied are described as follows.


Flat Rate

The flat rate can be interpreted as a Subdivision Act 1988 benchmark based philosophy. This generally takes the following approach:

- The Subdivision Act 1988's 'up to 5%' contribution rate is used as a benchmark and is considered to be a valid contribution sum, subject to location specific or project specific adjustment.
- This approach is often related to an open space strategy and costs of an open space strategy in a general or direct way, with a common approach being that council will part fund the outcomes of the open space strategy from consolidated revenue with the levy funding part of the cost.

Flat Rate Plus

This approach is similar to the flat rate model but can identify an area and / or development type under which a higher rate could be considered, on a case-by-case basis, without specifying what the rate would be. This essentially leaves the door open for an assessment of a higher rate but does not guarantee it.

As noted in the discussion regarding Whitehorse's experience with this approach, there can be difficulty in justifying a higher rate unless the schedule specifies what the rate would be under certain criteria.

Sliding Scale

The sliding scale is essentially the same in philosophy as the flat rate approach in that it can be interpreted as a Subdivision Act 1988 benchmark based philosophy. This approach uses the Subdivision Act 1988's 'up to 5%' contribution rate as a benchmark for a valid contribution sum. Again, this can be related to an open space strategy.

The main difference in this approach is that it seeks the maximum contribution from 'bigger' developments, with the assumption being that bigger developments have a greater capacity to pay contributions compared to 'smaller' developments. Smaller developments have a lower capacity to pay, it is assumed, and pay a lower rate.

In terms of demand, it is possible for a number of small developments to generate the same number of dwellings and population as one large development but pay less. For example, three developments that deliver three lots each (i.e. nine in total) may pay 2% under the sliding scale approach but a single large development that delivers nine dwellings (same as the three smaller ones) may pay 5%.



Criteria Based

The criteria based approach does not specify a rate up-front but rather specifies a set of criteria under which rates would be derived for a subdivision, on a case-by-case basis. This approach may set criteria and conditions for areas, development types and other variables.

This approach can lead to more uncertainty and difficulty in reaching an agreement on an appropriate contribution.

Precinct Based Needs Assessment

The precinct based approach seeks to provide a stronger nexus between developments that pay open space contributions and areas that receive benefit from planned open space investments. The approach assesses specific open space needs and identifies required open space investments - such as land acquisition and / or works to land - and estimates the cost of delivering the investments. The cost is then related to subdivision to determine a levy rate. The rate can be variable by area and / or development or be averaged across areas and development types.

6.7 Relationship to Other Funding Mechanisms

It is common for Councils to use both DCPs and open space levies for open space provision.

It is a requirement that the basis of the mechanisms be separate and use of funds apply a separate list of works.

Some councils separate projects into different mechanisms by type of project, such as applying open space levies to land acquisition and DCPs to construction on land.

Some separate mechanisms based on scale of project. For example, it is common practice for growth area Precinct Structure Plans to include large open space projects (land and works) in a DCP and use open space levies for smaller parks (land and works) within estates.

6.8 Open Space Levy Implications for Whitehorse

The City of Whitehorse's existing schedule to clause 53.01 is based on the 2007 open space strategy and provides for a minimum 4% open space contribution across all land uses, along with an option to make a case for a higher rate for strategic sites.

In recent years some other established areas councils have increased mandatory rates for areas planned for development intensification.

It may be possible for Whitehorse to review its levy schedule if justified, based on an assessment of need and planned open space investments via an updated open space strategy. The Council budget for 2021-2022 includes funding for a new Open Space Strategy 2022-2037.

Moreover, wording used in the schedule could be clarified in accordance with discussion shown earlier in this section.



7.0 CASH IN LIEU OF PARKING PROVISION

7.1 Overview

The planning system can provide the option for proponents of planning permits - both new development or change to land use that generates a need for additional parking - to pay a cash contribution to council in lieu of providing car parking spaces on site. This is allowed in circumstances where a parking overlay (Clause 45.09) has been prepared and a supporting cash in lieu scheme has been prepared.

7.2 Parking Overlay

The basis for a cash in lieu scheme is a parking overlay, which assesses parking needs in a selected precinct and nominates parking rates for land uses, among other things. The overlay can modify the default state-wide parking rates at clause 52.06 of the planning scheme.

A reduced parking rate is typically justified and needed in an activity centre, where sustainable transport modes are provided and seek to be enhanced, and traffic congestion is to be avoided.

Reduced parking rates are also necessary for some developments to be constructed viably from a design perspective and from a financial perspective.

A parking overlay has been implemented for the Box Hill Activity Centre, as shown as Schedule 1 to the Parking Overlay. This provides for reduced parking rates for selected land uses. In addition to the reduced rates, a permit can be sought to reduce (including reduce to zero) the minimum number of car parking spaces required for a use as specified in the schedule.

Figure 8: Schedule 1 to the Parking Overlay of the Whitehorse Planning Scheme

Use	Rate	Measure
Dwelling	0.5	Resident spaces to each one bedroom dwelling, plus
	0.75	Resident spaces to each two bedroom dwelling, plus
	1.0	Resident spaces to each three or more bedroom dwelling (with studies or studios that are separate rooms counted as a bedroom), plus
	0.2	Visitor spaces to each dwelling for the first five dwellings, plus
	0.1	Visitor spaces to each dwelling for any subsequent dwellings
Office	2.0	To each 100 square metres of net floor area

Table 1: Car parking spaces

For all other uses listed in Table 1 of Clause 52.06-5, the number of car parking spaces required for a use shall be calculated by using the *Rate* in Column B of that Table (representing a minimum rate).

Source: Whitehorse Planning Scheme Online, June 2021



The overlay can also provide for a cash in lieu scheme if it is justified. The scheme works by giving a proponent an option to either meet the confirmed parking rate on site, or provide a cash payment per space if this is not achieved. The cash payment option usually replaces the option to provide a waiver or discount to the confirmed parking rate.

The parking overlay in Box Hill does not seek cash in lieu as this was not justified at the time of preparation of the Box Hill Central Activities Area Car Parking Strategy 2014 by GTA Consultants.

In order for a cash in lieu scheme to be justified, council needs to identify why it needs the cash, in terms of identifying a parking or transport solution to be delivered within a period of time. The costs need to be apportioned fairly amongst all users or beneficiaries of the solution and that collectively, the cash contributions will not fully fund the solution in most cases.

7.3 Planning Practice Note 57: The Parking Overlay

The Planning Policy Practice Note 57 provides guidance to councils about the preparation and application of a parking overlay. It outlines the necessary considerations if a financial contribution is proposed in a parking overlay pursuant to clause 45.09 of the planning scheme.

A schedule to the parking overlay can be used to allow financial contributions (or 'cash in lieu' payments) to be paid in place of providing private car parking spaces on the site. Any requirement for a financial contribution must be justified and should address the core principles of need, nexus, accountability and equity in the strategic assessment of the proposal before it is introduced.

- Need is the parking project(s)or proposed investments needed?
- Nexus is there a direct link between the types of proposals affected by the scheme and the infrastructure provision?
- Accountability what are the financial arrangements? How will the scheme be monitored and reviewed?
- Equity is the scheme fair in terms of who is required to pay? Would another method of collecting funds be more appropriate?

A requirement for financial contributions must:

- Relate to a use (or change in use) of land or development of land.
- Designate the area to which it applies.
- Be financially proportionate to the statutory right for which they are exchanged. Councils can only require a payment for car parking that reflects the cost of providing a car parking space.
- Identify a proper planning purpose to be funded by the contribution.

A project that provides car parking facilities, or other measures which reduce the demand for parking, would generally be regarded as a proper planning purpose.



The following information must be set out in the schedule:

- The area to which a financial contribution may be collected in place of providing car parking spaces.
- The amount required in dollars per car parking space.
- The method of indexing the amount.
- Financial arrangements associated with holding and spending funds paid, including the purposes for which the funds must be used.

It may also set out if appropriate:

- The ongoing monitoring and review arrangements, to reflect the change in land and construction prices.
- The condition to be included on the permit to secure the financial contribution.

Each payment should be made into a separate 'car parking and access fund' established by the municipality. The fund should only be used for the purposes identified in the schedule.

When a financial contribution is to be collected in accordance with a parking overlay, a condition should be included on the permit to secure the funds.

7.4 Example Cash in Lieu Schemes

The typical cash in lieu values adopted in locations across the state range from around \$2,000 to \$19,000 per car space. Some examples are:

- Berwick Village Commercial Centre \$16,935 per parking space.
- Springvale Activity Centre : \$19,000 per parking space.
- Glen Waverly Activity Centre : \$11,000 per parking space.
- Werribee City Centre : \$12,500 per parking space.

7.5 Cash in Lieu - Car Parking Scoping Study 2010

Council commissioned a scoping study of the potential application of a car parking cash in lieu scheme for activity centres. The study was undertaken by Urban Enterprise and Council considered the report in 2010.

The scoping study reviewed the mechanism and planning and development context and recommended that application of such a scheme may be feasible for the Box Hill Central Activity District, Nunawading MegaMile Major Activity Centre and Burwood Village Neighbourhood Activity Centre, subject to undertaking a more detailed feasibility study for such centre-specific schemes.

The consultant report stated that the application of such a scheme would not be viable in smaller centres.



7.6 Cash in Lieu of Parking Implications for Whitehorse

Council could explore the option to add a cash in lieu component to the Box Hill Activity Centre Parking Overlay if a parking and / or sustainable transport project is needed and justified. This Box Hill Integrated Transport Strategy may be used to justify this approach.

This cash in lieu model may also apply to other major activity centres as nominated in the scoping study that Council previously prepared on this topic.



8.0 POLICY AND STRATEGY REVIEW

8.1 Overview

Council's policies and strategies provide the strategic justification for the projects included in a DCP and open space levy or similar funding plan. The DCP system provides greater guidance on infrastructure project identification and assessment and as such that system is considered below in relation to infrastructure projects for a potential Whitehorse funding plan.

The principal reference for preparing a DCP is the 2007 Development Contribution Guidelines (the Guidelines) published by the then Department of Sustainability and Environment.

The Guidelines contains the following statement with respect to the role of a DCP:

Planning ahead is part of a council's strategic planning and service delivery responsibility. In greenfield areas, provision of new infrastructure to keep pace with urban development will be a priority. In established urban areas, upgrading the existing infrastructure may be necessary because of the redevelopment of existing sites, changing community expectations, changing standards of provision or the need to replace an existing infrastructure that has reached the end of its economic life."

The Guidelines state that the broad types of projects included in a DCP include:

- New item of infrastructure.
- An upgrade in the standard of provision of an existing infrastructure item.
- An extension to an existing facility.
- The total replacement of an infrastructure item after it has reached the end of its economic life."

Operational and recurrent expenditure such as maintenance costs for infrastructure cannot be funded by a DCP.

In identifying suitable projects for a DCP, the Guidelines divide infrastructure into development infrastructure and community infrastructure.

The following lists works, services or facilities that may be funded from a development infrastructure levy:

- Acquisition of land for roads, public transport corridors, drainage, public open space, and community facilities including (but not limited to) those listed under the last dot point in this list.
- Construction of roads, including the construction of bicycle and foot paths, and traffic management and control devices;
- Construction of public transport infrastructure, including fixed rail infrastructure, railway stations, bus stops and tram stops.
- Basic improvements to public open space, including earthworks, landscaping, fencing, seating and playground equipment.



- Drainage works including WSUD projects. However, any WSUD project costs in a DCP cannot also form part of a future voluntary offset scheme, which can relate to separate WSUD project costs. Overlaps in project costs must be avoided.
- Buildings and works for or associated with the construction of maternal and child health centres, child care centres, kindergartens or any centre which provides these facilities in combination.

Community infrastructure includes projects involving the construction of buildings or facilities used for community or social purposes. Examples include libraries, community halls, aquatic centres and sporting pavilions.

The following lists the costs that can be included in the calculation of DCP levies:

- The capital costs of providing the infrastructure projects.
- The cost of financing the infrastructure projects, if provided early in the life of the DCP.
- The design costs associated with the infrastructure projects.
- The cost of preparing and approving the DCP.

The need created by the development and the measures to satisfy the need must be adequately identified.

Council's strategies and policies establish the need for a project. New, renewal and upgrade projects are identified through the Council Plan, policies, master plans, strategies, asset management plans and identified service needs. Renewal projects principally are derived from adopted asset management plans while new and upgrade projects are sourced from adopted Council strategies/polices or master plans.

The following provides a brief description of the documents that assist in establishing the strategic justification of and need for the projects.

8.2 Whitehorse Vision 2020 – Community Plan

The 2020 Community Plan serves as a strategic framework for the municipality and guide to the future. The community plan for the municipality states: "We aspire to be a healthy, vibrant, prosperous and sustainable community supported by strong leadership and community partnerships."

- The Council Plan sets the strategic directions that Council will pursue over the next four years as follows:
 - Support a healthy, vibrant, inclusive and diverse community
 - Maintain and enhance our built environment to ensure a liveable and sustainable city
 - Protect and enhance our open space and natural environments
 - Strategic leadership and open and accessible government
 - Support a healthy local economy.
- The Council Plan sets the goals that Council will pursue over the next four years as follows:



- A safe, inclusive, resilient and diverse community which benefits from good health and wellbeing through the delivery of services, facilities and initiatives
- A well-connected City with a balanced approach to growth supported by infrastructure and development that respects our neighbourhood character
- A place where passive and active open space is highly valued, shared and enhanced
- A Council that communicates effectively, engaging with our community to enable the delivery of services and facilities that meet the needs of our diverse community
- Work in partnership to support a strong, active local economic environment that attracts investment and provides economic opportunities for businesses and employment for people.

