



CITY OF VINCENT

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING

21 November 2016 AT 6.00PM

Venue: City of Vincent – Function Room

UNCONFIRMED MINUTES

Attendees:

City of Vincent Councillors:

Cr Loden (*Chair*), Cr Cole, Cr Gontaszewski

Community Representatives:

David White, Halinka Lamparski, Isaac Lorca, Stephen Danti, Chris Cutress, Kim Frankowiak

City of Vincent Officers:

Manager Policy and Place (MPP), Sustainability Officer (SO), Project Officer Parks and Environment (POPAE)

1. Welcome/Declaration of Opening

The Chair opened the meeting at 6.10pm.

2. Apologies

Director Development Services (DDS), Director Technical Services, Chiara Pacifici, Sally Madden, Lisa Edwards, Kimberley Dupuy

3. Confirmation of Minutes

Minutes from meeting on 24 October 2016 were confirmed by all in attendance.

4. Lawler Street Sump – design options / costings

Halinka's Lamparski's design (prepared with assistance from David White):

- 90m³ of storage required for a 1-in-10 year event (based on advice received from one of the City's technical officers)
- Drainage cells and geotextile fabric for 90m³ estimated to cost \$20,000 (quotes obtained from two of the three suppliers for this product)
- Installation is simple and can be done in-house (cost to be determined)

- Additional materials needed: blue metal filler around cells, soil for planting on top (~1m depth), plants
- Total cost for this option likely to be ~ \$40,000-60,000
- Other considerations:
 - Ground water level is more than 10m deep and the site soil is freely draining sand (minimal risk)
 - Plantings on top of the water storage cells need to be appropriate for 1m soil depth, but larger trees can be planted around the perimeter of the site in deeper soil zones
 - Maintenance of the drainage cells is simple (done with the same equipment that is used for clearing street drains) but must be done to prevent the system blocking up, which would lead to drainage failure

Actions:

- Halinka to contact the City's Manager Asset and Design Services to confirm some of the assumptions used above, particularly the storage volume, then amend the design and post the details on Loomio
- EAG members to consider and provide comment/support via Loomio
- SO to pass the this design and the Group's consensus about the design to DTS

Alternative design by DTS:

- 150m³ storage to accommodate a 1-in-20-year event
- Initially sought to find a solution using gully soak wells only, which would have allowed the sump to be filled in completely, but this was not feasible – some water storage will still need to be provided at the sump site
- Compromise: 100m³ drainage cells at the sump site plus 50m³ gully soak wells along Lawler and Bedford Streets (requires 12 new gully soak wells)

As DTS was unable to attend this meeting, questions from the Group about this design option will be addressed via follow-up email:

- Why is this design based on a 1-in-20 year event? (Increasing frequency of heavy rainfall events / increasing hardstand from surrounding developments?)
- Estimated cost for the design?
- Is there a larger benefit from the distributed infiltration provided by gully soak wells compared to the single point infiltration provided by the sump?
- Would it be simpler and cheaper to deepen the existing hole to accommodate 150m³ and filling it with drainage cells?

Action:

- SO to pass on the above questions to DTS.
- DTS to respond to the group via email.

Recommendation:

That the options to turn this site into a community green space be considered by Administration and presented to council. Proposed pathway to Council: DTS and Director Corporate Services to discuss and identify the purpose and potential uses for this land, then take the available options to a Council Workshop. Council may then allocate budget for the preferred option. If there is to be a public space, the local community should be consulted on the (above ground) design of that space.

5. Meeting Schedule for 2017

The Group agreed to a fixed meeting schedule for 2017. Meetings of the whole Group will be held on a Monday at eight week intervals. First meeting for 2017 will be held on 20 February.

Sub-group meetings will be called as required.

Action: SO to set up the meeting schedule and send out calendar invitations

6. Other Business / Matters arising from previous Minutes

6.1 Composting Proposal

The Chair asked the Group to consider a proposal from community Group Transition Town Vincent (formerly Transition Town Mount Hawthorn) to set up a community compost hub at the public mulch pile site on Britannia Road Reserve.

