

MAV State Council Meeting – 23 October 2015

MOTION

FUNDING FOR SCHOOL FOCUSED YOUTH SERVICE PROGRAM

Submitted by: Manningham City Council

MOTION:

That the MAV State Council write to the State Minister for Education advocating for a further three year program funding to enable the Statewide School Focused Youth Service program (SFYS) to continue to be implemented across schools and communities beyond December 2015.

RATIONALE:

The School Focussed Youth Service (SFYS) is a statewide initiative established to support young people with complex needs or emerging mental health issues to remain engaged in learning.

Through the SFYS, schools and community organisations support at risk young people who require prevention or early intervention strategies to assist their learning, development, health and wellbeing.

The key strength and uniqueness of SFYS is underpinned by a holistic community approach with the development of strong local partnerships between schools and the broader community. In this, SFYS is critical in building the capacity and expertise to deliver responsive, preventative services and activities to support young people.

Funding for SFYS concludes at the end of 2015. Ongoing funding to continue this vital service is critical to ensure that risk factors are addressed or mitigated and at risk young people continue to be engaged and connected to education.

Note: Motions must be submitted by **one council but may be supported by other councils. The council submitting the motion will need to supply written confirmation from any council(s) listed as supporting the motion. All relevant background information in support of the motion should be included in the space provided for the rationale and not in attachments. **The motion and rationale should be no longer than one page.***

MAV State Council Meeting – 23 October 2015

MOTION

TITLE: MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE VICTORIAN BUILDING AUTHORITY

Submitted by: Manningham City Council

MOTION:

That the MAV urge the State Government to:

- bring forward a motion of no confidence in the Victorian Building Authority and their ability to regulate for a quality built environment in Victoria; and
- take prompt and decisive action to ensure that ongoing failings of the Victorian Building Authority are addressed to ensure that Private Building Surveyors are properly monitored and regulated to ensure that consumers are protected from defective building work and unsafe practices; and
- if the State Government decides it is necessary for Local Government to step in to monitor and regulate the Private Building Permit System within their municipalities, that an appropriate portion of the Building Permit Levy is redirected to Local Government to allow for the necessary resourcing and expense of fulfilling this important and onerous function.

RATIONALE:

In 2011, the Victorian Auditors General Office found that the former Building Commission ‘could not demonstrate that the building permit system was working effectively or that building surveyors are effectively discharging their role to uphold and enforce minimum building and safety standards’. An audit of building approval processes revealed that:

- Ninety-six per cent of permits examined did not comply with minimum statutory building and safety standards.” Instead, the results have revealed a system marked by confusion and inadequate practice, including lack of transparency and accountability for decisions made.
- In the absence of leadership, guidance and rigorous scrutiny from the commission, councils have adopted a largely reactive approach to enforcing the *Building Act 1993* that offers little assurance of compliance within their municipalities.
- Consequently, there is little assurance that surveyors are carrying out their work competently, that the *Building Act 1993* is being complied with, and the risk of injury or damage to any person is being minimised.

Since the adoption of the newly badged Victorian Building Authority (VBA) in 2013 the VBA has continued to fail to demonstrate that the building permit system is working effectively or that building surveyors are effectively discharging their role to uphold and enforce minimum building and safety standards. As such, the VBA has lost the trust and respect of Councils and the community.

Although the VBA has had a number of years to address these issues, the most recent 2015 audit into the state’s consumer protection framework for building industry regulation highlighted that many problems within the system had not been addressed. This is reflected on the ground with the alarming recent examples of the crumbling construction pit in Mount Waverley and the Docklands

highrise apartment fire.

Local Government urges the State to act on the many damning findings of the VAGO reports to restore confidence and address fundamental inadequacy of the current system. For the protection of our community.

MAV State Council Meeting – 23 October 2015

To submit a motion for consideration by State Council on 23 October 2015, please complete this form and email to [State Council](#), **no later than Friday, 25 September 2015**. Please note, deadlines are strictly observed.

MOTION

MAV – METRO PLANNING LEVY

Submitted by: Manningham City Council

MOTION:

That the MAV advocate to the State Government to

- (a) review the appropriateness of the Metropolitan Planning Levy given the introduction of the Fair Go Rate cap, and grant an exemption for community facilities planned by Councils;
- And (b) call for a substantial increase to planning permit fees so that Councils can recover their costs.

RATIONALE:

It is time for the State Government to give Councils a 'fair go' by reviewing the Metropolitan Planning Levy (MPL) and grant an exemption for community facilities built by Councils.

The MPL commenced on 1 July 2015. New provisions in the Planning and Environment Act 1987 require a levy payment prior to making a planning permit application for developments valued at over \$1 million within metropolitan council areas.

The MPL must be paid before lodging a planning permit with Council by obtaining an MLP Certificate which is only valid for 90 days, adding further administrative delay and cost to development projects. If the MPL Certificate expires before lodgement, a new certificate and fee applies.

Although the MPL aims to "improve the planning system and facilitate implementation of key planning initiatives to ensure quality growth and development of the Melbourne metropolitan area", it can be demonstrated that it has become a potential barrier to growth and development:

- The MPL rate is set at \$1.30 per \$1000 (or 0.13% of the whole value of the development) for affected projects. For an \$18 million community facility the Levy payable by a Council is \$22,000. It is not appropriate for rate payer or grant monies to be paid to the State Government rather they should be invested in better local facilities.
- Councils pride themselves on delivering quality services and facilities for local communities in an efficient and effective manner. Achieving this goal is highly challenging in an environment where the core business of Council is being significantly stretched through ongoing cost shifting from State and Federal governments.
- As Victoria's population is projected to increase continuously to 7.6 million in 2031 and 9.8 million in 2061, it is imperative that the State Government work in partnership with Local Government, rather than taxing the growth of community facilities.

In contrast successive State Governments have continually failed to increase planning permit fees so that Councils can simply recover their costs, leaving ratepayers to effectively subsidize development assessments.

State Council requests that the State Government reviews the MPL and its appropriateness in light of the above, and calls for a substantial increase to planning permit fees.

Note: Motions must be submitted by **one council but may be supported by other councils. The council submitting the motion will need to supply written confirmation from any council(s) listed as supporting the motion. All relevant background information in support of the motion should be included in the space provided for the rationale and not in attachments. **The motion and rationale should be no longer than one page.***