Development of the Whitehorse 2040 – Community Vision is underway and expected to be completed in 2021.

8.3 Planning Scheme and Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS)

The new Planning Policy Framework (PPF) was introduced into the Victoria Planning Provisions (VPP) and all Victorian planning schemes through the gazettal of amendment VC148 on 31 July 2018. The translation of the Whitehorse Local Planning Policy Framework is in progress. In the interim the scheme operates with the State section in the PPF format and the Local Policy in the MSS format.

The MSS reinforces the key themes in the Council Plan. The Municipal Strategic Statement concentrates on the key land use issues identified at Clause 21.02 of the Whitehorse Planning Scheme.

With respect to development contributions, the Whitehorse Planning Scheme clause 19.03-1S contains the following:

- "Objective
 - To facilitate the timely provision of planned infrastructure to communities through the preparation and implementation of development contributions plans and infrastructure contributions plans.
- Strategies
 - Prepare development contributions plans and infrastructure contributions plans, under the Planning and Environment Act 1987, to manage contributions towards infrastructure.
 - Collect development contributions on the basis of approved development and infrastructure contributions plans.
 - Require annual reporting by collecting and development agencies to monitor the collection and expenditure of levies and the delivery of infrastructure."

Whitehorse Planning Scheme Clause 21.08 Infrastructure contains the following under Strategies:



 "Obtaining developer contributions toward cumulative infrastructure needs to which the development will add further demand."

The following is stated under further strategic work:

 "Investigate appropriate tools and locations for requiring Development Contributions across the municipality."

8.4 Plan Melbourne

Plan Melbourne is the metropolitan planning strategy. It identifies areas of state significance and areas of local significance. Planning for areas identified as being of state significance will be led by the Victorian Planning Authority in partnership with local government. Areas of local significance will continue to be managed by local government.

Whitehorse forms part of the eastern region in Plan Melbourne, and is noted to have activity centres, employment areas, community facilities and transport corridors.

Whitehorse is generally identified as a middle urban municipality with Box Hill identified as a health and education precinct as well as a metropolitan activity centre undergoing major change.

The municipality also accommodates the Deakin University education precinct, Nunawading Major Activity Centre along Whitehorse Road, Burwood Heights Major Activity Centre including the 20 hectare 'former brickworks' strategic redevelopment site, Forest Hill Major Activity Centre and Tally Ho Major Activity Centre.

The focus of growth and change is expected to be within the municipality's activity centres and employment clusters.

8.5 Recent Major Transport Projects

While not specifically identified in Plan Melbourne, the Suburban Rail Loop, Level Crossing Removals and North East Link Project are all major transport projects affecting Whitehorse.

8.6 Affordable Housing Policy 2010

The purpose of this policy is to clearly articulate the things Whitehorse City Council is doing, will do, or will consider doing, to support affordable housing within the municipality.

The policy is an internal policy. It has been developed in consultation with councillors and officers. It builds on the approach established in the City of Whitehorse Affordable and Social Housing Policy 2002. It also reflects the work Council has undertaken since the 2002 policy was adopted. The updated policy will provide direction to officers and explicitly state how Council will support affordable housing into the future.



8.7 Arts and Culture Strategy 2014-2022

The purpose of the Arts & Cultural Strategy is to achieve:

- A research driven strategic Arts & Cultural Plan for Council that delivers organisational goals and incorporates the needs and aspirations of the broader community; and
- Outcomes that would influence planning and policy across a wide range of Council Departments rather than it being a stand-alone Arts & Cultural Strategy.

The vision of the Strategy is to be a creative community that is vibrant, diverse and engaged through arts, culture and heritage. The strategy identified two major themes as priorities for Arts & Culture in Whitehorse:

- Arts & Cultural Facilities and Programs; and
- Community Cultural Development.

The strategy includes an action plan that include improvements to Council facilities and venues.

8.8 Asset Management Policy 2017

The purpose of this policy is to outline what is required at the City of Whitehorse (Council) to ensure comprehensive and effective asset management practices are developed and utilised across all asset classes. This policy is linked with the Asset Management Strategy.

This Policy applies to all assets owned, controlled, managed and/or maintained by Council.

Amongst other things the objectives of this policy are:

- To ensure sustainable management of assets by applying Best Appropriate Practice in Asset Management including the use of suitable asset management systems as applied to the different asset classes.
- To give priority to asset renewal (including upgrade as appropriate) when making capital investment decisions thereby ensuring Council's existing assets are properly managed to provide acceptable levels of service.
- To adopt a life-cycle asset management approach, incorporating life cycle costing into capital investment decisions.
- To continue to maintain an integrated Asset Management System to ensure a common asset data set is available for strategic, operational and financial reporting purposes.
- To progressively align Council's Asset Management Practices with the International Asset Management Standards; ISO55000, ISO55001, ISO55002, the National Asset Management Assessment Framework and the Municipal Association of Victoria's STEP Program.



8.9 Box Hill Activity Centre Transit City Structure Plan 2007

Box Hill is the main activity centre in Whitehorse. It provides retail, education, civic, medical, community service, entertainment and recreational opportunities for the regional population, as well as a hub for local community activities. It is strategically located along the Melbourne to Lilydale and Belgrave rail line, Whitehorse Road and the 109 tram route, which jointly form the spine of an area of intensive economic activity that extends through Melbourne's eastern suburbs.

The strategy addresses the following issues:

- Providing clarity as to the expectations of appropriate development within the Activity Centre, to facilitate the development process.
- Improving infrastructure and services to enable intensive development and to support new activities within the public realm – transforming a place created to support 'suburban' activity into one that supports 'urban' activity.
- Managing transitions between existing low-density uses that will remain for the foreseeable future and areas of higher-density new development; and managing the evolution over time of a new character in areas where existing low-density uses will sit amongst high-density development over a transitional period.

The plan proposes a number of actions to manage change including property acquisition and public projects.

8.10 Box Hill Central Activities Area Car Parking Strategy 2014

Box Hill caters for a mix of retail, commercial, residential, medical, education, transport and community uses and is guided by The Box Hill Transit City Activity Centre Structure Plan (2007). The Structure Plan seeks to ensure coordination in the development and enhancement of the centre by Council, stakeholders and the community up to the year 2030.

One of the key objectives of the Structure Plan was to promote the use of sustainable transport options over the private motor vehicle. As part of this process, a car parking strategy has been prepared to effectively manage existing and future car parking conditions providing for worker, shopper and visitor needs, and determine the extent to which Box Hill can support sustainable and economic growth.

Specifically, this study:

- Establishes the existing car parking characteristics of the area.
- Identifies shortfalls in existing short term, long term, on-street and off-street parking provisions and develop strategies to address the identified shortfall(s).
- Establishes the future demand for parking spaces and develop strategies to meet this demand.
- Establishes the 'tools' available to manage existing and future parking demands and their impacts on the surrounding areas.



 Determines which parking strategies and mechanisms are appropriate to be adopted for Box Hill (it recommended a parking overlay with reduced rates but not a cash in lieu scheme).

The Strategy makes 38 recommendations including the application of a Parking Overlay and changes to road configurations and active transport projects.

8.11 Box Hill Infrastructure Contributions Plan (Stage 1) Scoping Study, August2017

This report addresses Stage One of the project which investigates and analyses gaps in information relevant to implementing a development contribution mechanism as well as identifying any gaps in infrastructure, namely community and transport infrastructure, public open space, and the public realm.

The study recommends Council investigate the application of an ICP to the Box Hill MAC with the fallback position of implementing a DCP if ICPs are not introduced to established areas.

8.12 Box Hill Metropolitan Activity Centre to 2036 Draft Structure Plan 2020

The revised Structure Plan aims to reconcile the significant forecast growth in population, housing and employment with the necessary underpinning amenity, character, connectivity and resilience to support Box Hill's role as the pre-eminent urban centre for Melbourne's east.

The Draft Structure Plan establishes a preliminary catalogue of landscaping and urban design projects for the centre, plus land use and built form controls for an eventual planning scheme amendment.

Maps of the urban design framework and preferred building heights are shown in the following maps.









8.16 Box Hill Urban Realm Treatment Guidelines 2020

The Box Hill Urban Realm Treatment Guidelines defines the preferred design framework and standard of quality, style and application of public realm elements within the Box Hill MAC. It is intended to direct a more consistent urban character, whilst defining a program unique to Box Hill and its character.

The guidelines define a series of palettes and standards for development in the public realm.

8.17 Box Hill MAC Integrated Transport Strategy 2020

The Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) establishes a holistic approach for developing solutions to transport challenges within the Box Hill MAC. It establishes a program of transport infrastructure and policy upgrades aimed at delivering an efficient and sustainable transport future that aligns with Council and State Government's objectives.

The ITS provides a transport vision statement for the Box Hill MAC, which corresponds with the overall liveability goals for the community, focusing on environmental and economic sustainability, equity and safety to guide the future development of local transport.

The ITS recognises that conventional means of addressing transport issues – with its overwhelming reliance on private vehicles and parking – will not be capable of absorbing the expected rise in travel demand in the coming decades.

The ITS includes an action plan dealing with:

- Walking and cycling infrastructure
- Public transport
- Traffic and parking management
- Travel behaviour
- Technology and emerging trends.

The ITS includes an implementation plan which includes a list of transport projects and timeframes.



8.18 Burwood Heights Activity Centre Structure Plan 2006

The Burwood Heights Activity Centre has been designated as a Major Activity Centre and covers an area that is generally around the intersection of Burwood Highway and Middleborough Road, Burwood.

The structure plan developed the following vision:

- "Burwood Heights will evolve as an inclusive and vibrant Activity Centre that reinforces the existing sense of community and neighbourhood spirit. It will comprise a wide mix of uses that complement the role and function of other Activity Centres in the region and the range of services currently available in the existing centre.
- Burwood Heights will be easy to get to by public transport and will be easy and comfortable to move through via well defined, designed and active walking and cycling networks.
- The centre will integrate and respect the character and amenity of its surrounds. It will embrace the topographical, physical and environmental features of the locality and develop as an attractive and memorable place that integrates strong built form and landscape elements."

The key redevelopment site in the area is the Burwood Brickworks site which is central to Burwood Heights growing as a MAC. The structure plan is based on a set of key strategic principles that relate to:

- Role and function
- Movement
- Form
- Open space and environment
- Residential surrounds
- Facilitation and development.

The Strategy includes an implementation plan including infrastructure improvements.

8.19 Burwood Village Neighbourhood Activity Centre 2008

The Burwood Village NAC is an area centred around the intersection of Burwood Highway (east-west) and Warrigal Road (north-south). Warrigal Road also forms the boundary between the City of Whitehorse in the area east of Warrigal Road and the City of Boroondara to the west. The purpose of the study is to respond to changing trends and demands in the area by:

- Ensuring that land use and redevelopment are appropriate to the role of the centre.
- Ensuring that the centre responds to the needs of the community.
- Maintaining and enhancing the role of the neighbourhood activity centre as a community focus.
- Providing the principles and guidelines to improve the appearance and amenity of the neighbourhood activity centre.

The study contains an action plan that recommends streetscape improvements.



8.20 City of Whitehorse Adopted Budget 2020-2021

This 2020-2021 budget has been guided by the priorities outlined in the Council Vision 2013-2023, Council Plan 2017-2021 and other major strategies and plans. In 2020/21, Council will deliver on the final year of its current four year Council Plan. The budget is also informed by community feedback which has been accumulated through various consultations held as part of the development and review of key Council strategies and plans, the annual community satisfaction survey, from budget submissions received in previous years, and by a Mayoral budget consultation event held in February 2020. The budget outlines the services, initiatives and the significant Capital Works Program that Council plans to deliver in 2020/21 and the funding and resources required. Key highlights for 2020/21 include:

- \$162 million for the continued delivery of services to the community.
- A \$62 million Capital Works Program.

8.21 City of Whitehorse Budget 2021-2022

The \$219 million budget outlines the services, initiatives and the significant Capital Works Program that Council plans to deliver in 2021/22 and the funding and resources required. Some highlights follow.

- \$171 million for the continued delivery of a wide range of services to the community including sustainability, waste and recycling, home and community services, recreation and leisure, health and family services, arts and cultural services, libraries and maintenance of sports fields, parks and gardens, footpaths, drains and roads.
- \$78 million Capital Works Program including \$18.01 million to continue the Whitehorse Performing Arts Centre redevelopment, \$6.54 million for the Morack Golf Course Pavilion, Driving Range and Mini Golf Facility, \$6.23 million for the refurbishment of Heatherdale Reserve Pavilion and \$1.80 million for the replacement of the Main Street bridge in Blackburn.
- \$6.18 million for new operational initiatives including \$3.57 million to commence implementation of Council's IT strategy and a new Enterprise Resource Planning System, \$2.10 million for the Waste Service Charge initiative and \$0.15 million to commence preparations for the food organics and garden organics (FOGO) service which is planned commence in 2022/23 and \$0.15 to commence preparation of the Whitehorse Open Space Strategy 2022-2037.

8.22 Council Plan 2017-2021

The Council Plan details Council's contribution to the delivery of the Council Vision through an array of high level goals sitting beneath each Strategic Direction featured within the Council Vision. The Council Plan focuses on Council's approach to working with the community, key stakeholders, community organisations and other levels of government in order to achieve these goals over four years. The Council Plan also informs Council's long-term financial planning and Council's ten-year Capital Works Program. Finally, the Council Plan contains the



Strategic Resource Plan (SRP) which is a rolling four-year plan that outlines the financial and non-financial resources that Council requires to achieve the goals and related approach, as outlined in the Council Plan.

The Plan includes a number of strategic directions supported by individual plans and strategies as well as the strategic resource plan and the long term financial plan.