The proposal indicated that the initiative would provide an opportunity for households (and potentially schools/businesses) that otherwise don't have capacity to compost their own organic waste to take it to a centralised location where this can be done for them. It would also serve as a fund-raising activity for the Transition Town Group via the sale of compost.

There were a number of questions from the Group, including:

- Is it the role of the City to facilitate this service or is the market already providing such services for individuals and organisations?
- Is the proposed site the best location for a compost hub?
- What level of involvement is expected from the City?
- What is the likely level of support/objection from the surrounding residents?
- What are the potential risks?

Most of the above questions remain to be answered, but the group gave its qualified support for the idea and agreed that it was an idea worth investigating.

The EAG's support is contingent on:

- Local community support for the initiative
- The project being self-sustaining (not placing an on-going impost on the City's resources)

Recommendation:

That Administration start a conversation with TTV to clarify the proposal. Consider the likely impact of the Britannia Road Reserve Master Plan (to be developed in 2017).

Action: POPAE and SO to commence the conversation with TTV by providing a list of questions to be addressed in order to clarify the proposal.

6.2 Administration response to EAG's waste trial proposal

The Chair requested that Administration's response to the EAG's waste trial proposal be presented to the whole Group (having previously been discussed in detail only at a Quick Wins Sub-group meeting).

Administration's response:

- The EAG proposed three trial design options:
 - 1) 140L weekly rubbish and 240L or 360L fortnightly recycling
 - 2) 240L fortnightly rubbish and 240L or 360L fortnightly recycling
 - 3) 240L weekly rubbish and 360L fortnightly recycling
- Option two is not operationally feasible as it would require a fortnightly general waste collection – our waste services are not equipped to check individual household collection dates and will empty all bins presented. This option would also include a requirement for household composting, which would not be possible to set up in advance of trial commencement.
- Administration's preferred trial design is a combination of options 1 and 2 above: 140L or 240L weekly rubbish and 360L fortnightly recycling.
- EAG proposed targeting pensioners and minimum rate residents for the trial. Administration does not agree with this approach as the data collected from the trial needs to be as representative of the wider community as possible. Administration intends to select trial participants across the full spectrum of household types and perceived waste management needs.
- Weekly data collection from participating households will provide information about:
 - Whether increased recycling capacity leads to increased diversion of recyclable materials from landfill
 - The accuracy of residents' perceptions about their own bin needs
 - The pros and cons of various bin size combinations
- SO flagged that the officers tasked with delivering the waste trial are unsure about Council's expectation from the trial – what are the specific questions that Council would like the trial to answer?
- SO Also flagged concern from Administration officers about the potential timeline for the roll-out of bin options following adoption of a separated waste charge. Should Council adopt a separated waste levy and bin options with varying costs at the same time, there will be insufficient time between the adoption of the Budget and issuing of rates notices to reflect any changes in bin preferences on the rates notice for that year.

Outcomes:

- EAG accepted Administration's response to its waste trial proposal
- Cr Loden, Cr Cole and Cr Gontaszewski acknowledged officers' concerns about the timeline for rollout of bin-options as described above, and advised that they would like an opportunity for Council to meet with the officers involved in the waste trial to clarify what information Council wished to obtain from the trial.

Action: SO to convey the above outcomes to DTS

6.3 Additional business – educating the EAG on matters being considered

Chiara Pacifici was unable to attend the meeting but asked SO to pass on the following suggestion to the EAG:

- That future meetings be structured to allow a 20 minute presentation on the major topic of discussion for that meeting prior to the group considering the matter. The benefit being a more informed Group and better subsequent recommendations.

This proposal was discussed by the group and acknowledged as a valid option. However, rather than adopting a standard 20 minute information session as part of every meeting, the group agreed that this could be provided on an as-needed basis. In some cases, introductory reading material could be provided ahead of the meeting instead.

7. Next meeting

Next meeting 20 Feb 2017

8. Close

The Chair closed the meeting at 7.42pm

These Minutes were confirmed as a true and correct record of the meeting of the Environmental Advisory Group held on 21 November 2016.

Signed: Chairperson

Dated: This day of 2017