8.23 Housing Strategy and Neighbourhood Character Review Project 2014

Council has prepared an overarching housing framework which comprises three parts:

- Whitehorse Housing Strategy 2014
- Whitehorse Neighbourhood Character Study 2014
- Whitehorse Neighbourhood Activity Centre Urban Design Guidelines 2014.

8.24 Whitehorse Housing Strategy April 2014

The 2014 strategy updates the 2003 Housing Strategy. The 2014 project identified where change has occurred in the last ten years both in terms of the size, type and location of housing development, and also the types of housing being developed and how they have met preferred neighbourhood character objectives in residential areas.

The main focus of the review was on the role that Council can play as the planning and responsible authority charged with developing and implementing planning policy. It developed with consideration of other council, state and federal policies, objectives and roles, and is designed to complement and deliver on these.

The strategy sets a hierarchy of preferred locations for growth – substantial change, natural change and minimal change.

8.25 Neighbourhood Character Study 2014

The 2014 Neighbourhood Character Study updates the 2013 Neighbourhood Character Study.

This document identifies preferred design objectives and responses to ensure that desired housing outcomes can be achieved.

The document seeks to ensure that residential development strengthens protection of neighbourhood character. It recommends new precincts and preferred character statements for all residential areas, with guidelines for residential development within each neighbourhood character precinct.

8.26 Neighbourhood Activity Centre Urban Design Guidelines 2014

This document provides direction for development within commercial zoned land, specifically within the Neighbourhood Activity Centres (NACs) that do not have Structure Plans or Design Guidelines. The document includes an assessment of the role of the NACs, anticipated development in centres and provides built form guidelines to help manage growth.



8.27 Indoor Sports Facility Feasibility Study 2020

The Indoor Sports Facility Feasibility Study was a project identified from Council's Recreation Strategy (2015-2024). Previously Council undertook an Indoor Sports Facility Feasibility Study (2005) reviewing the provision of indoor sports facilities in Whitehorse. A key recommendation from the study was the construction of Sportlink, in Vermont South.

The study found that there is a good diversity of indoor sports available within the City of Whitehorse that are provided in a range of different types of facilities. However, demand suggests that an increasing number of smaller indoor sports will need to be catered for in the future. The 2020 study recommended a number of changes and upgrades to existing facilities and development of new additional facilities.

8.28 Interim Urban Forest Strategy 2018-2021

The Interim Urban Forest Strategy outlines targets, actions and principles intended to assist in the realisation of the following Council commitment:

 "Continue to sustainably manage, enhance and increase trees and vegetation in Council's streetscapes, parks and gardens, with species that enhance neighbourhood character, support biodiversity and are adaptable to a changing climate."

The Urban Forest Strategy is supported by an Urban Forest Policy and action plan which guides how trees will be managed. A target for 30% tree canopy coverage is included in the strategy.

Whitehorse Council is preparing to ratify the Urban Forest Strategy 2021-2031. Community consultation took place in January and February 2021 and a draft was submitted to Council in April 2021. The draft strategy outlines directions for street landscaping and Council initiatives. On resourcing, the draft strategy states: 'Each department will need to seek their own funding through the annual council budget either through operational, new business initiatives or capital funds as appropriate to the actions. Grant money should be sought where opportunities arise.'

8.29 MegaMile West and Blackburn Activity Centres Urban Design Framework 2010.

Whitehorse City Council has divided the MegaMile into East and West¹. The MegaMile East has been grouped with the Mitcham Neighbourhood Activity Centre (NAC) and Nunawading MAC, and a Structure Plan was prepared and adopted by Council in 2008. The MegaMile West has been grouped with the Blackburn NAC and is the subject of this Urban Design Framework (UDF). It is intended that principles developed for the eastern section of the MegaMile and existing policies for Blackburn will help to inform decisions regarding landscape, car parking and built form in the activity centres.

The aims of the Urban Design Framework are to:

¹ It is noted that the whole of MegaMile (both east and west spines) form part of the Nunawading MAC. However, urban design frameworks and structure plans have been divided into two separate groupings.



- Establish a vision for the MegaMile West Major Activity Centre that builds on previous planning studies, fills in gaps and responds to current environmental, economic and social factors.
- Research and identify issues and options for the redevelopment of key sites along Whitehorse Road, particularly bulky goods retailing, and in the Blackburn Activity Centre.
- Consider the options available if proposed rail transport projects take place.
- Examine ways to maximise and manage the potential of commercial growth of the MegaMile West and Blackburn Activity Centres.
- Address gaps in the pedestrian network and provide for a safe and direct pedestrian and cycle movement.
- Create urban design guidelines for the public realm areas and business zoned areas, addressing interface issues between industrial or commercial and residential uses.
- Establish if there are any facilities and services that the community lack in the area.
- Investigate ways to encourage a mode shift towards more sustainable modes of transport, namely walking, cycling and public transport, with consideration of the existing and proposed transport facilities in the area.
- Provide direction on built form within the study area.
- Address infrastructure for utility provision and waste management needs.

The UDF includes an implementation plan based on the themes explored in the framework and includes public realm and transport improvements.

8.30 Mitcham Station Precinct Built Form and Public Realm Guidelines 2012

The primary focus of the guidelines is on developing built form and public realm guidelines for future development of the project area around the new Mitcham Station and areas in the immediate vicinity.

The study has included a brief review of existing conditions including policy framework, infrastructure, connectivity, existing built form, current and future trends. The study has sought to identify the preferred built form and public realm outcomes for the identified study area and particularly the new land parcel configuration to occur as a result of the grade separation including Station precinct interfaces.

It provides design proposals for the public realm and sustainable transport improvements.

8.31 Municipal Early Years Plan 2014-2018

The Whitehorse Municipal Early Years Plan, Whitehorse: A City for all Children, provides a direction for Council and its partners to continue working together to improve outcomes for children from birth to the age of 12 and their families. It identifies how Council, can support families to provide the best possible environment in which to care for children and meet their developmental needs, health and wellbeing.

The plan identifies a strong vision for children and their families and a set of core principles that underpin the vision.



The document includes an action plan that outlines improvements, upgrades and new council facilities to service this age group.

8.32 Municipal Wide Tree Study 2016

The Tree Study provides options and recommendations for policy and controls and other (nonstatutory) mechanisms that will aim to ensure the future retention and regeneration of tree canopy. These include planning scheme changes to both protect existing trees and encourage the planting of future canopy trees. Options can also involve broader Council policy, advocacy and educational aspects to tackle the issue of tree retention on private land in a number of ways.

The study determines the types of trees that are most important as well as where in the City existing tree cover is lacking. While research and survey work is a significant part of the study, the community's views are also very important in determining the final recommendations.

8.33 Municipal Youth Plan 2014-2018

The Whitehorse Municipal Youth Plan -Whitehorse: A City for all Young People, provides a clear direction for Council and its partners to continue working together to improve outcomes for young people aged 12-25 years who live, work and study in the City of Whitehorse. It aims to identify the most effective ways to improve health and wellbeing outcomes for young people and to develop an integrated approach to planning and service delivery throughout the municipality.

The plan includes a strategic action plan as well as an implementation plan.

8.34 Nunawading MegaMile Structure Plan 2008

The purpose of the Structure Plan is to guide future development of the "Nunawading / MegaMile Major Activity Centre" and the "Mitcham Neighbourhood Centre", for future planning and enhancement. The study area has been defined by three very distinct precincts: Nunawading Activity Centre, Mitcham Neighbourhood Centre and the area in between known as MegaMile, which also extends westward beyond the study area and will therefore be subject to a series of separate studies.

The plan includes an investment and implementation plan which details land assembly as well as a works program.

A review of the structure plan has commenced.

8.35 Nunawading/MegaMile/Mitcham Structure Plan Background Review 2018

The Structure Plan in 2008 provides strong strategic support for the removal of level crossings at Springvale Road, Nunawading, and Rooks Road/Mitcham Road, Mitcham, and improvements and investments to the station and surrounds. Public realm improvements around the municipal offices, Britannia Mall, Station Street and Whitehorse Road, Mitcham, and laneways and streets in Nunawading have also occurred. The Structure Plan has guided



Council actions to develop and improve the centre over the past ten years with 69 actions now at various stages of completion.

Over the last decade, a number of major projects have significantly affected the activity centre, economy, planning and transport within and around it. These include:

- Eastlink.
- Level crossing removals at Heatherdale Road, Mitcham Road, Rooks Road, Springvale Road, Blackburn Road and Middleborough Road including new stations at Mitcham and Nunawading.
- Planning and construction of the Box Hill to Ringwood shared use path.
- Continuing population increases and demographic shifts.
- Introduction of lower speed limits around schools and in some activity centres.
- New multi-storey residential apartment buildings in Mitcham and Nunawading.
- Closure of Nunawading Primary School and purchase of the site by Council for redevelopment into the Nunawading Community Hub.
- Reformed commercial, industrial and residential zones in 2012/13.
- Application of three new residential zones in the municipality in 2014/15.

Council has also completed a range of new strategies and projects, including the:

- Neighbourhood Character Study and Housing Strategy.
- Industrial Development Strategy.
- Municipal-wide Tree Study.
- Cycling Strategy.
- MegaMile West and Blackburn Activity Centres Urban Design Framework.
- Urban design improvements in Station Street and Britannia Mall, Mitcham.
- Municipal office renovations and public improvements.
- Retail Strategy Review.
- Nunawading Visioning.

The plan includes directions and an implementation plan.



8.37 Pavilion Development Policy 2019

Council has developed the Whitehorse Recreation Strategy Plan (2015–2024) to guide the delivery of sport and recreation over a ten year period.

Supporting the Recreation Strategy Plan are a range of documents that further define and specify Council's role in the provision of sport and recreation opportunities. One of these is the *Sporting Facilities Guide – Seasonal and Casual Users*. The guide outlines the terms and conditions under which sporting and recreation clubs occupy Council's sporting facilities and provides a framework for the development and funding of sporting infrastructure. The pavilion policy should be read in conjunction with the *Sporting Facilities Guide – Seasonal and Casual Users*.

The policy provides a framework for:

- Facility standards to guide the development and/or refurbishment of pavilions.
- A framework for the funding contributions towards pavilions.

The policy the following defines three types of capital works projects for Council's sporting pavilions:

- Renewal.
- Refurbishment.
- New development.

8.38 Policy for Special Rate/Charge Schemes in Retail/Commercial Precincts or Centres 2014

The purpose of the policy is to provide a strategic and procedural framework to assist Council in establishing Special Charge Schemes for infrastructure projects pursuant to Section 163 of the Local Government Act 1989 (the Act).

The policy states establishment of an incorporated Business Association should be undertaken for a retail/commercial precinct. The Business Association then becomes the proponent of the statutory process of introducing a special rate/charge. Council facilitates implementation.

8.40 Road Safety Strategy 2013

The Whitehorse Community Road Safety Strategy 2013 identifies educational, behavioural, infrastructure and advocacy actions that respond to the road safety issues within the municipality. The aim of the actions is to further reduce the number and the severity of road injuries and deaths on roads and paths within Whitehorse.



The road safety priorities for Whitehorse have been identified following community consultation, a review of relevant policies, an analysis of crash statistics, and the evaluation of Council's previous efforts in delivering road safety programs. The priority for Whitehorse City Council is to implement actions that target:

- Pre-school and school aged children.
- Youth (road users aged 16-25 years).
- Vulnerable road users, such as cyclists, pedestrians and motorcyclists.
- Road users with limited mobility, such as the elderly and disabled.
- Safe vehicles.
- Risky behaviour, such as speeding, drink and drug driving, and fatigue.
- Safe roads, footpaths and off-road paths.

The strategy details a number of actions for each of these target groups.

8.41 Special Charge Scheme Policy

The purpose of the policy is to provide a strategic and procedural framework to assist Council in establishing Special Charge Schemes for infrastructure projects pursuant to Section 163 of the Local Government Act 2020.

The policy includes an implementation process.

8.42 Student Accommodation Strategy 2018

This strategy intends to guide the development and management of student accommodation in the City of Whitehorse. In doing so, it acknowledges there are a range of stakeholders that play a role in ensuring students in Whitehorse have access to safe and legal accommodation.

This strategy is based on the following:

- Analysis of the scale of the student population and its characteristics, the overall housing affordability context, and the development of a housing typology to help guide understanding of the various issues associated with managing student accommodation.
- Detailed policy review including comparison with mechanisms used by other councils to manage student accommodation.
- Design review including case studies of student accommodation across the typology of accommodation.
- Car parking and transport review and analysis, including tube count surveys, travel pattern interviews and parking demand assessments.
- Community and stakeholder consultation, including with Council staff, an online survey and targeted interviews with key stakeholders.

The policy includes a list of actions as part of the implementation plan.



8.43 Summary Asset Management Plan 2020

The purpose of this Summary Asset Management Plan is to provide an overall presentation of the state of the assets at Whitehorse including:

- The type and quantity of assets are under Council's control.
- Information on the condition of the assets;
- key findings associated with each asset class.
- Applied asset management strategies;
- forecast renewal funding demand based on the current levels of service.

This Summary Asset Management Plan provides a consolidated source of capital works program recommendations to inform the annual budget process.

The plan includes:

- Buildings
- Roads
- Drainage
- Open space
- Plant and fleet
- IT.

The appendices identify project areas and recommends for capital works expenditure over a ten year period.

8.44 Tally Ho Urban Design Framework 2006

The Tally Ho Major Activity Centre (MAC) is both a regional hub for high tech commerce and a centre for the local community. To ensure that Tally Ho meets the needs of the local worker and residential population, an Urban Design Framework has been prepared which sets out objectives and strategies that will guide development in over the next 15 years. The key objectives of the Framework are:

- To encourage economic development based on new generation commerce and knowledge.
- To facilitate growth and development to meet current and future needs whilst maintaining amenity and liveability.
- To create a sustainable urban environment.
- To encourage use of alternate modes of transport (i.e. other than privately-owned motor vehicles) by improving the extent and quality of bicycle and pedestrian networks and enhancing public transport infrastructure.
- To reduce at-grade car parking in the area.
- To increase the mix of uses in existing and new developments.
- To ensure community facilities can meet the current and future needs of the local population.
- To enhance the quality and extent of landscaping.



The UDF includes an investment and implementation plan which includes a list pf projects and costs.

8.45 Tally Ho Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines 2015

The Urban Design and Landscape Guidelines have been prepared to assist in realisation of the Tally Ho UDF. The intention of these guidelines is to provide detail as to ultimate built form and landscape outcomes for the private and public realm of the Activity Centre.

8.46 Whitehorse Cycling Strategy 2016

The Whitehorse Cycling Strategy 2016 has a vision of increasing cycling through creating a connected network of attractive, safe and inviting low stress streets and paths which are accessible to all and respects the needs of all users.

The action plan within this strategy outlines the infrastructure, education, advocacy, leadership and evaluation activities that will assist Council to achieve this vision.

The Whitehorse Cycling Strategy 2016 has also been prepared having regard to the broad number of other services provided by Council to the community. The actions within the strategy are considered to be appropriate given Council's authority and responsibilities, financial framework and the Council's wider vision of creating a healthy, vibrant, prosperous and sustainable community.

The strategy includes an action plan which details a number of projects intended to deliver the strategy.

8.47 Whitehorse Environmentally Sustainable Design (ESD) Policy for Council Buildings and Infrastructure 2021

This report seeks to incorporate ESD principles into buildings and infrastructure (assets) that are designed, constructed and maintained for Council's operational and community use. All new, renewal and extension of Council building and infrastructure projects, and maintenance works will be subject to the standards established by the report.

This initiative will enable Council to achieve targets within its Sustainability Strategy 2016-2022, actions in the Interim Climate Response Plan 2020-2022, and draft Urban Forest Strategy 2021-2031 (pending endorsement).

Council will develop a Sustainability Management Plan (SMP) that documents how all identified ESD objectives, targets and standards will be met, and how the performance outcomes will be achieved for each project and program.

This report was adopted by Council on 22 February 2021.

8.48 Whitehorse Health and Wellbeing Plan 2012-2021

This plan adopts an Environments for Health framework which holds that health and wellbeing is affected by many different factors across any or all four environments – the built, social,



economic and natural environments. These "environments for health" strongly align with Council's Strategic Directions 2013-2023.

The Whitehorse Health and Wellbeing Plan 2017-2021 meets the requirements under the Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 and is based on extensive community engagement and consultation with residents, visitors and workers, as well as partner organisations. The Plan is strongly aligned with the Whitehorse Council Vision 2013-2023 and the Whitehorse Council Plan 2013-2017, under the Strategic Directions 2013-2023 for the municipality:

- Support a healthy, vibrant, inclusive and diverse community.
- Maintain and enhance our built environment to ensure a liveable and sustainable city.
- Protect and enhance our open space and natural environments.
- Provide strategic leadership and an open and accessible government.
- Support a healthy local economy.

The document includes an annual action plan and achievement measures, which identifies projects, timing and the responsible Council department.

A new Council Plan and Health and Wellbeing Plan is in progress.

8.49 Whitehorse Industrial Strategy 2011

The purpose of the strategy was to develop an industrial strategy which would provide a framework for on-going employment and business investment in eight key industrial areas located within the City of Whitehorse.

The industrial strategy strongly emphasises that addressing non-economic specific matters is integral to the success of providing a framework for on-going employment and business investment in eight key industrial areas located within the City of Whitehorse.

Consequently, a number of additional and specific pieces of work are identified and recommended to be undertaken or commissioned by Council into the future to provide a framework for on-going employment and business investment in eight key industrial areas located within the City of Whitehorse.

The strategy makes a number of precinct based recommendations including public realm improvements.

8.50 Industrial Precincts Implementation Project – Urban Design Guidelines 2011

The preparation of the guidelines was recommended by the Whitehorse Industrial Strategy 2011.

This document is intended to assist with development applications and the planning approval process within industrial precincts. The document notes that achievement of high quality physical outcomes are contained within built form categories, including building height, landscaping, road design, setbacks, carparking, loading and waste storage.



8.51 Industrial Precinct Review 2019

This review was undertaken by Blair Warman Economics with funding from the North East Link Project to explore relocation options for approximately 80 businesses that will be acquired in the Bulleen Industrial Precinct. This report identified strategic directions to guide Council in promoting the future growth of industrial precincts.

The precincts have a low vacancy rate and there is limited supply of vacant sites. New development generally relies on the reuse and redevelopment of existing properties. This report was considered at the 15 July 2019 Council meeting where the report was noted by Council.

8.52 Whitehorse Integrated Transport Strategy 2011

The Whitehorse Integrated Transport Strategy 2011 creates a framework to consider the different modes of transport available to the Whitehorse community and provides direction to facilitate travel options and networks that are sustainable, convenient, accessible and safe.

The goals of the Whitehorse Integrated Transport Strategy 2011 are to:

- Improve the links between transport modes for the efficient and convenient movement of people and goods.
- Increase the use of sustainable transport modes of transport to minimise the impact of transport on the environment.
- Increase the use of sustainable transport modes that promote healthy lifestyles, such as walking and cycling.
- Increase the safety of residents and commuters who travel within and through the municipality.
- Promote economic development and social connectedness within our community.

The various actions that Council will undertake are listed under each strategic objective, and a complete table of the actions, indicative cost and timelines is included in the Appendix which is an action plan.

8.53 Whitehorse Open Space Strategy 2007

The open space strategy was prepared by Council with assistance from Thompson Berrill Landscape Design Pty Ltd (TBLD) in association with Environment & Land Management (E&LM).

The strategy provides direction for publicly owned land that is set aside for leisure, recreation and nature conservation purposes including land managed by Council, Parks Victoria, Melbourne Water and VicRoads. The Strategy ties in with state and regional level planning policy, local policy, demographic change and community expectations.

The vision for open space is to "continue to provide a diverse network of linked open space with people of all ages recreating, socialising and enjoying the outdoor space, and bushland reserves brimming with indigenous flora and fauna." Specific outcomes are:



- Improve the links between open space reserves
- Improve access to and use of existing reserves and maintain existing highly valued reserves
- Build on diversity which is a key strength of the Whitehorse open space system
- Adequate open space to meet existing and future population needs
- Improve the habitat corridor links and values of the existing linear open space system of Whitehorse
- Improve environmental sustainability of open space management and maintenance practices
- Reduce conflicts between different recreational users in open space.

Implementation is anticipated to be over a nominal 15 year period with some actions having a longer-term horizon. Implementation will be based on allocation of funding, rate of development and changing needs, receipt of open space contributions (via the Open Space Contribution and Subdivision provisions of the Victoria Planning Provisions) and availability of other funding sources such as grants.

8.54 Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011

The purpose of the Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011 is to provide Council with a framework for the sustainable provision of its network of play spaces, and to more fully quantify the cost of maintaining and improving the network into the future.

Council currently provides 169 public playgrounds, mostly in parks. The Whitehorse Open Space Strategy 2007 has underpinned the development of the Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011. The Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011 focus is primarily on play spaces for children aged 0-11. It does not include play areas such as skate/BMX and hard surfaces, which are considered in other service planning.

The objective of the strategy is to provide a framework and principles for the planning, design and management of Council's network of play spaces. It will also provide the service framework for the assessment of play space provision on a site-by-site or area basis and the development of an asset management plan for play spaces. The plan will inform Council's future capital works priorities and will assist in ensuring that the service can be sustained into the future.

The Whitehorse Play Space Strategy 2011 is a strategic document that considers trends in the provision of play spaces, guidelines, current standards and changes in the City of Whitehorse.

The document recommends actions to implement the strategy.

8.55 Whitehorse Recreation Strategy 2015-2024

The Recreation Strategy provides a framework to guide Council planning of recreation and sport services and facilities for the next 10 years.

The purpose of the Recreation Strategy is to:



- Identify strategies to encourage residents, families and visitors to incorporate more physical activity in their daily routines.
- Develop a rationale for future provision of recreation facilities and services.
- Provide direction on the provision of facilities that facilitate people to lead a healthy lifestyle.
- Provide direction in relation to the type and level of support Council should provide to recreation and sport.
- Establish short (1–3 years), medium (4–7 years) and long term (7–9 years) actions to address the findings of the project and provide a framework for monitoring the implementation of the Implementation Plan.

This document provides the context and planning hierarchy that inform the Box Hill Open Space Strategy.

Actions within the Implementation Plan that have identified the need for resources or will require resources such as facility development will be subject to strategic priorities, policy development, a detailed business case and the allocation of sufficient resources as part of Council's annual budget process.

8.56 Whitehorse Sustainability Strategy 2016-2022

The Whitehorse Sustainability Strategy 2016-2022 outlines Council's sustainability agenda for the next six years. It is accompanied by the Sustainability Strategy Action Plan.

The strategy outlines the priority environmental sustainability outcomes and key targets that Council will work towards over a 6 year period. The strategy contains a wide range of objectives and outcomes that will be delivered by different departments across Council. The key liveability outcomes that guide the strategy include:

- An informed and resilient community.
- Energy-efficient Council and community buildings and infrastructure.
- Using more renewable energy.
- Reducing waste to landfill.
- Reducing the use of potable water.
- Improved water quality of local creeks and waterways.
- Achieving a mix of sustainable local businesses and jobs.
- Making it easy to walk and cycle in Whitehorse.
- Providing better access to public transport
- Enhancing the health and diversity of parks and local vegetation.
- Providing more recreational open space.
- Contributing to a reduced cost of living.
- Adapting to climate change and peak oil.
- Improved access to local food.

The accompanying action plan details the specific programs and projects that will contribute to achieving the priority sustainability outcomes.



8.57 Whitehorse Urban Biodiversity Strategy 2014-2024

The Whitehorse Urban Biodiversity Strategy for Council Managed Open Space, Streetscapes and Community Facilities, has been prepared to address biodiversity conservation and management actions undertaken by Council. Whitehorse biodiversity has been defined to include all existing indigenous flora (plants), fauna (animals including insects and other invertebrates), fungi, mycorrhizal relationships etc. that are indigenous to the municipality, as well as the modified urban habitats and landscapes that these species rely upon.

The definition of Whitehorse biodiversity is primarily focused on indigenous flora and fauna species and vegetation communities but it also acknowledges that in a suburban modified landscape urban habitat is critical in maintaining indigenous fauna species. The focus of conserving and managing Whitehorse biodiversity is directed towards undertaking a series of practical biodiversity actions that will enhance existing biodiversity management actions.

Other actions are considered to be one-off actions and some will have an ongoing commitment and will contribute to biodiversity knowledge and planning across the municipality. Water management has been identified as of prime importance to biodiversity management. Riparian corridors provide opportunities for linkages across the municipality and into adjoining municipalities. Water is vital to maintaining biodiversity, as all species rely upon access to water.

The core of the Whitehorse Urban Biodiversity Strategy is the actions that will make a positive difference to biodiversity. It is recognised that there are three types of biodiversity actions within Whitehorse:

- Actions that are already occurring, that can be enhanced.
- One-off actions that can be undertaken to increase biodiversity knowledge and outcomes.
- Larger actions that would be on-going (both in a budgetary and time context).
- All biodiversity actions proposed below are subject to budgetary provisions.

8.58 Whitehorse Waste Management Strategy 2018-2028

The Whitehorse Waste Management Strategy 2018-2028 identifies contemporary challenges and opportunities around waste and litter within Whitehorse which include:

- Increased urbanisation and multi-unit developments.
- Changing community.
- Minimising and disposing of garbage in the future.
- Rise of technology.
- Changing economic conditions.
- Climate change emissions and organic waste.
- Continuous improvements to services.

The strategy includes a five year action plan.



8.59 Other Documents

The following documents have been viewed and are not considered to hold information for infrastructure need and funding purposes.

- 78 Middleborough Development Plan 2018.
- Blackburn Lake Surrounds Study 2020.
- Building Over Drainage Easements 2010.
- Collections Policy 2017.
- 104-168 Hawthorn Road Forest Hill Development Plan.
- Forest Ridge Development Plan Assessment Transport Impact Assessment.
- Tally Ho Commercial 1 Zone Review.
- Stormwater-Drainage-Policy-No-1-Outfall-Drainage-Policy.
- Stormwater-Drainage-Policy-No-2-On-Site-Detention-Policy.
- VCAT_Order_104-168HawthornRoad
- WCC Climate Response Plan 2020 2022.
- Whitehorse Residential Corridors Built Form Study 1.0.

8.60 Policy and Strategy Implications for Infrastructure and Development Contributions

Council has built up a significant body of policy and strategy information relating to:

- Strategic planning for future development in activity centres, employment areas and residential areas.
- Infrastructure needs to support the existing and new development, addressing a wide range of community facilities and engineering assets.

Much of the capital works information is captured within Council's capital works planning process. This information can form the basis of infrastructure funding mechanisms.



9.0 DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS AND PROJECTIONS

9.1 Population Context

According to ID Consulting, the estimated resident population of Whitehorse is estimated at approximately 183,100 in 2021 and the municipality's population is expected to grow by approximately 22% over the period to 2041 - reaching approximately 223,300 residents at that time.

A depiction of population and dwelling growth is shown in the figures below. Population growth is expected to slow in part due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.



Figure 9: Demographic forecast

Source: forecast.id

9.2 Demographic Context

Whitehorse is home to mostly family households (i.e. parents and school aged children).

The municipality is culturally diverse. Around one-third of residents were born overseas (primarily from Asia and in particular China) according to the 2016 ABS Census. Approximately 27% arrived in Australia within five years prior to 2016 (in Greater Melbourne the share was 24%).

In the City of Whitehorse, 67% of households were purchasing or fully owned their home, 24.2% were renting privately, and 2.4% were in social housing in 2016.

Housing costs were generally more expensive in Whitehorse compared to Greater Melbourne however the median income is also higher. Therefore, levels of housing stress are in line with the Greater Melbourne.



The main mode of transport in Whitehorse is by car, however with infill development near train stations occurring, patronage of public transport is increasing. In 2016, 16% of people (a growth from 14% in 2011) took the train to work as compared to 12% in Greater Melbourne.

9.3 Economic Context

Whitehorse is estimated to accommodate approximately 85,700 jobs within 18,200 local businesses (NIEIR 2020). The municipality accommodates approximately 92,500 employed residents and therefore has a high level of employment self-sufficiency.

Building approvals were valued at approximately \$1 billion in the 2020-21 financial year, or 2.8% of the state's construction activity.

In 2016 the three biggest industry sectors of employment for local residents were:

- Healthcare and social assistance (12,600 jobs)
- Education and training (8,600 jobs)
- Retail trade (7,300 jobs).

Manufacturing declined between 2011 and 2016 with residents employed in the industry falling by 1,500.

As at 2018, the unemployment rate was 5.93% in the municipality.

Relative to the whole of Australia, Whitehorse is socio-economically advantaged. On the SEIFA index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage, Whitehorse ranks in the 87th percentile while Greater Melbourne sits in the 70th percentile and Victoria at the 61st percentile.

Surrey Hills is the most relatively advantaged suburb (being in the 99th decile of SEIFA) and Box Hill is the most relatively disadvantaged (being in the 70th decile of SEIFA).

As of April 2021 in Whitehorse, around 4,600 people or 3.8% of the working aged population were receiving Job Seeker and youth allowance payments. This represents an increase of 1,876 recipients as compared to March 2020. Whitehorse nonetheless has less working aged residents on the welfare payments (3.8%) compared to Greater Melbourne (5.7%).

9.4 Development Areas

Development to support population growth in Whitehorse is planned to occur in activity centres and through infill development in suburban residential areas. Clause 21.06 of the Whitehorse Planning Scheme sets a framework for housing development activity, as shown in the figure below.





Figure 10: Whitehorse Planning Scheme Housing Framework Plan

Source: Whitehorse Planning Scheme

Areas highlighted in dark blue are subject to substantial change in residential density.

Areas bordered with red are subject to a structure plan or urban design framework with a view to increase commercial or mixed use activity.

Retail and commercial activity in neighbourhood activity centres is expected to increase in line with catchment population growth. Residential development is also expected in centres.

Box Hill Metropolitan Activity Centre (MAC) is the primary centre in Whitehorse and is one of nine designated Metropolitan Activity Centres within metropolitan Melbourne. It provides retail, commercial, education, civic, medical, community services, entertainment and recreational facilities for a regional catchment whilst also performing as a local hub for the immediate residential community. The MAC is strategically located along the Lilydale and Belgrave rail line, Whitehorse Road and the 109 tram route.

A proposed Suburban Rail Loop has been identified by the state government for investigation. The concept is for a 90-kilometre rail loop that will link every major rail line from the Frankston line to the Werribee line - including the Belgrave and Lilydale lines - via Melbourne Airport. The concept includes stations at Box Hill and Burwood.

The MegaMile Activity Centre along Whitehorse Road in Nunawading (encompassing MegaMile East and West precincts) is a focus for bulky goods retailing and motor vehicle sales for the eastern region of Melbourne. It serves a large regional catchment area.



Other major nodes of activity in the municipality include Burwood Major Activity Centre, which includes the 20 hectare 'brickworks' commercial precinct and residential development area.

The Forest Hill Chase Shopping Centre and Tally Ho commercial precinct are also significant employment clusters in the municipality and designated as Major Activity Centres.

In terms of industrial development, the municipality has significant clusters in Nunawading, Mitcham, Box Hill South, Vermont, Blackburn, Burwood and Box Hill North. Smaller precincts are located in other areas as well.

The following figure shows zones and suburbs of the municipality, including Box Hill Activity Centre as a separate area, as defined by ID Consulting.



Figure 11: Zones and Suburbs (including Box Hill Activity Centre)

Source: Whitehorse Planning Scheme; ID Consulting Boundaries

9.5 Development Conditions

The table below shows the total quantum of floorspace (square metres (SQM) of gross floorspace) and number of properties in the municipality in 2020.

Residential is the primary land use in the municipality (10.1m sqm of floorspace), followed by commercial floorspace (1.32m sqm) and industrial floorspace (1.04m sqm). There is approximately 584,300 sqm of retail floorspace in the municipality.

Residential refers to all types of dwellings, including separate houses, townhouses, villa units and apartments.


The retail sector includes shops, cafes, restaurants, supermarkets, shopping complexes, convenience stores and other similar activities.

The commercial sector includes offices, health, education, civic activities, places of worship, commercial accommodation, banks and recreation uses.

The industrial sector includes factories, warehouses, workshops, maintenance depots and other similar activities.

Category	Floorspace S	QM	Number o	f Properties
Residential	10,125,880	76.6%	71,183	85.5%
Retail	584,230	4.4%	2,248	2.7%
Commercial	1,315,425	9.9%	8,099	9.7%
Industrial	1,037,785	7.8%	1,479	1.8%
Other	162,706	1.2%	294	0.4%
Total	13,226,026	100.0%	83,303	100.0%

Table 1: Development Conditions in Whitehorse, 2020

Source: Whitehorse Property Rates Database, 2020; HillPDA

Note: Floorspace SQM refers to square metres of gross floorspace

The following table shows the 2020 data for the four main land use groups (i.e. residential, retail, commercial and industrial) for each of the 17 areas of the municipality outlined in Figure 11.

		Reside	ential	Ret	ail	Comm	ercial	Indus	strial
No.	Area	Floorspace SQM	Number	Floorspace SQM	Number	Floorspace SQM	Number	Floorspace SQM	Number
1	Blackburn	915,935	6,199	67,410	287	106,294	861	110,447	155
2	Blackburn North	445,793	2,968	2,313	27	26,639	248	33,542	31
3	Blackburn South	647,267	4,473	10,463	88	33,021	341	363	1
4	Box Hill Activity Centre	323,217	4,705	77,872	441	254,638	995	7,569	17
5	Box Hill Balance	382,210	3,027	5,116	26	48,393	358	3,982	9
6	Box Hill North	687,034	4,780	6,813	60	17,172	576	53,659	88
7	Box Hill South	517,086	3,585	47,518	76	41,528	404	132,912	136
8	Burwood	718,401	5,464	19,196	79	229,714	712	101,477	141
9	Burwood East	645,824	4,404	42,136	145	145,495	296	5,590	4
10	Forest Hill	648,393	4,590	69,082	287	65,617	372	3,524	2
11	Mitcham	982,079	7,074	57,058	221	86,277	973	189,831	350
12	Mont Albert	336,512	2,139	8,461	54	18,336	297	3,226	7
13	Mont Albert North	396,516	2,350	1,136	13	27,057	264	0	0
14	Nunawading	654,622	4,951	128,455	280	92,371	650	236,525	383
15	Surrey Hills	359,541	2,137	4,175	32	14,508	271	0	0
16	Vermont	628,103	3,956	5,693	45	49,377	296	121,020	153
17	Vermont South	836,605	4,381	31,333	87	58,987	168	34,120	2
Total	City of Whitehorse	10,125,139	71,183	584,230	2,248	1,315,425	8,082	1,037,785	1,479

Table 2: Development Conditions in Whitehorse by Area, 2020

Source: Whitehorse Property Rates Database, 2020; HillPDA

The following tables provides a high level summary of change in development conditions in the decade between 2010 and 2020.

This shows that residential floorspace increased by approximately 1.52m sqm of floorspace (at a rate of 1.6% per annum).



Retail & commercial floorspace combined increased by approximately 267,000 sqm at a rate of 1.3% per annum. This represents growth of approximately 26,700 sqm per year on average. Industrial floorspace declined significantly in the ten years to 2020 according to the data.

Category	Floorspace SQM	%	% pa	Number	%	% pa
Residential	1,516,910	17.6%	1.6%	10,574	17.4%	1.6%
Retail & Commercial	226,644	13.5%	1.3%	2,340	29.2%	2.6%
Industrial	-792,234	-43.3%	-5.5%	234	18.8%	1.7%
Other	99,005	155.4%	9.8%	151	105.6%	7.5%
Total	1,050,325	8.6%	0.8%	13,299	19.0%	1.8%

 Table 3: Change in Development Conditions in Whitehorse, 2010 to 2020

Source: Whitehorse Property Rates Database, 2020; HillPDA

9.6 Impact of COVID-19 on Future Development and Planning

It is important to note that data and assumptions in this report relating to potential future population and development conditions and infrastructure needs are based on long term trends and available data. It remains difficult to predict how the real estate sector might respond to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic over the coming years.

We consider it prudent that analysis should take a longer term view as to how the market might respond and recover and not try to model the current uncertainty for long term planning decisions.

The current property market appears to be holding up well, but we have seen recent declines in investment activity in high density apartment units for example.

The impact of the pandemic has not been fully absorbed by the property market and the next 12 to 18 months may see some declines in prices and construction activity. Market conditions may return to long term trends in 2022 or early 2023.

We observe that construction projects remain in progress in Whitehorse and land values remained steady throughout 2020 and increased in early 2021. The property market is being supported by low interest rates and government support packages.

In terms of the dwelling projections shown in this report, Council has recently updated its projections with ID Consulting in 2021 to take into account the possible impact of the pandemic on future population and dwelling conditions. This report is based on the updated data.

The non-residential development projections shown in this report are based on the updated 2021 population projections.

9.7 Residential Dwelling Projections

Whitehorse City Council sources demographic and dwelling projections data from ID Consulting. The data for 17 areas of the municipality (for areas shown in Figure 11) is provided in the table below.



Overall, the municipality is expected to increase its stock of dwellings from approximately 72,500 in 2021 to 90,500 by 2041. This data has been updated to take into account the likely impact of COVID-19 on Whitehorse.

The areas that are expected to realise the highest shares of residential growth are:

- Box Hill Activity Centre
- Burwood East
- Blackburn
- Mitcham
- Mont Albert.

Table 4: Dwelling Projections in Whitehorse, 2021 to 2041

Area No.	Area Name	2021	2041	Change 2	2021-2041
1	Blackburn	6,307	7,930	1,623	25.7%
2	Blackburn North	2,983	3,204	221	7.4%
3	Blackburn South	4,527	4,848	321	7.1%
4	Box Hill Activity Centre	5,203	11,373	6,170	118.6%
5	Box Hill Balance	3,067	3,662	596	19.4%
6	Box Hill North	4,816	5,348	531	11.0%
7	Box Hill South	3,619	3,949	330	9.1%
8	Burwood	5,581	6,404	823	14.7%
9	Burwood East	4,485	6,397	1,912	42.6%
10	Forest Hill	4,641	5,341	700	15.1%
11	Mitcham	7,131	8,795	1,664	23.3%
12	Mont Albert	2,177	2,682	505	23.2%
13	Mont Albert North	2,361	2,586	225	9.5%
14	Nunawading	5,012	5,927	915	18.3%
15	Surrey Hills	2,148	2,283	135	6.3%
16	Vermont	3,975	4,495	520	13.1%
17	Vermont South	4,405	5,263	858	19.5%
Total	City of Whitehorse	72,438	90,487	18,049	24.9%

Source: Whitehorse ID Consulting (2021 Data)

9.8 Residential and Non-Residential Floorspace Projections

The following tables show projections data for the four land use groups split over two tables.

The residential data is the same as above, although shown for 2020 and 2041.

The retail and commercial projections are based on the following metrics:

- The ratio of population to floorspace in 2020 is applied to the 2041 population projections for the municipality as a whole
- The shares observed by area in 2020 are assumed to be maintained in the future.



Whitehorse achieved 3.2 sqm of retail floorspace per person in 2020, which is above the national average of 2.2 sqm. This is because Box Hill and the significant amount of large format retail space in MegaMile in particular (and some other centres) serve a catchment broader than the municipality.

Likewise, Whitehorse's ratio of commercial floorspace to population is high (7.3 sqm per person). This reflects the significant health, education and commercial office sectors present within the municipality, including Deakin University, Box Hill Hospital and major office clusters in Box Hill and Tally Ho for example.

This approach adopted for this report provides for:

- Retail floorspace to increase from 584,300 sqm in 2020 to 723,100 sqm in 2041.
- Commercial floorspace to increase from 1.32m sqm in 2020 to 1.63m sqm in 2041.

Overall, retail and commercial floorspace would increase by 451,500 sqm in the 21 years to 2041, at an average of 21,500 sqm per year (all figures rounded). This is slightly less than the rate observed between 2010 and 2020 and is therefore considered reasonable.

Industrial development declined in the period to 2020 however it is assumed that industrial floorspace would stabilise and grow marginally to 2041. There is limited capacity for additional industrial expansion in the municipality as shown in recent research documents including the industrial precincts review.

It is assessed that industrial development will increase from 1.04m sqm in 2020 to 1.09m sqm in 2041. This represents growth of approximately 54,000 sqm overall at an average of 2,600 sqm per year.



No.	Area		Residential	(Dwellings)			Retail Floor	rspace SQM	
		2020	2020%	2041	Change 2020-2041	2020	2020%	2041	Change 2020-2041
1	Blackburn	6,199	8.7%	7,930	1,731	67,410	11.5%	83,432	16,021
2	Blackburn North	2,968	4.2%	3,204	236	2,313	0.4%	2,863	550
3	Blackburn South	4,473	6.3%	4,848	375	10,463	1.8%	12,949	2,487
4	Box Hill Activity Centre	4,705	6.6%	11,373	6,668	77,872	13.3%	96,379	18,507
5	Box Hill Balance	3,027	4.3%	3,662	635	5,116	0.9%	6,332	1,216
6	Box Hill North	4,780	6.7%	5,348	568	6,813	1.2%	8,432	1,619
7	Box Hill South	3,585	5.0%	3,949	364	47,518	8.1%	58,811	11,293
8	Burwood	5,464	7.7%	6,404	940	19,196	3.3%	23,758	4,562
9	Burwood East	4,404	6.2%	6,397	1,993	42,136	7.2%	52,150	10,014
10	Forest Hill	4,590	6.4%	5,341	751	69,082	11.8%	85,501	16,418
11	Mitcham	7,074	9.9%	8,795	1,721	57,058	9.8%	70,619	13,561
12	Mont Albert	2,139	3.0%	2,682	543	8,461	1.4%	10,472	2,011
13	Mont Albert North	2,350	3.3%	2,586	236	1,136	0.2%	1,406	270
14	Nunawading	4,951	7.0%	5,927	976	128,455	22.0%	158,984	30,529
15	Surrey Hills	2,137	3.0%	2,283	146	4,175	0.7%	5,167	992
16	Vermont	3,956	5.6%	4,495	539	5,693	1.0%	7,046	1,353
17	Vermont South	4,381	6.2%	5,263	882	31,333	5.4%	38,780	7,447
Total	City of Whitehorse	71,183	100.0%	90,487	19,304	584,230	100.0%	723,082	138,851

Table 5: Residential and Retail Projections in Whitehorse, 2020 to 2041

Source: HillPDA (based on Whitehorse Property Rates Database, 2020 and Whitehorse ID Consulting (2021 Data)

Table 6: Commercial and Industrial Projections in Whitehorse, 2020 to 2041

No.	Area	C	ommercial Fl	oorspace SQI	M		Industrial Floorspace SQM		
		2020	2020%	2041	Change 2020-2041	2020	2020%	2041	Change 2020-2041
1	Blackburn	106,294	8.1%	131,556	25,262	110,447	10.6%	116,191	5,745
2	Blackburn North	26,639	2.0%	32,970	6,331	33,542	3.2%	35,287	1,745
3	Blackburn South	33,021	2.5%	40,868	7,848	363	0.0%	382	19
4	Box Hill Activity Centre	254,638	19.4%	315,157	60,519	7,569	0.7%	7,963	394
5	Box Hill Balance	48,393	3.7%	59,895	11,501	3,982	0.4%	4,189	207
6	Box Hill North	17,172	1.3%	21,253	4,081	53,659	5.2%	56,450	2,791
7	Box Hill South	41,528	3.2%	51,398	9,870	132,912	12.8%	139,825	6,913
8	Burwood	229,714	17.5%	284,308	54,595	101,477	9.8%	106,755	5,278
9	Burwood East	145,495	11.1%	180,074	34,579	5,590	0.5%	5,881	291
10	Forest Hill	65,617	5.0%	81,212	15,595	3,524	0.3%	3,707	183
11	Mitcham	86,277	6.6%	106,782	20,505	189,831	18.3%	199,705	9,874
12	Mont Albert	18,336	1.4%	22,694	4,358	3,226	0.3%	3,394	168
13	Mont Albert North	27,057	2.1%	33,488	6,431	0	0.0%	0	0
14	Nunawading	92,371	7.0%	114,324	21,953	236,525	22.8%	248,827	12,303
15	Surrey Hills	14,508	1.1%	17,956	3,448	0	0.0%	0	0
16	Vermont	49,377	3.8%	61,113	11,735	121,020	11.7%	127,314	6,295
17	Vermont South	58,987	4.5%	73,007	14,019	34,120	3.3%	35,895	1,775
Total	City of Whitehorse	1,315,425	100.0%	1,628,055	312,630	1,037,785	100.0%	1,091,765	53,981

Source: HillPDA (based on Whitehorse Property Rates Database, 2020 and Whitehorse ID Consulting (2021 Data)

9.9 Development Implications for Infrastructure and Development Contributions

The municipality is expected to experience continuing growth, particularly residential, commercial and retail floorspace development to at least 2041. The growth is expected to be focused in and near activity centres, employment nodes and transport corridors, but there will also be broad-based infill development. This context will enable the preparation of a municipal wide development contributions plan.



10.0 INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

10.1 Overview

A process to review Council's capital works plans, based on policy and strategy information shown in this report, was undertaken during early 2021. Infrastructure projects were reviewed in meetings with Whitehorse staff.

10.2 Summary of Projects

The outcome of the process was identification of 106 potential projects for a funding program such as a DCP or similar mechanism. The total cost of the list is approximately \$287m. This is a reasonable cost from which to consider the development of funding mechanisms.

A summary of the projects by category is shown in the table below. The list of projects is attached to this document. It should be noted that the list is a work in progress and will be updated over time as more information becomes available.

The majority of the cost relates to community facilities of various types. This is not to say that Council will not invest in other project types in the future (such as in the next 10 to 20 years), but rather the table summarises information of known projects available at the time of writing.

For a funding mechanism to be supported, a specific list of projects is required, which shows location, cost and related specification of the works.

Council plans to update its open space strategy. That process is likely to identify needs in the future, which are not necessarily captured in the list below.

Dreiget Category	Codo		Number	Cost	Cost	
Project Category	Code	No	%	Amount	%	
Community Facility (CIL via DCP)	CFCI	21	19.8%	\$235,088,309	81.9%	
Community Facility (DIL via DCP)	CFDI	1	0.9%	\$20,524,830	7.2%	
Paths and Streetscapes	PADI	6	5.7%	\$8,005,000	2.8%	
Roads	RDDI	5	4.7%	\$1,934,000	0.7%	
Open Space Land and / or Works	OSDI	73	68.9%	\$21,459,000	7.5%	
Total		106	100.0%	\$287,011,139	100.0%	

Table 7: Summary of Preliminary List of Capital Works, June 2021

All of the projects noted above can be further tested in a DCP development process.

CFCI projects relate to the Community Infrastructure Levy component of a DCP.

The remaining projects relate to the Development Infrastructure Levy component of a DCP (including some community facilities as explained earlier in this report).

The open space projects could potentially be allocated to a DCP or the open space levy. There is a requirement to avoid using more than one funding mechanism for a specific project (i.e.



avoidance of 'double dipping'). It is possible to split the open space list into a DCP list and open space levy list based on which tool bests serves needs.

Additional project review and detailing is required in a DCP process to confirm the status of projects.

An example includes 60 playspace renewal works as shown in the detailed list in the attachments (2014-177 Play Space Renewal Program - Cyclical replacement & upgrade of play spaces). These are allocated to OSDI in Table 7 above. Such projects need to be validated as Council adopted projects and the project funding should be confirmed. If external grant funding or public open space levy funds are being used for the works, such funding must be excluded from DCP consideration.

A further four projects involve significant funding for upgrading three basketball facilities and one gymnastics and sports club (2019-545 Sports Courts Renewal Program). This is summarised in CFCI in Table 7 above. The basketball facility upgrades have a total cost of \$137,280,000. These projects will need to be checked to ensure that are no external funds contributing to the projects and that they have been adopted by Council.

10.3 Cost Estimate Date and Indexation

DCP levies are calculated on the basis of current day cost estimates and have a reference date, such as June 2021. Each year, levies are indexed to take into account cost escalation over time. There are many index options to choose from, with typical ones being the ABS Consumer Price Index or the ABS Producer Price Building Index or the Rawlinsons Construction Cost Index. The selection will depend on the nature of projects in a DCP.

When land acquisition is included in a DCP, a land valuation index method needs to be included for the land component. This is usually more complicated than using an independently published index method and can involve a valuer preparing updated valuations each year.

10.4 Location of Projects

The following table provides an overview of the location of the preliminary projects for DCP consideration. This indicates that projects are spread across the municipality. All areas have at least one project. Mitcham has 15 projects.

In terms of cost of projects, approximately 86.7% of cost from this potential DCP list is focused in the following areas:

- Forest Hill
- Box Hill Balance
- Vermont South
- Box Hill Activity Centre
- Nunawading
- Blackburn North.



However, the catchment of the projects can be beyond these areas (to be assessed in a DCP preparation process).

This information supports assessment of a municipal DCP model however details of the optimal area selection would be confirmed in a DCP preparation process.

Area	Nun	nber	Cost	Cost		
	No.	%	\$	%		
Blackburn	9	8.5%	\$9,370,000	3.3%		
Blackburn North	5	4.7%	\$28,546,250	9.9%		
Blackburn South	6	5.7%	\$865,000	0.3%		
Box Hill Activity Centre	7	6.6%	\$30,470,059	10.6%		
Box Hill Balance	7	6.6%	\$33,423,000	11.6%		
Box Hill North	5	4.7%	\$970,000	0.3%		
Box Hill South	1	0.9%	\$500,000	0.2%		
Burwood	4	3.8%	\$880,000	0.3%		
Burwood East	11	10.4%	\$7,580,000	2.6%		
Forest Hill	8	7.5%	\$94,700,000	33.0%		
Mitcham	15	14.2%	\$8,381,000	2.9%		
Mont Albert	2	1.9%	\$670,000	0.2%		
Mont Albert North	4	3.8%	\$1,305,000	0.5%		
Nunawading	6	5.7%	\$29,549,830	10.3%		
Surry Hills	2	1.9%	\$365,000	0.1%		
Vermont	5	4.7%	\$7,396,000	2.6%		
Vermont South	9	8.5%	\$32,040,000	11.2%		
Total	106	100.0%	\$287,011,139	100.0%		

Table 8: Location of Projects

10.5 Potential Additional Projects

Council's Capital Works Plan includes funding allocations into programs. Those which may have potential DCP projects contained within them are shown in the following table (total cost \$178m).

Within the summary line items, there could be additional DCP projects identified if more detailed information is provided (such as location and cost).



Project Number	Project	Cost to Council	Code
2014-65	Stormwater Network Drainage Rehabilitation Program	\$33,529,000	DRDI
2014-28	Local Roads Rehabilitation - Annual cyclic resurfacing of local roads	\$29,750,000	RDDI
2014-44	Footpath Renewal Program	\$27,600,000	PADI
2014-177	Play Space Renewal Program - Cyclical replacement & upgrade of play spaces	\$18,490,000	OSDI
2016-325	Reconstruction Future Roads Provision	\$14,603,000	RDDI
2016-326	Streetscape Renewal Provision	\$10,400,000	PADI
2014-8	Kerb & Channel Renewal Program	\$7,200,000	RDDI
2014-84	Sportsfield Ground Renewal Program - One site per year	\$6,570,000	OSDI
2014-105	Sportsfield Floodlighting Renewal Program	\$6,200,000	OSDI
2014-66	Programmed Drainage Upgrades	\$4,500,000	DRDI
2014-151	Sportsfield Training Net Facility Renewal Program	\$3,970,000	OSDI
2014-14	Road Bridges Renewal Works Program	\$3,120,000	RDDI
2014-59	Main and Local Roads - City wide tree planting program	\$3,000,000	OSDI
2017-361	Sportsfield Drainage Renewal Program	\$2,025,000	OSDI
2019-545	Sports Courts Renewal Program	\$1,899,000	OSDI
2014-53	Parks Constructed Pathways Renewal Program	\$1,450,000	PADI
2014-150	Sportsfield Infrastructure Renewal Program	\$1,430,000	OSDI
2014-152	Sportsfield Irrigation Renewal Program	\$1,350,000	OSDI
2018-426	Easy Ride routes: Design and Construction	\$1,327,000	PADI
Total		\$178,413,000	

Table 9: Summary of Funding Programs and Potential Additional Projects, June 2021

10.6 Infrastructure Implications for Whitehorse

A preliminary list of infrastructure projects that could be considered for a DCP or similar funding mechanism is available via Council's capital works planning process. A preliminary list of 106 projects with a total cost of approximately \$287m has been identified for further consideration. Most are community facility projects.

There are also a number of other funding allocations and programs that may contain additional DCP projects if more detail can be provided.

Additional project review and detailing is required in a DCP process to confirm the status of projects.

HIIIPDA

11.0 ANALYSIS AREAS

11.1 Overview

This section of the report provides an overview of the different geographic areas referred to in a DCP and identifies options for Council consideration with respect to DCP area selection.

11.2 Area Types

A DCP refers to geography in a number of ways:

- DCP Area This is the total area covered by a DCP overlay schedule in the Planning Scheme. If a municipal DCP is used, the DCP Area is the whole municipality. If an area specific DCP is applied, such as to the Box Hill Activity Centre, then the activity centre boundary would be the DCP Area.
- Analysis Area This area is used to define infrastructure project catchments in a DCP, separately for each project. A project catchment can be one analysis area or an amalgamation of multiple analysis areas or all the analysis areas. An analysis area is the smallest potential project catchment.
- Main Catchment Area This is the catchment area for each infrastructure project in a DCP. A project's cost is spread across development within the selected catchment area to derive a levy for that project and area. The process is repeated for each project separately and therefore areas that have a large number of projects allocated to them will have higher levies (all other things being equal).
- Charge Area This is an area for which a unique DCP charge is set in the Planning Scheme. In most cases, Charge Areas are exactly the same as Analysis Areas. It is possible to merge Analysis Areas into a single Charge Area if it is desired to reduce the number of areas in a complex DCP, however, the lowest levy of the merged areas must be selected for the charge area.

An extract of the DCP Guidelines is shown in the figure below. This shows Analysis Areas and three infrastructure projects. Catchment areas are defined for the projects using Analysis Areas.

In the example below, AA1 would have a DCP levy that relates to Project A. AA21 would have a levy that relates to both Projects B and C. Seven areas would have no levy because they are not within a project catchment. All 30 areas would be listed in the Planning Scheme as Charge Areas (unless some areas are merged).







Source: DCP Guidelines 2007

The DCP Guidelines provide general guidance on how DCP areas should be defined. The Guidelines state that infrastructure in a DCP:

- Must serve a neighbourhood or larger area
- Must be used by a broad section of the community
- Will in most cases serve a wider catchment than an individual development.

In the section of the DCP Guidelines dealing with full cost apportionment DCPs, the following points are noted:

- Use the smallest practical unit that has data or has been used for other planning tasks
- Ensure that the Analysis Areas are small enough to avoid cross-subsidies (this is when a development pays for infrastructure it will not use)
- Ensure that the Analysis Areas can be aggregated to depict the main catchment area for each infrastructure project.

Wherever possible, use existing, easily recognisable boundaries such as roads, watercourses or property lines to define Analysis Areas. This will ensure that the areas are relatively intuitive to the wider community.

The Guidelines recognise that councils usually have their own system of dividing their municipality into suburbs, communities of interest or neighbourhoods, which can form the basis of Analysis Areas.



11.3 Analysis Areas in Whitehorse

In established area and municipal wide DCPs, an Analysis Area is usually a suburb or similar sized area. In some cases activity centres are also defined within the suburb structure.

Such areas represent a community of interest and have usually have population and residential development projections readily available.

On that basis, the 17 suburb-based data areas as provided by ID Consulting can be used as a sound default starting point for development of a DCP for Whitehorse.

The areas can be adjusted and modified if there is a reason to do so in the DCP preparation process. The primary reason for considering breaking up areas further would be if small and localised projects are included in a DCP, and a fair catchment area is much smaller than the initial Analysis Area.



Figure 13: DCP Analysis Areas in Whitehorse

Source: Whitehorse Planning Scheme; ID Consulting Boundaries



12.0 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

12.1 Overview

This section of the report provides an overview of DCP financial matters including how DCP levies are calculated, potential cost recovery from a DCP in Whitehorse, how the state government mandated cap on the Community Infrastructure Levy may impact DCP project selection, and the potential cost to operate a DCP.

12.2 Cost Apportionment Example

In a DCP, development pays for provision of infrastructure according to estimated 'share of infrastructure use' at full development (or at the end of the planning period such as 2041). A DCP is based on 'user pays' principles. If for example a development is estimated to generate 10% of the demand loading on an infrastructure item, it would pay 10% of the cost for the item. Such calculations are estimated up-front and included in the DCP report. The final DCP levy table is a summary of individual infrastructure project calculations.

A simple example of the calculation process is shown in Table 10 below for four different development scenarios. Common across all four development scenarios is:

- The total development expected at the end of the planning period (full development) is 1,000 dwellings in 2041
- The cost of infrastructure committed to the area by the relevant council is \$1,000,000
- The resulting DCP levy is \$1,000 per dwelling in all four scenarios (i.e. \$1m divided by 1,000 dwellings).

The only difference between the scenarios is the balance between the number of dwellings that exist today (2021) and those that are expected to be constructed in the future (between 2021 and 2041). That balance between existing and future development affects the income return to the council for the committed infrastructure works - but the levy is the same in all scenarios.

The decision to use a DCP in Scenario 1 (Greenfield Growth Area) in Table 10 is perhaps easier for a council than it is in Scenario 4 (Heritage Suburb). In Scenario 1, the council will recover 100% of the cost of committed infrastructure from development contributions over time. However, in Scenario 4, the council expects to recover only 5% of the cost of committed infrastructure from development contributions.

Two other scenarios are shown in Table 10: Scenario 2 (Activity Centre with 50% cost recovery) and Scenario 3 (Suburban Infill Area with 15% cost recovery).

The utility of including the infrastructure commitment in a DCP in Scenario 4 is debatable, with common arguments for such examples being:



- Not worth it the expected income from development does not justify council having to commit to deliver the nominated infrastructure within a specified timeframe and to maintain externally auditable records to track DCP operation, or
- It is worth it the council will build that infrastructure whether it has a DCP or not so it might as well collect some funds from development over time to help pay for the works.

The decision may vary on an infrastructure project-by-project basis depending on:

- Expected financial return
- Effort and cost to prepare a DCP
- Management effort and accountability responsibilities
- Strategic importance of the infrastructure.

Table 10: DCP Calculation Example

Variab	le	Scenario 1 - Greenfield Growth Area	Scenario 2 - Activity Centre	Scenario 3 - Suburban Infill Area	Scenario 4 - Heritage Suburb
A	Existing dwellings in 2021	0	500	850	950
В	Projected future dwellings between 2021 and 2041	1,000	500	150	50
С	Total dwellings in 2041	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
D	Future dwellings as a share of total in 2041 (B/C)	100%	50%	15%	5%
E	Infrastructure committed to the area	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
F	DCP levy per dwelling (E/C)	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000
G	DCP cost recovery (DxF)	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$150,000	\$50,000
н	Funding gap (to be paid from consolidated revenue) (E-G)	\$0	\$500,000	\$850,000	\$950,000

It should be noted that DCP calculations can become complex due to technical matters specified in the DCP Guidelines to do with converting different development types into a common demand unit using equivalence ratios, and having regard to external use of infrastructure from beyond the main catchment area of a project. These matters are not shown in the simple example above.



12.3 Potential Cost Recovery from a DCP

The cost recovery estimate for Whitehorse will depend on which infrastructure projects are included in a DCP, the location and catchment area of the projects and extent of new development anticipated in the catchment areas. This is to be assessed in a DCP preparation process.

Nevertheless, the figure below provides a high level guide to potential cost recovery. This figure is based on anticipated residential development within the 17 areas of the municipality. The figure shows the share of projected new residential development to 2041 relative to total residential development at that time.

This data suggests cost recovery could be around 20% as a municipal average. The Box Hill Activity Centre would have a higher cost recovery rate, which could be around 50%, given the nature of development anticipated in that area. Some of the established suburbs like Surrey Hills would have a low cost recovery rate because a lower rate of growth is anticipated. This is one consideration in DCP development.



Figure 14: Preliminary DCP Cost Recovery Estimate by Area, 2021 to 2041

12.4 Guide to the Community Infrastructure Levy Cap

The cap that applies to the CIL is \$1,225 per dwelling (for the 2021-22 financial year).

As a guide, if all 22 community infrastructure CIL projects in Table 7 above served the municipality overall (90,487 dwellings at 2041), the CIL would be calculated as approximately \$2,600 per dwelling (i.e. \$235m divided by 90,487 dwellings at the end of the planning period equals \$2,598 per dwelling), but be capped by state legislation at \$1,225 per dwelling. Any allocation of CIL projects above approximately \$111m would breach the cap and provide



Council with no benefit of including such projects over and above this sum in a DCP. This is a guide only.

Actual levy and cap calculations are based on the location, cost and catchment area of specific projects. It is possible that some areas will have variable levies (i.e. some higher and some lower) and as such selection of DCP projects will need to test the impact of the CIL cap in project selection decision making.

Nevertheless, the \$235m starting list of potential CIL projects provides a sound basis for such assessment and selection of a priority CIL project list for a DCP.

12.5 Potential Financial Outcomes for Whitehorse

This could mean that a \$200m infrastructure cost DCP over 20 years (for example) could generate a cost recovery of approximately \$40m and have a \$160m funding gap. Council would be required to build the \$200m of works and report annually on DCP progress regardless of actual collection over time.

The estimates are scaled based on DCP cost commitment. For example, a \$100m infrastructure cost DCP over 20 years could generate a cost recovery of approximately \$20m and have an \$80m funding gap. Council would be required to build the \$100m of works.

The actual estimate for Whitehorse City Council would be calculated in a DCP development process.

12.6 Costs to Support a DCP

The ongoing cost to support a DCP will vary based on local circumstances.

In established area settings, it is typical for an officer to be appointed on a full time or 0.8 EFT basis during DCP set up and operation for say two years. Some councils maintain this staff loading throughout the DCP lifespan or some may be able to reduce the role to 0.5 EFT. The decision relates to the time effort involved in DCP operation and reporting.

That is, a DCP could cost in the vicinity of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per annum to operate with DCP levy income being a function of the cost of works Council commits to include in a DCP.

In the example above, this could be income of \$2m per annum based on Council delivering \$10m worth of DCP works on average each year.

Actual timing of expenditure can be staged and be undertaken at any time point during the DCP timeframe, including early in the DCP or in the later years. However, because most DCP projects are drawn from the current Capital Works Plan most tend to be delivered early in the life of the DCP whereas collection of levies occurs over 20 years.



12.7 Summary of Financial Implications for Whitehorse

The infrastructure cost recovery estimate from a Whitehorse DCP is to be confirmed in a DCP preparation process but is likely to be around 20% of the cost of committed infrastructure as a municipal average (higher in high growth areas and lower in low growth areas). The actual dollar value depends on the value of infrastructure projects Council includes in a DCP and commits to deliver.

Annual levy income could be \$1m to \$2m per year over 20 years if Council commits to deliver \$100m to \$200m worth of works in a DCP. The ongoing cost to support a DCP could be in the vicinity of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per annum.



13.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

13.1 Overview

Local government has access to funding options via local rates, grants and development contributions. Sales of assets can be another option.

Within the realm of rates, Council can utilise Special Rates and Charges in some circumstances. This is not a development levy but rather an additional rate for a period of time. This mechanism is not a long term solution to assist in funding the infrastructure items referenced in this report.

Within the realm of development contributions, the mechanisms available to Council to obtain infrastructure funding and / or works from development proponents via the planning system are typically: planning permit conditions, voluntary legal agreements, development contributions plan (DCP), open space levies and parking precinct plan cash in lieu schemes.

The Infrastructure Contribution Plan (ICP) system of development contributions as proposed by the State Government is available to only selected areas in the state, these being declared metropolitan Growth Areas. The ICP system may become available to established areas at some point in time, but there has been no confirmed State Government announcement on this as at June 2021.

Council currently utilises conditions and agreements for matters that relate to the needs and impacts of specific development proposals. However it is often challenging to achieve a meaningful community infrastructure needs assessment for single developments and these are done somewhat in isolation.

13.2 Open Space Levy

Council currently utilises open space levy contributions pursuant to the schedule at Clause 53.01 of the Planning Scheme to help deliver open space in the municipality.

The City of Whitehorse's existing schedule to clause 53.01 is based on the 2007 open space strategy and provides for a minimum 4% open space contribution across all land uses, along with an option to make a case for a higher rate for strategic sites.

In recent years some other established areas councils have increased mandatory rates for areas planned for development intensification.

It may be possible for Council to review its levy schedule if justified, based on an assessment of need and planned open space investments via an updated open space strategy. The Council budget for 2021-2022 includes funding for a new Open Space Strategy 2022-2037.

Moreover, wording used in the schedule could be clarified in accordance with discussion shown earlier in this report to improve levy schedule interpretation and operation.



13.3 Cash in Lieu of Parking Provision

Council could explore the option to add a cash in lieu component to the Box Hill Activity Centre Parking Overlay if a parking and / or sustainable transport project is needed and justified. The Box Hill Integrated Transport Strategy may be used to justify this approach.

The cash in lieu model may also apply to other major activity centres as nominated in the scoping study that Council previously prepared on this topic.

13.4 Development Contributions Plan

Council does not current utilise a Development Contributions Plan (DCP), which can be implemented via a DCP overlay in the Planning Scheme if justified.

The municipality is experiencing development similar to other established area councils and is faced with similar infrastructure delivery needs. In concept, Whitehorse could also prepare a DCP.

The ability of the municipality to do this depends on the specific infrastructure needs that are identified and whether these needs relate to development and are compliant with DCP tests.

This report has found that Council has a significant list of works which can be considered for DCP application. The projects are supported by a significant body of policy and strategy information.

13.5 Development Projections

The municipality is expected to experience continuing growth, particularly residential, commercial and retail floorspace development to at least 2041. The growth is expected to be focused in and near activity centres, employment nodes and transport corridors, but there will also be broad-based infill development. This context will enable the preparation of a municipal wide DCP.

The municipal development estimates are shown below (also available for 17 areas within the municipality):

- Residential dwellings to increase from 71,200 in 2020 to 90,500 by 2041
- Retail floorspace to increase from 584,300 sqm in 2020 to 723,100 sqm in 2041
- Commercial floorspace to increase from 1.32m sqm in 2020 to 1.63m sqm in 2041
- Industrial floorspace to increase from 1.04m sqm in 2020 to 1.09m sqm in 2041.

The projections shown in this report take into account the potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on possible future population and development conditions.

13.6 Infrastructure Projects

A preliminary list of infrastructure projects that could be considered for a DCP or similar funding mechanism is available via Council's capital works planning process. A preliminary list



of 106 projects with a total cost of approximately \$287m has been identified for further consideration. Most are community facility projects.

There are also a number of other funding allocations and programs (\$178m) that may contain additional DCP projects if more detail can be provided.

Additional project review and detailing is required in a DCP process to confirm the status of projects.

13.7 Analysis Areas

The 17 suburb-based data areas as provided by ID Consulting can be used as a sound default starting point for development of a DCP for Whitehorse. The areas can be adjusted and modified if there is a reason to do so in the DCP preparation process. The areas would be confirmed or modified in a DCP preparation process.

These areas are used by Council in a range of planning projects and represent communities of interest.

13.8 Potential Cost Recovery from a DCP

A DCP collects levies based on development that requires a planning and / or building permit. It does not collect levies from development that has been constructed (and obtained required permits) prior to the DCP becoming legally operational (via gazettal of a DCP overlay in the Planning Scheme).

This means that a DCP will have a funding gap in proportion to the amount of existing development compared to total projected development at the end of the DCP planning horizon, which can be 2041.

The cost recovery estimate for Whitehorse will depend on which infrastructure projects are included in a DCP, the location and catchment area of the projects and extent of new development anticipated in the catchment areas. This will be assessed in a DCP preparation process.

Nevertheless, a preliminary estimate suggests cost recovery could be around 20% as a municipal average. The Box Hill Activity Centre would have a higher cost recovery rate, which could be around 50%, given the nature of development anticipated in that area. Some of the established suburbs like Surrey Hills would have a low cost recovery rate because a lower rate of growth is anticipated. This is one consideration in DCP development.

13.9 Commitment to Deliver

For a DCP to be approved, Council will need to identify and commit to deliver a list of infrastructure items (that are eligible for DCP use in accordance with the information shown in this report) and be required to report on delivery of the DCP each year.

The DCP project list will invariably be a component part of the overall list of works Council will deliver over time via its Capital Works Plan.



Given variable cost recovery rates for projects (by location), only those projects that are committed for delivery (and perhaps would have been delivered even without a DCP) may be the most suitable for DCP consideration. In that sense, a DCP in an established area can be viewed as helping to defray the cost of infrastructure over time, as opposed to being a primary funding source of the works.

13.10 Conclusions

The findings of this report are as follows:

- Whitehorse City Council has a significant body of policy, strategy and infrastructure project information which can be developed into a DCP.
- Not all of Council's planned future works should or can be included in a DCP. Only those that pass DCP tests can be included and only some of Council's community infrastructure projects should be selected for a DCP (up to the point the state mandated cap for Community Infrastructure Levies is reached).
- On that basis a DCP would sit alongside Council's broader Capital Works Plan and include some projects for partial developer funding.
- This report has found that a DCP preparation process should adopt a municipal-wide geographic scope. This is because potential DCP projects are spread across the municipality and many have broad service catchments.
- In terms of potential financial outcomes, a DCP may be able to deliver annual levy income in the order of \$1m to \$2m per year over 20 years if Council commits to deliver \$100m to \$200m worth of works in a DCP. The ongoing cost to support a DCP could be in the vicinity of \$50,000 to \$100,000 per annum.

Attachment 1

Proliminar	DCP List
Prenimary	Y DCP LISL

Project Number	DCP No	Project	Category	Sub Category	Cost to Council	DCP category
2014-113	1	Whitehorse Centre Redevelopment	Property	Buildings	\$20,524,830	CFDI
2014-16	2	Reconstruction Wellington Road, Box Hill	Infrastructure	Roads	\$625,000	RDDI
2014-164	3	Pipetrack Shared Path Stage 1E - Norma Road to Springvale Road Construction	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$280,000	PADI
2014-168	4	Pipetrack Shared Path Stage 2A - Springvale Road to Menin Road	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$390,000	PADI
2014-171	5	Pipetrack Shared Path Stage 2B - Menin Road to Rooks Road	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$460,000	PADI
2014-172	6	Pipetrack Shared Path Stage 3A - Mitcham Road to Reserve Avenue	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$295,000	PADI
2014-174	7	Pipetrack Shared Path Stage 3B- Reserve Avenue to Brunswick Road	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$220,000	PADI
2014-200	8	Morack Golf Course - Improvements to greens, tees, paths and drains	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$1,440,000	OSDI
2014-48	9	Streetscape - Blackburn Station Village Masterplan Implementation	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$500,000	OSDI
2014-49	10	Streetscape - Box Hill Central Activities Area	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$2,900,000	OSDI
2016-291	11	Reconstruction Windsor Crescent, Surrey Hills	Infrastructure	Roads	\$600,000	RDDI
2016-292	12	Streetscape - Cromwell Street and McIntyre Street Shops	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$180,000	OSDI
2016-316	13	Eley Park Pavilion Refurbishment	Property	Buildings	\$870,000	CFCI
2016-318	14	Heatherdale Reserve Pavilion Refurbishment	Property	Buildings	\$6,027,000	CFCI
2016-319	15	Mahoneys North Pavilion Refurbishment	Property	Buildings	\$7,788,000	CFCI
2016-320	16	Surrey Park South West Pavilion Redevelopment	Property	Buildings	\$9,113,000	CFCI
2016-323	17	Sparks Reserve South Pavilion Refurbishment	Property	Buildings	\$7,875,000	CFCI
2016-346	18	Morack Golf Course Pavilion, Driving Range and Mini Golf Facility Construction	Property	Buildings	\$6,570,000	CFCI
2017-398	19	Sparks Reserve West Pavilion Redevelopment	Property	Buildings	\$2,790,000	CFCI
2017-401	20	Yarran Dheran Reserve Information Centre Refurbishment	Property	Buildings	\$660,000	CFCI
2018-442	21	East Burwood Reserve South Pavilion Ramp Design and Feasibility Works	Property	Buildings Improvement	\$150,000	CFCI
2018-455	22	Koonung Reserve Pavilion	Property	Buildings	\$8,156,250	CFCI
2018-461	23	East Burwood Reserve South Pavilion	Property	Buildings	\$5,400,000	CFCI
2018-462	24	Vermont Reserve Pavilion	Property	Buildings	\$6,666,000	CFCI
2018-465	25	Lighting at Bennettswood Reserve North Oval	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$450,000	OSDI
2018-475	26	Ballyshannassy Park Pavilion	Property	Buildings	\$730,000	CFCI
2018-484	27	Whitehorse Reserve play space	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$75,000	OSDI
2019-497	28	Aqualink Box Hill Outdoor pool shade structure	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$187,000	OSDI
2019-508	29	Lighting - Box Hill Gardens Basketball Court	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$167,000	OSDI
2019-510	30	Streetscape - Britannia Mall, Mitcham	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$0	OSDI
2019-515	31	Henry Street, Box Hill Reconstruction	Infrastructure	Roads	\$100,000	RDDI
2019-517	32	Asquith Street, Box Hill South Reconstruction	Infrastructure	Roads	\$500,000	RDDI
2019-518	33	Enterprise Way, Mitcham Reconstruction	Infrastructure	Roads	\$109,000	RDDI
2019-535	34	Sportlink Multi Purpose Facility Redevelopment	Property	Buildings	\$6,570,000	CFCI
2020-553	35	Box Hill Integrated Transport Strategy (BHITS) Implementation	Infrastructure	Footpaths and Cycleways	\$6,360,000	PADI
2020-554	36	Streetscape - Vermont Shopping Centre Stage 2	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$700,000	OSDI
2020-555	37	Streetscape - Nunawading Shopping Centre Design	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$100,000	OSDI
PS1053	38	Surrey Dive - Playspace renewal - Municipal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$640,000	OSDI
PS3039	39	Lucknow Close Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3049	40	Heatherdale Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI

Project Number	DCP No	Project	Category	Sub Category	Cost to Council	DCP category
PS4004	41	Boisdale Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS5026	42	Benwerrin Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS5054	43	Pickford Paddock (North) - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS2067	44	Blacks Walk - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS3002	45	Lemon Grove Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS5043	46	Mahoneys Reserve - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS5061	47	East Burwood Reserve (South) - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS6037	48	Thatcher Reserve - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS1012	49	Memorial Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS1014	50	Springfield Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS1059	51	Combarton Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS2007	52	Koonung Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS2024	53	Cootamundra Walk (South East) - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS2028	54	Elmhurst Basin - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS2066	55	Kalang Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS3007	56	Walker Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3019	57	Schwerkolt Cottage - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3029	58	Berry Way - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3050	59	Laidlaw Court Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3052	60	Scott Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS4041	61	Murray Drive Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5004	62	Branksome Grove Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5008	63	Hunters Knoll - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5010	64	Edinburgh Patch - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS5016	65	Hurter-Finch Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5028	66	Ballyshanassy Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5038	67	Highbury Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS6001	68	Forest Hill Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS6018	69	Scarborough Park - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS6031	70	Spark Rise - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS6032	71	Bellbird Dell (North) - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS6062	72	Licola Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS6071	73	Billabong Park (North) - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS1005	74	Manniche Avenue Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS1010	75	Trainor Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI
PS1022	76	Halligan Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS1024	77	Willow Street Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS1041	78	Beatty Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS1050	79	Surrey Drive Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS1061	80	Belmore Road Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS1072	81	Gawler Chain (Central) - Playspace renewal - Nhood	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$240,000	OSDI

Project Number	DCP No	Project	Category	Sub Category	Cost to Council	DCP category
PS2003	82	Middlefield Park - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS2026	83	Pope Square - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS2057	84	Halley Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS2070	85	Cootamundra Walk (Central) - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3014	86	Casella Hollow - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3023	87	Trenham Court Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3030	88	Sim Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3035	89	Charles Rooks Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS3055	90	Park Close Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS4002	91	Russell Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS4022	92	Newbiain Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5013	93	Fulton Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5017	94	Eley Park (North) - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5040	95	Tainton Road Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
PS5041	96	Cloverdale Close Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5048	97	Norma Road Reserve - Playspace renewal - Local	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$125,000	OSDI
PS5049	98	Mock Street Reserve - Playspace renewal - Smalllocal	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$70,000	OSDI
1000	99	Box Hill City Oval Precinct redevelopment	Infrastructure	Parks, Open Space and Streetscapes	\$5,500,000	OSDI
1001	100	Sportlink - 2 additional indoor courts, new portal frame over outdoor courts (includes LED Lighitng), rebuild multi-purpose room.	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$16,200,000	CFCI
1002	101	East Burwood Master Plan - Review the existing facilities within East Burwood Reserve for current and future use. Determine future of Whitehorse Club and extent of development of Nunawading Basketball Centre.	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$150,000	CFCI
1003	102	Nunawading Gymnastics & Sports Club Upgrade Extend the facility to ensure compliance with sport codes and upgrade amenities.	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$8,100,000	CFCI
1004	103	Slater Reserve - Upgrade Demolish and rebuild two indoor court Basketball/Netball facility and amenities	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$19,900,000	CFCI
1005	104	Nunawading Basketball Centre Outcomes of East Burwood Master Plan to determine design. Current high level cost is for a two storey facility and includes Whitehorse Club existing amenities in new design.	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$86,000,000	CFCI
1006	105	Aqualink Box Hill Additional two indoor courts, storage and amenities, with allowance to explore car parking options.	Infrastructure	Recreational, Leisure and Community Facilities	\$15,180,000	CFCI

Total

\$287,011,139



Disclaimer

- 1. This report is for the confidential use only of the party to whom it is addressed ("Client") for the specific purposes to which it refers and has been based on, and takes into account, the Client's specific instructions. It is not intended to be relied on by any third party who, subject to paragraph 3, must make their own enquiries in relation to the issues with which this report deals.
- 2. HillPDA makes no representations as to the appropriateness, accuracy or completeness of this report for the purpose of any party other than the Client ("Recipient"). HillPDA disclaims all liability to any Recipient for any loss, error or other consequence which may arise as a result of the Recipient acting, relying upon or using the whole or part of this report's contents.
- 3. This report must not be disclosed to any Recipient or reproduced in whole or in part, for any purpose not directly connected to the project for which HillPDA was engaged to prepare the report, without the prior written approval of HillPDA. In the event that a Recipient wishes to rely upon this report, the Recipient must inform HillPDA who may, in its sole discretion and on specified terms, provide its consent.
- 4. This report and its attached appendices are based on estimates, assumptions and information provided by the Client or sourced and referenced from external sources by HillPDA. While we endeavour to check these estimates, assumptions and information, no warranty is given in relation to their reliability, feasibility, accuracy or reasonableness. HillPDA presents these estimates and assumptions as a basis for the Client's interpretation and analysis. With respect to forecasts, HillPDA does not present them as results that will actually be achieved. HillPDA relies upon the interpretation of the Client to judge for itself the likelihood of whether these projections can be achieved or not.
- 5. Due care has been taken to prepare the attached financial models from available information at the time of writing, however no responsibility can be or is accepted for errors or inaccuracies that may have occurred either with the programming or the resultant financial projections and their assumptions.
- 6. This report does not constitute a valuation of any property or interest in property. In preparing this report HillPDA has relied upon information concerning the subject property and/or proposed development provided by the Client and HillPDA has not independently verified this information except where noted in this report.
- 7. In relation to any valuation which is undertaken for a Managed Investment Scheme (as defined by the Managed Investments Act 1998) or for any lender that is subject to the provisions of the Managed Investments Act, the following clause applies:

This valuation is prepared on the assumption that the lender or addressee as referred to in this valuation report (and no other) may rely on the valuation for mortgage finance purposes and the lender has complied with its own lending guidelines as well as prudent finance industry lending practices, and has considered all prudent aspects of credit risk for any potential borrower, including the borrower's ability to service and repay any mortgage loan. Further, the valuation is prepared on the assumption that the lender is providing mortgage financing at a conservative and prudent loan to value ratio.

8. HillPDA makes no representations or warranties of any kind, about the accuracy, reliability, completeness, suitability or fitness in relation to maps generated by HillPDA or contained within this report.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under the Professional Standards Legislation



SYDNEY

Level 3, 234 George Street Sydney NSW 2000 GPO Box 2748 Sydney NSW 2001 t: +61 2 9252 8777 f: +61 2 9252 6077 e: <u>sydney@hilpda.com</u>

MELBOURNE

Suite 114, 838 Collins Street Docklands VIC 3008 t: +61 3 9629 1842 f: +61 3 9629 6315 e: melbourne@hillpda.com

WWW.HILLPDA.COM